

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

BF
1011
1568
21

VOLUME XVI.

(CONTAINING PART XLI.)

1901.

*The responsibility for both the facts and the reasonings in papers published
in the Proceedings rests entirely with their authors.*

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER AND CO., LIMITED,
CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.

1901.

[*The Rights of Translation and Reproduction are reserved.*]

ERRATA.

pp. 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, and 623—for “Miss C.” read “Miss B.”
p. 621, line 45—for “Miss G.” read “Miss B.”

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH,
PART XLI.

A FURTHER RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS OF CERTAIN
TRANCE PHENOMENA.

BY JAMES HERVEY HYSLOP, PH.D.

(Professor of Logic and Ethics in Columbia University, New York.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTION, pp. 4-19 ;

Hypothesis of fraud, pp. 5-9 ; Conditions and precautions in arranging the experiments, pp. 10-13 ; Description of the mode of experimenting and making the record, pp. 13-15 ; Explanation of the general discussion, pp. 15-17 ; Explanation of the contents of the Report, pp. 17-19.

CHAPTER II.—GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE FACTS, pp. 20-123 ;

Preliminary remarks, pp. 20-21 ; Analysis of the first sitting, pp. 21-26 ; Summary of communicators' statements, pp. 26-115 ; (1) Robert Hyslop, pp. 28-85 ; Recapitulation of same, pp. 85-90 ; James Carruthers, pp. 90-94 ; Recapitulation of same, pp. 94-95 ; Robert McClellan, pp. 95-99 ; Recapitulation of same, pp. 99-100 ; Charles Hyslop, pp. 100-104 ; Recapitulation of same, pp. 104-105 ; Annie Hyslop, pp. 105-108 ; Recapitulation of same, p. 108 ; James McClellan, pp. 108-111 ; Recapitulation of same, p. 111 ; John McClellan, pp. 111-113 ; Statistical summary, pp. 115-123.

CHAPTER III.—THE TELEPATHIC HYPOTHESIS, pp. 124-157 ;

Definition of telepathy and explanation of the problem, pp. 124-128 ; General conditions to be met by telepathy, pp. 127-131 ; Classification of incidents bearing upon the hypothesis of telepathy, pp. 131-133 ; Limitations of telepathy as a scientific hypothesis, pp. 133-137 ; Special arguments against telepathy, pp. 137-157 ; (1) Selectiveness of the process, pp. 137-139 ; (2) Magnitude of its application to all living consciousness and memory, pp. 139-142 ; (3) Inconsistency of its mistakes and confusion with the assumption of its easy access to all living memories, pp. 142-146 ; (4) Differences in clearness of the communicators, pp. 146-147 ; (5) Inconstancy of the communications and changes of communicators, pp. 147-149 ; (6) Inconsistencies in its assumptions, pp. 149-150 ; (7) Variations of the *point de repère*, pp. 150-151 ; (8) Reproduction of what would be expected on the spiritistic theory, pp. 151-152 ; (9) Necessity of combining various other processes and assumptions with telepathy, pp. 152-154 ; General difficulties, illustrations, and summary, pp. 154-157.

CHAPTER IV.—THE SPIRITISTIC HYPOTHESIS, pp. 158-241 ;

The unity of consciousness in the communications, pp. 158-176 ; The general unity of the phenomena, pp. 160-170 ; Synthetic unity of individual incidents, pp. 170-176 ; The dramatic play of personality, pp. 176-214 ; Nature of the argument from dramatic play, pp. 176-177 ; The place of the trance personalities in this play, pp. 177-182 ; Analysis of the dramatic play in the first sitting, pp. 184-190 ; Illustrations of dramatic play in the later sittings, pp. 190-211 ; Summary of George Pelham's interruptions, pp. 211-213 ; Argument from confusion and error, pp. 214-238 ; Relation of mistake and confusion to telepathy and other assumptions, pp. 214-221 ; Illustrations, pp. 221-238 ; Automatisms, pp. 238-241.

CHAPTER V.—DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS, pp. 242-288 ;

General nature of the difficulties, pp. 242-244 ; Objection from the nature of "proof," pp. 244-247 ; Influence of suggestion, pp. 247-248 ; Objection from the triviality of the messages, pp. 248-250 ; Clairvoyance and telepathy at a distance, pp. 250-256 ; Objection from the limitation of communicators to friends and relatives, pp. 256-258 ; The conditions of existence after death, pp. 258-262 ; The identity and independent personality of Imperator and Rector, pp. 262-268 ; The combination of telepathy and secondary personality, pp. 268-273 ; Unity of the Phinuit and Imperator *régimes*, pp. 273-280 ; Relation of secondary personality to the spiritistic theory, pp. 280-285 ; Objection from the alleged mental degeneration of spirits, pp. 285-288.

CHAPTER VI.—CONCLUSION, pp. 289-296 ;

Reasons for scepticism, pp. 289-290 ; Magnitude of the theories alternative to spiritism, p. 290-292 ; Contradictions and weaknesses of the telepathic hypothesis, pp. 292-294 ; Tentative character of the conclusion, pp. 294-296.

APPENDICES AND NOTES, pp. 297-645.

APPENDIX I.—Detailed record of first four personal sittings, pp. 297-344.

Latest Notes to Appendix I., pp. 344-366.

APPENDIX II.—Detailed record of Dr. Hodgson's five sittings in my behalf, pp. 367-407.

Latest notes to Appendix II., pp. 408-416.

APPENDIX III.—Detailed record of last eight personal sittings, pp. 417-536.

Latest notes to Appendix III., pp. 497-536.

APPENDIX IV.—Experiments on the Identification of Personality, pp. 537-623.

APPENDIX V.—Experiments on Communication through a Tube, pp. 624-634.

APPENDIX VI.—Experiments in Hypnosis, pp. 635-642.

APPENDIX VII.—Quotations bearing on the Mental Condition of the Communicator while Communicating, pp. 643-645.

A FURTHER RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS OF CERTAIN TRANCE PHENOMENA.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES H. HYSLOP.

(This paper is a sequel to those in *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 436-659; Vol. VIII., pp. 1-167; Vol. XIII., pp. 284-582; Vol. XIV., pp. 6-78.)

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.¹

The problem which presents itself in the present record of experiments with Mrs. Piper is simply that of *personal identity*, and not any of the larger claims of the doctrine of "spiritualism." Both the question of the supernormal and that of general "spiritualism" are thrown out of court, the one on the ground that it has to be assumed to escape the other, and the second on the ground that its wider

¹ It seems to me desirable to warn American, and perhaps some English, readers against a misapprehension of the pretensions in this report. I presented some of the facts of this report last spring (June 4th, 1899) before the Cambridge Conferences (Massachusetts, U.S.A.). Though I was extremely careful in that address not to make any final choice, any more than I do now, between the alternative theories which I stated, the facts aroused the usual newspaper interest. I was interviewed by reporters to whom I absolutely refused to tell my facts or any settled opinions. But it was immediately published and quoted in the newspapers all over the United States, and in some parts of the United Kingdom, that I proposed to "scientifically demonstrate the immortality of the soul within a year." There is no foundation for the attribution of such a claim to myself. The facts are these: I was seen by only four or five reporters. I refused absolutely to tell them a single fact in my sittings, but referred them to previous Reports and talked only of the frauds and illusions connected with the subject. In response to the question whether I proposed to scientifically demonstrate immortality, I was extremely careful to say, "No, I do not," and stated the alternative theories between which we have to choose. I knew too well the *a priori* standards which characterise the conceptions of those who think they know what a "scientific demonstration" is, and not only did not claim any such efficiency for my facts, but was emphatic in disclaiming any such pretensions. But knowing what impressions widely-circulated statements produce, and that even men who claim to possess scientific intelligence either accept newspaper reports as true or snatch at them for the sake of using a standard for heaping ridicule upon those against whom they have no facts to produce, I have also been careful to state to the scientific public in two of its most important publications in America (*Science*, November 10th, 1899, Vol. X., p. 695; *The Psychological Review*, January, 1900, Vol. VII., p. 84) just what I have indicated above. I make no claims to "scientifically demonstrating" anything, not even my facts. I have given a preference for the spiritistic theory in explanation of my alleged facts, in order to force the issue on an important investigation and in order to devolve upon those who have not accepted any supernormal phenomena at all the duty of rescuing me from illusion.

J. H. HYSLOP.

aspects are not a part of the problem at issue in these experiments. What "spiritualism" is in its general aspects I need not care, as there are not data in my record to throw any light upon its complexities as usually conceived. The issue that is presented here is simply whether spiritism or telepathy from living persons exclusively¹, is the more rational hypothesis to account for the facts. Nor need I enter into any specific definition as to what shall be meant by spiritism. It is first only a name for some other hypothesis than telepathy and intended to account for the unity and intelligence of the phenomena concerned. It is next only a name for the continuity of the stream of consciousness which once passed for a person. Consequently I use the term consistently with either pantheistic monism, or atomistic or monadic monism. Whatever theory we entertain regarding the individuality of man, the alternative hypothesis to telepathy, which is here called spiritism, must be independent of the question whether the stream of consciousness recognised as personal identity shall be either a mode of the absolute or an individual persistent centre of its own activity. Consequently, I shall have in mind, when using the term, the conception of a surviving consciousness and personal identity which is absolutely necessary for the establishment of anything like a true spiritism, and thus wholly eliminate all conceptions that are associated with the idea of phenomena originating from some cause merely different from the normal and voluntary self. The latter idea goes no further than secondary personality, as it is so well known. The former excludes all intrinsic connection between the subject through which the phenomena are apparently obtained and that which is their alleged source. Whether the real source is a surviving soul or not may be discussed without any preconceived theory of what a soul must be. Spiritism, therefore, as an alternative explanation to telepathy, is nothing more than the question whether the brain of the medium is adequate to account for the facts. All other problems may be postponed until we know more than we do now regarding such phenomena.

In fixing these alternatives, however, I am told that I should include the possibility of fraud, which is simpler than either of the others. My reply is that I shall not discuss that hypothesis at length. I consider it as having been excluded from view as much as ten years ago, and no one except those who have resolutely remained ignorant of the Society's work in general, and who have not taken the pains to acquaint themselves with the very special precautions in regard to this matter in the Piper case, would compromise his

¹ I shall throughout this Report use the term "telepathy" to denote a process between living persons only. (See footnote, p. 124.)

intelligence with that accusation without giving specific proofs of it. For the special benefit of that class, I shall refer it to the record which shows what means were taken to eliminate this resource for explanation. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 437-440, 444-447, 558-560, 615; *et al.* Vol. VIII., pp. 1-9; Vol. XIII., pp. 284-5, and Vol. XIV., pp. 7 and 50-78.) Nor is it necessary to resent any insinuations that we are duped, until those who are possessed of so much intelligence without any previous study of this special instance can produce specific evidence that the subject of our investigation exhibits the qualities and engages in the kind of work that must be supposed in order to meet the case. It is easy to say "fraud" and suggest any number of imaginable methods of deception, as it is known and practised in most that passes for spiritualism. But it is quite a different thing to indicate the exact kind of "fraud" necessary to reduce the character of a given case. Those who are at all acquainted with the conditions and nature of the Piper phenomena, and who are not willing to excuse their indolence by an appeal to an explanation for which they have no evidence, will very quickly discover that there is only one kind of fraud even conceivable in the case, and that is the employment of detectives for obtaining information. This method will undoubtedly account for the cases with which the public is usually entertained, but any attempt to apply it to the present instance in detail, taking adequate consideration of the content of it, will be confronted with assumptions that are about as enormous as the spiritistic theory itself. I am not questioning the value of scepticism in this direction, but only insisting that it be intelligent and ready to accept the logical consequences of the supposition that it makes. The accuser does not stop to think of the magnitude of his hypothesis when applied to both the quality and quantity of the facts under the conditions involved.

But it is not this alone that eviscerates that suspicion of its pertinence. We might well admit that both quality and quantity would be vitiated by the existence of detective fraud, if that suspicion could be legitimately directed against the subject of our experiments. But in spite of the care with which the Society's publications have stated the conditions under which all arrangements are made for experiments, exempting Mrs. Piper from all responsibility for security against suspicion, not even the scientific public has yet been intelligent enough to discover that it is on an entirely wrong scent. It ought to be clear to even the most dull person, who must bear the suspicion of fraud, when Dr. Hodgson interposes between the experimenter and Mrs. Piper, and when he, with the rest of us, subordinates the evidential value of any experiments otherwise conducted. The situation is such, as the most cursory examination shows, that the notion of fraud cannot be entertained without implying the complicity of Dr.

Hodgson. Now Dr. Hodgson is not under the slightest obligation to prove his own honesty, or that he is not a fraud himself. Hence it is the duty of the sceptic to prove that there is collusion and dishonesty on Dr. Hodgson's part when any charge is made against Mrs. Piper. Members of the Society assumed the duty to examine into her relation to the phenomena, and having satisfied themselves of her innocence, Dr. Hodgson has chosen to shelter her behind his own responsibility, so that the man who wishes to cling to the suspicion of fraud must accept without wincing this responsibility for proving his suspicion. The time is past when we can indulge in the cheap accusation against Mrs. Piper, which tries to throw the burden of proof upon us who announce the value of our results. But when it is Dr. Hodgson who is the starting point of the experiments, critics must accept the challenge to investigate him, or turn their objections to his conclusions in another direction. They cannot stand idly by and demand proof for honesty when it is their duty to prove dishonesty. If we were dealing only with Mrs. Piper, the case might be different, but, as it is, we can safely leave to critics to make good against Dr. Hodgson the alternative to the hypotheses of telepathy and spiritism.

In regard to Dr. Hodgson's relation to the sittings generally, it will be important for the reader to know that he is not always present at the sittings that he has arranged for, and that some of the best communications have come to persons who, at the former period when the control of Mrs. Piper was not stringent, arranged for themselves and went to her without the knowledge of Dr. Hodgson at all, and reported to him afterward (*Cf.* Professor Nichols' case, *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII. pp. 374 and 534). At present, in spite of his control of all arrangements for sittings, he is often absent from whole series of them, and the fact makes no difference in the content of the communications. In mine I insisted on his presence, because I was not familiar with the automatic writing and did not wish to waste time in learning to read it. Dr. Hodgson acted as stenographer, so to speak, copying at the time much of the automatic writing, and noting all that was said, or done by both of us and by Mrs. Piper's hand. Any attempt on my part to do this without experience would have resulted in much loss of time and increase of confusion in the "communications," owing to the necessity of repeating until I could decipher the writing. But even then Dr. Hodgson was several times sent out of the room by the trance personalities, and his absence showed no effect on the contents of the "communications," except perhaps to improve that feature of them affecting their relevance, though it took more time for me to read the writing and to obtain a given quantity of material. For the occasions on which Dr. Hodgson was sent out of the room and was not present the reader can consult the following references

to the Appendices and detailed records. (Appendix I., pp. 305-306, 306-308, 309-310. All the best part of this sitting, in so far as content is concerned, came while Dr. Hodgson was out of the room. Appendix III., pp. 420-421). The reader can see for himself that in all the instances the "communications" were not interrupted either in manner or matter, except so far as I was the cause and so far as supersensible causes are assumed, so that no affirmation of their entire dependence upon his presence can be made. This is, of course, far truer of others than myself, as he was so often not present even in the house, and the sitter was unknown to Mrs. Piper.

Nor is this all, taking the whole case into account. Professor William James, of Harvard University, exercised more or less supervision over Mrs. Piper's trances and introduced unknown sitters as early as 1885, two years before Dr. Hodgson ever saw the shores of America. And, in fact, it was Professor James that made the appointment for Dr. Hodgson's own first sitting. Professor James says of this year, 1885, "I visited her (Mrs. Piper) a dozen times that winter, sometimes alone, sometimes with my wife, once in company with the Rev. M. J. Savage. I sent a large number of persons to her, wishing to get the results of as many *first* sittings as possible. I made appointments myself for most of these people, whose names were in no instance announced to the medium." (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., p. 652.) A favourable report of these experiments by Professor James was published in the spring of 1886 (*Proceedings of the American S.P.R.* pp. 102-106) one year before Dr. Hodgson came to this country.

Further, Mrs. Piper saw a large number of sitters during her visit to England in 1889-90, while Professor James and Dr. Hodgson were both in this country, and several English gentlemen were responsible for the appointments there, especially Professor Oliver J. Lodge, F.R.S., Dr. Walter Leaf, and Mr. F. W. H. Myers. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 436-447, 558-568).

All this implies that we cannot assume fraud without supposing that there has been a conspiracy of it in the Piper case, involving not only the above-named persons, but also many others that could as easily be mentioned. This insinuation must be made good by any man who suggests the possibility of fraud on the part of anyone connected with the case. I am myself not exempt from this accusation if a man chooses to make it, and one of my "scientific" colleagues frankly says that he reserves the right to believe, and that he would believe, as an alternative to fraud by Mrs. Piper, that I have lied about the facts. I am not competent to disprove such a theory, but I have shaped this report with the distinct purpose of inviting this charge. Nor does all this imply that I admit the possibility of fraud on the part of any of the persons named. *On the contrary, I do not*

admit that any such thing is possible in the case, because I consider that it was thrown out of court as much as ten years ago for all intelligent men. But I allude to it here, first, to show that I have been alert to all the issues likely to be raised in this problem, and, second—accepting a man's right to raise the question where his conviction is involved—to emphasize the fact that the present situation devolves upon him who entertains such a hypothesis the duty to furnish specific and adequate evidence for it. Professor James says on this point (*Psychological Review*, Vol. V., p. 421): "The 'scientist,' who is confident of 'fraud' here, must remember that in science, as much as in common life, a hypothesis must receive some positive specification and determination before it can be profitably discussed; and a fraud which is no assigned kind of fraud, but simply 'fraud' at large, fraud *in abstracto*, can hardly be regarded as a specifically scientific explanation of specific concrete facts."

In addition to this, when it comes to accusing Mrs. Piper of fraud without specific proofs, Professor James also says in the same reference: "Dr. Hodgson considers that the hypothesis of fraud cannot be seriously entertained. I agree with him absolutely. The medium has been under observation, much of the time under close observation, as to most of the conditions of her life, by a large number of persons, eager many of them to pounce upon any suspicious circumstance for fifteen years. During that time *not only has there not been one single suspicious circumstance remarked, but not one suggestion has ever been made from any quarter* which might tend positively to explain how the medium, living the apparent life she leads, could possibly collect information about so many sitters by natural means." (Cf. Professor Newbold, *Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., p. 7, and Mr. Andrew Lang, Vol. XV., p. 45.)

This statement of the situation will make clear why I absolutely refuse to discuss the theory of fraud. I say only so much as will force the public to face the issue and to understand why I accept no obligations whatever to treat the suspicion of fraud seriously. If the reader of this report will take the pains, he will discover that the care which I observed to keep all knowledge of my sittings out of the acquaintance of every one except Dr. Hodgson alone was undertaken distinctly with the purpose of showing clearly that every accusation or suspicion of fraud must accept the implied complicity of Dr. Hodgson, and make this good, or treat the problem of these experiments with proper respect. I also ignore the question regarding the genuineness of the trance, as that has been adequately attested by the proper persons, though I was careful to satisfy myself of this fact, not from any scepticism on that point, but because my duty as an observer required that I be able to give a reason for the belief. I can also say that

whatever suspicions existed in the Phinuit¹ days regarding this question, they are no longer applicable to the condition which I observed. I am willing to add also that, assuming that fraud is eliminated from Mrs. Piper's part in the acquisition of the facts in the record, I should not find it necessary to lay much stress upon the genuineness of the trance, as even the supraliminal communication of such facts as I have in my record would not lose in spiritistic suggestiveness by that circumstance. The only value in establishing the genuineness of the trance after removing the supposition of fraud is the fact that we simply make it more difficult for the common mind to explain the incidents on any normal grounds. This advantage, however, is more than offset by the fact that the genuineness of the trance opens the door wide to all the possibilities of the subliminal, which may include unconscious fraud to any extent without implicating the primary personality in any responsibility whatever for it. Consequently I do not treat the issue of the trance as the most important one, or as in any way crucial, but as valuable only in limiting the number of factors to be considered in the problem. The only reason for investigating the trance at all, in this or other cases, is that it was alleged and the test of honesty partly depends on it; but where no pretence of a trance is made, there is no reason for demanding that it shall occur, unless we find that it is actually necessary for desired results. The question of fraud is prior to this in its importance, and having shown adequate reasons for dismissing it from consideration, I pass directly to the main problem.

It will be necessary to explain briefly the conditions under which the experiments were performed, as this will serve the double purpose of making the results more intelligible to the reader who cannot witness the performance and of indicating the precautions taken, which will dispose of ordinary objections and show the proper incidence of responsibility for the value of the record. The arrangements for my sittings were made only through Dr. Hodgson, and with special care regarding secrecy. The following statements will make the whole case clear.

- (1) No one except Dr. Hodgson and my wife was to know that I was to have sittings, and only Dr. Hodgson was to know of the arrangements. This plan was carried out in entire secrecy.
- (2) The arrangements for the sittings were not made with Mrs. Piper in her normal state, but with the trance personalities in her trance state.
- (3) The arrangements for my sittings were not made in my name.

¹ Until the beginning of 1897 Mrs. Piper's chief trance personality, so to speak, was known under the name of Phinuit. See *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 440, 448-450, *et al.*; Vol. VIII., pp. 50-54 *et al.*

but in the pseudonym of "Four times friend," so that neither the supraliminal nor the subliminal of Mrs. Piper could have any clue to my identity (see Note 1, p. 344).

- (4) When I went to conduct the experiments and before reaching the house of Mrs. Piper, about two hundred feet from the house and while in a closed coach, I put on a mask covering the whole of my face, and entered the house wearing the mask, met Mrs. Piper, and went on with the sitting in this condition.
- (5) When introduced to Mrs. Piper it was under the name of Mr. Smith, which is the usual name by which Dr. Hodgson introduces strangers. I bowed to her without uttering a sound, the object being to conceal my voice equally as well as my face.
- (6) In the whole series of my sittings Mrs. Piper never heard my voice in her normal state, except twice when I changed it into an unnatural tone to utter a sentence, in one case only four words, as explained in my notes.
- (7) In the whole course of the sittings, also, I was careful not to touch Mrs. Piper, and I never came into any contact with her to render any muscular suggestion possible, except perhaps half-a-dozen times when I seized the hand while writing to place it on the writing-pad which it was escaping. Once, as indicated in the notes, I held her head while she was straightened in the chair in which she was sitting (p. 467). But at all other times I avoided every form of contact that could even make muscular suggestion conceivable.
- (8) The record shows that the facts obtained were either without any questions at all, or without questions calculated to suggest the answers given. I was extremely careful to avoid verbal suggestion. I have tried to draw attention to any special exceptions.
- (9) During the writing I stood behind and to the right of Mrs. Piper, in a position which concealed any view of me and my movements absolutely from any visual knowledge of Mrs. Piper, whether supraliminal or subliminal, even had her eyes been open instead of closed in the trance. It was necessary to take this position in order to be able to read the writing as it went on.

• The fourth, fifth, and sixth precautions were taken, because in 1892 I met Mrs. Piper twice for a short time and had a portion of a sitting (see p. 297). I had been brought into the room and introduced to her under a false name while she was in the trance, but introduced to her after recovery from it under my

right name. Hence the mask and concealment of my voice were measures against any possible identification, but were taken much more because I wished to be able to say so than because I felt any imperative necessity for doing it after my study of the case. The mask I kept on until the third sitting, when I felt it unnecessary to wear it any longer, for the reason that at the end of the second sitting the name and relationship of my father was given as Mrs. Piper came out of the trance. I had to assume from that point that her subliminal was aware of who I was, and further concealment from it was no longer necessary. But I still preserved my precautions against any identification by voice and muscular suggestion. I could rather safely rely upon the fact that the lapse of six years and that I was now wearing a beard would prevent visual identification, because I had a smooth face in 1892 when I sat. I can attach no special value to the concealment of my voice in the case after removing the mask, except as an indication of the general cautiousness with which I wished to conduct the experiments. In spite of the assumption, however, that Mrs. Piper's subliminal had gotten my name, I have no doubt that her normal state never obtained any knowledge of my identity until after the newspapers had published what I had been doing, and this was after the close of my sittings. She displayed absolutely no curiosity regarding me during the sittings, not even noticing me after the introduction on the first morning, and only the necessity of assuming that her subliminal knew my identity made further wearing of the mask useless for evidential purposes.

As regards the seventh, eighth, and ninth statements, one of the objects in my experiments was to test the influence of suggestion by the sitters. I had felt myself so hard pushed for arguments against the spiritistic theory that I tolerated in myself and others the appeal to illusions of interpretation and suggestion, as a resource against conviction until I could witness the phenomena at close hand. In reading the Reports I feared that possibly some incidents, or even a large number of them, quoted as evidence of spirit communication, might have their force impaired by this suspicion. My view at that time was based to some extent upon preconceptions formed by my idea of earlier sittings with Mrs. Piper and imperfections of the record. But both more careful reading and personal inquiry showed that my preconceptions of imperfection were grossly exaggerated, and that my doubts had to rest upon another basis altogether, namely, the confusions and errors. But, nevertheless, I wished to study the phenomena at close range, and the result of the sittings was to convince me that the hypothesis of suggestion was inadequate. I have tried by the fulness of the present record to give all others the same opportunity as myself to understand this feature of the problem.

It is not so easy to eliminate illusions of interpretation. We are never free from their possibility until we secure such definiteness in the facts that even a prejudiced reader cannot mistake their pertinence. Even in my first sitting some of the facts stated were specific enough for me to decide at once the question of their pertinence or impertinence, and hence illusions of interpretation had their limits fairly well defined, to say nothing of the mass of material in later sittings.

As this report will probably be read by some who are not familiar with either the whole record of the case or the difference between Mrs. Piper's mediumship and the *modus operandi* of other alleged "mediums," I shall briefly characterise the conditions under which the results are obtained, so that there shall be absolutely no excuse for the reader to study the present account with any erroneous preconceptions of what is meant by Mrs. Piper's mediumistic performances. The first important step in the study of her case is a definite conception of the exact way the facts are secured, and a recognition of points of important difference between this case and those which have determined the popular idea of mediumship.

- (1) Mrs. Piper goes into the trance in the following manner. She seats herself in a chair in front of a table, upon which are placed two pillows for a head-rest when the trance comes on. She may or may not engage in conversation while the trance approaches. In my case she generally talked to Dr. Hodgson about various domestic matters, the weather, etc. The approach of the trance is characterised by various indications as described in my notes at the beginning of each sitting. Finally when the head falls upon the pillows, it is arranged by Dr. Hodgson, or other sitter, so that the right side of the head lies on the palm of the left hand and looking off and away from the table upon which the writing is done. This second table is at the right hand, and upon it is placed the writing pad. In a few minutes after the trance occurs, the right hand shows signs of animation and slowly moves toward this table for the writing, when a pencil is placed between the two fore-fingers and the writing begins.
- (2) Mrs. Piper's normal consciousness, as the past evidence goes to show, knows nothing of what she has done or communicated in the trance. She also remains ignorant of the communications until they are published in some form, except, of course, when a sitter chooses to tell her something, which I need hardly say in my case was nothing. Hence we do not have to reckon with any views of Mrs. Piper's in estimating

the nature and value of the results, so that the facts have to be studied from the standpoint of the sitter or investigator.

- (3) There is no mechanical apparatus whatsoever in the experiments, except the writing-pad and pencil which you furnish yourself. Hence there is no excuse for comparing the case to slate-writing and cabinet performances generally. Absolutely nothing of this sort is connected with the sittings and experiments. They are conducted in open daylight, in a room without any special arrangements for them, except the tables as indicated, and this room, in so far as living persons are concerned, might be any one that the sceptical inquirer might wish to choose in any locality whatsoever, and not confined to Mrs. Piper's home.
- (4) In all cases of so-called independent slate-writing, that I ever witnessed (which were clearly fraudulent), I was either in the darkness or the phenomena were produced out of my sight; the slate-writing was done *nominally* by a spirit directly and not by the hand of the "medium," and I was not an eye-witness of the writing. But in Mrs. Piper's case, in addition to the daylight and absence of mechanical apparatus like slates or cabinets, the writing is done *visibly* with her own hand, and on paper and with a pencil of your own furnishing. That is to say, we can actually see as much of the *modus operandi* of the "communications" as we can see of any normal human act. Nothing is concealed from our view, except the physiological processes that are equally concealed from us in our own writing as well as all other human affairs.
- (5) The whole scientific and evidential importance of the results thus gets its credentials and value solely from the *content* of the "communications," and not in any special way from the manner of obtaining them, except as detective frauds are excluded from the matter.
- (6) I should also indicate briefly the manner of making the record. Dr. Hodgson sat near the table on my right where he could see the writing as it proceeded. This he copied, reading it in a low voice as an indication to the trance personality that it was intelligible, or sometimes with a tone of interrogation and doubt which would be followed either by the word "Yes" sometimes written out, or assent by the hand, or by the repetition of a word or phrase not rightly read at first.¹ He was

¹ After I became more familiar with the writing I often made attempts to read aloud portions of it instead of Dr. Hodgson.

unable to copy the whole of the automatic writing at the time, as it was necessary for him to record his own or my questions and statements made at the time and to describe certain mechanical features of the process not expressed in the writing, leaving room for the insertion of the omitted portions of the writing afterward. When a question was to be asked or a statement made to the "communicator," Mrs. Piper's hand was spontaneously raised toward the mouth of the sitter who addressed the hand, and it then immediately proceeded either to present the message to the "communicator," often extending itself out toward some "invisible presence," or to write out a reply. After the sitting was over, usually in the afternoon of the same day, Dr. Hodgson and myself went over the record together, completing the copy of the automatic writing. From this record type-written copies were made and sent to the printer. The printed proofs have been compared first with Dr. Hodgson's copy, and then once more with the original automatic writing, so as to secure the utmost possible accuracy.

These facts will leave no excuse for any further misunderstanding of the Piper phenomena, and ought to remove such misconceptions of them as have been derived from the popular notion concerning mediumship.

There is one other feature of the sittings which it is necessary to describe in order to obtain a clear idea of their complexity outside our positive knowledge. I have described above what we actually know about the *modus operandi* of the case. But beyond this there appears to be a consistent *régime* in the process, for whose validity no one can vouch until the spiritistic theory is sufficiently proved to make it inherently probable. This *régime* is the action of the "controls," and the little alleged *coterie* of spirits that are trying to communicate from a discarnate world with the incarnate. We can describe this appearance without vouching for its reality. But there appear to be several persons or spirits having Mrs. Piper in charge for the same purpose that animates our experiments. The chief of these are called by themselves "Imperator" and "Rector," and are assisted sometimes apparently by George Pelham and two or three others (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XIII. pp. 407-412). Rector usually acts as amanuensis in the writing. George Pelham acted as chief amanuensis at my first sitting. Imperator seldom writes with Mrs. Piper's hand, but generally employs Rector through whom to communicate. Usually also the communications that purport to come from other discarnate spirits are made through the amanuensis, or even through one or more other "spirits"

before the amanuensis obtains them for writing. All this, however, can only be a help to the imagination in understanding the dramatic play of personality in the record, and hence can have no direct value in the estimation of the facts in relation to the problems of personal identity.

In describing the details of my sittings it seems to me admissible to use the language conforming to the spiritistic hypothesis, and this entirely independent of our final interpretation. The main justification for this course lies in the fact that it is under the form of spiritistic communication that the phenomena occur, and we should state the case in terms of its own purport. Notwithstanding this, however, I might have dealt with the facts in detail by adopting the hypothesis of a secondary personality of Mrs. Piper, masquerading as "spirits," and fishing and guessing and filching telepathically from the minds of myself and other persons the necessary data for this purpose. But this hypothesis has not appeared to me at all probable as a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena before us, especially as I neither see the *a priori* necessity for assuming it nor admit the adequacy of the empirical evidence apart from this case for its application and extension to the degree required. I have been driven to the favorable consideration of the spiritistic hypothesis, and instead of evading it as long as possible throughout my report and resorting in a pedantic way to circumlocutions for the purpose of preserving the impression of cautiousness which I tried to maintain in forming my convictions, I have decided to treat the sittings in general from the point of view which I finally reached. But I intend to apply the spiritistic theory throughout, not merely because it recommends itself to me as the best one, but also because it seems to me of more importance to see how far the application of this conception would throw light on the numerous details to which many persons might be inclined to apply such hypotheses as fishing and guessing on the part of the supposed subliminal of Mrs. Piper. After all, however, I do not wish the reader to lose sight of the fact that the consideration essential for him to note is rather the possibility of the application of the spiritistic hypothesis as a rational one, a position that I shall reiterate from time to time in the discussion. He must not suppose that I am here offering any demonstrable proof of its necessity for the explanation of my own sittings. The evidence drawn from those indeed appears to be objectively inferior in many ways to much that has already been published in these *Proceedings*, especially in Part XXXIII., but in the previous reports on the Piper case the records have not been dealt with in detail from the spiritistic point of view, and the reader has scarcely been able to judge how far that view appears to cover the various minutiae of facts, errors and confusions. Instead, therefore, of seeking to point out what incidents might be explained on the

hypothesis of fishing, what on the hypothesis of guessing, what on the hypothesis of telepathy, etc., I have tried to take the reader behind the scenes, as it were, and to show what relations the different incidents may suggest with the habits and experiences of the supposed real communicators. But while I shall here discuss only the results of my own series of sittings, let me warn the reader once more that my conclusions do not depend on those results alone. It is far otherwise. They are the outcome of the study of my own record added to the evidence offered by Professor James, Professor Lodge, Mr. Walter Leaf, Mr. Myers, and Dr. Hodgson, superadded to the large number of various and spontaneous experiences recorded in the volumes of our *Proceedings*. The spiritistic hypothesis simply gives unity to a far larger class of phenomena than that of the Piper records, and this additional class remains inexplicable by the assumptions which we often indulge in the Piper case. I offer, therefore, my analysis, not as proof, but as legitimate interpretation of the record and the results of psychical research generally. I am willing even to be generous to critics, and to admit, for the sake of argument, that the spiritistic theory cannot be proved in the sense that some appear to demand of a demonstration. I am dealing here only with the probabilities which favour simple as opposed to complex hypotheses, and hence am testing the consistency of the former in a case which is but an additional specimen of our work, and which is not treated as sufficient proof of itself.

In pursuance of the purpose just announced, I shall here enumerate the communicators by name that figure in my series of sittings. There is my father, Robert Hyslop, who is the chief communicator throughout and who died on the 29th of August in 1896. Frequent communicators were my brother Charles, who died a young boy at four and a half years in 1864, and my sister Anna, who died at three years of age, twelve days later. Also in several sittings apparently my uncle, James B. Carruthers, communicated or made unsuccessful attempts at times. He died on December 2nd, 1898, from an accident on the railway. In the five sittings held for me by Dr. Hodgson while I remained in New York my father was the only communicator, with the exception that my sister Anna seemed to be present once. In the next eight sittings, at which I was present myself, my father was the chief communicator; but in the course of them, in addition to all that have been mentioned, my mother, twice by name, Martha Ann Hyslop, who died in October, 1869, my cousin, Robert H. McClellan, who died in 1897, and his father, my uncle, James McClellan, who died about the beginning of 1876, were communicators.

There were no other communicators in my personal sittings except the trance personalities, with an occasional message from the George Pelham of Dr. Hodgson's Report, and one from a person whom we call

Mr. M. (p. 458) and who is not connected with me at all, but with one of the other sitters. In Dr. Hodgson's sittings held in my behalf there were several other communicators, but the communications regarding them were not relevant to myself, and some of them were too private for incorporation. The latter and some of the former are excluded from the detailed record.

I shall now indicate the general method of procedure which has been adopted and which is as follows. The Appendices I.-III. contain complete records with explanatory notes of all the sittings, both those at which I was personally present and also those which Dr. Hodgson held in my behalf. Each Appendix is followed by further explanatory notes embodying the results of later inquiries concerning statements made at the sittings. Appendices IV. and V. contain accounts of experiments, imitative in their character and made for the purpose of obtaining light on certain questions involved in the Piper phenomena. Appendix IV. deals with two of these questions, namely, the triviality of the incidents which people naturally choose for the purpose of identification, and the quantity of evidence sufficient to establish the same result. Appendix V. deals with the mistakes made in the transmission of messages through an imperfect channel. Appendix VI. is an account of a case which I think may serve to illustrate the state of mind in which I believe the communicators find themselves when in the act of communicating. Appendix VII. consists of quotations.

In Chapter II. of my Report I give a somewhat detailed account of the facts in the record, together with such comments by way of corroboration or otherwise as my latest inquiries enable me to make, and after dealing with the group of incidents connected with each communicator in the record, I summarise briefly the results (pp. 28-123). But although this lengthy account of the facts is intended to show the unity of the case in a way that perhaps many readers of the Appendices alone would not detect, it is not intended to be a *substitute* for the detailed records. It seems to me impossible to obtain a proper conception of the issues involved without a most painstaking study of the Appendices themselves, containing the detailed records. On this point I make no concessions to the popular demand for a merely readable story, but expect from those who claim to be intelligent a minute and patient study of the phenomena, such as we demand in all scientific and philosophic problems. We spend years, even generations, in the critical study of Plato and Aristotle, Kant and Hegel, etc., and we think ourselves repaid, though we fail to arrive at any dogmatically definite conception of their doctrines. And this study is given to them without regard to the question whether we agree with them or not. It suffices to understand them. But in no case do we permit a man to approve or criticise what he has not studied. Again, there is scarcely any limit

to resources, intellectual and financial, which have been expended in the most patient study of Darwinism, which involves the gradual evolution of human life. It ought not to be less legitimate, it ought not to be less imperative, to study at least as thoroughly those phenomena that purport to throw light upon the *destiny* of that life.

I therefore venture to think that our inquiry has reached such a stage that no brief summaries of facts or conclusions can at all meet the importance of the case. The problem is not one which the "man in the street" who reads as he runs can be expected to solve either for himself or for others. What the sources are of the statements made at my sittings and in other analogous ways through other persons is a question that certainly demands the most searching investigation into their minutest details. With this in view I gave Dr. Hodgson's Report, in conjunction with its detailed records, four very careful and critical readings, yet I found that there were many points which I failed to appreciate fully until after I had finished and studied my own series of sittings. Hence I have included in this Report and Appendices an exceptionally large amount of detail involving description and comment, with the hope of enabling the reader to realise to some extent the significance of the sittings, which cannot be appreciated as fully as is desirable without direct personal experience. Even my own mental attitude at the time I have endeavoured to show by retaining in the Appendices all (except three or four not affecting this issue) my original notes which further investigation has shown to be erroneous, including illusions of memory and interpretation that occurred to myself, and especially the changes of opinion which fuller knowledge of the case or clearer and later communications forced upon me. I have done this also with a view to certain difficulties connected with the main problem, as my own mistakes on various points appear to me to suggest a very significant bearing upon what we should expect to find in the statements by the communicators. I do not, of course, repeat these changes of opinion in my general account of the sittings in Chapter II., except when reference to them seems necessary to explain the proper significance of the most important incidents.

So important, therefore, do I regard the detailed records that I suggest to the student the propriety of turning to them immediately after reading my general account in Chapter II., and before going on to my discussion of the case in Chapters III.-IV., where I examine the application of the telepathic hypothesis (Chapter III.); of the spiritistic theory (Chapter IV.); and after considering some special difficulties that may be entertained in regard to the spiritistic theory (Chapter V.), I express, in conclusion, my adoption, for the present at least, of the spiritistic theory as the most satisfactory (Chapter VI.) I now pass to my general account of the facts.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE FACTS.¹

In summarising the facts in the record, I shall group them, as far as this is possible, according to their subjects, treating together those that occur in different sittings but pertain to the same incident. In this manner we shall better be able to comprehend the collective force of the evidence as it is represented in complex wholes. The first sitting, however, I shall treat rather by itself, as it is evidentially unimportant, and such value as it obtains comes chiefly from the light that later incidents throw upon it.

Another reason for this isolation of the first sitting from the summary of the others and for the mode of treating its contents is the fact that my notes in the Appendices give no adequate account of its possibilities. Until I had formed a better understanding of the phenomena generally and of my later sittings in particular, I not only assumed that this first one was evidentially unfit to interest the reader, but also that the confusion was so great that I could not make any use of it except for its dramatic play. In fact I treated it and would treat it alone as absolutely worthless, and it will doubtless remain so for the reader. But careful study of all the phenomena convinced me that this judgment might be too harsh and that it could be made quite intelligible, if not slightly evidential, by disentangling its threads of suggestive possibilities. Instead, therefore, of producing an elaborate system of notes explaining these possibilities in connection with the detailed record, I have preferred to indicate here the results of my latest study of the sitting, while permitting the reader any judgment that he may be pleased to form regarding either my opinion of its possible value or the suggestive import of its incidents. Hence I separate the account from the summary of other sittings in order to make clear the distinction that a critic may wish observed, though I am at great pains to indicate its intelligible possibilities, its unity with later sittings and the interest of its dramatic play.

But I must utter a special warning against misunderstanding the method I have employed in studying the record. I have often recognised the relevance of certain names and incidents, apparently

¹ In this chapter I frequently quote passages from the detailed records, but in doing so I have not thought it necessary to reproduce in all cases the repetitions of words, etc., precisely as they are given in the Appendices. In the same way I have abridged the extracts where such changes would effect greater clearness for the general student and aid in discussing the questions at issue. The reader, of course, can always compare the extracts with the more complete statements of the detailed record.

making a determined effort to find significance where there is no evidential value. I was induced to do this partly by the discovery that many of the statements which have to pass as literally false are so near the exact truth that they could not be construed as telling against personal identity and partly by the desire to show such a psychological analysis of the various situations and possibilities in special cases, that even many technical errors might appear consistent with the evidential matter, thus offering a possible alternative to guessing and suggestion. In other words, I have endeavoured to supply such information to the reader as will enable him to see for himself how far errors may be due to imperfect conditions for communication. Compare Maltine incident (p. 418), and Munyon's Germicide (p. 391).

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST SITTING, DECEMBER 23RD, 1898.

The chief interest of the first sitting, then, from the point of view above indicated, is the dramatic feature representing the process of ascertaining either my identity or the proper communicator. After the usual preliminaries at the beginning of the trance, such as greetings, arrangements for future sittings, etc., the function of amanuensis was turned over to G. P. in this instance, and Dr. Hodgson was sent out of the room just as a lady claimed to be present to communicate with me. Several pages of writing follow, in connection with this attempt to "reach" me, that are full of confusion so far as evidential matter is concerned, though intelligible as dramatic play in the trying conditions for selecting the proper communicators. In the midst of this confusion the names Margaret, Lillie, and Henry [?] were given, evidently by the lady who claimed to "belong" to me as my mother (p. 306). Careful investigation shows that there is no Henry, near or remote, among the direct family connections. There is an interesting piece of contingency in the first two names, as I had a sister by the name of Margaret, the oldest in the family, who died when I was two years old, and another, my twin sister, by the name of Sarah Luella (*Cf.* p. 331), at which Lillie might be an attempt. But I cannot be sure of any relevance in either of them, and the contingency deserves to be mentioned only as one of those things that so easily mislead the ordinary inquirer into the recesses of this subject. Whatever the theory to account for these phenomena, it is evident that these names belong to the connections of the lady claiming to be related to me. Assuming from the spiritistic point of view that a number of persons were trying to "reach" me by shouting all at once into the telephone, so to speak, we might interpret these names as significant, excepting the name "Henry."

The communications that follow show confusion, though capable of being disentangled by legitimate interpretation. The name "Alice"

comes closely upon "Henry," but is immediately corrected to "Annie," which is the diminutive name of a deceased sister, though this relationship is not here asserted by the communicator. In fact, it is not possible to assume with any assurance who the communicator might be, though it is probably the person who claims to be my mother. On this assumption she is trying to give the names of the members of the family with her, and the correction of the mistake of "Alice" for "Annie" is possibly made by the latter herself. Immediately following this I am asked if I remember anything about my brother. I ask who he is, meaning that I want his name, and the reply is: "I say, brother. I am your . . . I know I am and . . ." which might be either from this brother or the person claiming to be my mother. I then asked: "When did you pass out?" and got the answer: "Only a long time ago." This would be true of both my brother and mother, while the "only" might be interpreted as a word from the message "only a short time ago" of someone else, possibly my father. This is apparent from the answer to my next question, which was: "Any other member of the family?" The reply was: "Yes, two. I have seen Annie and mother and Charles and Henry." Whoever the communicator was in the previous equivocal messages, it is apparent, on the surface at least of this last answer, that it was neither my brother nor my mother. Hence seeing in the sentence thus naming the members of the family that the communicator was not my brother Charles, and, as I knew there was no Henry in the family, I tried the dodge of pretending to believe that it was Charles Henry, and asked if it was. The answer: "No, Charles," was very pertinent and correct, as it excluded the Henry from consideration. Thinking that I was not dealing with my brother, but with my father, I asked the question: "Did he [Charles] pass out before you?" and the answer: "No, I did not hear, did you say before," was followed by, "Yes, *he did*, some time before." The latter was correct, assuming that it was my father. The allusions that follow to the trouble with the head and heart would apply, as far as they go, to my father, and the passage comes to an end with the odd statement: "I say, give me my hat." I learned later that this expression was characteristic of my father (*Cf.* p. 313). I here presented an accordion for the hand to touch (for reasons that the reader will find explained in the history of the Piper case. See footnote, p. 307), but it did not prevent the confusion, so that the communicator was supplanted by my brother Charles apparently, though there is no positive assurance of this until the communication is stated in the first person of the one claiming to be my brother. But he in turn is almost immediately supplanted by a lady. The statements about the ownership of the accordion depend for their relevancy altogether upon the question who is communicating,

and this is not made clear. Apparently it was my father who had referred just before to his suddenly passing out at last, to the trouble with his head and heart, and said, "I say, give me my hat," and hence assuming that it was he that said, referring to the accordion,—“this was not mine but his. It belonged to George” (*Cf.* guitar incident, p. 461),—we have two statements that are false, though it is interesting to see that they are apparently corrected immediately and spontaneously. But if my brother Charles said it, as he was evidently communicating in the next sentence, the first statement would be true, supposing that the pronoun “his” referred to the previous communicator assumed to be my father. My brother’s next and very definite statement, supposing that the original is rightly read as “my father,” was exactly true in all its details, namely, the ownership of the accordion, the implied death of the owner, and the name of my brother. My statement that “it belonged to someone else” is not suggestive of the facts, though it might appear suspiciously near it. The strongest fact in the passage is the statement or implication that Charles is the name of my brother. Annie, or Anna, was the name of my sister, but I am not distinctly told this, while I am left altogether to the contents of later sittings to infer the possibility that the allusion to the trouble with the head and heart, and to the want of a hat comes from my father. No independent evidential value belongs to the passage. There is simply in it the apparent groping about of inexperienced communicators to make their presence known.

Following this episode G. P. wrote: “You will have to have patience with me, friend, for there are three persons who are all speaking to me at once. One is calling mother, and the other is calling Charles, and the other is calling for you” (p. 308). The communication from the lady that apparently came from the person “calling mother” is clear-cut and definite. But not a name or a fact in it has any relevancy to me or to my family connections. Dr. Hodgson is then sent out of the room and G. P. writes: “I cannot keep the lady from talking, neither can I keep the young man who claims to be your brother.” The reference to Edwards which follows, and which has no significance to me, might be connected with the communicators claiming to be my mother and brother and who disappear. At this point the communication became relevant, and suggested my brother Charles: “I had a fever, and they said it was typhoid. My throat, I had a very bad throat, and it took me over here. And I did not know any one before I left my body.” It was true that Charles died of a fever, but it was not typhoid. It was scarlet fever. I found also—what I did not know at the time of the sitting, though I may have heard it mentioned when I was a child—that he suffered with a very putrid sore throat during his illness. I learn that this is characteristic

of scarlet fever, but I did not know the fact at the time of the message. The statement that he did not know any one before he left the body will depend for its truth upon its interpretation. If it means that he did not know any one "in spirit" before his death, it is perfectly true, as my sisters Margaret and Sarah died before he was born. If it means that he did not know any of us or any person "on earth" it is equivocal. If it means that he does not remember any one, this might be true, as he was only four and a-half years old when he died thirty-four years ago ; but if it means that he never saw or knew any one, it would be false.

My brother continues : " I think I have been here a good many years, and I do not know all of my . . . , " which if it had ended with " brothers and sisters " would have completed the truth, as two brothers and a half-sister were born after his death. But I interrupted with the question, " Have you seen mother ? " He said, " She is here with me. She is all right. She came here after I did. " It is true that my mother died after this brother. I then asked if he had seen anyone else besides mother, having in mind my father, and the reply was, " Yes, I have. Do you remember she had a sister who was in the body when I passed out ? But she came here, too, and she came after mother. " Every word of this is true, both as to the facts and as to the time relations of their occurrence ; but it was not reading my thoughts at the time. Only one of my mother's sisters has died since she did in 1869. No answer came to my request for the name of this sister. But he continued : " Then there is another one who is here, and she is nearer to you than all the rest of us, and she will soon be able to tell you all you would care to know. " This either means nothing or it might be a possible reference to my *twin* sister, who died when she was four months old. But she never comes to communicate, neither does my sister Margaret, who died when she was two years old, and when I was only one month old.

Then immediately follows : " Where is Will ? " This is the name of one of my brothers still living, and was brought out in a most unhesitating manner. The message, however, in which he states that he is bringing some one here to communicate, and that she was the last to " come here, " is perfectly unintelligible.

At this point my brother is apparently interrupted, though I did not suspect it at the time, by an attempt of my uncle to communicate, who had died about a month before the sitting (p. 310). I surmise this because of the two references " El . . . " (which becomes Eliza, the name of this uncle's wife at a later sitting, p. 314) and " Robertson, " which was apparently intended for " Robert's son " (p. 317). These two points came out later in connection with incidents

which obviously pointed to this uncle. I was also as much confused here as the communicator.

But my brother resumes his messages where he left off for my uncle (?), and I interrupted him with the question: "Time of year passed out?" The answer was: "I think it was winter, because I remember seeing it snow." As a fact, it snowed the day before and I think on the morning of his death. I further asked where I was at the time, and the reply was: "I think you were not with me. I do not think I saw you at all before I came here." I was absent on an errand when he died. The statement, however, can hardly be interpreted as recognising this absence, but rather indicates that he did not remember me, which is possible enough (see above, p. 24). But why should telepathy put the matter in that form? If it be the answer that I wanted it might be called telepathic, and the first part of the statement bears that interpretation. But the later part puts another meaning on it, showing the natural point of view and possibly the fact for the communicator, while this was contrary to what was actually in both my supraliminal consciousness and my memory! I knew him well enough, but it would be natural for him not to know me or to remember me.

After a second unimportant reference to my mother again in response to my question about her, he suddenly asked me: "Well, what did you mean by asking for George?" Earlier in the sitting I asked: "Have you seen George?" (p. 307), the name of a brother still living, though I did not say he was living, but was trying to make the communicator think that this person was on the "other side." After my saying that I wanted merely to know if he remembered him, he said: "Yes, but George is here. I say George is not here." As G. P. (real name George) was the amanuensis, there might have been some misunderstanding at first, on his part. When I repeated the question: "Do you say George is *not* here?" in order to see which statement was meant, the answer came: "I say he is not, and I could not understand why you asked me if he was here. Neither is he coming for awhile yet. He is well and doing well and so be it." This was an interesting and pertinent statement, though it is suggestive to see it in the mouth of my brother, when, if the interpretation of the passage in which I asked the question first about this brother George be correct, my father and brother were both present (p. 308).

The name Corrie, which I was asked if I remembered, has no pertinence; but if it had been Cora (*Cf.* p. 452) it would have been more important, as the name either of my aunt Cora or of my oldest sister Margaret Cornelia, who was named after this aunt. (*Cf.* p. 350 and Note 61, p. 514.) I asked, "Is it Mary," and the reply came: "I say

it is, and she is father's sister." My father's oldest sister, who died before I ever knew her, was called Mary Amanda. I never heard the name Mary applied to her, but always heard her called Amanda, and this not often. The reference to Elizabeth, possibly as my mother's sister (though the statement can as well refer to the Mary repeated here, in which case it would be false), contains only this approximation to the truth, namely, that the sister of my mother, who died either before my mother was born, or when she was very young, was called Eliza. The sitting at this point began to come to an end.

The sitting as a whole left a bad impression upon me at the time, as it seemed so full of confusion. To an outsider it must still seem utterly unintelligible, and would be the same to myself but for the subsequent sittings and the light which a study of them throws upon this one. There was not at any time evidential matter enough in it to incline me toward the spiritistic hypothesis, nor did I suspect at all even any supernormal phenomena. But in the light of the facts which I now know and of a clear understanding of the represented machinery of communication, I can make a clear and intelligible story out of the sitting, excepting the statements associated with the lady who was not a relative of mine. But it would not have the slightest value as evidence for the spiritistic theory, unless we considered the actual coincidences in it as favourable to that doctrine and not accountable to telepathy.

I now proceed to deal with the remaining sittings and to give the chief incidents connected with the different communicators. These are my father Robert Hyslop, my uncle James Carruthers, my cousin Robert McClellan, my brother Charles Hyslop, my sister Anna Hyslop, and my uncle James McClellan. My mother is not prominent enough as a communicator to give her any place in this summary.

As an important help to the reader it may be useful to have a running account of the chief "communicator's" life and its relation to the other persons mentioned in the record. I shall not, however, mention any other events than are necessary for the right comprehension of the record and its unity. I shall group the incidents in a chronological order as far as possible.

My father, Robert Hyslop, was born in 1821 and lived on a farm in Ohio until 1889, when he moved West into a neighboring State. He suddenly returned to his old home, dangerously ill with something like cancer of the larynx, in August, 1896, and died on the 29th of that month at the home of his brother-in-law, James Carruthers. Somewhere about 1860 he injured his spine by a day's overwork and a few years afterward became affected with locomotor ataxy and gradually lost the use of one of his legs so that he had to use a crutch for a

while, and finally a cane after some improvement. In 1876 he had a slight stroke of apoplexy, or something like it. After it his hearing became affected, one ear being quite deaf. About three years before his death he lost the use of his voice from what was probably paralysis of the larynx. Finally a year or so before his death he took what he thought was catarrh, but which was more probably cancer of the larynx, and it was accompanied with frequent spasms which threatened to end his life.

My father had three sisters, Mary Amanda, Nancy, and Eliza. The first of the three married James McClellan, who figures as one of the "communicators" in this record (pp. 108-111). She died in 1849, five years before I was born. The other two are still living, but lost their husbands a short time before my first set of experiments. Eliza married James Carruthers, the "communicator" who appears now as "uncle Charles" and now as "uncle Clarke" in this record. The name of the other uncle was not even hinted at in the "communications," though one allusion implies his death (p. 316). My mother died in 1869 and my father was married a second time in 1872.

The names of my brothers and sisters are Margaret Cornelia, who died at two years of age in 1854; Sarah Luella, my twin sister, who died four months old in 1854; Charles, who died at four and a half years in 1864; and Anna Laura, who died nearly three years old in 1864. Of those living are myself, James H., George, Lida (Eliza), William, Robert, Frank (Francis), and Henrietta, my half-sister, spoken of as Hettie in this record.

My father belonged to a very orthodox sect. It was the small body of Associate Presbyterians who refused to join in the union of that denomination with the Associate Reformed Presbyterians to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1858. He took an active but not official part in the controversies that went on about this union at the time. It was this fact that brought him into acquaintance and friendship with the Dr. Cooper mentioned in the record, the latter finally going into the union. My father remained in the small body that refused to modify its doctrines and practices. This body held out against every form of instrumental worship in religious services, and also against the singing of hymns of human composition. There were many other points of distinction which are not important for this record. But in his life my father adhered strictly to the covenants of his profession, and knew nothing of science and philosophy, except what I discussed with him, though he read deeply and thoroughly in the theology of his church and was in that a very intelligent man. He had keen and quick perceptions, and understood any question clearly when put to him in the right way.

When he gave me an education he rather hoped I would study for the ministry, but he never undertook either to persuade or compel me to do so. He left the whole matter to my free choice. But when he ascertained from my confession in 1882 that I had to modify my religious beliefs he felt the apostasy very keenly and it was long before he could in any way reconcile himself to it. My "ideas" were a perpetual puzzle to him and his own orthodoxy too fixed to listen to the wiles of scepticism. He was not known to the public in any way, and was what would be called a very obscure man. His name never appeared in print except in an occasional article of his own in the denominational periodical with a small and obscure circulation, or in connection with some matter of county or township interest.

Statements of my Father, Robert Hyslop.

The second sitting opened with a very marked difference between it and the first. The situation seemed to have completely changed. The same apparent causes for confusion were not manifest. The trance personalities seemed to have the situation perfectly at command. The first sitting had closed with the expressed indication by G. P. that the lady who had claimed me for her son should be made clear again. But in the meantime it was as if the trance personalities had consulted over the situation and the evidence, and had become assured of the right communicators. The opening of the second sitting after the usual preliminaries with the confident address to me in my own name in the very first words is evidence of the appearance as I have described it. I was addressed: "James. James. Speak. James. James, speak to me. James. James," the name by which my father always called me after 1877. But there was no such apparent fishing and hesitation in regard to the rightful communications that had marked the dubious situation in the first sitting. The way was now perfectly clear for settled communications.

In a few minutes after addressing me as indicated above I was asked "Where is Willie?" This was a repetition of the name of my brother and the question regarding him of the previous day. Some non-evidential statements followed, and my father's place was taken by my brother Charles, who gave both his name and relationship to me, and intimated that the previous communicator was my father. No important fact was stated by my brother, and he was followed by a long communication purporting to come from my uncle. But I pass this by for the present to summarise those from my father, leading to his own identity and suggestive of that of others. After my uncle left my father returns to take up his communications. I quote the record (p. 316).

Will you let me return again and help to free my mind? Do you know Uncle Charles? (S. : What Uncle Charles?) He is here. (S. : I don't know any Uncle Charles.) And * * No, I am thinking . . . let me see. I think it is not a real uncle. You must remember what I mean. He used to be so nervous. ¹

It all at once dawned on me that "uncle Charles" was a mistake for "uncle Carruthers," who had died about a month previously. He was the husband of my father's sister. The relevance of the passage is therefore evident. Almost immediately my father says, evidently with reference to this sister and another, both of whom had just lost their husbands within a month of each other: "I wish you would tell the girls I am with them in sorrow or pleas . . . or joy, it matters not. What is their loss is our gain." The name (Eliza) of one of these "girls," his sister and the wife of the communicator to whom he had just referred, was given in my uncle's communication. The sentence, "what is their loss is our gain," was both pertinent and a common expression of father's in situations of this kind. The record then proceeds as follows:—

(S. : Free your mind, father.) I will, indeed, but have you seen the children yet? (S. : I have not seen them for two years.) They are wonderfully good, I think. I know, James, that my thoughts are muddled, but if you can only hear what I am saying, you will not mind it. Do you know where George is? (S. : Yes, I know where he is.) Are you troubled about him . . . he is all right and will be, James. (S. : Yes, all right.) *Worry not.* (S. : No, I will not worry.) But you do. (S. : Yes. I have worried some, but I will not any more.) Thank God. James, if you will only stick to this . . . stick to the promise not to worry, you will in time be contented and happy while still in the body (p. 316).

This is a very pertinent passage. How much so is brought out more fully in my notes (pp. 317, 352). But the name of my brother is correct, and the advice not to worry about him was characteristic of my father in the matters connected with this brother. The mental attitude of apology toward him is that of my father toward him while living. The expression "stick to this" was also characteristic.

¹ *Asterisks* mean that a word or words are omitted which were actually written or spoken at the sitting, but which were undecipherable. *Dots* mean that there has been apparently some interruption in the speech or writing, but not that any words written or spoken have been omitted.—J. H. H.

¹ In the accounts of the sittings, the sitter's remarks and questions are throughout given in round brackets, and the explanatory notes in square brackets. The letter "S" stands for "Sitter," in this case myself, and "R. H." for Dr. Hodgson. In the sittings for February 7th, 8th, 16th, 20th, and 22nd, which were conducted by Dr. Hodgson alone while I was in New York, all the remarks, of course, were made by him.—J. H. H.

At this point I placed the accordion on the table, and after a short interruption by my uncle my father continues (p. 318):—

Do you recall your lectures, and, if so, to whom [do you] recite them now? I often hear them in my own mind. Give me some [thing] for the purpose of helping me remain here longer. (S.: Yes, here it is.) [giving accordion] My toy. I remember it so well. I left all so suddenly, yet I knew I was coming. (S.: Yes. Yes, I think so too.) Do you remember what my feeling was about this life? (S.: Yes, I do.) Well, I was not so far wrong after all. I felt sure that there would be some knowledge of this life, but you were doubtful, remember. (S.: Yes. Yes, I remember.) You had your own ideas, which were only yours, James.

My father was of the orthodox belief and, of course, accepted a future life. I was sceptical on this, as on other subjects connected with orthodoxy, and I was the only one in the family, as indicated here, that was so affected, so far as my father's knowledge went. The passage is therefore quite correct in its details, as well as the phrase "you had your own ideas," as I would say "opinions." But the subject and allusion to my scepticism introduces a topic to which my father returns again and again during my experiments, and always with new facts of our experience in connection with it. I shall therefore state in this connection all that was given in his communications regarding it. It relates to the materials of a conversation that we had on this very subject on my last visit to him in January or February, 1895. There appears in the communications more sympathy with "spiritualism" than most persons would recognise in him from his orthodox affiliations. But the fact was that he knew absolutely nothing about that doctrine in its fraudulent aspects as it is usually known. He never saw anything of it personally, and knew it only as stated in one of his Biblical commentaries. Hence he did not know enough about it to despise it. But in this conversation with him, which occurred several times on the two or three days I stayed with him, he showed a surprisingly receptive attitude toward it. I had been lecturing on psychical research in Indianapolis a few days before, and the conversation came about in thus explaining the nature of my sudden and unexpected visit to him. His receptive attitude, however, at that time will explain why I am not surprised at the tone of his speech in the present allusions to be considered immediately. It is, of course, the later communications that give me the right to interpret the above passage as referring to the subject in view.

In the sitting of December 26th he returned to this subject as follows: "I see clearly now, and oh, if I could only tell you all that is in my mind. It was not an hallucination but a reality, but I felt it would be possible to reach you" (p. 325). At this point I interrupted with a question, but after a little interval he resumed the same thread.

“James, are you here still? If so, I want very much to know if you remember what I promised you. (S : Yes. I hope you will tell me what you promised.) I told you if it would be possible for me to return to you I would (S. : Yes, I remember), and try and convince you that I lived. I told you more than this, and I will remember it all. I told you I would come back if possible, and . . . let you know that I was not annihilated. I remember well our talks about this life and its conditions, and there was a great question of doubt as to the possibility of communication, that if I remember rightly was the one question which we talked over. Will return soon. Wait for me” (p. 325). A little later in the same sitting he said :—“I have been calling for you ever since I left my body” (p. 327). Later still in the same sitting, speaking of trying to prove his identity, he again alludes to keeping his promise (p. 332).

In the sitting of December 27th (p. 341), he asks :—“What do you remember, James, of our talks about Swedenborg? (S. : I remember only that we talked about him.) Do you remember of our talking one evening in the library about his description of the Bible? (S : No.) Several years ago? (S. : No, I do not remember it.) His opinion of its spiritual sense? (S. : No, I do not remember that but perhaps some one else in the family does.) I am sure of our talks on the subject. It may have been with one of the others, to be sure. In any case I shall soon be able to remember all about it.”

On February 7th following, Dr. Hodgson began his series of sittings on my behalf, and near the beginning of the first one, father alludes to the Swedenborg incident spontaneously (p.370), as might be natural from the attitude that I had taken toward it in my last sitting previous, and expressed his satisfaction with my understanding of it, as told him in January by Dr. Hodgson, the message having been sent him through Rector. A little later in the sitting he says : “I often think of the long talks we used to have during my last years in earth life of the possibilities of communication with each other” (p. 372).

In my own sitting of May 29th the subject is resumed in the following brief manner :—

“Yes, I am here and I am thinking over the things I said when I was confused. Do you remember of my telling you I thought it possible that we might live elsewhere? But to speak was doubtful very” (p. 420). Near the beginning of the sitting for May 31st, another remarkable passage on this subject occurs. In response to my good morning to him, he began : “I heard every word and I am coming nearer to you. There is no dream here. And shut out the thought theory and do not let it trouble you. I went on theorising all my earthly life and what did I gain by it? My thoughts only became more subtle and unsatisfactory. There is a God, an all wise and omnipotent God Who is our Guide and if we follow the best within ourselves we will know more of Him. Now speaking of Swedenborg, what does it matter whether his teachings were right or wrong so long as we are individually ourselves here” (p. 438).

In the sitting for June 6th there is a longer and more interesting passage on this subject. In reply to a statement of explanation indicating that I had looked up a certain matter to which he referred, he began (p. 474):—

Well, now I feel satisfied to feel that you are at least pulling with my push, and that is all I can ask of you. I remember perfectly well what my own theories were concerning this life, and my too often expressing doubts about it. I do indeed, but I think I was moved with the thought that I should live somewhere and not die as a vegetable. Do you remember our conversations on this subject? (S. : Yes, I do. Can you tell when it was. Yes, I do remember the . . .) Yes, do you remember of my last visit . . . your last visit (S. : Yes.) with me? (S. : Yes, I remember it well.) It was more particularly on this occasion than before. (S. : Yes, that is right. Do you know what I was doing just before I made the visit?) Yes, I believe you had been experimenting on the subject, and I remember of your telling me something about hypnotism. (S. : Yes, I remember that well.) And what did you tell me about some kind of manifestation which you were in doubt about? (S. : It was about apparitions near the point of death.) [Excitement in hand.] Oh, yes, indeed, I recall it very well, and you told me [about] a young woman who had had some experiments and dreams (S. : Yes, that is right.) which interested me very much, but yet you were doubtful about life after so-called death. Remember the long talks we had together on this, James.

In the sitting of June 7th the subject recurs again (pp. 484-485):—

Do you remember what I said when you told me about the dreams and what answer I gave you in regard to it? (S. : No, I have forgotten that, but I think some one else may remember it who was present.)

I said there were doubtless a great number of these cases, when summed up they would be of great importance in trying to explain a life elsewhere, but they seemed to indicate it. Don't you remember it now? And one of our own family had an experience some years ago. Do you remember anything about this either? (S. : Yes, I remember that. Can you say which one had that experience?)

I intended to, and I wanted to remind you of it before, but I was too far off to say it before I came here. I have often thought about it : in fact we have spoken of it together since I came here. I mean since I passed out. It was Charles who came and took my place before I had time to finish it. I will try and finish it before I go. And he saw the light, and spoke of it before he came here, James.

Oh, dear, I want to say a great deal more, and cannot they give us more light? [Hand bows in prayer.] The light is not so good this day as we would have it be, yet we will help give it.

I am still here, James, and I am thinking about the experience your uncle had before he came here. It was your uncle who had it, and we have often spoken of it together here, James. (S. : Yes. That is the uncle who married your sister Eliza.) [Hand assents.] Yes, Clarke. And it was a notification of his coming suddenly. He often refers to it.

Is this clear to James, friend? [Rector's question to Dr. Hodgson.] (S. : Yes, that is clear.) [I had the legibility of the writing in mind. See Note, p. 485.]

I did wish to say this when I was referring to it last time, but I was too far off. I remember very well the facts and you must.

Now for the facts as I recall them. They are substantially as indicated in the communications with the exception of two or three. I did hold those long conversations with my father on my last visit, as stated here. I was exceedingly sceptical about the subject and about a life hereafter. I made this very clear in my treatment both of apparitions and of the first two reports on Mrs. Piper, which I explained away by telepathy, "the thought theory," as stated here in the communication. My attitude toward apparitions is intimated in the statement of the communicator that he did not think it would be a "hallucination, but a reality." I was confident, however, that we had not talked about Swedenborg, and did not believe that father knew anything about him. But investigation showed that we did talk about him, and that my memory and judgment were wrong on this point. (See Note 17, p. 361.) We did also talk about hypnotism. Father brought this up for explanation, mentioning some striking public performances reported in the town. I discussed the matter fully and tried to hypnotise my brother several times and failed, much to my father's disappointment. Most interesting also is the fact that I told him in that conversation of Mrs. D.'s dream and the experiment which I performed in connection with it. (*Proceedings*, Vol. XII., pp. 272-274.)

In regard to the promise made to me that he would return and if possible let me know that he still lived, I can only say that I wrote to him on his deathbed "to come to me after it was all over," my intention being to try the experiment of which we hear so much. But in the reply to this letter, which he dictated to my stepmother, no such promise is made, and I do not recall ever broaching it at any other time, or any such promise being made. But from the reply that he made to my stepmother when she asked him what I meant by this last request in the last sentence of my last letter to him, it is reasonable to suppose that he had this return in his mind, as he evidently understood the request, but would not reveal his thoughts. (See Note 9, p. 356.) As to his remark about the effect of a large number of apparitions on the evidence for a future life, I do not recall it. I was more likely the person to hold this view of them, and have no doubt that I expressed it as the suggestion of such experiences, though I was not prepared to accept them as satisfactory proof. His perspicacity and his interest in the subject at the time qualified him to either make or appreciate the remark, but I do not recall that he made it. The

experience of my uncle cannot be verified, as it is described here. He did have a vision at one time, to which he gave some religious importance in his life as a monition to decide which path he should choose; but, in addition to the fact that it occurred under a dose of morphine in a serious illness, its character would not appear to a scientific mind as in any respect premonitory—even after premonition was proved—and I could not find any traces among the members of his family of any other experience in their knowledge that would justify the interpretation here given. But in all other respects the coincidences in the communications speak for themselves, both as regards the matter of personal identity and that of an independent memory exhibiting itself throughout every condition of the experiments.

To return to the point (p. 318) at which I began this long incident about the present subject—after an interesting interruption of the communications with some conversation by Rector with Dr. Hodgson about a “little girl trying to find her mother,” the incident having no reference to me (p. 319)—my father returns to say that he “was the last to come here,” and asked if I recalled his being frank, and said, “I recall the struggles you had over your work well, very well. Everything in life should be done with sincerity of purpose. I know well all the difficulties which you encounter” (p. 321). The first statement was a correct fact, his frankness with me was a marked characteristic, and the reference to sincerity of purpose contained the exact phraseology which represented his constant advice in any trying intellectual, moral, or religious difficulty. The sitting then came to a close.

Near the beginning of the third sitting, after addressing me as “James,” etc., my father asked me if I remembered the story he used to tell me of a fire when he was quite young. I asked what story, and the message was repeated, and I thought of a certain fire of which I knew when I, not he, was young (p. 324). In the effort to have it cleared up the subject was changed. But I brought him back to it by a question regarding it, and the reply was, “Oh, yes, the fire. Strange I was forgetting to go on. I was nearly forgetting to go on with it. The fire did great damage and I used to think I never would care to see the like again.” I was unable to conjecture to what he referred with any assurance, especially as there were both exaggeration and discrepancies in it, so far as my memory of fires was concerned. Nothing more was volunteered on the subject in this series of sittings. But in the sitting by Dr. Hodgson on February 7th, Rector indicates that father is thinking of a fire about which he wishes to be clear (p. 372). Then on May 30th at my sitting (p. 430), father asks, “And do you recall the fire I spoke to you about?” I replied that I remembered a fire, but was not certain what fire he meant. The reply came, “We lived near, and although it did not interfere, it gave me a

fright. My thoughts are quite clear on this point. I think there can be no mistaking it." Singularly enough, this is followed by the spontaneous remark that some things which he has tried to say may seem muddled, as the first allusion to the fire evidently was, according to the sequel, in the following facts

Investigation at first discovered no probabilities in the first mention of the fire. Later my aunt recalled a fire when my father was young, which probably instigated the concern he felt about fire throughout his life. But on reading the passage in the sitting of May 30th to my stepmother (p. 430), she and my sister at once recalled a fire that gave my father quite a fright. It was not when he was young, but a short time before he moved West. He was always anxious about his barn and house, as he could never be induced to insure them until late in life. The occasion that fits the later message is described fully in my note (p. 364). It brings out the exaggeration and possible truth in the first message, as well as the certain truth in the second, so that a singular interest attaches to the statement that indicates an apparent consciousness of confusion in this incident.

The next allusion after the fire in this sitting of December 26th was to our conversation on spirit communication, which has been discussed already. At the end of it I took the opportunity to ask the question, "Do you know what the trouble was when you passed out?" and there followed one of the most remarkable, though confused messages in the record. I asked the question in order to test his identity most thoroughly, and had in mind the disease from which he *thought* he suffered, namely, catarrh, while I knew it was probably cancer of the larynx. I knew that if cancer of the larynx was mentioned, the theory of telepathy would have a strong, if not conclusive, point in its favour. But the following communications came in answer (p. 327) :—

No, I did not realise that we had any trouble, James, ever. I thought we were always most congenial to each other. I do not remember any trouble, tell me what was it about? You do not mean with me, do you . . . (S.: Father, you misunderstand me. I mean with the sickness.) Oh, yes, I hear. I hear you. Yes, I know now. Yes, my stomach. (S.: Yes, was there anything else the matter?) Yes; stomach, liver, and head. (S.: Very well. Tell all about it.) He has taken off this condition, but tells me he could not see clearly. What was meant by his eyes. His stomach and . . . speak plainly . . . [to invisible] I do not get it. Sounds like Bone (?) Bone (?) Bone (?) he is telling me. Wait.

He places his hand over his . . . heart beat (?) (S.: Heart?) Yes, let me reach thee, friend. [Hand moves over R. H.'s head.] Think I am finding it hard to breathe . . . my heart, James . . . my heart, James. . . difficult to breathe. Do you not remember how I used to breathe? (S.: Yes, father, you are on the right line now.) Yes, I think it was my heart which troubled me most, and my lung. Stomach and heart.

I felt a * * * [undeciphered] and tightness of my chest . . . and my heart failed me. He says distressed in the region of the heart, but at last I went to sleep. Was it not congestion, James? (S.: Not that I know of.) [I had the catarrh in mind in saying this when I should have had the death scene.] I will try and remember all about it, he says, yet I remember heart and head well.

A little later he apparently returns to the recollections of his last moments and says: "Do you know the last thing I recall is your speaking to me. (S.: Yes, right.) And you were the last to do so. (S.: Very well. Was any one else at the bedside?) I remember seeing your face, but I was too weak to answer" (p. 332).

I did not discover in this remarkable passage until I was reading the sitting over at Dr. Hodgson's office, that it was an attempt to describe the incidents of his death. I was prevented from seeing this because the spasms of the larynx from which he frequently suffered were accompanied by great difficulty in breathing, and I disregarded the other allusions as automatism; until it all at once came upon me, from the recollection indicated in the term "congestion," that he had interpreted my question in another, and in fact, more correct sense, to refer to his death. At once every one of the incidents indicated assumed a perfectly definite meaning, as my note shows very clearly (p. 328). The trouble with his stomach was especially noticed in the morning about seven o'clock. The heart action began to decline about half-past nine, and this was followed by increasing difficulty in getting his breath until the struggle for this became one of the most painful things I ever witnessed. Just after the last effort his eyes closed as if going to sleep, and in a moment the jaw fell and the end came. The allusion to the "congestion" appeared to suggest telepathy to account for it, as soon as I saw the meaning of the question, as I knew from the doctor's statement that he suffered from congestion in his spasms, and I thought that my father knew nothing about it. But the doctor's testimony shows that my father did know the fact (p. 356). It is not known whether he suffered with his eyes during his last moments, though it is probable. The references to his liver and to what was interpreted as "Bone" are unintelligible.

The allusion to my being the last to speak to him is a remarkable incident. When his eyelids fell, as I said, I exclaimed, "He's gone," and I was the last to speak. Father had been unable to speak for more than an hour. All these incidents, including the physical symptoms of his dying, are a confirmation of my inference regarding the "consciousness of dying" in this very case, though I did not mention any names, in the account of it published in the *Journal of the S.P.R.* (Vol. VIII, pp. 250-255). That inference was that he was conscious of dying. The statement, however, that "at last I went to

sleep" might throw some doubt on the implication that I attached to the "consciousness of dying" in this case. But it is interesting to trace a perfectly clear consciousness up to the closing of the eyes and falling of the jaw after the motor system refused to allow any expression of consciousness.

The statement at the close of the message referring to his last moments and illness that he would try and remember it, gave me an opportunity to ask him if he remembered what medicine I had gotten for him in New York, this medicine having been obtained for his catarrh. I thought that this question might help him out in the answer. He said:--

Yes, I do faintly. (S. : Never mind. Tell me about it later, when you feel clear.) James, it was my heart, and I remember it well, and my eyes troubled me also. Do you remember this? (S. : No, I do not remember this.) Do you not remember what the swelling meant? I remember taking hold of my own hands and holding them together over my chest, but strange I cannot think of the word I want. I know it so well too. (S. : Do I know it also?) Oh yes, very well. (S. : Did I ever have the same sickness?) Yes, long ago. (S. : Yes, that is right. What did I do for it?) This is what I cannot think, and it troubles me a little, James, because I know it so well (p. 330).

The first part of the answer to my question seems to be a reversion to his sickness after telling him not to worry about the medicine. The difficulty with his eyes I knew nothing about at the time, but learned from my stepmother, since the sitting, that during the last year of his life he was troubled with his left eye in particular, as well as with his larynx. The reference to the swelling was pertinent, as he often expressed wonder that the outside of his throat should be swollen from the effects of catarrh. He probably held his hands over his breast when taking the inhaler to bed with him, but this is not verifiable. The answer that I had the same sickness *long ago* is correct. I had the catarrh very badly between fourteen and twenty-one.

After an interval (occupied by other communicators) my father at once began to try giving the name of the medicine, and apparently tried to say quinine (quien), but on being asked if this was what he meant, the hand dissented (p. 332), and after saying that "it begins with D," gave it up with the statement, "Oh, I know it so well, yet I cannot say it when I wish to." I repeated the request not to worry about it, saying that it would come again.

Near the beginning of the sitting of the next day, December 27th, he undertook to answer the question about the medicine and succeeded. He said : "I remember Himi [or Hime] S (R. H. : Is that Hume?) (S. : Yes, that is right.) Yes. S. * * * is (!) Hume [?] [not clear intermediate letters] hme (!) (S. : Yes, that is right. Now one

or two words after that.) S nut [?] Serris [?] doings [?] I cannot catch all now . . . life. . . . You know what is on my mind perfectly, James. I used to speak of it often" (p. 336).

The medicine that I got for him was Hyomei (accented on first syllable) and he came near enough this in "Himi" for me not to press the struggle farther. What the "S" and "Serris" meant was not clear. A few minutes later, he resumed the attempt, as follows:—

I am thinking of Streine (?) Str . . . stri . . . strycn . . .
 Speak, speak. (S. : Well, father, is this Stryc?) Yes. (S. : Well, what is the next letter?) Nia . . . E . . . E . . . Str. Slower, sir, do not speak so fast. I will help you. Now slower—[to spirit.] StR . . . Strycnine." (S. : Good, father, that is right.) Do you hear me, my son? (S. : Yes, father, I hear you perfectly.) I remember you went and got it for me. God bless you, James, he says. And a numerous amount of other medicines [?] which I cannot * * * [undec.] (p. 337).

I remembered nothing about his taking strychnine, and ascertained from my stepmother, my brother, and my sister that he was taking it with the Hyomei. Later I found that my father had mentioned both *arsenic* and *strychnine* in one of his letters to me written about three months before his death, so that I had forgotten the fact. The "S nut" and "Serris" may have been attempts to give one or both of these names. But the Hyomei was the only medicine that I myself obtained for him. The strychnine was prescribed for him by the physician where he was living. I learned that my father had taken a great many different medicines.

In getting the confirmation of the strychnine incident, my stepmother mentioned incidentally another medicine that he had taken in considerable quantities, and, as a further test, when Dr. Hodgson held his sittings for me, I sent on the question to know whether he remembered any other medicines that he had taken besides the Hyomei and the strychnine, and at about the same time. Dr. Hodgson asked the question near the close of the sitting on February 8th. On February 16th Rector stated that it was morphine, and immediately afterward Dr. Hodgson repeated the question to father and he confirmed Rector's statement (p. 384). A little later he spontaneously apologised for taking morphine: "Do not gather the idea that I was a subject to morphia because I was not, only as a medicine" (p. 385).

Inquiry showed that he had never taken any morphine and that he was always very strongly opposed to using it. At the opening of the sitting for February 20th, after Dr. Hodgson explained to him that I did not know about the morphine, but was thinking about some "patent medicine," he requested Dr. Hodgson to ask me "if he does not recall the fact of my taking several grains of morphia before I took

the Hyomei?" (p. 391). This would have been correct if he had said arsenic. Rector then says:—

"I think he will recall it yet," and father at once takes up the thread and says: "It was, if I remember rightly, I think some months before when I had a bad or ill turn." It is true that my father had a specially ill turn some months before he sent for the Hyomei. He then apparently recurs to the inquiry about the "patent medicine," and says: "I will try and recall the name of that preparation" (p. 391).

In a few minutes, and after a respite, he began: "Yes, I took . . . yes, I took M U M U N Yes, I took Munion M U N Y O N sounds like . . . and he repeats again and again *Gerniside* (Gerniside?) Yes, *Germiside*." In a few minutes again, in response to the question of Dr. Hodgson about any other medicines, he said: "I took at one time some preparation of oil, but the name has gone from my memory. I know everything so well when I am not speaking to you" (p. 391).

Inquiry discovered that father had never taken any of Munyon's Catarrh Remedy, which would be the only one of Munyon's medicines that he would be disposed to get, nor did he take any other of that system of medicines. But I ascertained that he had often talked of getting this very medicine, having seen it advertised, according to the testimony of my brother, in a circular, and it is widely known as a germicide. The "preparation of oil" he did use. It was called Japanese Oil, and was sent to him by a friend. . This incident was not known to me.

On February 22nd, near the beginning of the sitting, he spontaneously referred (p. 397) to "taking this vapor preparation to which I have previously given mention." The Hyomei is a vapour. Then on the first of my last series of sittings, May 29th, I was at once accosted with the question: "Was it malt you wished me to think about . . . Maltine you . . ." (p. 418).

If this has any pertinence at all it is an incident like "Munyon's Germiside." He never took any Maltine. But when my stepmother wrote to my brother that father was losing flesh, my brother, seeing that he was not rightly nourished, at once wrote to father to get some Maltine and take it. It is probable that he talked about it, but my stepmother does not recall whether he did or not. It thus appears, so far as inquiry goes, that morphine was never taken by my father at all; that Maltine and the Munyon Remedy had both been specially in his mind at one time (though I was never aware of the fact); that strychnine was taken by him in connection with the Hyomei (a fact wholly forgotten by me), although I did not obtain it for him; that Hyomei, a "vapor preparation," was the special medicine that I did get for him, and that I remembered well, and that a "preparation of oil" was taken by him, as was entirely unknown to me.

A few communications, of little evidential value, except the allusion to my voice being the last he heard when dying, followed the attempt to give the medicine in my sitting of December 26th (p. 332), and then my uncle interrupted. But his place was very soon taken by my father again with the singular remark (p. 332): "Yes, Hyslop. I know who I am. And Annie too," as if amused at the confusion of my uncle, which was very evident. He then proceeded with the communications to me (p. 333).

And long before the sun shall set for you I will give you a full and complete account of your old father, James. Keep quiet, do not worry about anything, as I used to say. It does not pay. Remember this? (S.: Yes, father, I remember that well.) That, James, was my advice always and it is still the same. You are not the strongest man you know and health is important for you. Cheer up now and be quite yourself. (S.: Yes, father, I shall. I am glad to hear this advice.) Remember it does not pay and life is too short there for you to spend it in worrying. You will come out all safe and well and will one day be reunited with us, and we shall meet face to face and you will know me well. What you cannot have be content without, health or anything else, but do not worry, and not for me. This is going to be my life, and you will know all that it is possible for any one to know. (S.: Yes, father, I am glad of that. It will be my life here too.) Yes, I know it, and as we lived there so we will also live here. Devoted you were to me always, and I have nothing to complain of except your uneasy temperament and that I will certainly help. Only trust in all that is good, James, and be contented whilst you stay and I will certainly be near you. I am a little weary, James, but I will return and recall if possible my medicine.

The evidences of personal identity are very strong in this whole passage, though they will not appear so to the general reader, until he is told the fact that one phrase after another of it is exactly what my father constantly used to me in life. "Do not worry," "it does not pay," "life is too short," that we shall be reunited beyond the grave, are all as natural as life to me. Hundreds of times he has warned me that I am not so strong as some men. Of course, the incidents are not so striking as most of those upon which I have commented, but they reflect a tone of mind toward me that is exactly as I knew my father, and are suggestive of identity on any theory of the phenomena whatsoever. It is clear and intelligible, almost too much so to escape suspicion. But it has too many psychological points of identity in it to be treated as in any way the product of chance.

The sitting for December 27th was opened with some general and unevidential remarks from my father regarding his condition for communicating and indications that he had been told by the "control" that he would have an opportunity to return and communicate with

Dr. Hodgson in my absence. The dramatic play in this has its interest, as it involves a question directed to Dr. Hodgson, which was closely enough associated with me for the communicator to expect that I would ultimately get the messages. After being assured that he need "not feel troubled because he could have no further talk" with me at this time, he began at once to ask about his things that he had taken with him when he moved from his old home in Ohio :—

James, do you remember what . . . the things I took out West. (S. : Yes, father.) Well, are they not for you . . . (S. : Some of them I think are. What ones are for me ?) I wish all the books, every one, and photos (R.H. : Photos) (S. : Pictures) painting Pictures . . . yes, every one of those of mine. I took them out West you remember. (S. : Yes, I remember.) I should have said that I wished I would have had you have them before now. [Rector explains.] He speaks too rapidly, fearing he may forget something . . . had said all I wished. Cannot you send for them. I am sure . . . will give them up. (S. : Do you want one of the books to touch ?) Yes, very much. My diary, anything, diary . . . yes, or anything, any one of them. Give me one, James, if possible. I have something on my mind (p. 335).

There is a curious combination of evidential matter and of appreciative reference to the use of the things to which he refers. The first evidential fact is the allusion to his moving out West. He did this in 1889, and, of course, took all his household goods with him, including his books and pictures. He had some photos and two or three chromos which in his parlance might be safely called "paintings." The mention of his diary is also somewhat pertinent, as he had a day-book in which he kept both his accounts and various matters usually put down in a diary, some of the things being directions which I found applying to the management of the estate after his death. But, in mentioning the articles here, there is the evident desire that they shall be produced to "hold him" in the communications. This is a curious recognition on the "other side" of the conditions for satisfactory communication which we have learned empirically on this side. Why and how they affect the results we do not know, but they apparently do as a fact, absurd as it may seem to us. A little later in the same sitting he repeats : "Get the pictures ; do you not want them, James ?" (p. 337).

On February 8th he alluded to his habit of "poring over the pages of his books and writing out little extracts from them in his diary" (p. 380). This is true except that the extracts which he was accustomed to make were not written in his account book. He might have kept them in the diary, but this is now unverifiable. On May 30th he again asked me if I remembered his library and books, and inquired what had become of them, saying, "I am sure they are all right wherever they are, but there are some things on my mind which I must get off

(p. 434). On June 6th he again asked me about the books, and wanted to know what I had done with those he had given me (p. 473). Also on June 8th (p. 490). This will come up later in another connection. But it is referred to at present in order to exhibit the action of memory from sitting to sitting.

In the interval between two attempts, December 27th, to give the strychnine (p. 336) he mentioned a knife which has considerable evidential importance. He said, "Do you remember the little knife I used to pick out my nails with . . . ?" (S.: I am not sure, father.) The little brown handle one. I had it in my vest and then in coat pocket. You certainly must remember it. (S.: Was this after you went out West?) Yes, I seem to lose part of my recollections between my absence and return, just before I had this change, and the cap I used to wear—the cap . . . the cap I used to wear. And this I have lost too" (p. 336).

I knew nothing of this knife, but wrote to my stepmother, brother, and sister, without telling them what I was doing, to know if father ever had such a knife, and received word from all three of them that he did and that they had it yet. I then wrote to know what he used it for, and received the answer that he used it for paring his nails and various purposes about the house. But it seems that he did not carry it in either his vest or coat pocket, but in his trousers pocket. It is interesting, however, in this connection to remark his own spontaneous intimation of a defective memory.

A little later, in this same sitting, he recurred to the knife in the following manner. "Ask Willie about the knife. (S.: Yes, father, I will ask Willie about it, but there is one other boy who will know better than he.) I do not . . . George. (S.: No, not George.) Rob. Did you ask me to tell the other . . . Roberts (?) Robert. (S.: That is good, father, but not the one. Yes, Robert is the right name, but the one that will remember the knife is a younger boy.)" Rector then added to me: "He [referring to Imperator] will explain it to him, and I will get his answer soon" (p. 337.) A few minutes later father returned to the matter as follows: "Do you mean F . . . James? (S.: Yes, father, I mean F., if you can tell the rest.) Yes, I can remember very well. F R A D (?) " (p. 337).

The names of my brothers, Willie, George, and Robert, always called Rob., were correct, and the "D" in the original automatic writing might justifiably be read as a combination of N and K, which would make the name of the younger brother, Frank, correct and also the answer to my implied question. But we decided to treat the writing as a confused letter D with the doubt against instead of for us. The right attempt, however, was evidently made, and came nearly enough succeeding to indicate what was intended. The name of Willie had been spontaneously given in the first sitting (p. 309) and I had tried to

deceive the communicator in the same sitting (p. 307), but the names of Rob. and Frank were given here for the first time.

On February 8th in Dr. Hodgson's sitting for me, after alluding to his pen and paper cutter (*Cf.* pp. 379, 380), which were contemporary articles with the knife, he asked Dr. Hodgson: "Perhaps you will recall my asking for my knife" (p. 378). This is a very pretty illustration of the unity of consciousness and association with contemporary articles, and a memory of what had been mentioned before, Dr. Hodgson knowing nothing of the relation between the knife and the articles with which it was associated. The most important points in connection with the knife were that my father specifically mentions it, that he called it a brown handled one, that he mentioned its special use, and that all the facts were unknown to me.

In regard to the cap incident, I said in a short note at the time that I knew nothing about it, and I could have added that I did not care, as I regarded it as absurd—a mere automatism. It was only after it had been mentioned a second time that I made inquiries about it. It turned out such an important incident that I must narrate the facts very fully.

On February 16th my father sent to me through Dr. Hodgson the question: "Do you recall a little black skull-cap I used to wear, and what has become of it. I have looked and looked for it, but do not see it anywhere about. Answer this for me, James, when you come again" (p. 387).

I made inquiries of my aunt whether father ever wore such a cap in his early life, and receiving a negative reply (p. 387), dropped the matter. But on February 22nd he said to Dr. Hodgson: "Did you remind James of my cap?" and Dr. Hodgson replied: "Yes. He does not remember it." My father then said: "Not remember it? Ask Nannie. You see I was in the West, far from him for some time, and my habits of dress and my doings may not be known to him, but the rest may remember, if he does not" (p. 406).

This is a very remarkable passage, every word of it being true, except the name Nannie, which the context led me to suspect might be a mistake for Maggie, the name of my stepmother. It led to careful inquiries about the cap. I found that my stepmother had made him a black skull-cap to wear at night because he had complained of a cold head on cold nights, having been very bald for many years. But he did not wear the cap more than a few times. It could not be found as no one knows what became of it. It was at this point that it suddenly occurred to me that the "Nannie" was a mistake for my stepmother, as I had found some truth in the incident and observed that the word "aunt," which had been used for my aunt of that name, had been omitted. There had been some earlier references to the name "Nannie" without

the prefix "aunt" (p. 388). I therefore suspected that we had here a distinction between the aunt and my stepmother, and it became a later problem to settle this matter, which I postponed as long as possible with the hope that her name would ultimately be given correctly without suggestion from me. On May 29th he alluded to the cap again without mentioning my stepmother, and he referred to my brother as the one with whom he had left it "Do you remember a small cap I used to wear occasionally, and I left it, I think, with Francis. (R. H. : Francis?) [Hand dissents.] Fred, F R E. I mean Fredrick (?) [S. shakes his head negatively.] No, not that, but with F." (p. 425). My brother Francis, always called Frank in nickname for Francis, his correct name, was at home when the cap was made, but there is no reason to suppose that it was left with him any more than with my stepmother or any one else. The chief interest in this incident is the mention of it as if it had not been spoken of before. The assumption is all along made that I ought to know about the cap, when as a fact I knew nothing whatsoever regarding it, so far as I can ascertain, until told after the mention of it in this record. Some features of this case will come up again when considering the name of my stepmother (p. 69). It is important here only as representing an incident of which I knew or remembered nothing, and was apparently given for the main purpose of identifying himself very clearly; but it only happened in the end to supply any service for this object, though—in the first passage in which it aroused my attention, namely, that in which he alluded to my ignorance of his habits after moving West (p. 406),—it was connected with so much truth that I needed only to know the facts and to confirm my conjecture regarding the intended meaning of the name "Nannie" in order to find in this passage a strong incident for personal identity.

Returning to December 27th, just after alluding to the name of my brother George in the knife incident (p. 337) my father took him up for some further very pertinent communications. He began:—

"Do you hear me . . . what I told you about George? (S. : Yes, you mean before.) Yes, I . . . (S. : Yes, I remember.) I had a great deal to think of there, James. (S. : Yes, father, you did.) And the least said the sooner mended. Hear? (S. : Yes, father, I hear.) Do you understand? (S. : Yes, father, I understand.) *I will work now, and unceasingly as I can for him*" (p. 337). The pertinent parts of this message are the reference to the "much to think of there" and the phrase "the least said the sooner mended." My notes explain both of them (p. 348). Then after he had attempted to give the name of Frank in response to my desire for it, he made a number of relevant observations, generally very pertinent though not specifically evidential, such as the wish to "step in and hear me at the college," an explanation of why he had done so much for me, and finally his proposal to "right matters to his own liking, especially with the boys"

(p. 338). My father did have much anxiety in connection with my brother George, and as I learned later from my aunt, the phrase, "the least said the sooner mended," was a common expression before my time in the family, and used to describe situations of the kind indicated here, and which was fully exemplified in the prudential method that father always employed in his correspondence with me about my brother (p. 349).

At this point in the communications we interfered to read to my father some statements that I had prepared beforehand for the purpose. The arrangements for this had to be made with Rector, so that he would understand what I wanted. I had prepared some explanation of my reticence as influenced by the desire to avoid making suggestions, and some items indicating my general object in the experiments and its relations to the general beliefs of my father, in order partly to reveal my identity more clearly than I had done, and partly to call out some expression from him that would indicate what I knew of his religious life, as none of it up to this point had revealed itself. When the proposition was made to Rector, he explained at once that my father could get the messages only in fragments now, and that we should have to repeat it later (p. 338). As soon as this was understood we placed the accordion on the table to "hold him," and I began to read my message slowly to the hand. I first explained why I had not asked him many questions, saying that I had desired to avoid making suggestions, when I received the very appreciative answer: "Ah, yes, I remember the difficulties." In my conversation with him on this subject and the early Piper reports, I had explained to him fully the danger of suggesting our answers by our questions, when experimenting with mediums. I then proceeded, and in referring to the ultimate significance of work likely to prove a future life, said, with the purpose of exciting his religious consciousness, "You know it is the work of Christ and you will remember that I always said that I wished to live the life of Christ, even if I was not a believer." As soon as this sentence was finished, and before I could go on with the next sentence, Rector took the hand away, and, as if having said to the communicator, "do you hear that?" quickly wrote: "Perfectly. Yes, that is surely James." My statement, of course, could suggest the reply, but it is interesting as having been said to Rector and not to me, and comes through, either as an automatism, or as a message whose value Rector could appreciate and deliver for our purpose. I went on and closed with the desire that he should work on the "other side," as I should on this, to do the work of Christ. He said: "Yes. *I will and unceasingly.* You know my thoughts well, and you also know what my desires were before entering this life. And you also know whom I longed to meet and what I longed to do for you . . . whom I longed to meet he says. (S.: Yes, father,

I know well.) Good. Keep it in mind, James, and I will push from this side while you call from yours, and we will sooner or later come to a more complete understanding" (p. 340).

The pertinence of this is the fact that father had always believed he would meet Christ face to face after death, and was very much hurt when he found that I could no longer accept the beliefs and hopes of orthodoxy. Presently I asked him directly whether he remembered much of his religious life (p. 340), and he replied: "Yes, I think I do nearly everything, and my views whereas they were not just correct in everything, yet they were more or less correct, and I have found a great many things as I had pictured them in my own earthly mind. Since Christ came to the earthly world there has been an almost constant revelation of God and His power over all" (p. 341). He then asked me if I remembered our conversation about Swedenborg, which I have already mentioned, and to which I refer again for the sake of the pertinence of its connection. The passage just quoted, while it contains no incident that is evidential, has a tone about it that is not telepathic, as it reflects alleged facts neither in my mind nor in his terrestrial experience, but which would be quite natural if the spiritistic theory be correct. It is perhaps not beyond the power of a secondary consciousness to produce the like, and I refer to the incidents only for the psychological unity of purpose in them and their appreciation of the situation, with occasional touches of identity in them, too slight to be marked by any one but myself. But compare with this the whole passage in which the reference to the hymn, "Nearer My God to Thee" occurs, where also there is marked the same apparent change of opinions held in life (p. 389). For a peculiar interest attaching to the words "push" and "call" the reader may consult the notes on page 340.

After the allusion to Swedenborg, he immediately reverted to the subject of my reticence, and said very pertinently: "I am glad you have not given me any suggestions for your sake, but it has perplexed me a little, and at times seemed unlike yourself. I faintly recall the trouble on the subject of spirit return." After what I said above, the pertinence of this needs no explanation. Immediately following this, I asked him who was with us on that occasion, and he replied that he did not understand my question. I repeated it, and he said it was in New York, evidently still misunderstanding my query. I was living in New York at the time. I dropped the matter, as I saw there was some confusion about it, and in the attempt to mention a few moments later those whom he had not yet mentioned, he said: "No, I think I have sent all except sister. (S.: Yes, I think perhaps you are right. One thing I had not understood. Now which sister is this?) I mean *Nan*. R [P?] Mannie, and after my acknowledgment added "Give my

love to her, of course." Then, after a sentence or two to myself, said: "Tell Eliza too; *both*. And tell them to believe and trust in God always, and I will often bring comfort to Eliza in her sorrow" (p. 342). My father's sister Eliza had lost her husband very suddenly by an accident just a month previous to the sittings, and he had been a communicator in the second sitting (p. 314). The other sister, Nannie, had also lost her husband almost as suddenly just two months before. But I received absolutely no communications from him. But there is some reason to suppose that the "Nan" immediately changed to "Mannie" was an attempt to say "Maggie" (*Cf.* pp. 342, 365), which was the name of my stepmother, and which would have been the correct answer to my question. It is equally possible that both my aunt Nannie and my stepmother were intended, though the use of "both" and the reference to his sister Eliza a little later is against this and perhaps in favour of the reference to his sister Nannie alone.

Immediately after the allusion to my two aunts the record proceeds: "Do you remember the glasses (S.: What glasses?) and where they are? She has them, I think. (S.: Yes. Who has them?) Nani. (S.: No, not Nannie.) Ani. (S.: What glasses did you ask about?) M . . . Mnni. (S.: Whom did you leave them with?) I am thinking. It was Eliza. I do not think I said just right." The sitting had then to come to a close before anything more could be said (p. 343).

My father died in the house of my aunt Eliza, and he did leave his spectacles there. Myself and stepmother *Maggie* took them from there after his death, but in saying that he did not "think he said just right," he evidently had in mind the mention of my stepmother as the person with whom he left them, which would also have been correct. Had the statement been: "I left them with Maggie at Eliza's," it would have been exactly the truth, which is only vaguely hinted at here. The possible meaning of "Nani," "Ani," and "Mnni" in their connection with Maggie is indicated later (p. 365-6).

It may be a matter of some interest to the reader that at the close of this sitting, as Mrs. Piper came out of the trance, she uttered the full name of my father, "Robert Hyslop."

On February 7th Dr. Hodgson opened his series of sittings on my behalf. They are full of an interest additional to the evidential one for personal identity. The dramatic play of personality, which I shall discuss later, is a most striking characteristic of them. The first four of them are not so plentiful in specific evidence for identity, but still have sufficient to show that we were dealing with the same consciousness. Two or three very important matters occurred in them, and the last had as significant incidents as any of the sittings which I attended personally.

After the usual preliminaries in the first sitting of this series, Rector remarked that if Dr. Hodgson had no more questions, he would bring my father to him at once. A singular piece of dramatic play followed, in which a colloquy occurred on the "other side," indicating a misunderstanding on my father's part as to the person to whom he was to communicate. He appears to have thought he was to communicate to me as before, and the matter had to be explained to him, the details of the "transcendental" conversation appearing in the record (p. 370). As soon as he understood the situation, he began with a reference to the Swedenborg incident to say that he was glad that I understood him, Dr. Hodgson some time before having sent my word to him through Rector that he was right about it (pp. 370, 341). Then he went on with a message for me. The first was: "I am thinking of the time some years ago when I went into the mountains for a change with him, and the trip we had to the lake after we left the camp, and I have often thought of this." There follows immediately a long account of an accident to the train and engine on one trip out West in which he said "we or I was caught." The description of the accident is very detailed. But father never took any trip with me to the mountains, and the allusion to such a trip has to be set down as false, though my note shows how slightly the statement would have to be altered to be true (Note 26, p. 408). But no accident occurred on any trip that I or any one else can remember, though I do remember a delay on the trip in 1861.

It was necessary after the long account of the accident to give him the spectacle case to "hold him." He recognised it, though this fact had no evidential value. But there was a very pretty piece of dramatic play connected with it. Rector saw the effect of the effort to describe the accident and asked for a book. Dr. Hodgson gave the tin spectacle case, saying that this was all he had with him. Through Rector the recognition was made and the case called a "spectacle case," instead of "glasses case," in correction of the latter, the former being his usual name for it. This, however, is a slight matter, but when he said directly: "I am quite sure of what I am saying to you, my friend. I think Nannie will remember this also very well. You might speak to her about it or ask James to do so," he indicated a correct appreciation of the situation, and was correct as to the source for confirmation of his statements about the existence of the case for years in the family—supposing that this was the usual name intended for my stepmother (*Cf.* pp. 69, 366). The rest of the sitting was taken up with an explanation by Dr. Hodgson of the nature of the experiment and its object, so that my father could better understand it. He expressed his appreciation of my desire and promised to satisfy it. The sitting then came to an end.

The sitting of February 8th opens with communications from Emperor, Rector, and Doctor, before Rector takes his place as amanuensis in the intended communications from my father. The reason for this is not explained on this occasion, but it is sometimes alleged that Emperor "comes in," or writes for the purpose of "restoring the light," as the agency by which they communicate is called. In this connection a curious statement is made by Emperor, just before the communications of my father begin. Through Rector he said that it would be impossible to answer for Mr. W. on that day, as it would necessitate using too much light, and they must give this for "this kind gentleman, viz., Mr. Hyslop." The messages from my father then began, as follows:—

Good morning, James. I am glad to be here again. I am your father still who is trying to help you find me. I recall quite vividly some few recollections which I think will interest you somewhat. I remember some years ago of sending George some of the photos taken of the library, and he said he would return copies after he had finished them. I also recall the disturbance and trouble I had with one of my eyes, the left one. Do you not remember this and the little so-called . . . what . . . P . . . A . . . yes I hear. Pad. Pad. I had a peculiar mark which you will recall, at the back of the ears [ear ?] (p. 377).

The first matter of interest in this passage is the evident supposition of my father that he is communicating with me directly, and he does not discover until later (p. 379) that he is talking to Dr. Hodgson. But he shows a memory of the conversation with Dr. Hodgson in the previous sitting, where the object of the sittings was explained, and the incidents here mentioned are a clear effort to fulfil the promise there made. But the first one has little truth in it. Father had no "library" proper. He kept his books and did his reading in what he called, with everybody in his neighbourhood, the sitting-room. I find in these sittings, however, that "library" is uniformly employed for just this room in his house. But he never had any photographs of it taken. He had sent my brother, on the occasion of the latter's marriage, photos of himself and our mother, which hung in a room upstairs, and my brother has them yet. But there was nothing said or expected about getting copies of them returned. This was in 1884. It is worth remarking in this connection that a younger brother about this time was engaged in canvassing for the reproduction of photographs, and secured many such from various persons to be returned after finishing them. I cannot ascertain whether he had any of father's for the purpose. There is nothing in the message, however, that would lead me to suppose that this was meant. We can only conjecture its possibility from what we know of the general sources of confusion.

The disturbance with the left eye and the spot near the left ear were more pertinent. In response to my inquiry about the

trouble with his eyes, which I had connected with what was said about the death scene, and about any marks behind the ears, as indicated here, I received from my stepmother a negative answer. But when I read the record over to her this summer she noticed that the statement was with reference to the *left* eye and at once and decidedly confirmed it, stating that he often took his spectacles off and complained of trouble with the left eye. She still said, however, that there was no mark behind his ears, but incidentally remarked that there was a spot or mole in front of the left ear and concealed by his side whiskers. Of the existence of this I never knew, as I had never known my father without whiskers. One incident may then be taken as wholly correct and the other as nearly so.

Dr. Hodgson had asked him to tell what was in the tin box or spectacle case, and he remarked after a pause that he used to put his pen in it, but immediately corrected the statement, which was false, and said that it was where he kept his "paper cutter," which was also false. I had supposed that the allusion to a "paper cutter" was absurd in any case, as I knew that father's reading never required such an implement. He had not bought a book for forty years and none of his papers required cutting, so I rejected the allusion as false. But on inquiry I found that my brother Frank had made him a small paper cutter for opening his letters and that he usually carried it in his vest pocket. But his pen was actually in this tin box at the sitting and the box had not yet been opened. He then made an allusion to his knife, which has already been quoted, and asked to go away for a minute and return (p. 378).

As soon as he returned, which was in a few moments evidently, as little writing had been done in the meantime, he at once seemed clearer, and recognised that it was not I to whom he was communicating: "Here I am. Yes, I see, you are not really James, but his friend. Glad I am to know you. (R. H.: I am very glad). Yes, I remember I used to have this little case on my desk a great deal. Yes. And I am sure I used to place my spectacles in it. Yes, and some time my paper cutter" (p. 379). It was probably not this but the leather spectacle case that he kept on his desk at times. But he kept his gold spectacles in this tin case, and the case in his trousers pocket, I believe the trousers that he wore on special occasions such as going to church, etc. But he never put his paper cutter in the case, at least, according to the memory of any one living. A moment later Dr. Hodgson asked him again to say what was in the box and the reply was, "Looks like my glasses." His gold glasses were in it, but the statement, though correct, is not important, as it might be guessed from the nature of the case. No clairvoyance is indicated by the experiment.

His favourite book, Anderson's "Lectures on Theology," was shortly afterwards presented, and before the title of it was mentioned to him there was a confused attempt at giving it in the word Ferdinand. Then Dr. Hodgson asked him the question which I had sent about other medicines than those already mentioned. He was then given until the next sitting to think it over, and after some communications from Prudens and Rector, the sitting came to a close with but a few evidential incidents from my father. But the dramatic play throughout was a most interesting feature of the sitting, as it marked a singular contrast between the intelligent and clear conversation of the trance personalities and the difficulties and confusions attending the efforts of my father;—a fact of some importance as showing that we cannot attribute the difficulties of intelligent communication to the subjective condition of the medium, for in this case we should have to expect the confusion of a communicator coinciding with that of the trance personalities, which seems never to occur in any way reflecting on the spiritistic theory.

The next sitting was on February 16th. It opened correctly enough with an attempt to mention the medicine to which the previous day's question had reference, and which he had taken in addition to what I had been told; but the medicine named, morphine, was a mistake. Some further attempt followed to name the contents of the spectacle case, the spectacles being named, but nothing else. While doing this, he recalled the fact that he had often heard of Dr. Hodgson while he was "in the body," a fact that was true, as I had mentioned Dr. Hodgson in the conversations discussed (p. 385). Some further conversation followed with Dr. Hodgson, but it is of too little evidential value to be repeated here. It is intelligible and consistent with the communications generally, but has no weight. Just as Rector remarked that he seemed "quite clear just now" and expressed the desire to have him asked another question that I had sent on, Dr. Hodgson put it:—"Do you remember Samuel Cooper, and can you say anything about him?" There had been some difficulty between the two men and an alienation for years followed, and I hoped to bring my father's mind back to his old home in Ohio by it. The answer was absurd and false with reference to *Samuel Cooper*. But the sequel showed that there were some facts in the answer that were relevant to a *Joseph Cooper*. As the incidents connected with the name finally have very considerable importance I shall group together all that pertain to this question. The answer began and was repeated later:—

He refers to the old friend of mine in the West. I remember the visits we used to make to each other well, and the long talks we had concerning philosophical topics. Let me think this over, James, and I will answer it completely and tell you all about him (p. 386).

Not a word of this was true with reference to Samuel Cooper. But at the next sitting, February 20th, the question was repeated to Rector to take to him (p. 394). At the opening of the next sitting, which was on February 22nd, he said (p. 397):—

And the name Cooper is very clear to me also as I had a friend by the name who was of philosophical turn of mind, and for whom I had great respect, with whom I had some friendly discussion and correspondence. I had also several tokens [?] which I recollect well. One was a photo, to which I referred when James was present, and in my collection, among my collection. Do you recall, James, the one to which I refer? I know this clearly, and I have met him *here*. He is, if you recall, on this side of life with me, and came some years before I did. I liked much his philanthropic views, and as you will remember, a close companionship with him. I am too weak to remain, will return in a moment.

Among my collection of letters you will also find several of his which I preserved. I remember a discussion on the subject of religion with him some years ago. Doubtless you are thinking of this also. There are many things I can recall concerning him later. Look for my letters, also the photo to which I refer, James.

At the sitting of May 29th, which was the first of my last series of personal experiments, the several questions left over from Dr. Hodgson's sittings were approached spontaneously, and after ³Dr. Hodgson was sent out of the room father began:—

I am here again. I am trying to think of the Cooper school and his interest there. Do you remember how my throat troubled me. (S.: Yes.) I am not troubled about it, only thinking. (S.: I am glad to hear that.) I remember my old friend Cooper very well and his interests, and he is with me now. (S.: Yes, I am glad to hear it. Tell about him.) He is with me now. He maintained the same ideas throughout. And perhaps you will recall a journey U D we took together (p. 420).

On May 30th again he said: "I have talked it over with my old friend Cooper, and we both agree that we will very clearly speak our minds here. We are the same friends to-day that we always were, and James also" (p. 427). This statement only made confusion worse confounded from my standpoint. The James mentioned I could not identify, but Rector went on: "Let me speak, R. There is a gentleman on our side named James also. Kindly do not get the one here confused with the one in the body" (p. 427). This is an interesting piece of dramatic play. I thought of my uncle James Carruthers, but, as my uncle James McClellan communicated later, it might refer to him, though there is no evidence here for this, and, so far as pertinence is concerned, might be James anybody (*Cf.* p. 445). It is appropriate to add, however, that I ascertained from his living daughters that my uncle James McClellan was a warm admirer and most probably a personal friend of this Dr. Cooper (*Cf.* p. 427). In the sitting of

May 31st, near the close (p. 445), he said again, coming to the subject spontaneously :—

I want to tell you all . . . Samuel Cooper. You remember you asked me what I knew of him. Did you think I was no longer friend of his? I had several letters which he wrote to me concerning our difference of opinion, and I think they were with you. Have you got them? (S. : I shall look them up. Do you remember any other differences with him?) I think I do on the subject of this very question, his religious views.

Immediately following, father begins to ask about his family, and then remarks that he is getting confused and leaves (p. 445). On June 1st (p. 452), just after my sister Annie gave a long communication, my father suddenly broke in :—

Yes, I am back again now. I heard you say it was strange I could not tell you more about Cooper. What did you mean by that? (S. : I wanted to know if you remembered anything about the dogs killing sheep?) [Excitement in hand.] Oh, I should think I did. Yes, I do very well, but I have forgotten all about it. This was what we had the discussion about, and I made it unpleas[ant] for him. Yes, very well, James, but just what you asked me this for I could not quite make out as he was no relation of mine. I remember it all very well and if I could have recalled what you were getting at I would have tried to tell you, but I see him seldom, and I referred to him only because you asked me about him. (S. : Yes. All right, father, I wanted it for my scientific purpose.) Oh yes. Why did you not just remind me of it? Well, I will work for you and to remind you of other things quite as good. But don't hurry me, and in time I can talk to you just as I used to.

The excitement in the hand and the reference to the unpleasantness were perfectly pertinent, though it left all else that had been connected with the name of Cooper in its original obscurity. This Samuel Cooper's dog had taken part in killing some of father's sheep, and some unpleasantness arose in connection with the shooting of the dog, and the two remained unfriendly for years, when they were finally reconciled in a beautiful manner a short time before Mr. Cooper's death. But it is strange that this incident in their lives was not recalled at once by my father.

When I went West to look up some incidents in these sittings, I was explaining the confusion and error in these messages about Mr. Cooper, and my mother remarked that father was well acquainted with Dr. Joseph Cooper, of Alleghany Theological Seminary, and that he had probably corresponded with him at one time. She added that father always spoke of him in the highest terms, and made it a point to see him when he could at the synodical meetings of the United Presbyterian Church. I probably have heard of the man, but I certainly knew nothing of father's interest in him, and still less of certain incidents in the

communications of great pertinence. The allusion to his being a friend out West is not strictly true; but father knew of the Cooper Memorial School at Sterling, Kansas, which was built in memory of this Dr. Cooper (Note 39, p. 499). Father's trip to Kansas with my stepmother was a few years before the building of this Memorial School.¹ All the language applied to his being of a philosophical turn of mind is strictly correct, and from what I learn of his opinions and character he was just the man for father to correspond with about the time of the formation of the U. P. Church in 1858. What had therefore appeared originally as nonsense and false turns out to have a pertinence that was wholly unexpected, especially as a means for examining the claims of telepathy. The reference to "tokens" is very interesting. They were little coin-like pieces of metal that were used at the communion services of the church of which my father was a member. This was a name by which they were always called. My father was the ruling elder, and it was his duty to keep these tokens in security. When the congregation at his old home was dissolved he put the tokens away in a chamois skin bag, and after his death they came into my possession. I kept them as a memento. The connection in which they are mentioned is the most interesting part of the message (See Note 29, p. 410).

To return to Dr. Hodgson's sitting of February 16th, this first allusion to the Cooper incidents was followed by the second mention of his skull-cap and then by an inquiry sent through Rector for "a special pen or quill, as he calls it, with which he used to write" (p. 387). In a moment he said: "I recall a thin black coat or dressing gown affair I used to wear mornings, I can see myself sitting in my old armchair before the open fire in the library reading over the paper. Look at me there, James, and see me in the gown I refer to and answer me." After some allusions to me he said: "As I grew older, we grew together, *i. e.*, companionable, as we were much together, and Nannie I often think of her and her faithfulness to me. Did you realise that my bronchial trouble disturbed me much?" (p. 387).

My father used a quill pen constantly in earlier life, and before he got the gold pen which was in the spectacle case, I remember his making quill pens for me. My stepmother says he did have a thin black coat for morning wear in the house, and I remember him well in his armchair before the open fire reading his paper. In fact, he did

¹ The statement made in the *New York Independent* (Vol. LII., p. 750), that my father had visited the Cooper Memorial School with my stepmother in 1884 is incorrect. My stepmother knew of this institution, and in my conversation with her about the Cooper incidents I misunderstood an oral statement about the visit to Kansas in 1884 with father to be that they had visited this school. She corrected my error soon after reading the article. The "Cooper School" was not built until several years later (*Cf.* p. 500).

all his reading in it. But I knew nothing of a "thin black coat" connected with his habits. I find from my stepmother that he did use such a coat as here described during the last year or two of his life when I knew little or nothing of his personal habits. We did grow more companionable as he grew older, and were much together when we were together at all. My visits were not frequent after 1889. He became more reconciled with my free-thought, as he found that there were points of agreement between us that he had hardly expected. The allusion to the faithfulness of Nannie is very pertinent, assuming that the name is a mistake for my stepmother, as later developments unequivocally indicate is the case. He was an object of her special care for the last six or seven years, and more or less for twenty years of his life. The allusion to bronchial trouble explains itself after my statement regarding his cancer of the larynx. It is interesting also to remark that the black coat, the reading of his paper in the armchair and the open fire, the bronchial trouble and the black skull cup were contemporaneous with the time when he had special reason to think of my stepmother in the manner indicated here.

Shortly afterwards he put a question regarding my sister Annie, and there followed some very remarkable passages between him and Dr. Hodgson, that I must give in full:—

Do you remember your sister Annie? (Did James have a sister Annie?) Yes. (All right. I will tell him.) She is here with me, and she is calling to you. (Mr. Hyslop.) Yes, I hear you. What do you wish?

(It is curious. I know your son James very well, and we are interested together in this work. I have a sister Annie also, and she is still in the body, and I think your views in the body were probably not unlike my own father's, and you might be interested to meet my father over there, and you can talk to him about James, and perhaps he will tell you something about me. I think you and my father would get along very well.)

Well, I am glad to know this, and I will surely look him up [Cf. p. 389.] but you will remember one thing, and that is that my Annie is not yours. (Yes, I understand. She's with you.) Yes, and I will surely find your father and know him. These kind friends will help me to find him. (Yes, they will: they will introduce you to him. I shall be very pleased if they will.) Was he very orthodox do you think? (Fairly so.) Well, there is no need for it here. However, we won't discuss that until later, when we know each other better. (He was a Wesleyan Methodist.) Well this, of course, was more or less orthodox. (Yes. Oh yes, indeed.) Exactly, well we will get on finely soon. I know this perfectly well. But I must get accustomed to this method of speech, and see how I can best express my thoughts to you. (Yes.) I am now thinking of my own things and concerns. I can preach myself very well. Ask my son if this is not so. [Cf. p. 432.] I recall many things which I would gladly have changed if it had been as clear to me as it is now. I wish I could take my knife a moment, as it will . . . [Knife from parcel C, given to hand.] It will help me when I return to you.

I do not think I can say more to you now. (Well, I am very pleased to have had this talk with you, and I am sure that James will be glad to read what you told me about the medicine and gown and reading the paper and so on.) Well, I have so many things to say of much greater importance in a way later, when I can fully and clearly express myself. I am anxious to do much for him. (Yes.) Will you excuse me. I must go. (Yes, certainly. Good-bye for the present. Thank you very much.) [Excitement.] There is one tune going through my mind. Listen. *Nearer my God to Thee.* Hyslop." The sitting then came to an end (pp. 389-390).

The mention of my sister Annie was pertinent, and the conversation with Dr. Hodgson perfectly appreciative and intelligible, as every one acquainted with Calvinism and Wesleyanism will recognise. My father was a Calvinist. It was a curious episode to ask if Dr. Hodgson's father was orthodox, after Dr. Hodgson expressed the probability that his father and mine would agree in their views, and the statement, in reply to Dr. Hodgson's characterisation of his father as a Wesleyan, that this was "more or less orthodox" could be treated as a mediumistic echo of Dr. Hodgson's "fairly so" in reply to father's question. Hence, when I read the quotation from the hymn "*Nearer my God to Thee*," which will appear so pertinent to readers generally, it can be imagined how opposed to personal identity it was, if I say that my father was always strictly opposed to hymn-singing in any form of worship. He belonged to a denomination which would not tolerate it. The quotation thus appeared to me to be a fine case of mediumistic interpretation from the secondary consciousness, which we might suppose familiar enough with Wesleyanism to venture on some hymn after allusion to that creed. There was the lone allusion by father to his "preaching" himself which suggested identity and which was true of him, but not as a lay preacher, for he would not accept any right to preach as that term is usually understood, until the "laying on of the hands" was performed on some one specially prepared for the work. But the church which he attended could not have services all the year round, and as he would not allow us to attend any other church service for many years, and until his own church was dissolved, he would read a sermon to us or comment on a chapter in the Bible on Sundays when we had no preaching, and he called this a substitute for the sermon.

But when calling my stepmother's attention to the terrible way in which the allusion to this hymn told against my father's personal identity, she decidedly agreed with my judgment, but innocently remarked, without seeing the point, that *father had a special dislike for this very hymn, and used often to express his surprise that orthodox people could sing a Unitarian hymn!* The discovery of this fact, absolutely unknown to me, completely changes the whole colouring of the conversation. This, together with the allusion to his preaching,

explains the reference to what he "would have gladly changed if it had been as clear as it is now," and also the expression that there was "no need of orthodoxy" there. There is thus a distinct undercurrent of changed and consistent conviction throughout it all, with the two evidential facts of his "preaching" and of the reference to the hymn that ought naturally to be suggested in this connection, and when his aversion to it is known in connection with this evident change of feeling, it turns into one of the most remarkable passages in the record (*Cf.* pp. 340, 424).

Its importance and cogency are very much strengthened by father's spontaneous statement at the opening of his communications at my last sitting, June 8th (p. 490). He addressed Dr. Hodgson as follows: "I know your father very well. (R. H. : I am very pleased that you have made his acquaintance.) I find our minds were not quite the same when on earth, but our ideas of God *were*." This is undoubtedly correct in its import, and shows an interesting memory adjusted to the situation. But it contradicts the impression that Dr. Hodgson's language on that occasion was calculated to make in expressing the likelihood that their views would agree. I could have said at the time, had I been present, that they would not agree.

At Dr. Hodgson's sitting of February 20th, following the one that I have been discussing, the first incident regarded the Munyon's Germicide which I have already mentioned. Then a long conversation took place between Rector and Dr. Hodgson regarding the best way to conduct the experiments with my father. When this was over, the questions about Samuel Cooper and the strychnine were repeated, and the spectacle case was put into the hand again. Some of the same references to paper-cutter, etc., that were made before were given again, and mention made of a writing pad, some "number rests," and two bottles that used to stand on his desk, one of them round and the other square. My mother did not recall all of these at first, owing probably to the nature of my questions, but did afterwards, and my brother remembers the bottles, one an ink and the other a mucilage bottle distinctly. The writing pad was correct and the "number [of] rests" if they refer to the shelves on his desk, used as rests, is correct. But nothing more of importance occurred in this sitting.

The next sitting by Dr. Hodgson was held on February 22nd. The first references were to the medicine, a photo and the Cooper incident, already discussed. After closing this he began telling about a cane, which, though the story seems much confused, issues in such an important incident that it must be given at length.

Now what can I do for you? Do you remember the stick I used to carry, with the turn in the end, on which I carved my initials? If so, what have you done with it? They are in the end. (Yes, I understand.) I used

to use it for emphasising expression occasionally. [Hand strikes pencil on book several times.] (Thumping down?) [Hand keeps repeating a turning motion.] Yes, he turns it about and then carelessly drops it . . . the end of it. Understand? (Yes. I think so.) If not, speak now before he becomes in any way confused. [This was Rector's statement to Dr. Hodgson, but father proceeds] James. [The hand was apparently listening to spirit and I turned to arrange some sheets of paper on the floor.] Look, friend [said Rector] . . . Do you wish to go to the college this A. M. ? If so I will remain here . . . understand? [The hand between each word of the first sentence above stopped writing and made a turn, somewhat like the motion that the hand would make in wiping once round the bottom of a basin ending palm up.] (Rector, now, in this way?) Wait [?] [Hand turns to spirit, then to me] (Rector, that way?) [I read the sentence over, imitating the movements of the hand] Yes (with a twirl of the stick?) nervously. This is almost identical with his gestures. He is amused at our description, friend, and seems to vaguely understand our imitation. Draws it across his so-called knee, lets it fall by his side, still holding on to the turned end. Hears sounds of music, to which he listens attentively, with the exception of keeping time with the smaller end of his stick (p. 397).

When I first read this, I recalled a cane with a "turn" in it, which I had given father myself at the request of my aunt Nannie, who furnished the money and wished her name concealed in the affair, telling me that the one he used was broken, as she reminded me since this sitting. But I never knew father to carve his initials on anything. I wrote to my stepmother to know if he had carved his initials on his cane, and received an emphatic negative for reply. No one seems to have recalled another cane, a gold-headed ebony one on which his initials were carved on the end as indicated in the message, which had been given him by us children years before, and which had been lost on the cars on one of his trips. It was lost by his brother-in-law, who gave him another stout plain cane with a curved end. I had completely forgotten this fact of the other cane at the time of the sitting and was reminded of it on my inquiry in the West. I treated the incidents here narrated as a confusion of the gold-headed cane with the one that I had sent him myself. The dramatic representation of the communicator's actions in describing something in connection with the cane I treated as mere secondary personality. Careful investigation, however, showed that father was in the habit of thumping this curved handled cane down on the floor or against the door, when he could reach it, to call my stepmother, as he could not speak above a whisper. Also the circular motion described by Dr. Hodgson might be an attempt to reproduce an action which was very frequent with my father, according to the statement of my stepmother, when he was in a playful mood. He would reach out and catch her by the arm or neck with the hook of the cane and enjoy himself at her

expense watching her try to extricate herself. My brother and sister as well as my step-mother testify that he often drew or rolled his cane across his knees, as he was hardly ever without it in his hands, and that there were two occasions in which he was in the habit of keeping time with this cane. First, when he was listening to music, and secondly, when he was in meditation upon some subject. All these facts were wholly unknown to me (*Cf.* Note 36, p. 416). But at the time the confusion was too great for me to consider the incidents as interesting in their present shape. I resolved, however, to test my conjecture as to the possible reference to the two canes that I had in mind at the first opportunity that offered. I did this at my last sitting in June.

I had given a cane with a curved handle to my father shortly before the presidential election. On it was a representation of a "gold bug." Some years previously father had changed his political party. When he came to his old home in Xenia, Ohio, to die, my cousin, Robert McClellan, the one who is a communicator in this record, came with his wife to call on father and in the conversation expressed his curiosity about father's politics in the question: "Well, uncle Robert, how are you in politics now?" My father replied simply by picking up this "gold bug" cane and shook it at my cousin, and all had a hearty laugh about it. This incident I had from the parties present at the time after I arrived to see my father. I found my father very much interested in the issues of that campaign. Hence, with this incident in mind, I resolved to kill two birds with one stone by referring to this occasion and the cane to see if any light might be thrown on my conjecture already stated.

In the sitting of June 8th I had alluded to the presidential election and the passing of hard times as an explanation of a certain incident (p. 494), and as soon as the allusion was understood I asked:—"Do you remember how you shook a walking-stick at Robert McClellan about that time?" Great excitement followed in the hand, and as soon as it calmed down it wrote:—

"Well I do. I never was more excited in my life. I think I was right too. (S. : Well, who gave you that walking stick ?)" The forefinger of the hand which had been listening to my question began tapping me on the left temple for fully half a minute and then wrote: "You did, and I told him about it. [Pointing to Dr. Hodgson.] (S. : Yes, I thought so. What was on it?) What was on it? I think I know that it had the little top [?] I . . . I think it had the little ring? Ring. [See cut, p. 495] on it." (S. : I think I know what you mean by that. That is near enough. Do not worry. You recall it well) [p. 494.]

The lines here might fairly represent an imperfect attempt to draw the beetle or "gold bug" on the cane I gave him, or the mode of

mending the other cane by the tin ring. The allusion to the "top" and "ring" had no meaning for me at the time except as mistakes. He had referred to a cane in Dr. Hodgson's sitting on February 22nd, which I afterwards found was probably not the one that I here had in mind. But on my personal inquiries in the West, I ascertained a fact of some importance that I did not know. I found that father had mended the cane with a *tin ring* about four inches long. The cane is still with my stepmother. But there is no trace in this February sitting that father had in mind the "gold bug" cane. It was far more natural to mention the older one that he had used for over twenty years, and as it was his brother-in-law's substitute for the gold-headed cane, it was natural to associate it with that on which his initials were carved, and we can interpret the confusion as an incomplete message. There was probably some confusion also in his own mind regarding the matter, until he finally drew the representation of the "gold bug," unless we treat it as an attempt to draw the "ring" and not the "gold bug" at all, as I had also been a party to the present of the gold-headed cane. But, however this may be, the allusion to "the little top" and to the "ring," before correcting the statement to the representation of the beetle, fits the first two canes and not the one that I gave him. But the incidents fit in one way or another all three canes, and the liability to confusion from defective association is well illustrated by similar illusions of my own, mentioned later (p. 228).

The second fact resulting from my inquiries, and which I did not know at the time, refers to the excitement which father confessed on the occasion to which my question referred. The wife of my cousin, Robert McClellan, told me that she and her husband had to leave the room sooner than they intended, because my father, who could not talk above a whisper, showed so much excitement on the issues of the campaign that they were afraid a spasm of the larynx would come on in which he was likely to suffocate. I knew that he was intensely interested in the campaign, but I was not told of the special incidents of his talk with my cousin.

To summarise the case, father had three canes; the gold-headed cane on which his initials were carved, the stout one with the curved handle, which had been broken and mended with a tin ring, and the "gold bug" cane that I gave him which also had a curved handle. The communications nominally purport to refer to but one of them. Their fitness, however, depends on distributing the incidents among all three canes. The initials on the end, as mentioned in the record, fit the gold-headed cane; the ring, curved handle, and habits of using it in various ways fit the second; the recognition in answer to my question and the statement that I gave it to the communicator fit the "gold bug" cane. The drawing is equivocal, and may fit the

second and last. Consequently, on the assumption that confusion is certain to be an incident of communication, the statements may have evidential value. Otherwise they obtain little or no importance.

Immediately after the cane incident in the sitting of February 22nd, Dr. Hodgson read a letter that I had sent for the purpose of trying to improve the communications and of starting associations belonging to my father's life in Ohio. We were both dissatisfied with the results of the previous sittings. I shall not repeat the letter here, nor shall I quote all that he said in reply, as part of it, though accurate enough, is not evidential. In the letter I referred to the time that I started to college, and because my father had showed considerable emotion on the occasion, I asked, "Do you remember how you felt then?" The reply contained at first the sentiment and thought of what he said to me on that occasion, but is wholly non-evidential, though it is literally true that he told me he did not wish me to want for anything. But after the end of the letter he said to Dr. Hodgson, "God bless you, my son. Do you remember this expression? I wish you to know that to me James was all I could ask for a son, and when I left him or he left me I was heart-broken in one sense, but I felt that I had much to look forward to." The pertinence of this statement is apparent when I say that on the morning that he put me on the train for college, the first time I had ever been left to my own responsibility, he being conscious of the temptations to which I would be exposed out of his sight and myself unacquainted with the world, after giving me the advice mentioned, he bade me good-bye and broke down crying, the only time that I ever saw him shed tears in my life. In important partings like this father always bade me good-bye with "God bless you."

In the letter I also alluded to my Aunt Nannie's care for us, and said: "I remember, too, how we used to go to church." Mrs. Piper's hand bowed in prayer for a few moments, and then the reply came:—

"I remember the coach very well, and the roughness of the roads and country. I also remember Aunt Nannie and her motherly advice to you all, and I look back to her with a great gratitude for her kindness to us all. Do you remember Ohio, James, OHIO . . . and anything about Bartlett. I have not seen him yet, but hope to in time. I am trying to think of the principal of your school and what he said to me about George. I am still troubled about him, and if you can help me in any way by sending me anything encouraging about him I shall feel better I know." After some further conversation with Dr. Hodgson about his concern for my brother, he added: "You see I left with this on my mind, and I cannot dispose of it until I have learned from James that he will not feel troubled in this regard. We had our own thoughts and anxieties together regarding this and Aunt Nannie also" (p. 401).

This is also a remarkable passage. Every incident of it is true and pertinent, except the reference to Bartlett, which I cannot explain, except as a possible reference to Bartlett pears, of which father was very fond and to whose culture he had devoted some unsuccessful efforts, or to *Bartlow*, the name of the township in Ohio, in which my brother George lives. The mention of the "rough roads and country" was very pertinent, for they were very rough at the time in mind, when my aunt was keeping house for father after the death of my mother (*cf.* p. 402). "Carriage" is the word father would use, but probably Rector is more familiar with "coach." Ohio was his old home. The school incident was this. My brother George wished to go to college, but had become interested in society while at the High School, and on this account father hesitated to send him. In the summer of 1876 I was riding out of town with my father in a spring wagon, and we talked the question over about my brother, and I urged father to try him. He then told me that he had talked the matter over with the principal of the High School, and thought he could not undertake it. There were several principals during the time of my brother's attendance at the High School. One of them is dead. The one who most probably talked with my father is named Bonner, and is still living. On inquiry I find that I am the only person living that knows or remembers the incident. A year or so later my brother left home to take charge of father's land in the northern part of Ohio, and in the years that followed the management of land there for father, my aunt Nannie and myself—my aunt Eliza leaving her small interest in it to my father's care—my brother's loss of money and dilatory methods of doing business were a source of much worry and trouble to all three of us.

The special pertinence of all this is too apparent for further proof or comment. Rector followed it, while father was resting, with some advice that I should send something in the way of a message to get the anxiety expressed off my father's mind, and when father returned he alluded to the cap again in connection with the name "Nannie" (p. 406). Nothing more of importance was said at this sitting, which soon after came to a close. There were some interesting explanations of father's state of mind, and the prospect that he would in time be as good a communicator as another person named (p. 407).

The next series of sittings were personal, and were eight in number. In the first of these, on May 29th, the first allusion was to the Maltine incident already discussed (p. 418), which was an attempt to answer the question asked by me through Dr. Hodgson at an earlier sitting. One curious allusion here, apparently to what I was doing in the experiments on the identification of personality, is interesting (p. 537), though it is not clear enough to make it evidential (p. 268).

He said (p. 419): "Do not go more to that place. I am not there, and you cannot find me if you go. (S. : What place is that, father?) With the younger men trying to find me. They are not light, and I cannot reach you there." Soon after my first four sittings in December I had been conducting with my students the experiments in Appendix V., and this was the first sitting at which I was present since those experiments. He then asked to know what "Nani" said about the paper, having reference to his own injunction at one of Dr. Hodgson's sittings to ask her about it (p. 419). He showed himself anxious all along to have his reading the paper in his armchair identified. An allusion to my mother and sister Annie followed, and after this a short passage connected with our conversations on spirit communications. He then asked me if I remembered what he told me on my departure for school, and I repeated my desire to know the name of the school. But my attempt failed and later another institution to which I went afterward was hinted at very clearly (p. 449). Shortly after, and during Dr. Hodgson's absence from the room, I was asked: "And do you remember John? He has just come to greet you. And do you remember anything about Lucy. I say Lucy. She was Nannie's [?] cousin" (p. 421). This was nothing but confusion to me at the time. But later events show the connection that enables me to put an intelligible meaning on the passage. Lucy is the name of Robert McClellan's wife, and she is still living, her husband having died a year later than my father. She was evidently intended in the next communication from my father. John was the name of Robert McClellan's grandfather. But the statement that this Lucy is "Nannie's cousin" is wholly false. The doubt about the reading of the word for "Nannie" enables us to suggest that possibly it was a mistake for "Annie," my sister, in which case the statement is correct. It is not impossible to put this interpretation on the original writing. But I do not claim this conjectural reading as evidential.

A confused message about my "brother F . ." terminated father's communications, and my sister took his place and said a few words (p. 421). She correctly stated two facts, that she had died before father and that it was long ago. On father's return he made some allusion to a church, and a moment afterwards said, "And perhaps you will recall an old friend of mine who was a doctor, and who was a little peculiar in regard to the subject of religion, and with whom I had many long talks. A man small of stature and more or less of mind. It has gone from me—*i.e.*, his name, but it will come back to me" (p. 421.) This suggested a doctor, Harvey McClellan, with whom I knew father had had long talks on religion, and a little later in the same sitting (p. 425) an apparent attempt to give the name as father left was made in the name Henry [?] McAllam

[?]. On June 6th (p. 473) father asked me : "What was the name of that Dr. I cannot think of his name." This occurred soon after my uncle James McClellan had communicated. Then on June 8th (p. 491) my father said, without any pertinent connections that are traceable : "There was a Henry [?] McClellan also. I think you may know this. He was, I think, an uncle of the McClellan boys." The statements regarding stature and religious views would be equally or more applicable to father's dentist, who was always called Doctor, and whose name, however, was never mentioned at all at the sittings. It is, unfortunately, not made clear whether the doubtful "Henry McClellan" was intended by the person described or not.

Immediately following this allusion to a doctor on May 29th (p. 422) father began a communication having much interest in spite of its confusion.

Do you remember McCollum [?] (S. : McAllum.) (R. H. : McCollum.) (S. : No, know what it is.) (S. : Spell it again.) McAllum. (S. : How was he related to you ?) He was McAllan [?] (S. : Yes, that's it.) Don't you U D. who I mean ? He came over some time ago. (Yes, I remember. Tell.) What about your uncle ? (S. : Which uncle do you mean ?) I mean . . . let me hear once more . . . I mean Charles. (S. to R. H. : That's not quite right. Shall I make him spell it out ?) (R. H. : Yes.) You must remember him. (S. : Yes, I remember him. But please spell out the name in full.) In full. (S. : The name of Charles is not right.) In full did you say ? (S. : Yes.) C l a R l . . . [Hand signifies dissent.] Speak it more loudly. C l o r R . . . C. [pause] (S. : That's Clark.) C l r a R a k E. C l a r k (S. : That's right.) E (S. : Not quite) son [?] . . . there are some more which I will . . . I say. He is here himself speaking it for me. C l a r k e. Clarence. Speak it louder friend. Well he is uncle C l a u c [?] C l a r a k e. I will wait for it. It sounds very like it. Clarke. Charles [?] Well, never mind. Don't try. Wait a moment and do not hurry . . . yes and McAllan. Well you must know him. I had a cousin by that name. Don't you remember it.

I saw in the "McCollum" and "McAllan" an attempt to give the name McClellan, and it was confirmed both by the previous name Lucy, which was that of his wife, still living, and by the statement that "he came over some time ago." The inference, however, is confirmed by later events. He was not my father's cousin, but his nephew, and my cousin. The confusion and error thus have an interest, and no less is this the fact with the attempt to give the name of my uncle, which never succeeded. They never got nearer his name, which was Carruthers, than Clarke or Charles. (Cf. Footnote p. 423.)

The next question that I was asked was : "Where is George ? I often think of him, but I do not worry any more about him," both the name and the implication in the term "worry" being correct, and in a moment came the quick communication : "Do you remember Thom

. . . Tom . . . and what has he done with him. I feel quite . . . yes . . . yes, all right . . . I mean the horse" (p. 423).

We had an old faithful horse by the name of Tom, that used to get excited and work too hard if fretted in any way, and father always cautioned us against using the whip on him, and when the horse became too old to work, pensioned him, so to speak, and allowed him to die on the farm. I find by correspondence with the brother named here that he buried the horse after its death. This was after I had finally left home, and was somewhere about 1880 or later. The last part of the message has a most important interest. After the confusion with the names of my uncle and cousin, Rector evidently wanted this name to be completed, supposing apparently that father was trying to give the name of some person, and seems to have asked him if he was clear. Father's answer shows that he felt clear about it, and the sudden explanation of what he meant by saying that he meant the horse both determined the evidential value of the incident, and satisfied Rector as to the situation.

He then expressed wonder as to what my sister meant by referring to a sled, which she had done a little earlier, and then came: "James, are you waiting for me? I used to read the paper in my chair, but strange they none of them remember it. Did you write to Nannie about it, James? . . . And the little tool I used for my feet. He says no. S t o o l. Yes, I had for my feet. Cannot you remember? (S. : When was this?) Just before I came here" (p. 424.)

Father had a stool for his feet, but always refused to use it. When my stepmother would offer it to him for propping his feet up near the stove, he would put it aside and thrust his feet direct into the oven to warm them. This was very frequent during the last year of his life. The chair incident and reading his paper explain themselves and represent the facts already mentioned (p. 387).

After my father's confessing a change of views about the Bible, which might be construed as an objection to identity, a few brief communications from my sister Annie concluded the sitting.

At the sitting of May 30th, the first allusion was to the Cooper incident, and then there came a long and confused series of communications apparently from my cousin Robert McClellan (p. 427). The evidence that he was the real communicator comes later. The fact to be noted here is his appearance personally after my father's allusion to him in the previous sitting (p. 423).

My father followed my cousin, and first made an allusion to the fatal nature of his illness, and said that nothing would have done him any good—which was undoubtedly true—referred to my being tired, and repeated the advice which he had been accustomed to give me, saying: "You know how I used to talk to you about overdoing

anything, and you will remember your tireless energy." Pertinently in this connection, as he always pointed to his own condition as an illustration of overwork, he asked: "Do you remember when I got hurt?" and made a clear and correct statement about the fire incident (p. 430). After explaining his own confusion in these communications, he began the following complicated message:—

Charles. (S. : Is this brother Charles ?) Yes, and John. I just called them. (S. : What John is this ?) Brother John. (S. : Is this brother Charles speaking ?) Yes, and father. We are both speaking. Chester [?] Clarke [?] and Charles [?] Yes. Oh speak, James. Help me to keep my thoughts clear. (S. : Yes, I think you are uncle, are you not ?) No, it is I, your father, who is speaking, and I am telling you about Charles and John. (S. : What John is that ? I remember Charles, but not John, unless it is John some one else.) McJohn. There are two of the McLellen over here. (S. : Yes.) And this one is John. (S. : Yes. Do you remember where he lived on earth ?) *I do.* What . . . (S. : Do you remember where he lived on earth ? I remember John McClellan.) I don't believe I understand just what you said, James. (S. : Do you remember where he lived on earth ?) Ohio. Was it that you meant ? (S. : That is right.) I told it I thought before (p. 431).

Except for later developments and inquiries I could give no meaning whatever to this passage. I suspected who was meant by the "Chester," etc., but father had no brother John or brother of any kind. This, however, was cleared up by the evident intention to speak of John McClellan, who was named spontaneously a minute later. I knew but one John McClellan, and that was the treasurer of the institution in Ohio to which my father sent me. So much then appeared true in the message; but it implied, as an earlier use of the name John with the statement that he had come to greet me, that he was not living. Here was a good test, and I inquired only to find that the John McClellan that I had in mind was still living. But this mistake was spontaneously corrected by my uncle, James McClellan later (p. 470), giving John as the name of his father who had died many years ago, and saying that his brother John, whom I had had in mind, was coming soon (p. 471). He also lived in Ohio. The "Chester," "Clark," "Charles," etc., were, as I think, attempts at my uncle Carruthers, and the first Charles was the name of my brother.

After a pertinent allusion to setting an "example for his sons," which expressed the main moral purpose and characteristic of his life, uttered here from a misunderstanding of a statement of mine, he apologises for his mistakes and said, "There was another one here whom you must have forgotten. Do you remember Mary Ann Anne ? (S. : Well, the rest of it.) Do you remember Mary Anne Hyslop ? (S. : Yes I do. What relation was she to me ?) Have you forgotten

your mother? (S.: No, no, father. I have not forgotten, but I wanted to see it written out here.) Well, speak to her, my boy" (p. 432). Some non-evidential communications at once came from her, and her initials were signed at the close of them. The message had her religious nature in it, but no interesting facts. Her correct name was Martha Ann Hyslop. "Mary" was, I suppose, Rector's mistake for "Martha" (*Cf.* p. 481 and mistake of "Nannie" for "Maggie," pp. 69, 342, 365).

Following my mother and her religious tone of thought my father continued, "James, do you remember my preaching? (S.: I remember you used to talk and read to us about the sermons) and . . . Sunday . . . mornings . . . at home? (S.: Yes, I remember that well.) Do you remember the dining-room and prayers?" (p. 432). I have already explained (pp. 432-433) how father used to spend the Sundays, or Sabbaths as he would invariably say himself, on which we had no preaching, and morning prayers were said invariably in the "dining" room if that term be given the flexibility necessary to fit the case. But we had two rooms that could be given that name. We dined usually in the kitchen except when company was present, when we took what we sometimes called a dining and sometimes a sitting-room. Prayers were held as often in one as in the other of these rooms. But the use of "Sunday" is interesting, as it is against identity. The hesitation, however, and the fact that G. P. is assisting, as indicated a few minutes later (p. 434), are curiously suggestive. The Emperor group of personalities always use the word "Sabbath." Rector was the amanuensis here. Hence it is interesting to see the word "Sunday," which G. P. would always use, written out when he is assisting. Immediately following this passage is an interesting one regarding my brother, and it has a most intimate internal connection with the allusion to the morning prayers. The evidences of this are too personal to publish, except that I shall say that this brother was a special object of father's prayers and life-long religious solicitude. He said here, "Think there is one of the boys I have not yet mentioned. Isn't there? (S.: Yes. I think so. Yes, I think you have not mentioned him very clearly.) [I had my brother Frank in mind, whose name had not been given in this form, but in the form that was not generally used, that of Francis (p. 433).] Well, I was not sure, but I would like to reach to brother Robert myself . . . Robert cousin" (p. 433). The pertinence of this is its recognition of what my cousin had said about this brother (p. 427). He had always shown the same interest in him as my father. This cousin's name, already given, was Robert McClellan, and hence we have both the correct names given here and the recognition that one of the persons mentioned had mentioned the other.

Immediately following this was an allusion to his library and books, and then a confused attempt to give the name of my half-sister, in which G. P. figures confessedly (p. 434). After my deliberate assistance in recognising one letter of it, it is not necessary to lay any stress upon the virtual success in getting it. Following some of Rector's remarks about my father's memory, father continued: "James, do you remember a little bridge we used to cross in going up to the church? (S.: Yes, I remember the bridge and the creek.) Yes, I do very well. I do also. Mother just called my mind to it" (p. 434). This is a little equivocal, as I cannot tell whether he refers to his own mother or to mine. The reference to "mother" would apply to both of them, though it is hardly specific enough to give it evidential value.

Father then returns to my sister: "Hettie. Tell me about her. Does she ever speak of me. I don't suppose you can tell because you are not with her often. James, I am * * [undec.] I am glad he [?] is . . . he is . . . here comes John again, we will be obliged to let him go for the present." "And if you will speak to me, James, I will tell you that cousin Annie is very anxious to send her love to H. H. Hettie. (S.: I will give her love to her.) And do you remember anything of Ruth? I often hear her speak of her, and . . . she is only a friend I think." The sitting then came to an end (p. 435).

My father shows a perfectly correct appreciation of the facts when he said that I do not often see my sister, as the statement implies the situation consciously recognised and stated elsewhere (p. 375), that I was in New York and my sister not. I seldom see her.

There are two possible interpretations of the references to "cousin Annie," "Hettie" and "Ruth." Both of them have the same pertinence. My notes will explain them (p. 505).

At the next sitting, May 31st, father first referred to "the thought theory" and Swedenborg (p. 438), and then this was followed by a long communication, apparently from my cousin, as the latter part of the message indicates, but ostensibly from the "John" of earlier communications. This must be noticed under the head of my cousin. He was followed by my brother Charles. Father tried again and failed. It was explained that my father was "a little dazed," and G. P. broke in with the statement, "I am coming H. to help out," and inquired of Dr. Hodgson about a Dr. Meredith. In a minute or two father began: "I wish you would hear me out, James, my son. I am going to try and keep my thoughts straight. Yes, I will do my best for you. How is Franks? (S.: Frank is much better.) I thought he might come to us for awhile, but we have not seen him yet" (p. 441). My brother Frank was an invalid at the time of father's death, and was unable even to be present at the funeral. My father thought he would not recover. I had learned a short time before the sitting that his health

had been recovered. The pertinence of the remark about him would have been spoiled by my statement here, had it not been that father's question about him first implied the situation before I had said anything. Then followed a pertinent question from him, showing that he had referred to this brother in order to make sure that he had mentioned all the members of the family, and my answer to it opened up the most interesting incident of the whole record. I saw my opportunity to suggest the giving of the name of my stepmother, which I had only conjectured from the incidents before mentioned.

But I must summarise here the allusions that stimulated a careful inquiry into the mistake connected with the name of my stepmother. A curious confusion had persisted in regard to this until I directly asked for the name. The name "Nannie" with the prefix "aunt" was several times used for my aunt by that name, and where the incidents and connections fitted this aunt. But it was also often used *without that prefix* where the incidents and connections fitted only my stepmother, whose name was Maggie.

I did not suspect the confusion of "Nannie" with "Maggie" on December 27th in the use of "Nani" and "Mnni" (p. 343), as father had a little before referred, as I supposed, to his sister, and gave what we read at the time as "Nannie," but later as "Mannie." Besides most that was said, except the reference to the glasses, would apply to this sister, though more pertinently to my stepmother (*Cf.* Note 25, p. 365). But in Dr. Hodgson's sitting of February 7th, father, speaking of his spectacle case, said, "I think Nannie will remember this also." February 16th my father mentioned the cap incident, his dressing gown and his bronchial trouble (p. 387-8) in connection with the name "Nannie" without the prefix "aunt" and he also remarked, "I often think of her faithfulness to me." All this applied to my stepmother and not to my aunt. Again on February 22nd, in the last sitting by Dr. Hodgson, the cap was mentioned a second time, and connected with the name "Nannie" without the prefix "aunt," and all the other incidents in the same connection fitted my stepmother and not my aunt. Then at the sitting of May 29th, when I was present, father asked, "What was it Nani said about the paper?" (p. 419), referring to the incident of reading his paper in the chair, mentioned in Dr. Hodgson's earlier sitting (p. 387). There was no reason whatever thus to refer to my aunt, as only my stepmother, brother, and sister knew the facts. Later in the sitting of the 29th, father recurs to the same incident and asks, "Did you write to Nannie about it, James? papers. . . ." (p. 424). After mentioning my brother Frank for the purpose indicated, the record proceeds:—

"Have I overlooked any one, James? I will not . . . (S.: Yes, you have overlooked one, and then the name of another, my present mother,

was not given rightly. Yes, you overlooked one of your children.) [I had in mind the sister mentioned in a remarkable way later (p. 460).] Have I? Have I? Well I will think about it and see whether I have forgotten them. I know I never forget anything, but when I can tell it all to you is a different matter. Did you say anything about mother, James? (S.: Yes, you did not give rightly the name of my mother on earth now.) But the one with me? (S.: Yes.) I was speaking about . . . I thought. I intended to bring her and keep her clear. (S.: Yes, that was right. I remember my mother on your side, but there is one on this side, you know)" (p. 441). This was May 31st.

The source of the confusion here is perfectly evident. I ought to have said *stepmother*, as was finally done later (p. 483), but she was always spoken of as "mother," and I thought that the addition "on this side" would make this clear. But evidently my conception of the situation was not clear to my father, as his answer showed that he had my own mother in mind, who was with him at a previous sitting (p. 432).

The sitting of June 7th was almost wholly occupied with the attempt to get my stepmother's name. I had resolved, after talking the matter over with Dr. Hodgson on the way to the sitting, to start the subject, and the opportunity offered itself near the outset. "(Who made that cap you referred to so often?) Mother. (S.: Well, which mother? The one on your side or on this side? Which mother, the one on your side or the one on my side?) on my side" (p. 478). Understanding this last statement to be an answer to my question, and not being sure what it meant, I said: "Do you mean in the earthly life or in the spirit life?" The answer came: "Oh, I see what you mean. Your mother, James, is with me, but Hettie's mother is in the body" (p. 478).

This last answer was correct in every detail, and satisfied me that the name "Nannie," so often given where I had thought my stepmother was really meant, was probably a mistake for Maggie, especially as "Nannie" had been given in connection with the cap and other incidents applicable only to my stepmother (p. 406). I then started the next question with a double object, namely, to get incidents that I did not know, but which were connected with her, and that might elicit her name by accident. Father had taken a trip West with her before moving West himself, and the incidents of that trip were unknown to me.

(S.: Yes, that is right. Do you remember any trip with her out West?) Certainly, I told you about it before some time ago, did you not understand it? (S.: No, I was not quite sure what you meant. When you can I would be glad to have you tell some things about that trip, but don't hurry.) Yes, but it was she who made my cap and you had better ask her about it. S a r a h. S A R A H." Dr. Hodgson was about to speak

when father went on, ending in confusion. "Let me see. What is it I wish to say. Ellen. Help me, Oh help me to [R.H. puts leather spectacle case and brown knife on table next to hand. Hand moves back the knife and retains the spectacle case.] recall what I so longed to say. My own mother Nannie. I . . . wait I will go for a moment. Wait for me, James." I said I would wait and G.P. appeared, asking Dr. Hodgson if he had been sent for. Father proceeded: "I think, James, you mean when we met with the accident, do you not? (S. : No, not the accident. You took a trip with Hettie's mother just before you went out West. It was that to which I referred.) Well I am sure I have told you of this before. Think it over and you will recall it. I am not sure I mentioned her, but I had it on my mind when I referred to the trip I took just before going out West, do you not recall it?" (p. 479).

The fact is that I was in as much confusion as my father, as I had not recognised the trip to which he had referred before (p. 421), because it was connected with the Cooper incident, which had appeared as nonsense to me until I verified it from my stepmother after the sittings were over. Hence I was thinking of the trip that he had mentioned in my first series of sittings, which was taken with my own mother and aunt Sarah in 1861. The expression, "my own mother Nannie," is a very significant one, especially as a little later (p. 481) the same references come out still clearer. His own mother's name was Margaret, the same as that of my stepmother, which I wanted. Nannie was the name of his sister, and was used in connections where Maggie, my stepmother's name, should have been given. Ellen has no special significance in this connection.

At this point Dr. Hodgson, who did not know that I was quite satisfied with results, since he did not understand the facts as I did, called G. P. and explained the situation, and asked for my stepmother's real name. I explained to G. P. (p. 480) the mental situation of myself in regard to the two trips and what was wanted. G. P. said: "I see. Well, I will assist him; do not hurry." Then followed an interesting colloquy begun by father, after G. P. had explained to him the source of my confusion in not knowing which trip he referred to before, whether it was the one with me or the one with my stepmother. He said: "Yes, this is . . . the one he referred to was the one with yourself . . . yes which interrupted his thought somewhat." Though this is a correct acknowledgment of the case and interesting as explaining the interruption, it contains much confusion still. It seems in the first part to imply that the trip he took with my stepmother involved my presence with them, when this was not the fact, except that they visited me in Chicago on their way home (p. 440). The latter part seems to indicate only that my allusion to the trip was the source of the confusion. But in what follows there is a clear attempt to straighten the matter out. After some altercation with

Rector, who had advised him to wait, but who finally gave way, father began :—

“It was Aunt Nannie (R.H. : ‘About Nannie’) about Aunt Nannie. I thought it all over about the cap when I spoke of her. I say I . . . ” (S. : The cap was not made by aunt Nannie. You told me rightly a moment ago.) You are not understanding me, James, let me explain. I thought of H. . . . H A R . . . H . . . no go on. I thought of my mother and aunt my sister both at the same time and I wanted to say that both of their names came into my mind as you spoke of Mary here, and I got a little confused about it. I am all right now. I wanted to say something about our visit to her also.” Dr. Hodgson was about to interfere when I remarked that I understood the matter, and the communications went on. “And between the visit to the boys and aunt Nannie I got confused a little. (S. : Yes, I understand perfectly.) Well we saw George. We saw George and Will. Now what did I . . . oh yes, I then arranged to go out there to live. I” [Pause]. At this father disappeared (p. 481).

The answer to my correction of his apparent allegation that aunt Nannie had made the cap is a perfect piece of interpretation of my actual misinterpretation of his meaning. My statement was calculated to produce worse confusion and I should have remained quiet; but fortunately he saw, as he states, my misunderstanding of his meaning, and quickly explains that he had not intended to connect the cap with aunt Nannie, though the previous sentence, perhaps incomplete, is capable of that interpretation. Possibly the “HAR” is the result of an attempt to say Margaret, and only the syllable “Mar” comes as “Har.” The next sentence gives the same explanation of his confusion that I have previously mentioned (p. 481), and indicates very clearly my correct interpretation of the former. There he had said, “my own mother Nannie,” which would imply that his mother’s name was Nannie to any outside reader; but I knew the facts well enough to discover that the unity was in the interpretation that I gave, and it is confirmed by the recognition of the distinction here between his mother’s and sister’s names. Recognising that his own mother’s name was the same as the one that I had asked for and perhaps wondering why he had succeeded only in sending that of his sister, he explains that he had thought of both of them at once, as I spoke of “Mary here.” Now I had not spoken of any “Mary” by name, and I could never make out until this writing what this “Mary” could mean. In the request to have my stepmother mentioned (p. 441), I had referred to my own mother in the phrase “my mother on your side,” without giving the name. Now in the sitting of May 30th (p. 432) my own mother’s name came out as Mary Ann Hyslop instead of Martha Ann Hyslop. Most probably, therefore, the name Mary in the present allusions of

June 7th is the same mistake as on May 30th, and so is intended for my mother. Consequently, with the allusion to *his* mother whose name, Margaret, was the same as my stepmother's, and to his sister, whose name, Nannie, was the same as that which was mistaken for that of my stepmother (pp. 69, 343), and with the reference to my mention of my own mother before, we have a clear indication of what was in my father's mind and intentions. Who was meant by the message becomes clearer still in the statement about seeing my two brothers George and Will and then arranging to go out West. For he did see both these brothers after the return from that Western trip and then made his plans to move. Though he has not yet given the name, the incidents make it impossible for me to mistake who is meant.

My sister Annie took father's place for a few moments, and on his return he resumed the attempt to name my stepmother and said :—

"I am here once more and I am thinking about the trip I took with H A T . . . [Hand dissents.] H A R . . . No. [S. shakes his head negatively.] I want to speak of other things. Will you try and tell me exactly what you want " (p. 482). Then began the most interesting part of the whole drama. Dr. Hodgson explained our understanding of the situation as some confusion still about my stepmother, but Rector indicated very emphatically that it had "nothing to do with mothers of any sort, but with trips," and asks us not to worry him but to refer to something else. Dr. Hodgson then explained that the name of my stepmother had never been given correctly, saying, "mother in the body," however, until I suggested "stepmother." Rector to my astonishment at once asked : "Has it been asked for?" Dr. Hodgson's reply was : "The stepmother has been referred to in various ways ; for example, as Hettie's mother. She has also been called Nannie, but her name is not Nannie." "Well" [continued Rector] "there would certainly be a mistake in that because they all know better here than that, because Nannie in the body only acted as a mother to them after the mother of these children here came here and that must be why, if they referred to her as mother Nannie " (p. 483).

Now this was a perfectly correct statement on the part of Rector, but Dr. Hodgson, not understanding the facts as I did, replied, "No, Rector," and Rector in despair gave the game up, and saying, "I cannot understand it," yielded his place to G. P. It was too late for me to correct Dr. Hodgson's statement. But he went on to explain the situation to G. P., saying what the mistake had been, and G. P. replied sharply, "Well, why do you not come out and say, give me my stepmother's name, and not confuse him about anything except what you really want? (R. H. : I think that it has been asked for directly, but cannot be sure.) (S. : Yes.) Has it, very well, if she has a name you shall have it. G. P. understand?" (p. 483). Dr. Hodgson explained that there seemed to be some peculiar difficulty about her name. G. P. replied, "I do not think so, H., but I do think he would

refer to it in his own way if let alone. I know how you confused me, by Jove, and I don't want any more of it. I am going to help him, and he is going to tell all he knows from A to Z. No doubt about it, H. No one could be more desirous of doing so than he is. Is that clear to you? Well, when he gets ready out it will come, and there is no use wondering about it. I see him now, and he is anxious to say something" (p. 484).

G. P.'s blunt, sharp answer to Dr. Hodgson's explanation is beyond all praise for its appreciation of the situation as he understood it, and his way of advising us how to simplify the problem would be accepted by every reader as a most rational rebuke for our confusion and mixing up of demands; but it was based upon an entire misunderstanding of the fact that we had asked for the name of my stepmother, and he seems not to have known that the question of trips entered into it, as Rector did. It is true, nevertheless, that, had it not been for our habit of letting the communicator take his own way we should, in all probability, have simplified the request, as G. P. put it in his conception of the situation.

Before my father's return my uncle asked me an absurd question and disappeared, and then my father appeared and went on to our conversations about this subject before he died (p. 484). Finally at the close of the sitting G. P. suddenly appeared and wrote:—

I will speak for a moment and say I do not see any reason for anxiety about Margaret. (R. H. : Who says this?) George. He said, I suppose I might just as well tell you first as last and have done with it, or James may think I do not really know. Go tell him this for me. You see I got it out of him for you, H., but you no need to get nervous about it, old chap (p. 486).

Margaret of course, was the correct name, and if it could be finally gotten so easily by telepathy, why all this fuss? The character and manner of G. P., with his intelligent appreciation of the whole situation, make one of the most interesting features of the case, and display every evidence of independent intelligence.

This episode regarding my stepmother's name began in the sitting of May 31st, near the close, and ended on June 8th. I return now to that of May 31st.

After father's allusion to my mother (p. 441), he was followed possibly by an attempt of my Uncle Carruthers, if the letters "E . . . E . . . El . . ." are any indication of it (*Cf.* pp. 310, 314, where a similar beginning ended with the completion of the name Eliza). But my uncle failed, and then came a long communication from my cousin Robert McClellan. When my father returned he apparently referred to the Lucy just mentioned before at the close of my cousin's effort, and accompanied the reference with a group of names quite pertinent

to the McClellan family (See Note, p. 433). Some confusion followed, and, after an automatism regarding his often hearing my sister Hettie playing, meaning the organ, perhaps, which she used to play, he proceeded to "speak of the foot which got injured in the accident," the incident being applicable to my "uncle Charles," as it was the cause of his death, but the name was not mentioned. He ran off into a dazed condition and started possibly by the letter F to say Frank, but said "it was Will's," and added, "He got it injured and so did I. Did you know he was on it?" (p. 444). My father did injure his leg (cf. p. 430), but my brother Will did not, as I had to ascertain later. My brother Frank injured his leg by a fall, and was threatened with locomotor ataxy. The confusion is apparent, and thinking that it might be true without my knowledge, I said I would ask about it, and the communications went on:—

The boys were so unlike you. I do not think you often asked anything of them, you never used to do so. (S. : That's right.) You remember what she used to say, if they were like James I would not have anything to think about, but . . . how is Helen. I am really too weak to think more for you, James (p. 444)

This is a very pertinent reference to my brothers, as it reflects father's exact opinions. I seldom asked him about them, as I corresponded with them, and I also seldom or never asked any favours of them. What is attributed to "she" in this case is exactly true of my stepmother, as she states it over her own signature (p. 512). The "Helen" is meaningless unless it is an attempt at Henrietta or Hettie again. The sitting came to a close after some communications from my two uncles, before father had an opportunity to return.

At the sitting of June 1st, as soon as it was opened, father began to answer an earlier question to tell me where he had sent me to college. "I intended to refer to uncle John, but I was somewhat dazed, James. Do you understand me?" I said that I understood, and he stated that he had referred to this for clearing matters up, and added, "And there is another thing to which I would refer, and that is the university. It was there, James, that I had you go, and the others I will refer to soon." Now, assuming that this "uncle John" refers to the John McClellan whom I know, the statement about sending me there to the university is perfectly true and pertinent. But this John McClellan was neither mine nor my father's uncle. He was my cousin's uncle, and, according to my uncle James McClellan's later statement (p. 472), this John referred to by my father was my uncle's father, and would be no relative of my father or myself. Besides, though it is correct that father sent me to the university here indicated, it was not the college that I had in mind when asking my question, and it was not the college connected with the answer to my

question about how he felt when he started me away from home (p. 401). Also the institution to which my original question related was not called a university; the institution to which my father referred in connection with John McClellan was called a university.

The next passage has some remarkable features in it, and as an explanation of his difficulties, it is accompanied by a reference to his previous intention to mention "the Mclellen family one by one and to keep all of their names quite clear," and he then added:—

"Do you remember our old home in the little town of C. and where I with aunt Nannie lived after your mother left us and we brought you up." Another statement followed, evidently explaining to Rector that he was not confused, and asserting "the names of your mother's family are all known to me." He continued: "I intended to clear up about James and John Mclellen before I left." [See previous sitting, p. 445.] "Speak, James, if you . . . (S. : Yes, father, I hear clearly and remember the old home and aunt Nannie bringing us up.) And the special *care* I had with one of the boys. It is all right in my mind now. I only refer to it that you may know it is I, your father, and no one else who is speaking, and . . . (S. : Yes.) I also wanted Clarke for a mere recollection, not because I had any special interest otherwise. (S. : Yes, I know, and—did he have anything to do with your sister?) Oh yes, only by marriage. (S. : Yes, that is right, and is he on this side or not?) Yes he is, and has been for some time. (R. H. : That's not clear.) I often see him. (S. : Yes, do you mean that he is on *your* side?) He is here. (S. : Yes, what brought him there, to your side?) Why do you not remember of his coming here suddenly, James? (S. : Yes.) It was pneumonia. (S. : Yes, I remember his sudden coming, but I wanted to see if something said about him before was what you meant.) What it was, due to it, and if I mistake not you remember it very well. (S. : Yes, I remember it, but do not worry about it now. It will come again. You can go on.) I only was disturbed because of the accident that I could not make clear, and Charles interrupted me somewhat because he had a *fever*, and yet we are not suffering with anything, don't think that, James, will you. (S. : No, I shall not. It is all right.)" A confused reference was then made to my aunt, and in a moment his place was taken by my sister Annie (pp. 449–450).

The incidents about my aunt helping bring us up after the death of my mother are all true. I had mentioned her name and my memory of her care for us when we were young in my letter read to the hand on February 22nd (p. 400). The time and place relations in the statement are exactly correct, except that there is an error in the letter for the town indicated. It should have been X. (for Xenia). My aunt did not remain as long with us as the language here might imply. She remained with us three years. The reference to the special care, with the italics, has a very definite pertinence for all the members of the family who know the facts, and the story cannot be told here, as it is too personal. The name Clarke is not correct,

though it is the same as has usually been given for the uncle meant, and the answer, that he was related by marriage only, states the case rightly, as no indication in the name here or in the question I put occurs to suggest this answer. That he is on "that side" is also correct, also the time relation in our parlance, this being seven months previous to these sittings. He also died suddenly, but it was not from pneumonia. It was by an accident on a railway. This is apparently indicated in the allusion here to an accident. But it will be interesting to note in this confusion that the uncle, James McClellan, who had been mentioned a few minutes before, had died from pneumonia, and the allusion to Charles, my brother, saying that he "had a fever" was also correct, he having died of scarlet fever. My notes deal with this confusion at length (p. 513). It is also interesting to see how much truth lies in the background of the confusion, especially when we remember that the name of my brother has often appeared as that of my uncle. The confusion consequently seems to show indications that the communicator was conscious of it, or uncertain whether I had gotten his message rightly.

After my sister's long communication, father returned and referred to certain habits of my brother. "Do you remember where George used to go, and it did not please me very well. You see the hours I spent over him and with him, the advice I gave him, and very little good at times. I remember Frank, and I also recall the time he caught the fish. Do you remember that Sunday?" I asked if he meant Frank, and the reply came: "Yes; I refer to him as he knew about it and the trouble it gave me." After some interlocution regarding my going home and the communicator's desire that I ask Frank about it, he continued, "And there was a place he used to go evenings, and both his aunt and myself did our best to keep him out of *temptation*." I repeated my query to know if Frank was meant, and the reply was, "Yes, I do mean Frank" (p. 454).

My father did deprecate the social habits of my brother George, though his reason for it did not reflect on this brother. The fishing incident I knew nothing about, but inquiry developed that the only fishing experience that gave Frank any trouble with father was on a Saturday and not on Sunday, and that the escapade also involved my brother Robert. The same inquiry also showed that neither father nor aunt ever complained of Frank's social habits. Now it was the social life of my brother Robert that should be deprecated in the messages here, while those of my brother George were never rebuked by my father for moral reasons. In fact, the whole passage is definitely applicable to my brother Robert, and not to the others, except that Frank was connected with the trouble about fishing, and that father did object to George's going to a certain place. The mistake here is

somewhat like that of the guitar (p. 461). Consequently there would be absolutely no clue to any possible truth in these messages, except for the incident in which this brother Robert was involved with Frank, namely, the fishing. My notes make this incident clear (p. 516).

Following the above and in the same sentence came: "But do you remember anything about War? (S.: Yes, I do. Go on.) and the mental anxiety I passed through at that time? (S.: Yes, I remember it very well indeed.) and my leg? I am getting tired, James. Will rest a moment and return" (p. 454). Father did pass through a very anxious time during the Civil War, as he was much interested in the abolition of slavery. He would probably have volunteered but for the injury to his back and leg which had incapacitated him for the duties of a soldier.

My brother Charles followed with some communications, and when father returned he made a number of statements of minor importance, and the sitting closed with a reproduction of what might close a letter from him. "I must leave you soon, they say, so accept my little helps and remember me as your * * [undec.] father, R. H. Hyslop." There was no intermediate H in his name, which was simply Robert Hyslop. It is not impossible that the surname is an expansion of the initial "H" (p. 456).

The first communicator in the next sitting, that of June 5th, was my mother. The only evidential incident in her communication was the question whether I had any more headaches; I often suffered with them when she was living and she gave me soda for them. After fourteen or thereabouts I had no trouble with them. My father followed with some short unevidential messages, though alluding to past communications and difficulties in sending them (p. 458). His place was then taken by my "uncle Clarke," who gave the clearest set of messages he had given since the sitting of December 24th. The most striking feature of it was the coming on of confusion just as he mentioned the name of my sister Lida, and my father's taking up the thread at once in a relative clause, saying: "which is the one I failed to mention . . . and I had to come to straighten out uncle Clarke's mind, James" (p. 460). This was correct. Lida was the one I had in mind a previous sitting (p. 441) when I said that one beside my stepmother had not been mentioned. Alluding to my sister Lida, still, my father went on with the communications:—

I wanted to speak of her myself, James (S.: Yes, that is right) and I wanted to hear her sing. Do you hear me clearly? (S.: Yes.) I know you will remember the organ (S.: I remember it.), and I was just thinking of our Sunday evenings at home. (S.: Yes.) Yes, although time has changed those days they are still lingering in my memory (S.: Yes, I remember them. Please go on.), and I remember our little family circle very well.

You see I go back some time ago for the purpose of recalling incidents which took place when you were one of them. I am not dreaming, my son, but I am quite clear and near. I had no idea at first what you really wished of me, then it all came to me when you said : [hand indicates R. H.] Well, how would you have James know it was you? [Hand moves towards R. H.] (R. H. : Yes, I said that.) Yes, you said that. I remember the organ and our singing the . . . Oh, what was that hymn, James, we used to sing so often? (Keep calm. It will come all right.) N . . . Well, I will think of it presently and . . . is it all clear to you, or are you confused?" (p. 460).

We did have an organ, and father wanted my sister Lida to learn to play and sing with it. The close proximity of the allusion to "Sunday evenings at home" to that about the organ seems to imply the habit of spending those evenings about the organ. But this was not the fact. It was positively forbidden, as father was opposed to all such music on Sundays, and also to its use in any form of worship. The Sunday evenings were spent in a far more prosaic manner, though in an appropriate religious way. All the singing about the organ was done on week days. The statement that the events here mentioned belonged to the time when I was a member of the family circle was exactly correct. The reason specified for his giving these incidents in connection with the allusion to Dr. Hodgson's explanation of what I wanted in the proof of identity is an interesting bit of intelligence, as this explanation was made on February 7th previous (p. 374), and father was not before sufficiently acquainted with either this problem or scientific questions to appreciate the matter without direction. The resumption of the organ and hymn singing contains the implication that this special hymn was accompanied by the use of the organ, but this was never done with the "hymn" that I would expect him to speak of here. In fact, "*psalm*" is the word that I ought to have gotten. There was a special psalm that was frequently sung at family worship. But as the same mistake in the use of "Sunday" is made as before (*cf.* p. 432), we can understand on the supposition of an intermediary, G. P., how the terms would not be father's. G. P. stated on June 6th, the next sitting (p. 468), that he was present at this sitting for a few moments at least. But the association of the organ and the singing of this "hymn" could be accounted for only on the supposition that he had changed his views on the matter of instrumental music (*cf.*, allusion to hymn, p. 389), and was too confused to state what he had in mind. It is possible that we children sang some of Moody's and Sankey's hymns with an organ accompaniment on week-days, but as no one attempted to play the organ but myself, and I only chords, it is not a fact that makes the incident here any clearer.

The next incident is one of very considerable interest. I shall give it in full. It follows the one just given and without interruption.

It is most interesting also to remark that it concerns a musical instrument, probably suggested by the reference to the organ, and belongs to the same period of the "family circle" alluded to above.

Yes. Oh . . . what has Will done with the flute . . . not flute, I . . . oh dear I know so well what I mean . . . fid . . . fiddle . . . fiddle. (S. : I do not know, but I think you are thinking of another brother and another musical instrument.) Yes, I think I am thinking of George (S. : That is right.) and his C . . . Vial . . . it is my fault . . . [R. H. puts knife on table.] I am thinking of George and his . . . the instrument he used to play . . . but the name has gone. [Hand sways in the air and moves fingers suggesting playing a guitar. J. H. H.] (S. to R. H. : Look at that hand. Do not bother about the name now. I know exactly what you mean.) Yes, all right. After I go out I will return and recall it. I feel I must go for a moment (p. 461).

This is sufficiently explained by the simple fact that my brother George had a guitar on which he learned to play, and father had known nothing about it for seventeen years before his death. The dramatic play of imitating the use of the instrument, together with the confusion of names for it, was exceedingly interesting, and is one of those complex incidents which are difficult of explication by telepathy.

A long communication from my brother Charles followed, and the sitting came to a close.

In the next sitting, June 6th, after the usual preliminaries, G. P. spoke a few words with Dr. Hodgson, saying that he had helped "a man by the name of Charles" the last time, but did not have time to say "How de do, H." He alluded to his intention to aid an elderly gentleman, and my father appeared ready to communicate, when I asked for the communication of incidents that occurred before I was born, and which my two aunts would know. The matter was further explained to Rector and G. P., who made it clear to my father, to whom I had used the expression that this plan would "shut out the thought theory," to which he had alluded in the Swedenborg incident (p. 438). He expressed his understanding of my object, and left to "think it over." His place was taken for a few minutes by my cousin, Robert McClellan.

When father returned, he at once said:—"Will you kindly ask Aunt Eliza if she remembers a young man named Baker, and if she recall going to a prayer meeting one evening with him, and if she remembers who teased her about him, and ask them both if they remember *Jerry*. (R. H. : *Jerry*?) Yes. (S. to R. H. : That's right.) Perhaps you may know this. If you do, say so, James, and I will think of something else which you do not know" (p. 469). Interested in the

mention of this name, I asked for its completion, when I was told,—evidently by Rector, as the interjection is his,—“Ah, but it is no use if you know it. . . .”—a fine rebuke for my own disregard of the demand that I had made, as I did know of this person having been in the family. Father then continued and said: “But ask her,” referring evidently to the same aunt as before, “if she remembers who put the shoes *in her bed* and a sock on the *post*. No one on earth can know this, as mother is here and she and the Rogers girl only will testify to it. [Excitement in hand.] I have something better. *Ask her* if she recalls the evening when we broke the wheel to our *wagon* . . . and who tried to cover it up, so it would not leak out so to speak. I remember it as if it happened *yesterday*, and she will remember it too. I cannot tell you any more just now, but I will think over what is on my mind about our school days and of my trying to preach to the boys in the *barn* and more about it. Be sure and ask about Baker, Jerry and the broken wheel.” He then left and was followed by my uncle James McClellan (p. 470).

Neither of my two aunts could remember anything of these incidents, except the pertinence of the reference to Jerry and that father did tease his sister Eliza about walking home from a prayer meeting, though the name Baker is not right. This Jerry was an orphan boy taken into the family when I was a very young child and I have no personal recollection of him, as he left the family before I was old enough to remember him. But I have heard father and my two aunts mention him often, as there were special reasons in his innocent stupidity for remembering him. It is also natural that my two aunts should not recall the other incidents here mentioned, as one of them is seven and the other thirteen years younger than father, the latter, Eliza, being the one that figures in all but one of the above incidents.

When father returned at the close of my uncle's communications he alluded to a box of minerals that he said he had when a boy. After some brief allusions to a box of books (p. 473) he gave the long and remarkable incidents about our conversation on spirit communication alluded to earlier (p. 474), and as the sitting was coming to an end, referred to the difficulties of expressing himself, with the remark that he hoped his thought in fragments would at least comfort me a little, apparently accepting the work as a matter of personal interest and consolation to me. I saw this and expressed the hope that it would help me in the great cause for the world, and the pertinent reply came: “Yes, and humanity at large, I trust.” He then bade me good-bye, saying: “Good-bye, Robert Hyslop, your old father” (p. 475).

I could not verify the statement about the “box of minerals,” so called, but I found that he was once interested in Indian relics, and knew myself that he once had a small collection of Indian stone relics.

The sitting for June 8th was opened by some advice and prescriptions from the trance personalities in behalf of both my physical and spiritual welfare, in which there are evident traces of a serious purpose, however we interpret them (p. 488). When father appeared, he first referred to his having made the acquaintance of Dr. Hodgson's father, and mentioned their agreement and differences in belief when living (*Cf.* p. 389). He then said that he had learned from "them," the trance personalities, that I was going away, and that he wanted Dr. Hodgson to take his messages sometimes. He then asked if I was going home soon, and I replied in the affirmative. He promised to be there and to watch for anything we said, and report it to Dr. Hodgson. Nothing came of this. He repeated some questions about incidents that he had told me, and expressing his satisfaction with my reply and getting these things off his mind, asked, "Do you remember that Eliza's name was really Elizabeth? She was named Elizabeth as a child, and as time went on we began to call her Eliza" (p. 491).

Aunt Nannie denied that there was any truth in this. Aunt Eliza herself said that she was called Lizzie when a child, and was afterward called Eliza, by which latter name I had always known her.

Shortly afterwards father asked me to talk to him as I used to do, and as I had kept him all these sittings telling his own story, I at once took up the request, and there began as clear a conversation, with pertinent answers and incidents, as ever came through a telephone.

I began the conversation with the statement: "I bought the house in which you lived out West in order to avoid expenses with the courts." The reply and conversation came as follows: "Oh, I understand *well*. I am *glad*. (S.: George is still on the northern land.) And will be, I fear" (p. 491). Both these answers are to the point, and the first one properly appreciative. My father had wanted for years to have his northern land sold and my brother to leave that locality. Then followed a very remarkable incident. I asked: "You will remember Harper Crawford, I think?" This man was one of father's old neighbours, and his daughter married my brother. As soon as the question was put the hand showed considerable excitement, and the answer began:—

Yes, I do very well. What about him? I have tried and tried and tried to spell his name for you, but I could not seem to articulate for their understanding. (S.: Yes, I understand perfectly. I shall mention another too. Do you remember Robert Cooper?) Certainly I do very well indeed, and I have intended to speak his name for you also, but tell me about the mortgage. (S.: I have not heard about it, but shall learn this summer.) And then let me know about H A R P E R S. (S.: Harper Crawford, you mean.) [Hand assents.] (S.: All right. I shall do so.) I want to know this one thing only. Are they doing anything about the *church*? (S.: What church do you refer to, the church in your old Ohio home?) [Assent.] (S.: I

have not heard, but shall inquire.) They have put in an organ—Organ. They have put in an organ, James. (S. : Very well, I shall look this up. Do you mean the first U. P. Church ?) I cannot seem to get that, James. [Hand listens again.] (S. : Do you mean the First United Presbyterian Church ?) I cannot get that, can you say it for me slowly ? (S. : Do you mean the First United Presbyterian Church ?) Say the two last slowly—got it all but that. (S. : U-ni-ted.) Yes. (S. : Pres-by-te-ri-an.) Yes, I do. (S. : Very well, I understand. You say they have an organ now.) I say yes. (S. : Very well. I shall be glad to find out about it.) Yes, but I am telling you. (S. : I understand perfectly, that will be a good test.) Well, it is so, James (p. 491).

I interrupted the conversation with my father about Harper Crawford by a reference to Robert Cooper, as the reader will observe. The allusion to the mortgage has this interest. My cousin Robert Cooper was burdened with a mortgage on his property at the time of my father's death, and my cousin Robert McClellan had helped him out of embarrassment. My father never knew these facts, but the death of Robert McClellan a year later and the fact that he is one of the communicators in this record enables us to suppose that my father might have obtained his information on the "other side."

I learned also when in the West that an organ had been put into the Sunday-school and later into the body of the First United Presbyterian Church to which Harper Crawford belonged, and also that this Harper Crawford was one of the two or three persons that left that church on account of this very fact. The other persons who left this church for the same reason were my uncle Carruthers ("Clarke" of these communications) and his wife. On the examination of my father's correspondence, which I had kept, I found that one letter, about two months before his death, had mentioned the fact that Mr. Crawford had left this church, but the letter does not say why, so that I was in all probability ignorant of the organ incident, while only my subliminal can be said to have known the fact of the man's leaving the church. But in any case, to start this remarkable incident belonging to a memory a thousand miles distant, and selected from the whole universe of living consciousness, just by mentioning a name, is an achievement in telepathy, if that is the explanation, that makes one wonder why the name of my stepmother was not gotten more easily.

This incident was immediately followed by another which has less evidential value, perhaps, to an outsider, but which abounds with indications of personal knowledge regarding facts commonly known to both of us in connection with my brother :—

Tell me something more about George. He always did look out for number one. (S. : Yes, I cannot tell very much about George, because, as you know, he very seldom writes letters. You understand.) Yes, *I think I do,*

perfectly well. (S. : When I come back here again I think I can tell you many things about him.) Yes, but, James, I know a great deal myself and did worry as you *must know*. (S. : Yes, I understand, and you know I worried much also.) Yes. *Who* could know *better than I do*. Remember what we *talked over* when you came out there. (S. : Yes.) *Well*. I can say only one thing. Do not worry any more about him or anything *else* (p. 492).

The pertinence of this is sufficiently indicated when I say that every word of it is true. Father had worried a great deal about my brother George, and I with him. But as my statements suggest the other facts, there is only the appreciation expressed in the words italicised, thus marked in the original, and here, as having an interest for the emotional element in this study of the unity of consciousness. But the narrative goes on with an interesting return to the mental state just indicated. I said :—

(S. : No, I will try not to worry.) And about the fence. I am thinking about the tax I left. (S. : The tax has been paid. I settled that all right. Nearly all the debts have been cleared off. We owe only aunt Nannie a little.) *Oh*, what a relief to my *mind*. I have thought and thought and thought what would Frank or George do if they had a hand in it. Do you remember what you did for *me once* (S. : I am not sure just now, but if you will remind me.) in regard to a tax *one year*? It was what I wrote you about and you actively *helped*. (S. : I do not remember it, but you must not be surprised, because I helped you so often with money, you remember.) Yes, but about . . . dear James, do you not remember just before I came here I was not well at the time and I wrote to you about the *tax*? I should never forget it. (S. : I do not exactly recall it, but I think it most probable, because I know just what the situation was). Well, it will come back to you I hope as it will live with me *forever*. What about the fence? Do you know what I mean? (S. : I think I do. I know that we have repaired the fence.) All right. I intended to have it done before I left, and I also had this on my mind (p. 493).

This is a most interesting passage. His taxes at the time of his death were unpaid, because of the total failure of the wheat crop, and no man that I ever knew hated more to be unable to pay his taxes. His finances were in a sad condition for the reason mentioned, and he had concealed this fact absolutely from me. It was his intention to provide for this and the repair of his farm fences by borrowing. But there is a wonderful pertinence in the allusion to my two brothers. Frank was an invalid at the time (*cf.* p. 441) and unable even to attend the funeral, with no expectation of ever recovering his health, and was named as one of the executors of the estate in father's will. Frank then was in no condition to settle up the confusion incident to all affairs of this sort. I learned also in the West, after the sittings, what I did not know before, that my brother George had been named

in the will as one of the executors ; but some years before his death, for the reasons implied in the appreciative conversation above and dissatisfaction with this brother's business methods, my father removed his name from the will, and two or three days before his death substituted mine for that of my stepmother. The next incident about another tax I did not remember, but thought it referred to the one that I paid just after his death. But I found in his letters that it was just as said here, except that it was not just before his death. It was in 1892. He wrote me about his tax, and instead of asking me to lend him money for it, requested me to write to my brother Will and urge him to settle the matter. I do not remember doing so, but my habit of always meeting such requests would justify my saying that I probably did so. My brother Will finds on his books that he had paid the tax after the date of my father's letter.

Soon after I remarked regarding the cane that it was connected with the campaign, asking if he remembered it, and father replied : " Yes, *well*, and I remember the talk with R. about the president." This referred to the talk with my cousin Robert McClellan on politics, as mentioned (p. 494). He then mentioned a chest, which he said he had bought at an auction years ago, and had kept on an attic floor. I remarked, using my stepmother's name, Maggie, purposely, that she would probably know, and he asked if she had not put the stick (cane) in it. This incident is not exactly true as it is stated, but it is possible that there are some confused facts in it (p. 495). As the sitting closed he said, assuming that I was going home as promised him, " You will give my love to Maggie, Nannie, Eliza. Oh, she is not there, but take it to her," apparently discovering that one of them, I cannot tell which, could not be seen at the old home. This would be true of my stepmother. Mrs. Piper then began to come out of the trance (p. 496).

Recapitulation.

The reader who has followed the preceding account through all its details will, perhaps, be as much impressed by the apparent confusion in many of the incidents as by the definitely correct statements. But I have tried to suggest that even the confusions and errors are accompanied usually by true statements and have such associations with the course of thought on the part of the communicator that they continually indicate groups of memories pertaining to my father's mind. It is, of course, difficult to estimate the value of all this material. It is, so to speak, like a fitful and incoherent dream, or series of dreams, or better still, like the wandering mental condition of a hypnotic patient with the ordinary inhibitions cut off and yet aware of a definite purpose to be executed, with interludes of close approximation to the

ordinary waking consciousness. One of the questions, therefore, that we have to determine is, how far the facts are actual manifestations of a particular personality.

To enable the reader to appreciate my answer to this question more fully I here summarise briefly the chief types of references made by my father from which I think it will be evident, without any doubt whatever, that the communicating intelligence claiming to be my father is either actually this person (with his mind at times somewhat confused and labouring under difficulties in expressing himself to me), or a very extraordinary personation of him that has acquired a knowledge of his experience ranging from an early period to his death, and including not only a proper appreciation of the matters in which he was most interested, but specific recollections of little possessions and peculiarities, some of which were entirely unknown to myself.

His own name and mine were correctly given and it was he who first mentioned Robert and eventually Frank and Hettie as among his children. I mentioned George myself first (with the intention of misleading the communicator), and other communicators mentioned the rest of the children, Margaret, Sarah, Annie, Charles, Will and Lida before my father did so. The distinction was correctly indicated in all of these names between the living and the dead. The names Ellen and Helen occurred in my father's communications without any statements that showed what relevance was intended, though in the case of Helen the connection suggests that it might be a mistake for Henrietta, the name of my half-sister. They are not the names of any members of his immediate family.

The most notable cases of names which were either not obtained at all or obtained only after much difficulty were Maggie, McClellan, Henrietta, Martha, and Carruthers. Some effort was made to get the name Carruthers, but after I was apparently satisfied with Clarke no further attempts were made. Martha was given as Mary and I did not press for its correction, as it was obvious, both from the context and the correctness of the other two parts of the name, who was meant. McClellan was finally given in practically correct form by G. P., who gave also Margaret for Maggie and Hettie for Henrietta, rather curious variations from what were dominant in my mind.

Whatever detailed references my father made to the members of his family concerning his personal relations with them and his appreciation of the points in their character were pertinent throughout, except in the one instance in which the language he used fitted Robert and was not applicable to Frank to whom it was applied. The most important instances of these were connected with myself (his opinion of me and what he used to say to my stepmother) and with George and the worry about him. Also the special care of one of them in connection with the

reference to our bringing up in the old home, and the mention of my sister Lida and the organ. We might also include the reference to his frankness in expressing his personal feelings towards us when he broke his usual reservation.

The quiet manner of father's life for twenty years before his death left him little with which to occupy himself except his personal interest in the members of his family, the management of his finances which gave him a great deal of vexation, and the events of the day in politics and religion. Our correspondence was almost exclusively on the subject of politics and his financial affairs, never on religion after 1885. Not a word came from him spontaneously on the subject of politics. But his allusion to the taxes, the fence and his worry about my brother George were entirely appropriate to the reasons for the financial concern he felt in life. His immediate reference to the mortgage when I mentioned Robert Cooper was relevant in this connection.

My father's habits of religious thought come out in various places in the record, as in the consolatory messages to his sisters for their recent bereavement, the reference to his "Sunday preaching" and prayers, incidental references to his moral and religious solicitude for myself, and in the special incidents which apparently indicate a change of conviction in matters in which he had been extremely conservative, as in his conversation with Dr. Hodgson ending with the significant allusion to the hymn, "Nearer my God to Thee." Closely associated with the same were his repeated references to the important talks with myself on this whole question of psychical research and a future life, when he reminded me of "the thought theory," hallucination, my doubts, hypnotism, "manifestations" recognised as apparitions, my experiment with the young woman in connection with her dream, and Swedenborg's opinions, all of which formed the subject of those conversations.

Also certain facts associated with his sickness and all the main symptoms and incidents accompanying the last hours of his life, though connected with more than the usual confusion and difficulty, and the clear allusion to my voice being the last that he heard. Similarly his remembrances about the medicines which he took were in most cases less clear than is desirable, as he specified some which he had only thought of taking (Maltine and Munyon's), and at least one of which there is no evidence that he had taken it at all (morphine). He mentioned one of which I was ignorant (the preparation of oil), and one which I had casually heard of in a letter and had forgotten (strychnine). His chief success was in specifying correctly in reply to my question the medicine which I had obtained for him (Hyomel).

The incidents of his early life, given in response to my demand for something that occurred before I was born, were very clear. They

were the Baker incident, Jerry, the broken wheel, the shoes in the bed, and the preaching to the boys in the barn. The meaning of the name Jerry I happened to know, and the incident of walking home with a young man from prayer meeting is true, except the name Baker, but the others were unverifiable.

Two automatisms appeared to have some significance. They were the reference to my sister Hettie's playing, and the phrase, "Give me my hat," both indicating actual facts in my father's life and knowledge.

Another series of references which I may here group together concern my father's personal experiences, appearances, and little personal habits and articles that he possessed. Curiously enough his recollections about these were the most confused, possibly in some cases positively erroneous, where my own memory was most clear, and, in fact, nearly all his most specific references concerned articles the very existence of which was not known to me at all. That he was a little elderly gentleman, that he could only whisper, that he had no teeth, and that he could not sing were correct statements made about him as Mrs. Piper returned to consciousness. The reference to his books, pictures, etc., had some pertinence, but they were confused and of no evidential value, though I was familiar with the circumstances connected with them. But the references to the trouble with the left eye, the mark near the ear, the thin coat or dressing-gown he wore mornings, the black skull cap, the tokens, the stool, the writing pad, the rests, and the round and square bottles on his desk, the paper-cutter, his diary, the brown handled knife and the nail paring, and the horse Tom in connection with George were mentioned with almost precise correctness, and were all but the tokens, the diary, and the last incident wholly unknown to me. The visit to George and Will before moving West was also probably unknown to me. The references to the place in which he said he kept his tin spectacle case and the paper knife were not true, and the box of minerals was either a false or an indeterminate incident.

The most important instances of error in my father's communications, and which will be regarded by many persons as telling against his identity, although I myself explain them, as the reader understands, on the assumption of temporary confusion in the act of communicating, or possibly as due to an error of memory, are as follow: That he sent me books, a box with two books, that Will had his foot injured apparently on the railroad, that there was trouble with Frank's fishing on "Sunday" (instead of Saturday), that it was Frank (instead of Robert) who was exposed to social temptations, that Will played the flute or fiddle (instead of George and the guitar), Ferdinand (for Anderson), pneumonia for accident, the misapplication of "cousin" to his nephew, apparently a visit to Frank, apparently also the intimation that Jennie

was the name of a relative of my step-mother, and the other mistakes in connection with the names of persons and medicines mentioned above.

Finally, there are various more or less complex groups of incidents mentioned by my father which it is difficult to estimate evidentially from the objective point of view, owing to the error or confusion with which most of them are complicated, or to the impossibility of verification. And yet, on the whole, they appear to strengthen distinctly the evidence that my father was actually communicating. They are the trip to the lake, the railroad accident, in which he was concerned, the canes, the fire and his fright, the Cooper incidents, the church and the organ in connection with Harper Crawford, the "coach" and the rough roads and country in Ohio, and the talk with the principal of the school about George, etc. From my point of view, neither successes nor failures in recollection by the communicator in regard to individual facts, like names or isolated references and events, are at all comparable in evidential value with groups of facts constituting an organic and complex whole, and associated together, as they would be, in my father's mind, even if these groups of references are accompanied by some incoherence, confusion, and error. Even if we supposed that the first three of the above groups of incidents were to be estimated as entirely false (two of which I have so classed in the statistical summary for the sake of avoiding inaccuracy on the other side), and the fourth as without value one way or the other, there would remain three striking pages, or chapters, so to speak, of the actual personal experiences in my father's life which were reproduced with almost absolute correctness. An interesting feature about them is that in two out of three cases the main points were entirely unknown to myself.

There was nothing in my father's general mental habits, except his religious affiliations, that would give him any peculiarities of phrase by which his personality might be easily and distinctly recognisable. Occasional words and phrases which I have noted in their place are decidedly not characteristic of him, and may be attributed to the trance personalities or to G.P., as the use of "Sunday" for Sabbath, "coach" for carriage, "library" for sitting-room, etc. But such as were characteristic, though individually frequent perhaps in the use of other people, may collectively have some interest as possibly evidential to that extent. The most distinctly recognisable instances, some of them unknown to me, were: "You had your own ideas," "stick to this," "well I was not so far wrong after all," "my sincerity of purpose," "do not worry, it does not pay," "meeting face to face," and being "reunited" after death, "what is their loss is our gain," "the least said the sooner mended," "you are not the strongest man," "remember it as if it happened yesterday," etc.

There will, of course, be various opinions regarding the strictly evidential value of the communications alleging their sources from my father, whether taken individually or collectively. But I think that the reader will no doubt agree, after examining my experiments on the identification of personality which are given in Appendix V., and noting the slight evidence necessary for establishing identity, that, if ordinary agencies are inadequate to account for the phenomena of this record, I am either actually communicating with the independent intelligence of my father, or that we have a most extraordinary impersonation of him, involving a combination of telepathic powers and secondary personality with its dramatic play that should as much try our scepticism as the belief in spirits.

“Uncle Charles” (*Carruthers*).

The name of my uncle, James Carruthers, who died December 2nd, 1898, was never obtained directly from him nor in any clearly recognised form. But the name of his wife (my aunt), his relationship to various persons in the family, some incidents in his life, and an indication of the accident by which he lost his life, unmistakably suggested who was meant by “Uncle Charles” and “Uncle Clarke.” Most of his own attempts at communication were exceedingly confused, though not worse than many instances of my cousin to be considered next. In some cases he was apparently unable to complete a sentence, so that if we had not better data upon which to form a judgment than his messages, we should have to treat the record more sceptically; but taken in connection with clearer communicators, we can detect an intelligible meaning in this instance, while we remark that the confusion in it is incompatible with any rational application of the telepathic hypothesis.

The first indication of his presence is in the first sitting on December 23rd, 1898, but it is so slight that I should never have suspected it but for the evidence of its connection with later developments. In this sitting the short communication occurred: “Do you remember who you used to call Ell . . . el (?) . . . not distinct. . . . Where is Robertson?” (p. 310). I took this as a confused attempt to get the name of my brother Robert, but later passages in which it occurs (*Cf.* pp. 317, 332) rather indicate that it is for “Robert’s son” and an inquiry for me, as he always called father by the name of Robert. The “Ell . . .” and “el . . .” are broken attempts at the name of his wife, as we shall learn from the next message (p. 314).

In the second sitting, December 24th, the following occurred: “What is it? E * * [undec.] Elsie El . . . is . . . Elsie. (S. : I don’t know that name.) Eliza . . . Eliza (S. : Are you calling Eliza ?) Yes. (S. :

Yes, I understand.) I am, James. (S. : Yes. What do you wish to say to her ?) Give my love (S. : Yes, I will.) and tell her not to get discouraged. She will be better soon. Understand ? (S. : Yes, I understand.) I often see her despairing. Where is she now, James ? I will go there soon. (S. : She is at home. Do you know why she grieves ?) [Hand points towards invisible.] Yes, because I left her. But I really did not leave her. I wish I could tell you all I would like, you would not think I had left entirely. I feel much better now. She thought she saw me in her sleep. I was there. Father, father, father . . . going . . . going . . . going . . . be back soon." [Dr. Hodgson made a remark to me explaining the meaning of this last, and the communication began again.] "Oh if you only knew how glad I am to see you, you would be glad, because it will be a help to me to go on in my life and keep her from feeling any pain. (S. : Yes, tell all you can.) Will you comfort her ? She ought not to be lonely. I am trusting to Him [Imperator] to help me to speak plainly. (S. : Yes, I will comfort her.) I am glad, so glad. Are you still here ? I will look and see. I have not been here very long, and yet I would not return for all I ever owned, music, flowers, walks, drives, pleasures of all kinds books and everything. I do remember all here so well. What can I do to help you all to know I live still. (S. : Tell me all you can of your life here on earth.) Oh I should have much to do. Where there is light I will always be. Mother, mother, going, going."

Here my father returned to take my uncle's place, and asked me if I knew "uncle Charles," saying, "He is here." When I said that I did not know any such uncle, he replied that he was not a real uncle, and that I must remember what he meant (p. 316). James Carruthers married my father's sister, and it occurred to me that the "uncle Charles" was an attempt to give his name. This, with the pertinent indications of his identity in his own communications, gave me a definite clue upon which to depend in the future. He succeeded this time in the name of his wife Eliza, and it is interesting to note that it started with nearly the same form whose meaning I did not suspect in the first sitting (p. 310 and above). The allusion to her despair had, as a fact, more pertinence than I knew, and than such a general and expected observation would usually imply, though I cannot treat it as evidential. (See Note 7, p. 353.) I found also on inquiry of my aunt that the mention of music, flowers, etc., contained very pertinent indications of some of his pleasures and habits in life, about which I knew nothing.

Apparently there is an interpolation by my father during my uncle's communications. At least the language: "I feel much better now. She thought she saw me in her sleep. I was there, father, father," connecting the passage with his disappearance a few minutes before, and the fact that my aunt Eliza, who is referred to here, did have a vivid dream in which she saw my father a short time after my uncle's death (*Cf.* p. 355), favour this interpretation. Possibly also the

resemblance of the words "mother, mother," etc., in the original to "brother," as the two are very often written much alike, may suggest the same conclusion, as my father was my uncle's brother-in-law.

A little later in the same sitting he reappeared, and a remarkable colloquy took place, upon which I shall comment in the discussion of the dramatic play of personality, but there was little evidential matter in it. Following father's departure from the "machine," he said :—

What can I do to help Eliza feel that I am not dead? (S. : Tell us who are with you, and that will help Eliza.) Yes, all you shall know each one in her. . . . You are not Robertson (?) are you? (R. H. : Is that Robertson?) You are not George, are you? (S. : No, I am not George.) (R. H. : I am not . . .) No, James, I know you very well, but this other one. . . . did you know the boys . . . do you know me? (p. 317).

The interest in this lies in the query whether Dr. Hodgson was "Robertson," possibly Rector's mistake for "Robert's son," (Robert Hyslop's son.) I supposed in the query "you are not George," the name of my brother, that he was asking this of me and I said I was not, so that the next remark was very pertinent, while the ignorance about Dr. Hodgson is a curious reflection upon the telepathic hypothesis after his many years' acquaintance with Mrs. Piper's trance personalities.

In the sitting of December 26th (p. 332), apparently my uncle again communicated. He asked : "Where is Eliza?" and said, "I remember her and Robertson." With some further incoherent statements bearing traces of the temporary loss of the sense of personal identity, he disappeared as father broke in with the curious remark : "Yes, Hyslop. I know who I am and Annie too," at least apparently indicating very clearly a consciousness of the situation and of the disturbed consciousness of identity in my uncle.

My uncle did not appear again personally in this series of sittings, nor in those of Dr. Hodgson. But my father, in the sitting of December 24th, evidently alluded to the event of his death, as well as that of another uncle, in his message of consolation to his two sisters for their sorrow, saying : "What is their loss is our gain," a very characteristic phrase of his in alluding to the incidence of death (p. 316).

In the sitting of May 29th my father mentioned this uncle and tried to give his name, as already quoted, but got no nearer than "Clarke," or "Charles," (p. 422). These names were also repeated by him on May 30th, and "Chester" added (p. 431). On May 31st (p. 442) the letters "E. E. El . . ." came and nothing more, until later in the sitting (p. 445) when Rector wrote : "Clarke is here again." I was immediately asked : "Do you know me? Do you remember James?" This was the Christian name of my uncle, and I asked for the rest,

and evidently Rector replied: "And it is Clarke. Both are here . . . are speaking to you." I asked: "Is it James that speaks to me?" and the reply was: "Yes, there were two James, and do you remember an uncle. (S.: Yes, I remember, and uncle James what?) Well, it is he. (S.: Which uncle James?) H . . . James Mc." Here I recognised James McClellan by saying, "Yes, that is right" (p. 445). But the sitting came to an end before anything more could be made clear. On June 1st father referred to him again as "Clarke," and said, in response to my question whether he had anything to do with his sister, that it was "only by marriage," and that he was on his side, both of which were correct and suggested his identity (p. 450).

When I asked what brought him to his side, the answer came "Why do you not remember of his coming here suddenly, James? (S.: Yes.) It was pneumonia." The answer "pneumonia" was false for the uncle Carruthers just mentioned, but true for the uncle James McClellan, spoken of a few minutes earlier (p. 450), and then followed an allusion to "the accident that I could not make clear" which nearly answers my question as to the cause of my "uncle Clarke's" death (p. 450). My uncle Carruthers died suddenly from the effects of a railroad accident.

On June 5th he appeared personally, announced by Rector in the sentence, "Here is Clarke." Uncle follows.

"Give my love to N. [Hand tightens in excitement, and pencil is nearly forced out from fingers. R. H. lays his hand gently over it.] Give . . . Give my love to Nan. And let me think a moment. I am a little anxious to tell you first about yourself. I left so suddenly I had no time for anything. I am all right now, only my head troubles me when speaking. Wait for me. And do you remember Rice" (?) (R.H.: Rice?) [Assent.] [Then hand dissents violently.] (R.H.: No.) "Yes . . . Piece (?) Pierce. I say Pierce . . . D." (S. to R.H.: I don't remember him.) (R.H.: Say so.) (S.: No, I do not remember him, but you may say something about him and I shall inquire.) "D R. Pierce. Lidia. Lidia . . . LI . . . Lidia." (S.: Yes, I remember Lidia. What relation is she to me?) "Annie and she are cousins. Lidia. Aunt." (S.: Yes, which Annie is cousin of her?) "There is a sister Annie and a cousin Annie and Aunt Lidia. She was an aunt to James Hyslop if I remember rightly and there is a sister in the body by that name," and there followed the remarkable relative clause in the person of my father: "Which is the one I failed to mention . . . and I had to come to straighten out uncle Clark's mind, James. I am your father. I had to come and help uncle Clarke straighten out his thoughts." (p. 459.)

The whole passage is a remarkable one, and has many features of identity in it. For reference to "Nan" see p. 536. The name "Dr. Pierce," first "Rice," is an apparent attempt to give the name of Dr. J. P. Dice, who was my father's physician, a friend of

the Carruthers family, and who waited on father in my uncle's house during father's last illness. The letter D is significant for this interpretation. My uncle would know, of course, that I would recognise this doctor, and it was a good device for identifying himself in the absence of the ability to get his own name clearly. The name "Lida" was that of my sister, and she was so called in order to distinguish her from this aunt Eliza for whom she was also named. My uncle always called his wife "Liza" in familiar address. Coming in close connection with "Lida" the mistake is a natural one. The mention of my sister Annie was right, and if my conjecture (p. 536) is right, namely, that this "cousin Annie" is Rector's mistake for cousin *Nannie*, the relationship between her and my sister "Lida" is rightly named. It was also correct that this sister "Lida" was the one that my father had not yet mentioned, for whom I had asked previously without hinting at whom I wanted (p. 460).

In the same sitting a little later, my brother Charles alluded to this "Dr. Pierce," and said: "He was a friend of uncle Clarke's, and he is still over there" (p. 463). Both statements are true of this Dr. J. P. Dice, whom I interpret this "Dr. Pierce" to mean. No further communications came either from my uncle or about him, except in the sitting of June 7th, when my father again alluded to him (p. 485), in connection with the incidents of our conversations in February, 1895, regarding this subject of spiritism. Father referred in this communication to an alleged experience of my "uncle Clarke," which I could not verify, and which was said to be a "notification of his sudden coming." His death was a very sudden one, from a railway accident, as already indicated.

The most interesting feature of the communications from my uncle personally, and concerning him by others, is the difficulty that they offer to the telepathic hypothesis. They are by no means so clear as those from my father. But the names, incidents, and relations involved are just as clear or unclear in my own mind and memory as the facts about anybody else. There is absolutely no intelligible reason, from the standpoint of telepathy, why there should be any more confusion in his case than in that of others, but we have in the actual messages exactly the personal equation and differences that we ought to expect on the spiritistic theory in dealing with different communicators.

There is not very much of special significance that apparently came directly from this uncle. There is much confusion and the most important name attempted, that of Dr. J. P. Dice, was only given partially. In fact the statements made about my uncle by my father, that he was my uncle; that he was related to my father only by marriage; that his death was very sudden; and the attempts to give his name Carruthers, were perhaps as suggestive of his identity as any

that came directly from this uncle himself. On the other hand, the name of his wife, Eliza; the reference to her despair and loneliness, the special character of which I did not know; the mention of the "talks, walks, drives, flowers, music and pleasures of all kinds," which represented actual facts in his life of which I was not aware; the statement that he had not been long deceased; the name and relationship to me of my sister Lida in conjunction with the name of my aunt Eliza, his wife, form together, in spite of the confusion in his attempts to communicate, a group of statements which cannot be entirely ignored.

Robert Harvey McClellan.

It will be found that the communications of my cousin bear the same characteristics of confusion in most cases as those of the uncle just considered. He died in 1897, about a year after my father, but was neither mentioned nor admitted as a communicator until my last series of sittings. In the sitting of May 29th my father evidently alluded to this cousin when he gave the name "McCollum," saying that "he came over some time ago" (p. 422), and later "McAllan," when he spoke of him as "cousin" (p. 423). Early in the sitting for May 30th, my cousin appeared personally, and began an interesting communication as follows, opening it with a remark that apparently indicates that he had been present some time before.

I am still here. I have been wondering if you remembered anything about me. I am your cousin H. H. McAllen. Dont . . . do you not hear me? (S. : Yes, I hear you. I shall be glad for you to go on.) I am with you still you see. Do you remember Wallace . . . and Williams, the Williams boys, I mean. I am at the moment trying to think what became of Robert. Speak to me for God's sake and help me to reach . . . (S. : Yes, I remember Robert, but which Robert is it?) I think you say which Rob is it : well Hyslop. (S. : That's right.) I mean Rob Hyslop of course. Which other could I mean? (S. : Yes, I remember him. He is in Cincinnati.) Give him my greetings. I am a little dazed for the moment, but have patience and I will be clear presently (p. 427).

The reference to Wallace and Williams is unintelligible. My cousin's initials should be "R. H." instead of "H. H." My cousin was very much interested in my brother Robert Hyslop, for reasons that are too personal to explain, and which are connected with this brother's conduct. He gave his name as Robert rightly, and then refers to him as he was usually called in the family, namely, as Rob.

After an allusion to his being dazed he referred to a foot that was injured on the railroad, and connected it with my brother Robert (p. 428). This was false, and I intimated as much. A little later he connected the same accident with the name "Will," which is the name

of another brother of mine. This was false again, but I did not intimate the fact. But at this point G. P. suddenly appeared and said that Emperor had sent him. I was then asked a question by my cousin that might imply from the context preceding that the accident was connected with George, the name of my brother again, though it is also the name of his own son. But the reference of the accident to either of them would be false. It would apply to my "uncle Charles" (Carruthers). The narrative continues:—

"James, was it George I have been trying to think . . . where is . . . and do you remember Peter who was . . . or belonged to Nanie. (S. : I do not recall Peter now, but I remember some one by that name) here. (S. : I do not know whether he is there or not. Is he on your side?) Yes, we say yes. I am W. H. McAllen [?]. The name does not sound right to us friend. It is he says Mc . . . sounds like McLellen. G. P. : Yes, I am he." (S. : Yes, I am very glad to hear from you. What relation are you to me?) Your cousin. (S. : That's right.)" After another remark or two my next question was : "Do you remember what I was doing when you saw me last?" And the reply was : "Yes, you were writing, teaching, I believe. (S. : Don't you remember a meeting in which I spoke?) [Much excitement.] "Oh yes, oh yes. Oh yes. Oh yes. But I could not exactly remember just what it was. (R. H. calm) but I could not exactly remember just what it was. And have you any knowledge of Merritt." He then disappeared (p. 428).

His name was not quite right, but it finally comes very nearly right ; G. P.'s statement was correct enough for all evidential purposes. He was also right in general as to what I was doing when I last saw him, which was at the time of my father's death. He it was that arranged for a meeting which I addressed on the issues of the last presidential campaign, and though the recollection of it was not suggested by my question, his recognition of it when I mentioned it was very characteristic. He always expressed himself in precisely this manner and language when something was recalled to his memory that he had forgotten. His wife remarked the fact to me spontaneously when she saw the record. But the name Peter, and its connection with "Nanie" and its possible connection with George had no meaning to me. In the sitting for June 1st, however, my sister Annie communicated for this cousin as an intermediary and asked : "What is meant by Peter? Was it the dog George had?" I saw by this that the George evidently referred to his own son, the older, and whose name is George. When West, I inquired first of the younger son, Jamie, whether his brother George ever had a dog by the name of Peter, and was answered in the negative, and on his expressing curiosity to his mother behind my back as to what I could mean by asking such a question, my cousin overheard his mother seriously say that it was true. She told me the next day that it was a little ugly

black dog that George had when he was between two and four. George himself did not remember it when I asked him some days afterward in another city, but he did recall another dog that he had when he was between five and six. Further correspondence with the mother showed that they were both right, as he had had the two dogs. I knew nothing of the fact, and my note shows (p. 515) that there is nothing to make this judgment improbable. My sister can be supposed to have gotten the information about the dog from my cousin Robert McClellan. My cousin has a living sister Nannie, but she remembers nothing of the dog, and the reference to "Nanie" remains unintelligible. I could also find no meaning among my connections in the reference to Merritt.

Later in the same sitting my father (p. 433) alluded to him as "Robert cousin," and as having mentioned my brother Robert, and foiled my father's desire to do that himself. On May 31st (p. 438) there was a communication, apparently about a John McClellan whom I never knew, and it terminated with a communication apparently from my cousin Robert McClellan, who asked the pertinent question: "Do you know where Frank Hyslop is?" as he was interested in my brother on account of the latter's bad health. Supposing, as I did, at the outset, that I was communicating with this John McClellan, a stranger to me, I asked where he knew Frank Hyslop, and got the correct answer—for my cousin: "Well, of course I know him and all of my cousins. Why shouldn't I, James." The pertinence of the names Hathaway and Williams is explained in my notes (see Note 94, p. 535). All that he said about my brother, namely, that he was going to be a doctor was false. He was correct in saying that his own wife was on this side (p. 440). Later he gave a clearer message. He tried to continue for a moment, but had to be told (p. 442) by Rector to "go out and come in again with the message." Rector then said that he had said something about "Lucy," which was in fact the name of his wife still living (*cf.* pp. 421, 452). A very complex passage followed, which I shall unravel in the more elaborate discussion of mistakes and confusion. (*Cf.* pp. 231-235.) He gave the Christian names and relationships of several persons, though in so confused a manner that I shall not duplicate the later explanation of it.

After this my cousin did not appear again personally until the sitting of June 6th. But in the sitting for June 1st my sister Annie gave the names "Jennie and Lucy" together, and said that this Lucy was on this side, which was true (p. 442). I knew nothing whatsoever of "Jennie," but found by inquiry in the West that she was the sister of my cousin's wife Lucy. I had never known her. She is still living. In the sitting for June 5th my brother tried to give

a name which was in reality that of this cousin's wife, and came nearly doing it. The message was:—

But he [father] often speaks of L u c y. (S. : Yes, can you finish that name Lucy? L U C I N . . . L U C Y . . . who * * [undec.] Mother, mother . . . I. It is L U C y I am speaking about. L a n * * [undec.] L U C y. No I cannot, James. (S. : I know what it is.) I will try again to make him hear. L U C y . . . A . . . Annie . . . will help me for a moment. I do not think it is wise, will return again when I can speak louder. I am not confused, am I? (S. : I think not, but what relation was she to me?) Well, I got it all but the Hyslop. (S. : Was she very close to me?) [Hand shakes slightly to indicate not understanding.] Say that again. (S. : Was she very close to me when she was living?) [My question was put in this form (*cf.* p. 309) to see if he had in mind my twin sister, Luella, though I felt it was intended for my cousin's wife.] Yes, very, and would have remained so, but not a sister, nor a cousin, nor an aunt, James, but it is on my mind, and I would like to tell you all I can about her, but I am a little weaker just now (p. 464.).

But as Mrs. Piper was coming out of the trance she gave the name in full. "Tell Hyslop. Lucy . . . Lucy . . . McClellan" (p. 466).

I, of course, knew what the name meant as soon as it was mentioned the first time (p. 421), but I wanted to see it completed, especially as my cousin himself was so confused in his messages. The believer in telepathy may note the interesting mistake of Rector in thinking that my brother Charles ought to have said Lucy Hyslop. There was no Lucy Hyslop and I was thinking all the while of Lucy McClellan until Rector said "Hyslop." There was some confusion after this possibly due to my question about my twin sister, as the reply shows, apparently implying that this Lucy is on the "other side," which is not the fact. The first part of the answer, "Yes, very, and would have remained so" can apply to my twin sister Luella that I had in mind, but the latter part fits Lucy McClellan, who was neither a sister nor aunt, and was a cousin only by marriage. It is possible, that, because of this confusion and Rector's discovery of his mistake, a special effort was made to give the name as Mrs. Piper returned to consciousness, and the effort succeeded. (For similar cases of success as Mrs. Piper returns to consciousness compare *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 305-6, 310 and 372). At the next sitting, June 6th, my cousin appeared near the beginning of it, and gave me the following message which was unintelligible to me at the time, except the allusion to Lucy.

"Is James Hyslop here; if so, give him my love and say it is as I would have it, and I shall always feel as I did before he went away. I want very much to say something to him, but how can I? [Pause.] I want to return as soon as possible and free my mind. I have much to talk over with him.

My name I gave to Mr. Clarke, and told him to say I was here. L U C Y (?) (S. to R. H.: What's that?) L U C Y. Where is the book of poems? Ask him if he knows what I am thinking about?" His place was then taken by my father (p. 469).

I found on investigation in the West that my cousin's sister Nannie had given him, and read to him very frequently during his last illness, a book entitled, "Morning Thoughts," every chapter of which closed with a poem, usually of some length. Taken altogether, his communications are neither clear nor rich in evidential material. Without the mass of evidence in the messages of my father, these of my cousin would perhaps not carry much weight alone, though my experiments on the Identification of Personality (pp. 537-623) show that we are entitled to give them some value, even independently of the better results of my father. For we saw in those imitative experiments how little evidence is necessary to correct identification of a communicator. If telepathy be once excluded, therefore, the spiritistic theory could easily triumph. The evidence for identity may remain the same on the telepathic hypothesis. Some of the best incidents eliminating acquisition from *my* memory are found in the messages pertaining to my cousin. They are the dog Peter, the connection of Jennie with Lucy, possibly the book of poems, and more remotely the "aunt Nannie," applicable to his sister. Had he been as good as my father, the record would in all probability have been full of incidents transcending my mind. As it is, the confusion which he shows illustrates again the remark made of my uncle's messages, that on the telepathic hypothesis there ought to be no such differences between communicators when the data of my mind are the same for all, and were plentiful enough regarding my cousin to have expected, on that theory, many more and clearer communications.

Recapitulation.

Somewhat as in the case of my uncle Carruthers, the statements that came directly from this cousin gain much of their significance from the information offered by other communicators. Thus he practically succeeded in telling me he was my cousin McClellan, but his first name, Robert, was supplied later by my father. Again he mentioned Lucy, but the name McClellan in connection with it was given by Mrs. Piper's returning consciousness as the trance was over. So also it was my sister's inquiry about the dog Peter that gave significance to his vague expressions on this point. It is worth noticing that only in the group of associations likely to be immediately and primarily stimulated by my presence were the facts approximately clear. These were his name and relationship to myself, the "Hyslop boys" and my father, calling him "uncle Hyslop," and his particular

inquiries after my brothers Rob Hyslop and Frank Hyslop. Attempts to get beyond this apparently resulted only in vague or erroneous statements, as when he said that my brother Frank or one of my other brothers intended to be a doctor, and that my brother Robert or Will had met with an accident on the railway. Although the small group of facts which I have mentioned indicates clearly enough what person is concerned as communicator, there is perhaps scarcely anything *characteristic* of him except the repeated phrase, "Oh yes, Oh yes."

Statements of my brother Charles.

This brother died, as already remarked, in 1864, when he was but four and a half years old. I have mentioned above the incidents which he gave in the first sitting to indicate his identity, and shall repeat them briefly. But the chief interest that attaches to them generally is also the same as that of my sister's, namely, their power to suggest difficulties in the theory of telepathy. Many of them do not profess to be personal experiences of his own, but were avowedly those of the persons for whom he acted as an intermediary. They show inexpugnably, in all ordinary conceptions of the process, an internal contradiction in the telepathic hypothesis. It is essentially absurd to say that telepathy could not get access to my memory or other living consciousness in terms of association with the person whose identity they are to prove, but can be effected under another name which is that of a pertinent person who never knew the facts. It is simply to say that telepathy can do with one name what it cannot do with another and the right name.

It will be recalled that in the first sitting my brother gave his name and relationship to me, and stated that he had had a fever, saying immediately afterward that it was typhoid, which was false; that he had had a very bad throat, which took him out; that it was in the winter and that he remembered seeing it snow (p. 310). He also referred in this sitting to my mother's sister, saying that she was living before he passed out and that she had died after my mother. This was true. He said that Mary was the name of my father's sister, and Elizabeth that of my mother's. The former was correct, the latter should have been Eliza, as I had to ascertain by inquiry. But it was not the name of the sister referred to as having passed out after my mother. I did not know that my father's sister was named Mary. I heard of her only as Amanda. She died before I was born. In the third sitting he responded to my question asked in the first that he had had scarlet fever (p. 330). All these incidents were true with the one exception mentioned. In the sittings of December 24th and 26th there were some brief and non-evidential communications except one incident from this brother (pp. 313-314, 330).

On May 31st, when I was present myself and just after my cousin Robert McClellan had been communicating in the first half of the sitting, Charles followed with a most interesting set of messages. He said:—

James, I am your brother Charles and I am well and happy. Give my love to the new sister Hettie and tell her I will know her some time. Father is . . . often speaks of her. (S. : Father often speaks of her?) Yes. Do you hear? (S. : Yes I hear.) Well, it was Frank who had the pictures and father would like you to have them if you are still in the body, James. Speak to me. (S. : Yes, I shall have the pictures, Charles.) He asked me to say this for him. His voice troubles him a little when trying to speak. (S. : Yes, I understand.) But if you could only see his delight when he hears you, I am sure, my dear brother, you would never doubt that he still clings to you. It is his one desire to comfort and help you, but he wants you to go home and rest there (p. 440.)

The chief interest in this passage is the manner in which he speaks of my sister Hettie. He died in 1864, and she was born in 1874. He alludes to her, therefore, in precisely the proper way, and the remark that "father often speaks of her" is exactly what he should say consistently with the statement about her as a "new sister." Father's pictures, which it is said I should have, were left with Frank in the sense that he was living with father at the time of his death, though spending the summer at my brother's. It would have been truer, however, to have said that he left them with my stepmother. The hypothetical clause, "if you are still in the body," is very curious. It seems to imply the existence of conditions intermediate between the present life and the one claimed for himself (*Cf.* p. 332). The last sentence of my brother's message concerning my father's "desire to comfort and help me" as a subject of common consciousness beyond, was as characteristic of father in life as it is in these sittings.

The next appearance was on June 1st, toward the close of the sitting.

What about aunt LUCY? (S. : Aunt Lucy who?) Charles is speaking this, and he came here quite young. She was related to the other mother, wasn't she? (S. : Do you mean the mother on this side?) Yes, I do. (S. : Well, can you tell what her other name is?) John can as he knows her very well. Ask him when he gets here, if that is you James. (S. : Very well. That is all right.) And what happened to the chimney after I left? Do you not remember? (S. : Yes, I remember it.) And wasn't it taken down? (S. : Yes, I think so.) I heard father talking about it to mother some time ago . . . I mean the chimney, James. (S. : Yes, I remember it well.) Well, all right, I am not worrying about it. Only I remember how cold it was before I left (p. 455).

The "aunt Lucy" is either meaningless or a mistake for my cousin, Lucy McClellan, and she is not related to my stepmother at all, as she

is only my cousin by marriage. I can make nothing of the reference to John, unless it be the John McClellan of previous communications (p. 438). He was either the grandfather of Robert McClellan, Lucy McClellan's husband, or the John McClellan of earlier communications (p. 111).

But the allusion to the chimney is very pertinent. There was a tall unseemly chimney on the kitchen, which was built in 1861. It was blown down in a cyclone in 1884, and just such an object as my father and mother would pick out for my brother to mention to me. But we can hardly assume that my brother would recollect it, although my mother might well mention it to him, as it was built when he was about a year old, and he was four and a half when he died. This assumption that he might remember it is not necessary, as he here creates an additional complication for telepathy by virtually disavowing the fact as one of personal knowledge in life, and represents it as acquired on the "other side." The incident itself is well calculated to suggest family connections at least.

On June 5th, following father's communication about my brother George's guitar, he began a most interesting set of messages:—

What is it . . . My step-sister . . . I am Charles. + [Imperator]¹ sent me to take father's place. Hettie I did not remember (S. : That is right.) as she was my step-sister, half-sister, I mean, but I could not think of it at first. Do you realise, James, how much our leader is helping me . . . (S. : I shall be glad to hear you go on.) He said—I mean, father said—you go, Charles, and do the best you can until I can breathe more freely. Do you remember uncle James McClellan . . . and Frank . . . speak . . . Hyslop? (S. : Yes, I remember Frank Hyslop well.) He is not here yet. He is over there somewhere. Father spoke to me of him a few moments ago. (S. : That is right.) You see father forgets nothing, but he cannot say all that he thinks yet. Who is Dr. Pierce? He was a friend of uncle Clarke's, and he is still over there. (S. : Right.) And perhaps you will take the trouble to find him at the . . . * * * [undec.] . . . Oh, I am getting mixed too. [R. H. puts knife into hand.] (S. : My brother Charles.) I was ill, wasn't I, very ill, and when they thought I was getting better I was really coming out. You do not know this, but aunt Nannie will, I know. I am thinking about father's war stories. Do you remember them? And anything about his leg? (S. : Yes I do.) and the little . . . James, what became of the little ship . . . (S. : I do not remember.) Think about the boat. The other boys must know what I mean. (S. : Yes, I shall ask them about it.) And ask about the time after I left that they got *turned over*. I cannot ask them because I know. (S. : I shall ask them myself this summer.) And what has become of Robert? (S. : Robert who?) Robert Hyslop. (S. : Your brother Robert?) Yes. (S. : He is in Ohio.) Well . . . well . . . is he well?

¹ The mark of the cross is frequently made to indicate Imperator.

(S. : Yes, he is well.) Are those his children? (S. : I do not understand.) No . . . No it was only interruption . . . I am thinking of my brother. (S. : That is right.) And he has some trouble with his eye . . . one . . . eyes. Yes, eyes. (S. : Yes, I think that is right.) Yes, it surely is right, and I am going to see what I can do to help him. I will do better for you bye and bye. James. Do not get impatient with me. I was all right, and I tried to do right always. Don't you think so. (S. : Yes, I do think so.) I want very much to help you to find us all. I could not stay away. We had one other sister, didn't we, or you did. (S. : Yes.) I mean you did. (S. : Yes, that is right. Can you tell her name?) Yes, Lida . . . (S. : Yes.) was her name, (S. : Yes, that is right.) and father knows more about her than I do, but often tells me about them, and of another one named like her. Li Lizz Lizzie Li no not exactly, but Eliza beth Eliza I am not not quite sure of this, James" (p. 462).

Following this came the passage about Lucy which I have quoted above (p. 101).

This long communication is full of interesting and evidential points, though not for the communicator himself, except perhaps in one detail, that of the reference to his half-sister. The message starts with an evident word on the "other side," as if trying to be sure what he was to say. That he could not remember Hettie is apparent from what I have already said above (p. 101). The correction from step-sister to half-sister is interesting, as the latter is the correct form. The names of my brother Frank and uncle James McClellan are correct, and it is also correct that this brother is still living. He was born three years after the death of my brother Charles. Assuming the "Dr. Pierce" mentioned to be intended for Dr. J. P. Dice, the statement about his being a friend of "uncle Clarke's" is also true. The allusion to his own illness and death cannot be verified, as only father and mother were present when the end came. The reference to father's war stories and his leg is very pertinent (*Cf.* p. 454). My brother died just at the close of the civil war in 1864, and, as said above, father was prevented from taking part in that strife by an injured spine and leg. The "ship" incident cannot be verified, and probably refers to a toy, if we allow ourselves any conjectures in this connection. It might be supposed to have reference to some accident, "turning over" of a boat, in connection with my brothers. But there was no stream of water near us for any enjoyments or accidents of this kind. The name of my brother Robert was correct, but he was not suffering from sore eyes. My brother *Will* was suffering from some difficulty with his eyes at the time, having gotten poisoned, as supposed, some time previously. The allusion to children, however, is explained by Rector to be an interruption. As my sister Hettie and brothers Frank and Robert were

mentioned in order, it is possible that during the interruption indicated my brother Charles passed in thought to my brother Will. The statement about my other sister and the giving of her name as Lida is correct. She was six and Charles four and a-half years old when he died, so that father would know more about her than my brother. The other "named like her" is evidently my aunt Eliza, the name here being correct, and subject of frequent mention in this record. My sister Lida (Eliza) was named for this aunt.

The chief value of this communication lies in the fact that it completely breaks up every principle upon which telepathy can claim a *point de repère* and method for its acquisitions. There is no principle of association in my memory, or that of any living person, by which these incidents could be telepathically obtained in the personality of my brother Charles. The communication is a piece of constructive intelligence which gets its unity wholly from the standpoint of real spirits. There is every mark of an independent intelligence in the telling of the facts, and an intelligence that never knew some of them personally while living, but has to get them on the "other side" in the same way that we should in actual life, namely, by conversation of some kind, as it is actually stated in the messages.

Recapitulation.

The statements coming from this communicator that are apparently presented as conscious recollections of his own are, as we might expect from a boy who died thirty-four years previously at the age of four and a-half years, very few. The correct statements are that he was my brother Charles, that he had died with a very bad throat of a fever (first wrongly described as typhoid, and afterward rightly as scarlet fever), that it was winter, and that he remembered seeing it snow, snow having fallen as a fact at the time of his illness and death, and that he died before his mother. Another statement possibly implied that he had never known me personally, or at least had no remembrance of me, yet I was at home with him during his short lifetime (p. 309).

The other statements made by Charles apparently depend on information received by him on the "other side." Some of them betray an obscure and imperfect knowledge of relationships and facts, such as might not improbably arise under the circumstances supposed on the spiritistic hypothesis; the reference to aunt Lucy, to Frank and the pictures, the confusion between my brothers Robert and Will, are instances of this. Beyond his personal remembrances of his earthly life and some facts either indicated before or given by him as an intermediary, perhaps the only significant fresh statements concerned what happened to the chimney, and his reference to his new sister Hettie, first calling her step-sister, and then immediately and more correctly,

half-sister, and his statement made at my first sitting that my mother had a sister who was living when he died, and that this sister died after my mother.

Statements of my sister Annie (Anna).

My sister Anna died twelve days after my brother Charles, in 1864, with scarlet fever, when nearly three years old. She was commonly called Annie by the members of the family since my mother's death, and possibly often before that event. Only her name appears in my sitting of December 23rd, and without the relationship to me. In the sitting for December 26th (p. 331) my brother Charles was apparently followed by my sister Annie, who seems also to have acted as intermediary for one or two statements from my mother. I quote the passage where I suppose that her communications begin. "Mother [? brother] . . . is here also. (S. : Mother, is that you ?) Yes, we are all here. Do you know who Sarah is? Anne [Anna?] (S. : Yes, I know who Annie is.) She wants to see you. (S. : Well, I hope we can some day.) She says you dream while she lives, and she sends her love to you."

Sarah, or Sarah Luella, was the name of my twin sister who died when she was only a few months old, and who was possibly meant by the "one who is nearer to you than all the rest of us," as mentioned in the sitting of December 23rd (p. 309). The record continues :—

Where is brother James? (S. : I am brother James.) How you have changed since I came here. [*Cf. Proceedings* Vol. XIII., p. 324] Do you remember anything about my hair? There is something I wish you to know. Do you, if you are my dear brother, recall anything about my hair? (S. : I am not quite certain.) They took a piece of it away. Did you know this? (S. : I think you are right.) I know I am. I know it well, James. And I remember a little picture of me taken when I was very young. Who has it now? I cannot find it and I have thought about it so much. (S. : I think I remember now. Do you remember Aunt Nannie?) [*Excitement in hand.*] Well, I think I do very well. I was named for her. Has she it? (S. : Yes, she has it.) Give her my love and tell sister Annie tells her . . . Anna not Anna but Annie . . . And I am your sister. (S. : Yes, I remember you well.) Do you not have anything to say to me. I came here just after Charles. (S. : Yes, that is right. I am glad to hear from you.) I tried years ago to reach you. I tried years ago through father. Did you know this? (S. : No, I did not know this.) I did. And if auntie is still in the body she will remember this. Here comes father (p. 331).

The incident of the lock of hair here implied is correct, though such incidents are too common to be evidential. The allusion to the picture is also correct, but liable to the same objection as the lock of hair, though the statement that it was "taken when I was very young" is interesting for its pertinence as well as its truth. She was not named

for my aunt Nannie. The correction to Anna here is interesting, though re-corrected, especially as it was indicated previously that my mother was present, who,—I learned from my aunt Nannie,—always refused to call her “Annie,” as she did not like the Scotch “Annie Laurie,” the full name of my sister being “Anna Laura.” My mother insisted on saying “Anna.” The statement that she “came here,”—died,—“just after Charles” is correct. The rest is unverifiable. No experiences such as are implied in the statement of trying to reach me through father are remembered in the family.

On December 26th my father spoke of my sister Annie (p. 332), and also on February 16th, in the sitting with Dr. Hodgson (p. 388), but she did not appear again personally until May 29th in my last series. On that date she took father’s place for a few moments and said :—

Annie . . . I want to help father to remember everything because I came here first and long ago. Do you hear me, James? Do you remember the large sled . . . the large sled? (S. : I am not sure.) S l e d Sled. (S. : Yes, I understand.) Do you know the one I mean. I remember you and the Allen boys had it when I was in the body. Do you remember it? (S. : No, I do not remember.) Here is father and he is alone again now and I will go for a moment (p. 421).

It is correct that she “came here first and long ago.” But while it is true that we had a large sled in the country, there were no Allen boys in the neighbourhood. If the “Allen” be a mistake for “McClellan” (pp. 422, 423) it is a possible incident, but it is unverified, to say nothing of the surprise it must awaken in our minds when we note that my sister was just two years and ten months old when she died.

On May 29th, just at the close of the sitting (p. 425), she asked : “Do you remember how I looked, and the little pansie flowers I pressed in one of my books.” She referred to this again on June 7th, see below (p. 108).

On June 1st she followed father in a most interesting communication. “I see you, James. I am your sister Annie . . . and I am very glad to meet you here. Pa is better now. (S. : Yes, I am very glad to see you.) Do you remember when I came to this life, James? (S. : Yes, I remember very well.) and did you know I did not see you? (S. : Yes, I think so.) But I thought of you a great deal and I am thinking now of Corrn [?] C a lora [?] what father calls her . . . not quite right . . . C l a C o r o [?]. You cannot help me can you, I mean mother. J e n n i e and L U C y. (S. : I remember Lucy, but not Jennie. I think there is a Jennie, but what Lucy is this?) She is on my mind at this moment and I want to send a message to her. (S. : Very well, send.) Do you remember grandmother? (S. : Yes, I remember her well.) Lucy is there and I am just thinking of her. Father knows about her better than I do. Yes, I have waited all these years to find you and I helped father when he came

here. I feel it because I do not remember more for you, James, but you have changed also. I had a sister-in-law, so I am trying to think of her. What is it you call her, James? Tell : no you better not. I will tell you pretty soon . . . very soon. I am sorry I cannot say more, but I hope to some day. What is meant by Peter? Was it the dog George had? (S. : I do not remember.) Can't you ask him? (S. : Yes, I shall ask him about it.) [Hand indicates fresh arrival] (p. 451).

The reference to pressing pansies is probably true. (*Cf.* p. 425.) The expression "Pa is better now" is very pertinent. Every one of us without exception always called him "Pa" until after 1877, when I began to call him "father," as he then began calling me "James," instead of "Jimmie." Three of the others have always called him, and still call him "Pa," and the sister Annie here mentioned never knew him by any other expression, though she has in all but this instance used "father" in these communications. It would be natural that she should not remember me (if this be what she meant by the statement "I did not see you"), as she was a little less than three years old when she died. But she ought to recall me as easily as the "Sled"! (p. 421). But perhaps the reference more obviously means that she did not see me at the actual time of her death, though I witnessed it. She very gradually lapsed into unconsciousness. Her asking me if I remembered it, her statement that she thought of me a great deal, and her remark to me afterward that I had changed also bear out this interpretation. The broken words "Corrn," etc., are possibly an attempt to name my aunt Cornelia, or "aunt Cora" as we always called her. She was my mother's sister and my mother was very affectionately attached to her. The name Jennie had no meaning to me, but I found on investigation that it is the name of the sister of this Lucy McClellan. I never heard of this Jennie before. My sister Annie never knew her, neither did she know Lucy, so that the statement that "father knows about her better than I do" is true enough. The reference to a "sister-in-law" is true, but there are three sisters-in-law, and this may be a mistake for the half-sister Henrietta or Hettie. The incident of the dog Peter I have already explained as referring to the pet of my cousin George McClellan (p. 515).

The same remarks apply to some of the statements that I made in reference to the last message of my brother (p. 104). They are the work of an intermediary.

On June 7th my sister again appears just after father had tried so hard to get the name of my stepmother. She said :—

How are you, James? + [Imperator] sent me to speak a moment while father goes out and returns. I am very glad to be here again. It is I, sister Annie. (S. : Good morning. I am glad to hear you again.) I perhaps can help you a little, James. I shall be glad if I can. Do you remember

anything about birds? (S. : Very little.) about anything I did. (S. : Yes, I remember only one thing that you did.) Yes, but I remember the birds very well. (S. : I am glad to hear it.) Will you ask auntie if she remembers the one I caught (S. : I shall ask her), and the flowers I pressed. Will you ask her for me. (S. : Yes, I shall ask her.) I think it was yellow in color . . . Yes, and I had a little pin-holder I made when I was in the body. I think she has it now. (S. : I shall ask her.) I hope so. Here comes father and I am going now (p. 482).

Neither the bird nor the pin-holder incident is verifiable, nor have they to me any internal probabilities, considering her age when she died. No one knows anything about the pressing of flowers, though it has some possibilities. (Cf. Note p. 425).

Recapitulation.

In this instance as in the case of my brother Charles, there is little of the earthly life that we could expect to be remembered by one who died thirty-four years ago when she was less than three years old, and it is not very clear which incidents are to be regarded as her own conscious recollections and which as related to her by others. Her correct statements were that she was my sister Annie, giving also the name Anna (perhaps an interpolation by my mother), that she died long ago just after Charles, that a piece of her hair was taken away, that a little picture of her was taken when she was very young, and her reference to Sarah. Her use of the word Pa, the only instance in the record, was characteristic and is specially noteworthy. But the statement that she was named after aunt Nannie was a mistake. Her reference to the Allen boys, the pressing of flowers, the pinholder, the birds and her catching of one, her not seeing me when she died, and the attempt through father to "reach me" after her death cannot be verified. Other statements from her and perhaps some of the incidents just mentioned apparently depend on information obtained on the "other side." The most important of them were the name Jennie in connection with Lucy and the specific reference to Peter as the dog which George had.

Statements of my uncle, James McClellan.

James McClellan was my uncle; he married my father's sister for his first wife, and my mother's sister for his second wife. He died in 1876 during the winter. His own direct communications were very clear, but he appeared only twice. His son Robert tried more frequently, but, as we have seen, was not a good communicator. Just at the close of the sitting on May 31st (p. 445), James McClellan and James Carruthers apparently were both present. There was some confusion at first, at least in my mind, as to who was speaking:—

"Yes, and . . . yes there were two James and do you remember an uncle? (S.: Yes, I remember, and uncle James.— what?) Well, it is he. (S.: Which uncle James?) H James Mc." I saw who was meant by this and did not press for any clearer statement. I simply replied, "Yes, that is right." He continued: "and a cousin John. Don't you remember us both? (S.: I am not sure of cousin John.) Well, I will tell you more about myself later, and we will perhaps understand each other . . . my sister Ann is here with . . . yes [?] Ann. Going."

I found on inquiry that he had a sister Mary Ann, and then discovered that while at college I had known this sister as Mrs. Mary Mitchell. It was new to me that her name had Ann in it. My first information of her death, so far as I am aware, was received in the above statements. (*Cf.* group of names p. 443 and Note 56, p. 510).

On June 1st father remarked on returning from a respite, "I intended to clear up about James and John McLellen before I left" (p. 450). On June 5th my brother Charles asked me if I remembered my uncle James McClellan (p. 463). At the sitting of June 6th, immediately after my father had answered my request to tell me something that had occurred before I was born, this uncle appeared personally, and gave one of the finest set of pertinent and evidential incidents in the record.

I am here once more. I am James McLellan, if you wish to know and you are my namesake. (S.: Yes, I remember you and that I am your namesake.) Yes, all right. We cannot quarrel about that, can we, James, but I despised the name of Jim. (S.: Very well, I understand.) What is it you want to know about Frank, or was it John who wanted to know? (S.: There was some confusion when Frank was mentioned, and also when John was mentioned. Who is this cousin John that was mentioned before?) It was not cousin, that was a mistake. (S.: Yes. Is he in the body or is he in the spirit?) He is here, and [Hand dissents violently.] I intend to straighten this out, but the light went out and I could not remain there. He is a brother . . . yes, all right . . . and he will be here soon. But it is still not straight. Wait and I will explain. You remember brother John very well, you must if you are James. (S.: Yes, I remember him well.) He was the one who went to war. (S.: Very well. Go on.) Let me see. Well perhaps you remember father, do you not? (S.: Do you mean *your* father?) Yes. (S.: Is this my uncle James McClellan?) Yes. (S.: No, I do not remember your father.) Well, he was John. (S.: Very well.) John James McClellan. [James written first. John written in front of James, then McClellan written after.] (R. H.: James John McClellan?) No. John James McClellan. (S.: Very well. I understand, and shall inquire about it.) Well, go ahead and inquire. I think I know. (S.: Well, all right. Please tell me anything you wish to tell.) I wanted to tell you about his going to the war, and about one of his fingers being gone before he came here. (S.: Very well, go on, please. I understand.) And he had a brother David, who had a S U N stroke. (S.: I understand. That is perfectly new to me. I never heard it before, and it

pleases me very much to learn this fact.) Well, he never was well after he received it until he came here. Then one more I wanted to speak of was N A N C Y, but I cannot tell you any more now. (S. : Very good. Thank you very much. Rest now.) Be brave, upright, honourable, do the best you can and don't forget your uncle James Mc. Good-bye. (S. : Good-bye, uncle, for the present.) * * * [undec. *James or yours.*] James McLellan (pp. 470-472).

Now the facts as I have verified them are these : I was his namesake. I suspected from the statement about his despising "the name Jim" that this might be the reason we always called him "uncle Mack." I asked his two remaining daughters if the statement was true, and one did not remember it, but the other did recall it at once, and told me of several instances in which both he and his wife had complained of his being called Jim. His father's name was John. If the James was intended as a part of the father's name it is an error. I never knew or heard of him, so far as I can recall, though I was thirteen years old when he died in 1867, and I may, therefore, once have known something about him. Also the name of my uncle's brother is John, and him I know well. He is still living, and in his ninetieth year, so that the prediction that he will die soon must evidently turn out true. (Cf. Footnote, p. 471). It was a very pertinent statement to make that I must remember this John well, as I was at the college of which he was the treasurer, and my uncle James died while I was in my junior year. It is interesting to remark the mistake, and what appears to be the immediate spontaneous correction of it, in the statement about the war. First he said it was his brother, and then altered this to his father. It is important to note that the other references in the passage which I have quoted specially concern this father, and it may be possible that my uncle James McClellan picked out the incidents referred to for the express purpose of giving me tests upon matters unknown to me. I found, as a matter of fact, that James McClellan's brother John had not been in any war, neither had his father. But another John McClellan was commissioned as an ensign on July 15th in 1810 for the war of 1812.¹ I found the corroboration of the statement in the history of Greene County, Ohio, where this other John McClellan lived. It is only stated that he was commissioned as an ensign as stated above. No further facts are given. I could get no confirmation about the lost finger in reference to my uncle's father, but it was true, it appears, of the other John McClellan

¹ My latest notes on the incident of John McClellan's part in the war of 1812 involve a correction of some things said in *Harper's Magazine* (Vol. CI., p. 97), and in the *New York Independent* (Vol. LII., p. 750). Note 94 (p. 535) explains this fully.

(p. 113). I found also that he had no brother David, but he had a brother-in-law, David Elder, who had a slight sunstroke just after the Civil War, somewhere about 1867, according to the testimony of one of Mr. Elder's living sons, though the other does not recall it. I had very great difficulty in finding the persons to confirm this fact.¹

Nancy was the name of the sister of this David Elder and of the wife of old John McClellan. It is to be noted that she was mentioned in immediate proximity to the name of her brother David. She was, of course, the mother of my uncle James McClellan, the communicator. I have no more conscious recollection of her than of old John McClellan.

About half of the incidents mentioned by this communicator were unknown to me. His correct statements on matters known to me were that he was my uncle James McClellan, and that I was his namesake. Mistakes or confusions were illustrated in an earlier reference to John as a cousin instead of a brother (p. 445), though this was corrected later (p. 471); in saying that this brother had been in the war and correcting it to his father, both being false; in saying that his father had lost a finger; and perhaps in giving this father's name as John James instead of merely John. The other John McClellan had been in the war and had lost a finger (Note 94, p. 534). The other statements, all substantially correct, concerned his sister Ann and the fact that she was dead, his despising the name Jim, his father's brother (for brother-in-law) David, and the sunstroke, and the reference to Nancy, the name of his mother.

John McClellan.

On May 29th (p. 421), and in close connection with the allusion to the Cooper incident, father said: "And do you remember John?"

¹ It was only after the most prolonged inquiry that I obtained the verification of the most important incidents. I think it is worth while to indicate to the reader the difficulties that I found in ascertaining the facts about David Elder's sunstroke.

Two of the living sons denied that their father had any brother David. This was strictly correct, but it was interesting to observe that I had found an uncle by that name who was their father's brother-in-law. The third son at first denied it, and then suddenly recalled his uncle David, naming him as Elder. But he did not know where he had lived and could not aid me in finding out anything more than the name. I wrote to the younger brother telling him that I had found an uncle David Elder, and he then recalled him, but did not know what had become of him, nor where he had lived. He referred me, however, to his cousin, the daughter of this David Elder, giving her name and address. I wrote to her and received a reply from her daughter, saying that her mother had been dead two years—a fact not known or remembered apparently by her cousin to whom I wrote. Through this daughter of David Elder's sister I obtained the names and addresses of two of her uncles, sons of David Elder. They were living in the State of Iowa, and from them I ascertained that David Elder, their father, had lived many years in that State and had died there in 1885.

He has just come to greet you for a moment." The connection of this name with that of Cooper, as a note shows, led me to mistake the import of this "John." I can even now only conjecture from later messages its possibilities. On May 30th (p. 427), my cousin, Robert McClellan alluded to the "Williams boys," about whom I knew nothing. But on May 31st (p. 438), at the close of father's first communication, he said: "Here comes John and Hathaway, and he is with him here." Immediately following this is a communication purporting apparently to come from this John, followed by communications from my cousin Robert McClellan. Later incidents indicate that this John was meant for John McClellan, who was not a relative of my cousin. But the communication was:—

"Yes, is James here? Ask him what can I do for you, my boy. I am back, and I feel much freer than I have before. I just waited to clear the way, and there is a young man here who is very kind to me. Do you remember yet about Williams? (S.: What Williams is it?) He is Frank. Here apparently my father interrupts with the statement: John is anxious to know. Speak, James." The communications continue. "(S.: I do not remember Frank Williams, but tell me more about him, and I may recall him.) He had two or three boys, sons, they were Arthur, Fred, and Irvin. You must remember it seems. I am not quite sure that you hear all I say, but take out as much as you hear. (S.: Yes, I hear it all clearly.) You may have to find out about them if you do not remember them. (S.: Yes. I shall try if you tell me where they lived on earth.) They lived not far from me in Ohio, and I remember Frank very well. (S.: Did Nannie know them?) She must have heard about them. (S.: What kind of work did they do?) Frank was at the library, and sent the books over to me just before I left." At this point my cousin, began his communications with the question: "Do you know where Frank Hyslop is?" apparently instigated thereto by the name "Frank" (p. 438).

No further personal communications came from this John McClellan so far as I can determine. But on May 30th (p. 445) the name "John" and then "Mc John" were connected with a confused message apparently from my brother Charles, who was followed by father. That a John McClellan was meant by the name was immediately indicated by the statement that "there are two of the Mclellen over here." Then on June 1st father said (p. 448): "I intended to refer to uncle John, but I was somewhat dazed, James." (*Cf.* Footnote pp. 472-473.) A little later father said again: "I intended to clear up about James and John McClellan before I left" (p. 450).

There seems to have been some consciousness of confusion which it was desired to clear up in connection with the name of John McClellan, as if I was in danger of misunderstanding the relevance of the communications. And we have seen above (p. 110) in the communication of James McClellan that there was some confusion between his own

father and the other John McClellan, who had been in the war of 1812 and had lost a finger. The sequel showed that the apprehension of the communicators was justified. For the identification of this old John McClellan and the discovery of the pertinence of the names and incidents in connection with him gave me much trouble (See Note 94, p. 535). I found that the facts did not fit the father of my uncle James McClellan. But having ascertained that there was another John McClellan who also lived in Ohio within a few miles of my uncle's father, I set to work to learn whether the names and incidents in these communications in any respect applied to him, and I found that he had been in the war of 1812, that he had lost a finger, probably in that war, that Hathaway was his son-in-law's cousin, and that he was himself probably connected with a Williams family, though this was possibly as far back as 1825 or earlier. He was familiarly called "old uncle John." This is of dubious importance (Footnote p. 472). Nothing could be learned about the sons of Frank Williams, Fred, Arthur, and Irvin. The reader may compare this with Professor Lodge's incident. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 527, 555-557).

Statements of other Communicators.

I may here add a few words concerning the trance personalities and George Pelham (G.P.), who was the chief subject of Dr. Hodgson's last report. G.P., as we have seen, acted sometimes as an intermediary for my relatives, but sent a few messages pertinent to Dr. Hodgson. One incident in connection with myself I have already mentioned elsewhere. This was the giving of the name of his brother Charles on June 7th (p. 486) in response to my statement that I knew his brother in Columbia University.

By the "trance personalities" I mean Emperor, Rector, Doctor and Prudens. Their own communications are—the bulk of them—at the beginning and the end of the sittings, and consist mostly of conversation with Dr. Hodgson about arrangements for sittings, and of advice and prayers for ourselves. They have no evidential value for personal identity, the main problem of my report, whatever they may be supposed to have for independent intelligence. Hence they can be studied by the reader himself without comment from me. Once we were reproved by Rector for eating too fast, and the rebuke seems to have been merited (p. 437). At the last sitting, June 8th, they undertook to give me a physical diagnosis, which was correct, and specially so in regard to the weak point in my constitution, saying that it was my stomach. They also gave me a course of diet which is unquestionably good, and they showed by their absolute prohibition of all alcoholic drinks that they would make good teetotalers or Prohibitionists. Their moral and religious maxims of advice were all that could be expected of their type, and are exceptionally lofty.

In fact the religious type of character exhibited by them is a most interesting feature of the whole regime, and it seems to me quite appropriate to collect here some of the prayers and benedictions that were offered at the sittings by these trance personalities in the form of automatic writing. I hardly need remind the reader of the moral and spiritual character of these personalities that claim to supervise the communications, but it forms one element, if only a small one, in my estimate of the problem. In quoting the prayers I shall not include the repetitions due to our inability to decipher, etc. It appears that the prayers are probably offered by Emperor, but he does not always act as the amanuensis in the writing of them. Rector often directs the writing as the amanuensis, the indication that both are parties to it being found in the sign of the cross or Emperor's name and the signature of Rector.

At the close of the sitting of December 27th a sort of admonitory prayer, followed by a benediction, was offered. It was:—

“Fear not. God is ever Thy guide, and He will never fail thee. We cease now, and may His blessings rest on thee” (p. 344).

On February 7th, at Dr. Hodgson's sitting in my behalf, at the end there came:—

“May God in His tenderest Mercy lead thee into light and joy, and may His blessings rest on thee” (p. 375).

On February 8th also at Dr. Hodgson's sitting in my behalf, and near the beginning, Emperor acted as his own amanuensis and wrote:—

“Holy Father, we are with Thee in all Thy ways, and to Thee we come in all things. We ask Thee to give us Thy tender love and care. Bestow Thy blessings upon this Thy fellow creature, and help him to be all that thou dost ask. Teach him to walk in the paths of righteousness and truth. He needs Thy loving care in all things. Teach him to do Thy holy will, and we leave all else in Thy hands. Without Thy care we are indeed bereft. Watch over and guide his footsteps and lead him into truth and light. Father we beseech Thee to so open the blinded eyes of mortals that they may know more of Thee and Thy tender love and care” (p. 375).

At the sitting of June 5th at which I was present, and near the end, there came:—

“Oh, God, thou allwise Father, give us more light on the returning of the light, and ere we return to earth * * * [undec.] we may be able to hear distinctly and clearly the voices of Thy Messengers and all returning friends. We beseech Thee, Oh Father, to render us thy help in all our undertakings. Faileth Thy help we are indeed bereft. Merciful Father, Oh Thou Allwise Merciful God, give us help and light” (p. 466).

Then on June 7th near the beginning came :—

“Oh, Holy Father, Thou Divine Being, maker of heaven and earth, we beseech Thee this day to send light unto Thy fellow beings. Keep them, oh Father, in the paths of righteousness and virtue. Lead them to know more of Thee and Thy wondrous workings for the redemption of their own souls. We ask for no more, but leave all else to Thee” (p. 477).

*Statistical Summary.*¹

It will aid in a clear conception of the facts in the communications if we give such a statistical summary of them as is possible. This cannot be done in the same manner that facts and events of the same kind usually can be classified, but they can be grouped in a way suitable to a rough comparison, that will supply the relative number of true and false incidents with which we have to reckon in making up our conclusions in the case.

The basis of classification that has been adopted rests upon the distinction between the true, the false, the indeterminate, and the mixed incidents. An incident in the classification does not mean merely some name or isolated fact, but may include a number of facts capable of being independent of each other in the course of events. Hence I have distinguished between an *incident* and the number of *factors* that may constitute it. An incident may be any name, conception, or combination of conceptions making a single possible and independent fact, or it may be any combination of possibly independent facts constituting some fact that was a single whole in the mind of the communicator. I shall illustrate what I mean by both applications of the term. A single proper name may be called an “incident” of one factor; so may any proposition indicating some single fact. Or an “incident” may be such a statement as that “my Aunt Susan visited my brother.” Here there are four factors in the single “incident,” that are not necessarily connected with each other. There is nothing in the use of the name “aunt” to suggest the name “Susan,” nor in both of them to suggest to any one either the idea of a visit or that the visit was paid to a brother. There are any number of possibilities in the combination of ideas with either the concepts “aunt” or “Susan.” Hence this can be treated as one of the synthetic incidents, as I call such cases in the discussion of certain problems. Or, again, to say

¹ Further inquiries made after this statistical summary was drawn up resulted in showing that some incidents which I had set down as true were false; that some incidents which I had set down as false were true; and that some incidents which I had set down as indeterminate were true. As the work of tabulating the incidents was a very laborious one, and as the result of further inquiry had improved the evidence on the whole, I have not revised the summary, but have preferred to leave it in the form most unfavourable to the spiritistic theory.

that "my uncle hurt his foot on the railway" would be to give one incident with three factors in it. But I have also chosen to characterise by the same term a class of communications which, though they did not represent a synthetic and single whole in the actual life of the communicator, yet seem to have that kind of mental unity in the communicator's mind which allows them to be spoken of as a whole with a number of factors. The line is not easily drawn between the synthetic event which was an actual fact in the life of the communicator and one that is the creation of his mind at the time of the message. For certain purposes in the argument it does not make any difference whether we distinguish between them or not, while also the factors retain all their value whether so connected or not. I have also often classified as "incidents" a series of communications which, though they do not represent any single event in life when taken together, yet represent a natural group of facts in one continued message. The main line distinguishing between the facts classed in one incident and those in another will be either the distinctly synthetic character of one as compared with another, or sufficient interruption and separation in the messages to justify speaking of two incidents instead of one. But the factors represent, as indicated, those facts, names, actions, or events that do not necessarily suggest each other, or are not necessarily suggested by any given name or fact. This analysis of a communication enables us to see more clearly how difficult it is to explain any complex circumstances by an easy theory. It is an important question in the consideration of chance, where we have to suppose that the brain of the medium has no clue to follow, either before any correct start has been obtained, or after it. It will be an important problem to determine how the unity of consciousness involved in such cases can be produced without some resort to intelligence, whether supernormal or not.

The table in which the facts are summarised does not classify them with reference to their *value*, evidential or otherwise, but only with reference to their truth or falsity. Facts, names, or events, without any evidential value, may be classed with those having this quality in a very high degree. This must be kept in mind when examining the table, as I do not mean to make the case appear any stronger from the mere force of figures, though in estimating the relation of the phenomena to chance we may safely rely upon this circumstance. I have often been asked what proportion of truth to error is found in the record, and I could not answer this query any other way than by making the comparison which the table gives, but this must not be interpreted as implying that all the facts have the same evidential value. The truth is that there are many true incidents that are far from evidential at all, but they are nevertheless true and capable of

general comparison with the false. Also I should add that the classification does not include mere repetitions.

The rules which have governed this classification should be indicated. I have classed as false one incident with seven factors because it is wholly inapplicable to my family, and so false in that relation, though it might represent a true set of facts capable of proving identity to the parties concerned. It has been the same with some other cases classed as false. For instance, certain incidents that might be attributed to mistakes of memory, such as those to which we are all liable, have been classed as false, and thus appear to have the negative value that suggests difficulties, but as false incidents they are very different in type from those that even suggest the truth that they fail to state. Similarly I might have treated certain incidents due to confusion of the communicator at the time. In this it will be apparent that the number of wholly false incidents might be considerably reduced, but I have not allowed myself any rights in this matter, but have judged of the case strictly, leaving to explanations of this kind the modification which is due the incidents. The false thus obtains, when it does not represent a mistake, some of the possible characteristics of the indeterminate, but the true cases have their whole meaning determined by their relation to the sitter. Whatever apology, however, is possible for the false as here represented, nevertheless it must have all the negative force of total error when measured against the true.

The class of indeterminate incident contains two types. First, there is that class which represents facts purporting to be events in the earthly life of the communicator, which I could not verify, though they are possible or even probable; for example, my father's reference to the broken wheel. The second class contains alleged incidents in the transcendental world which it is impossible to verify, but which represent statements on the same level as the verifiable; for instance, my brother Charles' reference to his hearing father and mother talking about the chimney. If rejected altogether they diminish the number of indeterminate incidents.

The above general explanation will enable the reader to understand the tabular review which follows. For example, to take the second sitting out of my first four it is seen, on consulting Table I., that of the true incidents there were three with one factor each; one with two factors; one with three; three with four each; one with six, and one with eleven; no incidents that were false; one that was indeterminate with three factors, and one mixed incident with nine factors, of which eight factors were true and one false. The Roman numerals indicate the number of the sitting in each set.

I must warn the reader that I attach no intrinsic value to this statistical review, but present it only as a concession to the statistically

inclined person. Its fundamental fault is that it both puts the most complex incident on the level of the simplest, and conceals the evidential importance of all of them in respect of their quality, which is far more important than mere quantity alone. The review is a convenient *ad hominem* argument against those who might wish to appeal to chance on the basis of mere number, if we once accept the correctness of the classification of the incidents, but it cannot affect any judgment that is not enamoured of figures. Perhaps it has the merit of affording a sort of bird's-eye view of the number of incidents that are synthetic as distinguished from those that are simple, and also some conception of the degree of complexity involved. But all this depends on the criterion for determining the "single" incident and the amount of complexity, and hence the table must be treated as merely a rough attempt to suggest the comparison between the true and false at large in the record. This one numerical result may have some value.

TABLE I.—FIRST FOUR SITTINGS.

	TRUE		FALSE		INDETERM.		MIXED				
	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	True.	False.	Indeterm.
I.	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	1
	—	—	1	7	—	—	1	4	3	0	1
II.	3	1	—	—	1	3	1	9	8	1	0
	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	3	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
III.	6	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	0
	5	2	—	—	—	—	1	4	2	2	0
	4	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
IV.	7	1	1	2	—	—	1	3	2	1	0
	3	2	—	—	—	—	1	4	3	1	0
	1	4	—	—	—	—	1	5	4	1	0
	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summary	16	1	5	1	5	1	1	2	1	0	1
	12	2	1	2	1	3	2	3	4	1	1
	5	3	1	7	—	—	3	4	8	3	1
	4	4	—	—	—	—	1	5	4	1	0
	1	5	—	—	—	—	1	9	8	1	0
	2	6	—	—	—	—	1	11	8	2	1
	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE II.—DR. HODGSON'S SITTINGS.

	TRUE		FALSE		INDETERM.		MIXED				
	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	True.	False.	Indeterm.
I.	2	1	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	6	2	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
II.	1	1	2	1	—	—	1	2	1	1	0
	3	2	—	—	—	—	3	4	6	6	0
	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
III.	7	1	1	1	—	—	1	4	1	2	1
	2	2	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	0	1
	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
IV.	1	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
V.	3	1	—	—	—	—	1	9	8	1	0
	2	2	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	0	1
	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summary	14	1	5	1	—	—	3	2	3	2	1
	13	2	1	4	—	—	4	4	7	8	1
	1	3	1	6	—	—	1	9	8	1	0
	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	3	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE III.—LAST EIGHT SITTINGS.

	TRUE		FALSE		INDETERM.		MIXED				
	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	True.	False.	Indeterm.
I.	6	1	2	1	—	—	1	2	1	1	0
	7	2	2	2	—	—	3	3	3	2	4
	1	3	1	4	—	—	1	4	1	0	3
	1	5	—	—	—	—	1	5	4	0	1
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6	4	0	2
II.	2	1	—	—	1	1	2	3	3	0	3
	1	2	—	—	2	2	3	4	6	1	5
	5	3	—	—	1	3	1	5	2	0	3
	1	4	—	—	1	4	2	7	12	0	0
	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
III.	2	1	1	6	1	1	2	5	8	1	1
	1	2	—	—	1	2	2	6	10	1	1
	2	3	—	—	1	7	1	7	5	0	2
	1	4	—	—	—	—	1	9	6	3	0
IV.	2	1	—	—	1	1	1	3	2	1	0
	4	2	—	—	—	—	1	4	3	1	0
	4	3	—	—	—	—	4	5	9	2	9
	1	4	—	—	—	—	1	7	2	5	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	8	7	0	1
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	11	8	3	0
V.	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	3	2	0	1
	4	2	—	—	1	2	4	4	8	0	8
	4	3	—	—	—	—	1	5	3	0	2
	1	4	—	—	—	—	2	6	7	0	5
	1	5	—	—	—	—	1	7	2	5	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	13	11	0	2
VI.	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1
	2	3	—	—	3	3	1	4	3	0	1
	1	4	—	—	1	4	1	13	12	0	1
	—	—	—	—	1	5	1	18	16	0	2
VII.	2	2	—	—	1	2	1	2	1	0	1
	3	4	—	—	1	6	2	3	3	1	2
	1	5	—	—	1	8	1	7	5	1	1
	1	6	—	—	—	—	1	10	3	0	7
VIII.	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—
	2	2	—	—	3	2	—	—	—	—	—
	3	3	—	—	1	4	—	—	—	—	—
	1	4	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	—	—
	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summary	14	1	1	1	9	1	3	2	3	1	2
	23	2	1	6	10	2	9	3	13	4	10
	21	3	—	—	4	3	10	4	21	2	17
	9	4	—	—	4	4	9	5	26	3	16
	3	5	—	—	1	5	5	6	21	1	8
	2	6	—	—	2	6	6	7	26	11	5
	3	7	—	—	1	8	1	8	7	0	1
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	9	6	3	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	10	3	0	7
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	11	8	3	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	13	23	0	3
—	—	—	—	—	—	1	18	16	0	2	

TABLE IV.—TOTAL SUMMARY.

TRUE		FALSE		INDETERM.		MIXED				
Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	Inc.	Fac.	True.	False.	Indeterm.
44	1	11	1	14	1	7	2	7	3	4
48	2	1	2	10	2	11	3	17	5	11
27	3	1	4	5	3	17	4	36	13	19
14	4	2	6	4	4	10	5	30	4	16
6	5	1	7	1	5	5	6	21	1	8
7	6	—	—	2	6	6	7	26	11	5
3	7	—	—	1	8	1	8	7	0	1
1	8	—	—	—	—	3	9	22	5	0
1	10	—	—	—	—	1	10	3	0	7
1	11	—	—	—	—	2	11	16	5	1
—	—	—	—	—	—	2	13	23	0	3
—	—	—	—	—	—	1	18	16	0	2
152	369	16	36	37	90	66	348	224	47	77

TRUE INCIDENTS. FALSE INCIDENTS. INDETERMINATE INCIDENTS.
 152 16 37

TRUE FACTORS. FALSE FACTORS. INDETERMINATE FACTORS.
 717 43 167

The nature of some of the factors makes it impossible to lay any special stress for evidential purposes upon the discrepancies between the true and the false, except in treating of the general question regarding the importance of the phenomena and the consideration of chance. I have also shown how misleading the class called false is from the admission of incidents and factors that might be classed with the indeterminate. Similarly the indeterminate could be reduced by omitting the incidents having an alleged transcendental occurrence. This would greatly diminish the ratios between them and the true. But it is certainly very interesting to find so small a proportion of errors even when straining the case in their favour. In anything genuine the indeterminate ought to occur, and it is no less interesting to find their small ratio in the case. And it is to be specially noted that the indeterminate incidents increase precisely where we should expect the living human memory to be defective. Compare my father's communications respecting his boyhood (pp. 469-470).

The best place to study these classes of incidents is in the individual sittings where the relations between the true, the false, and the indeterminate can be seen in their proper proportions. The total summary has no other value than the comparison of simple and complex incidents. Thus we find that throughout the whole series of

experiments, there are forty-four incidents with but one factor in them. Such cases are more amenable to all sorts of objections than those which represent a combination of two or more independent factors that have no necessary connection with each other. Hence the summary shows the comparative importance of the incidents in so far as the mere number of factors composing them is concerned. But it does nothing more, while the individual sittings bring us into a clearer comprehension of such incidents in detail, and the individual incident when complex is still better than groups of them for evidential study, except when taken collectively. But the statistical account affords both a bird's-eye view of the numerical relations in the whole and an interesting comparison of the separate series of sittings with each other.

In looking at them, the most striking fact that meets the attention at once is the great number of mixed cases, as compared with the wholly false and the indeterminate. Perhaps still more noticeable is the smaller number of factors that are indeterminate in the mixed than those that are false. The whole matter, however, must depend upon the criterion used in the classification of incidents as mixed. If the line were drawn differently in some cases, we should increase the number of wholly true incidents and also the number in the false and the indeterminate. It would not alter the ratio between the true and the false on the whole, but it would alter the appearance of the table. But I tried to define the mixed class as strictly as possible.

A very interesting fact also is the difference between Dr. Hodgson's sittings and my own in respect of incidents of any sort. His fourth sitting appears to be absolutely worthless evidentially. I thought the first three should be included in this judgment until my investigations in the West discovered facts that I had previously supposed were false or worthless. His last sitting, however, as remarked already, is about as good as any of those at which I was present. One is tempted to ask the question whether the presence of someone as sitter who is an intimate friend or relative of the communicator may not qualify the latter for better work, just as some relic is supposed to do this. The question, of course, cannot be answered positively. But if the communicator's personal interest in the sitter can improve the messages by influencing the attention, this view is borne out by my last sitting, in which not a single mixed incident occurs, and also no false ones. Does not this circumstance confirm my supposition as to the source of the difficulty in Dr. Hodgson's sittings? The affirmative answer to this must be purely speculative, and I do not urge it, though it is worth while to call attention to a coincidence which agrees with the fact that in all spiritistic phenomena, so-called at least, this peculiar connection between the sitter and the communicator seems to prevail and to affect the messages in the way remarked. But whatever explanation be probable,

it is evident that my last sitting, when I deliberately conversed with the communicator in a way that I had refrained from doing before, commanded the communicator's interest and attention, so that I elicited a clearness in communications which I had not effected before (*Cf.* pp. 489-496). Many of the most important and evidential facts in the experiments were obtained at this sitting.

There is another most interesting fact to be noticed. As the incidents increase in the number of factors composing them, they decrease in their own number. This would be natural perhaps, but it coincides in these experiments with the fact that the communicator cannot usually remain long in contact with the "machine," and with the fact that the intervals of respite interrupt the narrative in favour of beginning new incidents. Hence the most complex incidents seem to exhaust a period of communication, while a number of simple ones can be given in the same period. The apparent result would be altered, however, if some cases classed as single incidents were broken up into several, though their value would not be changed.

Many of the most important features of the record cannot be expressed at all in this tabular account. They are statements which show the proper appreciation of questions, remarks, or other aspects of a situation, and also incidents of emotional tone. All that the table can recognise is the number of objective facts stated as such, chiefly, of course, concerning the earthly experiences of the communicator. Much other pertinent matter cannot be included, even though it is not without influence on one's convictions in estimating the whole.

CHAPTER III.

THE TELEPATHIC HYPOTHESIS.¹

In taking up the attempts to explain such phenomena, the telepathic hypothesis is the first naturally to come under review. This is the case, of course, for all psychical researchers who suppose that other objections to spiritism have been non-suited. The reader will have already learned (p. 16) that I do not intend to consider how far subliminal fraud, fishing and guessing are applicable to this and other Piper records. The reasons for adopting this course are various. Some of them are implied in later discussions. But the chief reason is that I do not think that such suppositions can be either consistently or rationally carried out, even if we make them adjuncts to telepathy. I leave to the ingenuity of *a priori* speculation the combination of assumptions necessary to meet the simple hypothesis which I have preferred to defend as satisfactory for the present. Hence, with the refusal to consider these, telepathy is the only real or apparent difficulty in its connection with secondary personality that I shall consider. But

¹ It is important in considering the telepathic theory to examine two things about it before measuring its application to the facts here recorded. The first is or concerns what telepathy really means, and the second is the reason for invoking it in the explanation of such facts in any case.

In taking up the first of these topics, the nature of telepathy, it will be important to recognise a current distinction of some value. This is the difference between telepathy at a distance, as the word etymologically imports, and direct thought-transference from the mind of the sitter, or experimenter, immediately present. Some have supposed that if you only exclude thought-transference from the sitter, and also that of the actually existing states of consciousness in the person at a distance, you have proved the spiritistic hypothesis once for all. This may be true as a matter of fact, but it is not the assumption upon which the psychical researcher has to work. For him subliminal telepathy present and at a distance has to be eliminated in some way before surrendering. Hence, for the purpose which we have in view here, the technical distinction between the two conceptions will not subserve any important end evidentially, though it would help in understanding both the complexity of the problem and the additional difficulties involved in telepathy at a distance over and above those in thought-transference at hand. This analysis I shall give of the matter for occasional use in this discussion where I may find it necessary to economise time and space. But for the general comprehension of the problem and of the meaning which I shall usually attach to the term, I shall only remark that I do not intend to recognise any qualitative difference between telepathy at a distance and thought-transference at hand, simply because we have to produce evidence that both are insufficient to account for the phenomena before resorting to spiritism. This is evident. But I shall analyse the case fully, though briefly, for the sake of clearness in comprehending it. If I could safely substitute a general term for telepathy I should do it, and employ this latter for its technical meaning as often understood, but I fear that it would only lead to confusion.

In transcending sensory perception we may conceive all acquisition of ideas as Transperception, or Transcognition, and thus have a term for a few minutes to

in the discussion of the subject I wish to keep the conceptions of telepathy and secondary personality distinct from each other as functional processes of the brain or mind as the case may be.

I wish, therefore, to examine first the strength of the telepathic hypothesis, as against spiritism, before approaching the objections to it. This procedure will enable the reader to observe what I have taken into account in rejecting it in favour of its alternative. First, I simply assume it as a fact sufficiently attested by evidence outside the Piper case, as well as by the phenomena in that case which make the supposition necessary for all attempts to escape spiritism. The only problem that remains is to see if the supposition will stand the strain that must be put upon it to meet the emergency. That is, can we push its implications so far that spiritism becomes preferable by virtue of the very magnitude of our suppositions to escape it.

Now *a priori* its strength lies in the assumption that it has no proved limitations in space and temporal coincidence with present active consciousness. We may have no right to this assumption, but in the absence of any demonstrable limits to transperception, after sensory experience has been transcended, we must be prepared for any suppositions whatever, especially when we add to this extension of

represent every possible conception for which telepathy has had to stand. I might even coin a more technical term, namely, Noopathy, which I should actually like to see come into use, as convenient for indicating the process that has to be eliminated in order to finally establish the spiritistic theory. This Noopathy, or Transperception could be subdivided into Telepathy, or thought-transference at a distance, and Parapathy, or thought-transference at hand, limiting the term, of course, to a process between the living. I also coin the latter term for its technical purpose. Each of these can be subdivided into two distinct problems, namely, transperception from the supraliminal, and transperception from the subliminal of the agent. But the present problem will not require any special use of this distinction, as the record shows how little supraliminal transperception has to do with the theories necessary to explain the phenomena. But the tabular analysis, representing the various possible problems that have to be ultimately considered in making up one's mind on the hypothesis to be adopted, will stand as follows :—

Noopathy	{	Telepathy	{	From the supraliminal.
			{	From the subliminal.
	{	Parapathy	{	From the supraliminal.
			{	From the subliminal.

The superficial distinction between telepathy and parapathy in this table is merely spacial. But it is in fact far more profound. Telepathy under all physical analogies has to contend with the laws of distribution of energy, which represent its variation inversely with the distance. Of course it may be wholly different with mental phenomena, but once concede this difference and physical explanations are thrown out of consideration, and the presumptions are in favour of a mind or soul

possibilities that of disregarding the distinction between present and past states of consciousness in the telepathic acquisitions. The very conception with which we start, therefore, involves enormous difficulties to be overcome, whether they be of arbitrary making or not. The second consideration in favour of accepting telepathy as an important alternative in the case, is the fact that an immense mass of evidence on hand bears no indications of personal identity, whereas evidence of this is indispensable to the spiritistic theory, and hence suggests the explanation of the more complex by the more simple. In all our cases of experimental telepathy there are no traces of coincidences that would suggest spirits as the cause (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. I., pp. 13-64, 70-98, 161-216, and 263-282; Vol. II., pp. 1-12, 24-42, 189-200, 207-216, 239-264; Vol. III., pp. 424-452; Vol. IV., pp. 111-126, 127-188, 324-337; Vol. V., pp. 18-168, 169-207, 355-359; Vol. VI., pp. 128-170, 358-397; Vol. VII., pp. 3-22, 374-382; Vol. VIII., pp. 422-435, 536-596; Vol. XI., pp. 2-17; also *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 10-85; *Apparitions and Thought Transference*, by Frank Podmore, pp. 18-143). Nor do we find any definable limits to it from space and temporal coincidence except in some instances by Mrs. Sidgwick and Miss Johnson, where distance seemed to affect the number of successes (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 536-596). There

which, under physical conceptions, is still *sub judice*. But besides having to contend with the known laws of distribution of energy, telepathy also represents a much wider selective power in its acquisition than parapsyche, and for this reason the technical distinction would be useful in certain discussions. But as we have to overcome every possible form of transperception, or transcendental cognition either evidentially or in conceivability, we need not confuse the present discussion with any other use of the term telepathy than is customary in psychical research. This will be apparent from the following delimitation of the problem.

If the alternatives were between spiritism and either parapsyche or telepathy from the supraliminal of the agents, the case would be demonstrated in favour of spiritism, as every one would admit. But as the psychical researcher has to assume that this alternative is at least between spiritism and parapsyche from the subliminal of the agents, the problem is complicated with the whole field of memory and so made much larger, though it is already clear in the Piper phenomena that on that conception of the choice the case would be unequivocally in favour of spiritism. But if we have to take telepathy into account, as defined in the table, the alternatives are very different, and the problem evidentially very much larger. The question would then be between Noopathy and Spiritism, as perhaps it is for the lack of any definable limits to mental acquisitions transcending sensory methods.

But valuable as such a complete analysis and the more technical use of new and old terms may be, I shall not complicate the present discussion by imposing any new difficulties upon the student in reading this report. I give the analysis in order to indicate what conception of the problem is before me, and permit the reader to apply the necessary meaning of the term telepathy as the exigency of the special case requires. Hence I shall use it as convertible with transperception, or noopathy.

But there is still another fact in regard to the meaning of the term telepathy, conceived as either noopathy or parapsyche. Before assuming that it represents a view that necessarily displaces spiritism, we require to recognise that its meaning

is in all of these no suggestion of personal identity, and hence if we once assume a non-spiritistic supernormal power sufficient to account for the coincidences, experimental and spontaneous, that are found in our *Proceedings*, we have a serious task to set aside that assumption. But it must be strained beyond acceptance before its alternative, spiritism, can be tolerated. That, I think, is a truism for the psychical researcher, and requires re-statement here only for those who are not familiar with our reports, and who may not otherwise understand the difficulties which I have been forced to consider before reaching my present convictions on the Piper phenomena.

Now in estimating the application of telepathy to the facts adduced in the record of my experiments the task of refuting that hypothesis would be an exceedingly easy one, if I had only to compare the results with my consciousness at the time. *There is scarcely a single spontaneous incident, if any at all, in the whole twelve personal sittings, to say nothing of Dr. Hodgson's five held while I was absent in New York, that represented a present state of my active consciousness until the communication made it such after the writing.* I watched very carefully for the influence of present states on the content of the messages and found not the slightest trace of a causal nexus. This is a circumstance, however, that only the sitter can fully appreciate, as the record

definitely implies the *modus operandi* of the process that excludes spiritism. As a fact, the term is not necessarily antagonistic to spiritism. There is one conception of it, possible at least, which does not contravene the theory which is here represented as its alternative, but which may allow us actually to invoke spiritism as an explanation of the coincidences and assumed transmission of thought that has induced us to consider telepathy as a fact at all. That is to say, telepathy might be the *modus operandi* of spiritistic agency in producing the coincidences which we are trying to explain away by the term. Not that I should advocate that conception of the process, but that our ignorance of the nature of the process permits us to assume that possibility *a priori*. Thus, if telepathy be a mere name for the transmission of ideas from one mind to another, or the coincidences that go under that name, we have no other conception of it than that of *facts that require a causal explanation*. Nothing is implied as to the intermediaries in the case. That must remain an open question. Assuming then that telepathy is nothing but a name for coincidences that demand a cause independent of sensory mediation, we could also assume with tolerable impunity that spirits are the media for effecting the phenomena, if we have any other grounds for supposing them to exist. But it is the want of evidence for the latter hypothesis that necessitates making the causal nexus one of immediate transmission between incarnate minds. Hence, though our ignorance of the real process is great enough to admit spiritistic agency as possible in mediating the coincidences, yet such a supposition serves no useful purpose in the premises, and only begs the question at issue, until we know more about it. That the spiritistic theory can be used to cover phenomena accredited to telepathy pure and simple is indicated both by the incidents in Dr. Hodgson's experiments with G. P. (*cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 304-308, 313-315), and by the attempt to decide whether the facts indicated a preference for the spiritistic nature of Dr. Phinuit, as a pre-condition of simpler explanation of his doings than the secondary personality of Mrs. Piper (*cf. Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 28-46, 54-56). But this discounts the evidential

does not show what he was thinking about prior to the communications. All that I can do, therefore, is to indicate that this difficulty has been adequately considered and met by an absolute disparity between the two sets of phenomena, in so far as the causal influence of the present states is concerned. I took special occasion to test this matter and found all grounds for such hypotheses wanting. For instance, if the present state affected either the manner or content of the messages, the mental perturbation or confusion as to what was meant by certain messages should have reflected itself in a corresponding confusion in the communication. Of course, there were occasions when my own confusion was coincident with the confusion in the record, but this was due primarily to the confusion in the communication and not to myself. It was too often my ignorance of the facts communicated that produced my confusion to suppose any influence from my state of mind upon the results. Besides, inquiry developed the fact that some of the best incidents which were wholly unintelligible to me at the time, but verified afterward, were coincident with mental confusion on my part. Dr. Hodgson's five sittings while I was absent are a fatal objection to any supposition of this kind. To psychical researchers this goes without saying. (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 453, 564-5, and Vol. VIII., p. 10.)

In line with the same thought it is interesting to remark that I had not dreamed of hearing from several of the communicators, and several

problem which, many suppose, requires that in some way we transcend telepathy of every sort as a condition of making any other hypothesis that will subordinate it in the end. Hence with scientific method to satisfy, which keeps us within the field of a direct process for the mediation of telepathic coincidences, we have to assume this in all our explanations and thus conceive it as antagonistic to spiritism, at least in its evidential aspects, if not in its process. Consequently, though I see nothing in the mere fact of thought transmission, conceived as a coincidence requiring a causal explanation, to militate against spiritism either as a general theory, or as the agency for effecting the coincidence (*cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XV., p. 18), nevertheless the circumstance that many of the coincidences do not furnish any evidence of personal identity makes it imperative to assume the possibility that the process is a direct one between incarnate minds, and thus conceive it as antagonistic to spiritism until it is shown to be either an independent or a subordinate agency in such phenomena.

The result of these two considerations, therefore, is that I shall treat the term telepathy as a name for a causal coincidence whose *modus operandi* is wholly unknown (*cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., p. 160), and indifferent to the limitations of space (*cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XII., p. 174) and of temporal coincidence with present mental states thus making it preferable to assume the possibility of a direct process between living minds, as long, at least, as it does not attempt to produce the personal identity of the dead. It is important to remark for the benefit of the scientific Philistine that unless this view of the case be admitted there is absolutely no escape from the spiritistic theory. That theory would then have nothing but fraud as its alternative, and the task of the psychical researcher would be a very easy one. Hence if I do not treat telepathy, conceived in the sense defined for the purpose here, as an alternative to spiritism, I should not find it necessary to discuss the question beyond the statement of the facts in my notes to the communications.

persons that I had expected on the telepathic theory made no appearance whatever. I had expected to hear from three on every imaginable theory of such phenomena, but one of these and a fourth who was desired show not a trace of themselves. Besides, although I got traces of two sisters long since deceased, and although there was much in my supraliminal and subliminal about them neither telepathy nor the dramatic personations of secondary personality presented them as personal communicators. It would have been useless to do so in any attempt to establish identity, since what I knew about them was merely told me after their deaths. On the telepathic theory I should have heard from them as well as from Charles and Anna. But does telepathy limit itself to common experiences between the sitter and the alleged communicator, excluding other derived knowledge associated with the persons, or are Imperator and Rector wise enough not to undertake communications that have no chance of proving personal identity, as they could not have done in the case of the two sisters indicated ?

This is a very important conclusion, not only because it excludes the whole theory of telepathy from the case, if that doctrine is made convertible with the transperception of existing states of consciousness, but also because it represents a fact quite at variance with the whole record of experimental telepathy as referred to above, where telepathy obtained access to the intended ideas of the agent, even though this is sometimes, if not always, postponed for a short time. If experimental telepathy indicates some connection, though slightly deferred, between present consciousness and the fact obtained by the percipient, we ought not to find such uniform variance with the sitter's consciousness in the Piper case and the incidents communicated.

A conclusion based upon this circumstance would throw telepathy out of consideration. But, unfortunately for spiritism (I am willing to say fortunately for both this theory and the interests of civilisation) the problem is not so simple. We have to assume a far larger possibility in the case, and this is the acquisition of facts from the subliminal of the agent. Whether it is absolutely imperative or not to assume telepathic access to subliminal knowledge I shall not decide. There is some evidence that it is a fact. The circumstance that the telepathic acquisition seems never to be instantaneous upon the inception of the agent's thought rather suggests the assumption. Especial evidence for this is noticeable in certain interesting cases (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 14, 548, 561). Consequently our duty is clear in such premises, and the problem becomes correspondingly difficult, as it is all but impossible to assert with absolute assurance that certain things have never been in one's knowledge. There will be evidences of this in my own record. (See pp. 337, 341, 440.)

Assuming then that telepathy may have access to the whole range of the individual's experience, supraliminal or subliminal, there is first the significant remark to be made, in suspicion of its capacity to meet the phenomena of this record, that both in my own experiments and apparently those of all others in the Piper case, there is no perceptible distinction drawn by that process between ideas present and ideas past but recognised, and so present after recognition, or between either of these and ideas wholly forgotten and unrecognisable on suggestion. The indifference of the process to absolute distinctions for our conception of knowledge is most amazing, and has no analogies or support in philosophy of any sort. This indifference also extends still farther. The access may be to facts not known to the sitter at all, and obtainable only at a distance from some unknown person. Of this again. I am now merely indicating the fact which shows that we cannot assert or suppose that any condition of an idea in the sitter's mind or memory, whether supraliminal or subliminal, recognisable or unrecognisable, has any determining influence one way or the other on telepathic acquisition. This is a suspicious fact for the theory. I do not say that it is an objection, for the present state of our knowledge does not justify so positive a statement until we have tried implications of the theory much farther. But I do say that, when the phenomena of the Piper case represent so clearly the character of personal identity of one that we once knew, and all in contrast to the ordinary results of experimental telepathy, this indifference to the distinctions which are so natural to our usual psychology is more consistent with the spiritistic theory, where we can assume the known mental laws, than with telepathy which at least appears to contravene them, and which, if it does not contravene them, seems to demand a wholly new law of mental action quite as unrecognised in psychology and physics as is spiritism.

There is a peculiarity about this indifference to ordinary psychological laws and distinctions which indicates that on the telepathic theory the process is hardly consistent with itself. The manner in which it defies our recollections, and the wonderful range of its power over important and trivial matters alike rather indicate that confusions and mistakes ought not to occur at all. When the most difficult and complex incidents are rattled off at a breakneck pace, and with apparent ease at times, it is absurd for a process which is wholly indifferent, presumably, to psychological laws as we know them, to falter and show confusion at some simple fact involving no necessary complications. The variations of facility and difficulty in the communications bear no determinate relation either to the nature and complexities of the incidents given or to the mental condition of the sitter. On the contrary, the free mixture of the known and the forgotten, or of the known and unknown

in the mind of the sitter, with absolute disregard of space and time limitations, all in the same sentence, makes the mistakes and confusions seem absurd in most, if not in all cases, on the theory of telepathic access. They would appear quite conceivable on the spiritistic hypothesis, as we should expect from known laws of mental action both confusion in such circumstances and a selection of incidents with reference to an interest and a unity wholly outside the experience of the sitter.

This last statement is illustrated, and telepathy at short range dismissed from view, by the large number of facts in the Piper record that show their origin beyond the mind of the sitter altogether. But I shall confine my instances to my own record where they are sufficiently numerous and complicated not to be discredited.

I shall enumerate the incidents bearing upon this argument in several classes, which may be indicated by Roman numerals. Class I. will contain those which I thought at the time they were given that I had never known, or that they were false, but which inquiry proved to have been at one time in my consciousness. Class II. will contain those which in all probability I never knew, but which, owing to the circumstances, I cannot prove were unknown. Class III., if the incidents can be admitted as evidential on the ground of my interpretation of them, will contain those which were unknown to me. Class IV. will contain those which I knew which Dr. Hodgson did not know, and which were given at the sittings that he held in my behalf. Class V. will contain the incidents which were given in the sittings at which I was present, and which I most certainly, that is without reasonable doubt, did not know until verified.

The reader may wish to know that the only fact which had been told Dr. Hodgson about my father was that my father was deceased. I mentioned no name and no incident in his life, except that I had told my father on his death bed to come to me after it was all over. This was a year or more before my sittings. Also I might say in regard to the mere question of the sitter's relation to the facts communicated I could have included Class IV. in Class V. This would increase that number considerably for the purposes of theoretical discussion.

Class I.—These are the Swedenborg incident (p. 31), the strychnine in connection with the Hyomei (p. 38), my father's visit to me in Chicago (p. 440), the curved handled cane which was repaired with a tin ring (p. 58).

Class II.—The organ incident in connection with Harper Crawford and the church (p. 82), the black skull cap (p. 43), and the visit to George and Will before going West (p. 72).

Class III.—There are “Munyon’s Germicide” (p. 39), the Maltine (p. 39), the reference to the “ring” on the cane (p. 59), the possible reference of my cousin to his sister as his aunt (p. 232), the reference to the book of poems (p. 99), the full pertinence of the allusion to my brother George in the matter of settling the estate (p. 85), the reason for connecting Harper Crawford with the organ incident (p. 83), the name Maria in close connection with the reference to “John’s wife” (p. 443), the trouble with my brother about fishing (p. 77), the mole near the ear (p. 49).

The sceptically inclined critic may prefer to say that Classes I., II., and III. can have no significance, the first being confessedly in my subliminal memory, the second doubtlessly in it and the third too dubious in interpretation to admit of consideration. But whatever may be said of these the following incidents are exempt from this sort of criticism, Class IV. having been obtained at Dr. Hodgson’s sittings when I was not present, and Class V. being unknown to me. The last eight incidents of Class V. were obtained at Dr. Hodgson’s sittings in my behalf. In all they constitute a numerous and important set of incidents bearing upon the tenability of the telepathic hypothesis.

Class IV.—Of these there are my father’s inquiry about his pen or special quill (p. 54), the fact that we grew more companionable as we grew older (p. 387), the reference to his preaching (p. 55), the advice given to me when I started to college (non-evidential) with its phrase “Want for nothing” (p. 61), his feelings at the time (p. 61), the allusion to the rough roads and country, the name of Ohio as connected with my father, the talk with the principal of the school, and the anxieties of my father, Aunt Nannie, and myself in connection with my brother George (p. 61), my father’s moving West and separation from me with my ignorance of his habits and dress (p. 43), the initials carved on the end of the cane (p. 57), the reference to Hyomei as a “vapor” (p. 39), the mention of the tokens (p. 54).

Class V.—I shall enumerate these as briefly as possible with the references. The Cooper case with its reference to discussions, friendship, correspondence, and especially the Cooper school (pp. 51–54), the paper cutter (p. 50), the writing pad (p. 49), the dog Peter which George had (p. 96), the name of Jennie in connection with Lucy (p. 106), the change in the name of my aunt Eliza (p. 82), my uncle James McClellan’s dislike of the name Jim (p. 109), his friendship for Dr. Cooper (p. 52), and the name of his mother Nancy (p. 110), the name of my uncle’s father, John (p. 110), the fact that a John McClellan was in the war (p. 113), the name Hathaway and its connection with this John McClellan (p. 112), that this John McClellan was familiarly called “Uncle John,” being no relative and not known

to me (p. 113), the incident of his lost finger (p. 113), the sun-stroke incident and its connection with the name David, the name of the brother-in-law (p. 111), the statement about myself put apparently into the mouth of my stepmother (p. 75), the reference to my uncle's walks, drives, etc. (p. 91), my aunt's dream (p. 91), the special pertinence of the allusion to my aunt Eliza's despair (p. 91), my father's habit of using the phrase, "Give me my hat" (p. 23), the incident of the fire which gave my father his fright (p. 34), the stool incident (p. 65), the name Ann as that of my uncle James McClellan's sister and the fact of her death (p. 109), the connection of my brother George with the disposal of the horse Tom (p. 65), the brown-handled knife and paring the finger nails with it (p. 42), the description of the use of the cane, including the reference to the manner of calling my stepmother with it, drawing it across his knees, and keeping time with music (p. 58), the trouble with the left eye (p. 49), the round and square bottles on the desk (p. 57), the incident of the hymn "Nearer my God to Thee" (p. 56), "the preparation of Oil" (p. 39), the writing of extracts when reading (p. 41), the thin morning coat (p. 54).

On the telepathic hypothesis the last of these groups of facts, which were unknown to both of us, would have to be acquired by the discovery of some existing memory in the far West, after selecting the right individual from the whole universe of living consciousness, from whom to obtain the facts while the fourth group might be supposed to have been obtained either from myself in New York at the time of the sitting or from the permanent acquisition of all my experience at the time of my sittings, or from the same sources as the incidents that were unknown to both of us.

But if we are going to admit such a process as this supposes, conceiving it as transcending all limitations of the sort mentioned, and obtaining access to any desired fact in any mind in the world and at any moment necessary, we have a hypothesis very difficult to refute. Its mere magnitude, barring the question of evidence, as against the finite character of the spiritistic theory, can create distrust and suspicion. We may well halt before asserting or assuming such an omniscient power.

But if any one chooses to advance it rather than spiritism we should find it very difficult to displace such a doctrine, as it is always difficult or impossible to compete with appeals to the infinite. We may well ask in reply whether such a conception is not convertible with pantheism, or that form of monism that conceives all phenomena whatsoever, present, past, and future, as modes of the absolute, a conception which I must consider as equivalent to spiritism, because we can as well postulate the continuance of each set of facts in that way as in

the form of individualisation usually imagined in the "spiritual body" or immaterial soul. The real question is whether any given stream of consciousness can continue or not, and the issue is not its relation, once existing, to the absolute; its persistence is just as possible under the conception of pantheism with its reduction of everything to modes, as it is under the conception of atomic monism or pluralism which endeavours to individualise the stream of consciousness in forms of time and space. But, in so far as the problem of psychical research is concerned, the *metaphysics* of survival after death is not a matter of present interest, but only whether the evidence justifies the supposition that an individual stream of consciousness once known continues to persist in other conditions. We need not call it "spirit" at all, if that term leads to an illusion regarding the facts. We may simply conceive the present stream as a mode of the infinite, and suppose that mediumistic phenomena enable us to communicate with a transcendental stream, as our ordinary intercourse is a communication with a terrestrial stream. In both cases we are dealing with modes of the infinite. With this premise, it should certainly be possible to insist that the facts acquired by such supposed telepathy involving the defiance of time and space, and imitating the selectiveness of the infinite, could be most easily conceived as implying the survival of the absolute's modes under changed conditions, just as memory represents our present command of the past.

The best analogy, however, is the one above where we compared the case to two streams of the same subject, representing the continuance of both with difficulties in the way of communication between the transcendental and the terrestrial that do not affect the intercourse between the two streams in the present life; that is between two terrestrial streams in different subjects or persons. The analogy can be further carried out in the chasm that we often find separating communication between the primary and the secondary personality. Now this infinite telepathy must either be reduced to this conception, or we have to suppose that Mrs. Piper's brain is the centre and origin of the whole affair. The latter is an hypothesis which I imagine the physiologist is hardly prepared to accept. But the possibility of making the telepathy required to meet the case convertible with spiritism, in the only meaning of the term that the facts support, or that has any practical interest for either science or morals, is a *reductio ad absurdum* of his theory for which the telepathist is probably not prepared. If, however, it does not mean the substantial identity of spiritism and omniscient telepathy by their unity in pantheistic monism, it certainly conceives a representation of the case which pits spiritism against omniscience. Whatever objections are to be made to such a supposition, if science has the audacity to make it, they must rise from the

magnitude of the hypothesis and both its difficulties for the ordinary scientific imagination and its return to something like first causes for explanation after preaching for centuries against this procedure.

Were it not for the exceptional character of the coincidences that suggest telepathy as an explanation of them we might ask a question that is now forbidden us because the facts are exceptional. Its first meaning is that of a connection between certain mental states that demands a causal explanation. If it meant nothing more than the admission of a causal nexus beyond sensory agency, we might ask for the evidence of the hypothesis that it is a direct process between the two brains. Usually even in new theories we only extend some old hypothesis to cover new phenomena whose relation to the old conception had not been suspected. Newton's theory of gravitation is an illustration of this. He only extended the assumed gravity that accounted for the fall of an apple to the celestial bodies from which it had been excluded before. *Hypotheses non fingo* was the maxim of science and is still, and new forces are not admissible except in the application of the Method of Difference. (Mill, *Logic*, Book III., Chap. VIII., §§ 2 and 3; Whewell, *Philosophy of Inductive Science*, Vol. II., pp. 409-12; Sigwart, *Logic*, English Translation, Vol. II., pp. 339, 419-20.) It happens, of course, in the phenomena under survey here that the evidence for spiritistic claims is the same that has to be adduced for the enormous extension of telepathy demanded to meet the emergency. We might then ask for additional evidence for a definite conception of the telepathic process which is assumed to account for the coincidences suggesting it. This is tantamount to demanding the pre-existing conception which is extended in covering such phenomena, and so to asking for evidence of the process assumed as well as for the coincidences requiring an explanation. But unfortunately we cannot hastily take this recourse for weakening the claims of telepathy, as the absolutely exceptional nature of the phenomena conforms to the requirement of exceptional theories, and both the general presumptions of physiological science and the exemption of experimental telepathy from traces of personal identity demand that we first assume the subject or the percipient as the cause, and so extend the simpler hypothesis involved in non-spiritistic phenomena to the wider class, if the extension does not exact more than the supposition can support. Hence, though it is possible to explain telepathy either by spiritism or in subordination to it after the existence of a soul is established, we are reduced by the conception indicated to another resource for disputing its adequacy. The problem is such that the very existence of a soul goes with the proof of its survival. That is to say, we cannot assume that there is any other subject of consciousness than the brain until we have applied the Method of Difference

and isolated consciousness or personal identity as a fact, from which to infer the existence of a subject for it other than the brain. Consequently, no presuppositions can be entertained for suggesting *a priori* possibilities in the direction of spiritism of some sort, as that theory would be practically proved by the admission that there is a mental subject other than the brain. The existence of such a subject once granted, whether simple or complex, the law of the conservation of energy would render survival of substance or energy in some form certain, even if it did not carry the continuity of our personal consciousness with it. But as the proof of this last is the first condition of assuming the existence of a soul, we are forced to remain by the functions of the brain until we have to gasp at the magnitude of the theories that are invented to sustain the case against spiritism.

The most important limitation upon telepathy as a theory is the question which every scientific man should ask himself, and that is whether he fully appreciates what it demands of his comprehension. It is a very easy thing to say "telepathy" when we find a mental coincidence between two persons that cannot be explained by chance or normal psychological laws. This is not only legitimate, but the only sane course to take if the premises demand such. But when the facts accumulate and extend their character until our first supposition begins to arrogate the attributes of omniscience it becomes suspicious. As a precaution against hasty conclusions involving matters so important as a future life, it is as imperative as it is useful. I have always used it, and shall continue to use it, where the facts imply a supernormal nexus between the mental states of two different persons but do not reflect any traces of the personal identity that suggests spiritism. It is the only safe criterion of the evidence that does not supply spiritistic implications. But in all cases, and especially when our facts enlarge the range of the theories we are in the habit of adducing for their explanation, we are responsible for the logical consequences that attend those theories. Experimental telepathy has a most decided limitation to its action. It appears to be confined to the intended fact in the communication, even if the fact be slightly deferred. Spontaneous telepathy involves the present activity of consciousness. But when we find the enormously complicated phenomena of personal identity involved, and every imaginable limitation of space and temporal coincidence transcended with the greatest ease, we must stop to ask what is involved in our telepathic hypothesis. Scientific method demands this procedure. No man can escape the necessary deductions from his theories, or the full interpretation of their meaning in the light of the facts they are made to cover. (Cf. Jevons, *Principles of Science*, Chap. XXIII; Mill, *Logic*, Book III., Chap. XIV.) This demand is designed to determine the range of their power, and it stands or falls with its ability or

inability to meet the situation. Hence it is much easier to say telepathy, and thus to create some confusion for spiritism than it is to supply evidence outside *a priori* possibilities and the privileges of scepticism for pretensions of such magnitude as a *quasi* omniscient telepathy supposes. But, once postulated, the hypothesis must stand the test of the following considerations, and be accepted against the suspicions that they arouse.¹

(1) There is not one single verifiable incident in the whole seventeen sittings that belongs to my own personal memory or knowledge *alone*. I cannot even except the Maltine incident (p. 418). The incidents affecting identity are either all common to the memories of myself and the alleged communicators, or to their memories and that of some other living person, the latter facts not being known to me at the time.

I had thought at one time that there was one incident which represented a decided exception to this assertion, though it appeared to contain no truth from the standpoint of my knowledge. This was the incident that I had in mind when I said in an article in the *New World* (Vol. VIII., pp. 255-272) that the discrimination in the selection of incidents "is so perfect that only a few *isolated* words, not incidents, can even be suspected of being filched from my personal habits of thought." I had reference to the "philosophical discussions" connected with the Cooper case in Dr. Hodgson's sittings for me, which, we must remember, involved my absence two hundred and fifty miles away. But the discovery afterward, that this Cooper referred to had a wholly distinct pertinence from that which I imagined it was intended for, completely removes this suspicion and puts the case in the category of the others.

Such a conception makes the telepathic discrimination and selection of verifiable incidents one of incredible proportions. The whole mass of my personal experiences, exclusive of those connected with the communication, is absolutely ignored, and only those which are common to the living and the dead are chosen. Still farther, this selective capacity extends to the discrimination between my memories regarding many deceased persons that I knew and who do not appear at all, and memories of a certain group of family acquaintances near and remote. Even here it omits some that I should have expected, and did expect, to "communicate." The fact that justified this expectation was actually intimated in a few instances, but no definite communications ever came to satisfy it. Still further yet, the discrimination and selection were

¹ Nothing in the discussion of the telepathic hypothesis must be interpreted as reflecting upon the supposition that the communications are telepathically dispatched from discarnate spirits. It is only the hypothesis of telepathy between the living that is here controverted, not as a fact, sporadic or otherwise, but as an adequate account of such facts as are found in this and other records of the Piper phenomena.

invariable between my own thoughts associated with my memory of the communicators and the real experiences common with theirs in life. That is to say, the process has infallible command over the distinction between the associated connection of my mere thoughts *about* the communicators and the same connection of my *real* experience in common with theirs! This is a fact that ought to embarrass the believer in telepathy, because that process in the experimental efforts to test it shows no selectiveness at all of an independent sort. It is definitely correlated with the arbitrary selection of the agent. But here we have an intelligent selectiveness with reference to the illustration of personal identity that arrogates every function of omniscience within the time allotted to its action. But now right in contradiction with this infinite discriminative power occurs the perfectly finite capacity for confusion, error, and difficulty in getting right these memories about the actual communicators which have been infallibly separated from my own personal experience associated and unassociated with the communicators! This is a kind of discrepancy or weakness that ought not to occur with so unfailling a power to discriminate between pertinent and impertinent incidents bearing upon personal identity. Assuming the application of telepathy, therefore, we have here a capacity absolutely free from illusion and mnemonic error in discriminating between the individual and the common incidents and selecting its field of operation, but full of contradictions, confusions and indistinctness within the limits of the field chosen for the acquisition of the facts. Why should this infallible distinction between the right and wrong groups of facts consist with so finite and fallible a capacity to give the right ones thus circumscribed.

Under the Phinuit regime this peculiarity was not noticeable. In fact the selection of much that did not show the slightest flavour of personal identity indicated a graver suspicion in favour of telepathy, as all that was necessary to account for the phenomena, especially since this supposition seemed to give a unity to the case which spiritism could not do without assuming that Phinuit was a discarnate spirit, and that was a part of the issue to be determined. But whatever theory we may have to account for the difference between the Phinuit and the Emperor regime, the fact of this unfailling discrimination of the true from the false, as between individual and common incidents for personal identity, and the amazing limitations in the attainment of the relevant within its own area, after its distinction from the irrelevant, remain an interesting and puzzling circumstance. This fact of limitation and error stands in proper conformity with the idea of finite processes with which science has everywhere else to deal, and so must make us cautious in supposing something that at least simulates the infinite, which the telepathy seems to do. There is no evidence and no analogy in either the physical or the mental sciences outside psychical research,

for any such power, especially when we assume the selectiveness exhibited by it. Telepathy simply becomes so large in its pretensions, if we insist on it, that there is nothing of which we can suppose it incapable, except perhaps prediction, and even this is excepted only for lack of the data by which to apply the assumption of telepathy as an escape from the spiritistic theory.

(2) The objection from the selectiveness of telepathy, once assumed, applies equally to its short and its long range. But I have not emphasised the infinity that is implied in the latter conception of it. Its enormous magnitude becomes much more astounding when we try to think of the selection it must make between pertinent and impertinent facts in the memories of living persons at any distance, after actually hunting them up and discriminating them from all other living persons, all equally unknown to the percipient. Had we to deal only with phenomena representing merely the memories of the sitter and such statements as are false or mere guess work when the "communications" transcended the memories of the sitter, we should find telepathy more tolerable (*Cf.* Proceedings, Vol. VI., pp. 461-462, 569-574; Vol. VIII., pp. 9-16). But when events or facts are chosen which are true and verifiably independent of the sitter's mind, the telepathy that would account for this becomes infinitely more selective and complex than that which is limited to the sitter's mind. To state it as boldly and clearly as is possible, it involves the power of the medium, wholly unconscious and not knowing the sitter, as any condition of establishing rapport at any distance, to select any absolutely unknown person necessary, anywhere in the world, and from his memory make the selection of pertinent facts to represent personal identity, as that selection has been described for the mind of the sitter!! Such a conception is the Nemesis of the credulity which is usually charged to spiritism. It ought to take far more evidence to prove this than to justify spiritism, which at least has the merit of remaining within the sphere of the finite, while it conforms to known mental laws in both its strength and its weakness.

Nor will any analogies from wireless telegraphy be applicable here, in spite of its conception of coherers arranged for particular kinds of messages. We must remember first that *the coherer in wireless telegraphy is a prearranged affair for its purpose and is limited to a particular kind of message.* Otherwise there is no success of any kind. There is absolutely no selectiveness in the coherer, and this supposition is necessary to the analogy. If the coherer could select any system of messages sent out into the ether and omit those not pertinent to the party at its end, the analogy might be urged. But this is precisely what it does not do and cannot do. We must first know both ends of the line sufficiently to adjust the coherer to the machine

sending out the messages, and the whole process is purely mechanical and absolutely wanting in the intelligent adjustment to the given situation as in psychical mediumship. Now in the Piper case there is no pre-arrangement for rapport of any kind with any special person, and on the telepathic hypothesis the medium must have the capacity to be and represent a coherer infinitely better than anything producible in wireless telegraphy, as she is spontaneously adjustable to any person in any condition, at any distance, and at any instant. The supposed process obtains in one part of a sentence a fact from the sitter, and in the other part of the same sentence mentions a fact unknown to the sitter and obtained from some one a thousand or ten thousand miles distant and unknown to the medium (*Cf.* answer to question about the cane, p. 494). In addition to all this it is intelligently selective for the purpose of producing the evidence for proving personal identity, leaving other matters aside. A man has only to state such a supposition in order to refute it, and in order to ridicule the assumed analogy with wireless telegraphy. There is in fact no resemblance between the two phenomena except their amazing character, and that is evidently a very poor fact upon which to base their physical identity.

As a more conclusive objection to both this assumed analogy and to telepathy itself without that analogy, I may refer to the universal law of the distribution of energy in the physical world. This law is that force varies inversely with the distance; the ratio may be the square, cube or other power. This makes it possible to assign definite limits to the perceptible influence of such forces. Now if telepathy follows any such laws in its action, it must be classed with heat, light and magnetism, and so regarded as propagated like them. Otherwise we have a universe of energy at variance with the physical, which is the point at issue. But if that be once granted the strongest *a priori* objection to spirits is forever broken down, and dissent from their possibility is mere quibbling after that. But if we assume, as we must on physical analogies, that telepathy conforms to this universal law, we find, in addition to the difficulty of its selectiveness, the circumstance that, in spite of its decreasing intensity, it passes all minds in its neighbourhood and chooses the right person at any distance, and the right fact for personating the desired individual as a spirit. According to all physical laws, and possibly this is confirmed by experimental telepathy (*Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 536-596), the nearer subjects ought to receive the benefit of the greatest intensity, and so to impress the medium, or to be the sources of her impressions. But this appears not to be the case. Her facts are *selected* pertinently to her object without regard to space limitations, or the laws for the propagation of physical energy.

Nobody seems to have any influence upon her "subliminal" but the right person in the world, and that person unknown to her. One part of a sentence is gotten with great difficulty from the sitter's mind, and the other with ease from some mind at any distance, in spite of the diminished intensity. Now there is not one iota of evidence for any such capacity in the whole domain of physical science, and there it must be found before reducing these phenomena to that explanation; nor is there any trace of such a process in the mental world outside the phenomena of psychical research, and these cannot be invoked against themselves. Hence, without the slightest trace of the limitations to the propagation of physical energy, telepathy must either be a process that belongs to an immaterial world, or it is a new physical force, mode of motion, or what not, that is both an exception to all known physical facts, and shows an intelligent selectiveness which baffles all conceptions of mechanical phenomena, while it conforms to physical facts in the law of propagation. In the former case the spiritual world is won in some form; in the latter we have a mongrel conception which is neither physical nor spiritual, but a mere makeshift in words that is without evidence and without intelligibility.

Were we dealing with the phenomena of apparitions and coincidences of the non-experimental sort, the objection from the analogy of wireless telegraphy might have more weight. For in these phenomena we might say that we are not likely to discover, and it might be impossible to verify, the existence of the coincidences themselves looking toward telepathy, were it not that the intercourse of friends reveals them to us. Our complete ignorance of experiences on the part of other persons that might be coincidental makes those which we discover through the intercourse of friends appear more selective than they really are. How do we know, for instance, that in our dreams and frequent thoughts, or our hallucinations, we are not recipients of influences from other minds on ours, under conditions in which it is impossible to determine the source of the impressions? May we not have many coincidental experiences, but only occasionally discover them from our intercourse with our friends? The law of the distribution of energy may then hold good for telepathy, and we may have less right to suppose the selective character of apparitions and coincidences than we are in the habit of taking for granted. All this is purely speculative and *a priori*, and is far from being a tolerable belief or possibility to me, and, besides, assumes the supernormal to begin with. I think there are abundant reasons in the nature of apparitions and coincidences, compared with ordinary dreams and hallucinations, not to press the hypothesis that the latter are ever coincidental for lack of the evidence to the contrary, and hence I shall not dwell upon that

question. I am anxious only to recognise what a telepathist might advance in his defence, as against spiritism, in the field of apparitions and coincidences. It is the *argumentum ad ignorantiam* which is used to diminish the importance naturally assigned to spontaneous coincidences and allied phenomena, and which certainly has its weight until we can show that, even in this field, it is either not applicable at all, or is so only to a very limited extent. But it is far more plausible than it appears, and while we may grant it all the importance imaginable for it in the field mentioned, it completely ignores the circumstance that no comparison with the Piper phenomena is possible in the case. The Piper phenomena are *experiments*, complete in themselves, and are *not spontaneous* occurrences. As experiments they ought to exhibit that access to the proximate emanations of thought, as in the physical world, instead of the remote, and should not be selective at all, if telegraphy after physical analogies is to be the explanation. But they indicate nothing of the kind, and no *argumentum ad ignorantiam* prevents our assuming them to be really as selective as they appear. Hence the process, if telepathic and under spacial limitations as to intensity and distribution, nevertheless disregards the whole universe of consciousness, except to select at any distance and without regard to the known laws of mind the facts that are pertinent to the supposition of personal identity. This teleological feature of the process destroys the right of concession to mechanical analogies in any respect, while the exclusion of proximate influences upon the results appears to contradict even the supposition or possibility of any resemblance, even of the *a priori* sort, to the distribution of physical energy.

(3) Another objection to the telepathic theory is the incompatibility of the various confusions and mistakes with the enormous power that must be assumed for its selective nature and its defiance of space limitations. This argument has two aspects. We may assume that the subliminal of Mrs. Piper is itself deceived as to the nature and source of its information, and compare the power implied in its successes with its limitations implied in its mistakes. On the other hand, we may assume that this subliminal is not deceived, and that it is an extremely acute intelligence, capable of understanding its object and consciously making its selection with reference to its purpose. We can then compare the mistakes and errors with this assumption of supernormal intelligence. Taking the first assumption, a power which only falls short of omniscience in its discriminative, selective, and acquisitive action ought not to stumble and become confused at some simple fact indefinitely less difficult than the hundreds in which it succeeds. Of course, the reply would be that the "conditions" cause it, and this must be accorded its *a priori* weight, for the reason that

we are really too ignorant of the "conditions" to plead them any more in defence of spiritism than in defence of telepathy, except as they are and must be more complicated on spiritistic assumptions. If the nature of the facts favours that conception of the "conditions" that must necessarily attend spiritistic phenomena, we may decide the balance in that direction. Otherwise we are engaging in *a priori* speculation on either side. But nevertheless I think there is one fact that makes the plea more cogent for spiritism than for the alternative view. It is that the difficulties in the communications exhibit evidences of a disturbed memory precisely as we should expect to be the case in the severance of a soul from the organism. We may accord that the trouble with proper names is as easily explainable on one hypothesis as on the other, a concession, however, which may be of very doubtful propriety, and is made only to concentrate the argument upon a more assured basis. But when the confusion is exactly like that of a person who has difficulties with his memory, and when it also coincides with what must necessarily be assumed on the spiritistic theory, namely, obstacles to communication of any kind, we find that there is no suggestion of a specifically known cause in the "conditions" between medium and sitter, but only on the side that conforms to spiritistic conceptions. Or, perhaps, to put the case in another way, if "conditions" are to figure in the matter, they indicate mental conditions subsisting rather in the communicator than in the relations between the sitter and the medium. The telepathic theory must assume that the "conditions" concerned subsist between two or more brains or minds, even though it possibly allows for oscillations of power in the mind or brain of the medium.

There is no trace of such oscillation as affects the issue in the mind or brain of the sitter, as the whole record shows, and we may well raise the question whether it is in any respect different with that of the medium, thus throwing the whole responsibility for difficulties upon what intervenes between the two brains or minds. But conceding this, there was, as I was careful to observe at the sittings, no discoverable trace of a definite correspondence between any real or supposed oscillations of my thoughts and the observed oscillations and intermit- tences of Mrs. Piper's subliminal. Both these facts are a presumption in favour of the spiritistic theory, unless we assume oscillations that we do not know anything about in the subliminals of both sitter and medium. But what telepathy cannot easily account for, if we concede any weakness in the presumption just indicated, is the fact that this oscillation of the conditions in the mind of the medium, necessary for good "communication," should so uniformly be avoided in the phenomena of secondary personality when non-spiritistic or non-evidential and yet assume the *rôle* of illustrating, in all its strength

and weakness, the character of a memory independent of the brain or mind of both sitter and medium when the phenomena purports to be spiritistic. That is to say, while we can discover some very general resemblances between the fluctuations of acquisition in experimental telepathy and the intermittent messages of the Piper record, yet there is in the latter an intermittence of a very different kind. It is the intermittence of dramatic play and of different personalities, necessitated perhaps by the obstacles to communication of any sort, if the time is to be occupied by relevant work at all. But such dramatic intermittence of personality seems to be neither a fact nor a necessity of the difficulties and fluctuations attending the supposed processes going on between percipient and agent in experimental, and possibly spontaneous telepathy. This is a fact in the mixture of truth and confusion in the communications which telepathy cannot face with confidence. To do so it has only to still more extend the powers that have already been stretched beyond the breaking point. (Compare *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 362-394.)

Taking the second assumption mentioned above, how can the incidents that are false be reconciled with the remarkable power of discrimination and selectiveness that have to be assumed in telepathy in addition to its defiance of space and temporal coincidence? (We have three types of incidents to deal with: The true, the false, and the indeterminate.) Whatever judgment we entertain about the indeterminate as possibly true and accessible to the telepathic hypothesis, we cannot say this of the false, especially those errors that just miss being true. A power of such magnitude and assumed acuteness in the discrimination of the true from the false, in its effort to convince us of the existence of spirits, ought not thus to contradict itself and forfeit our confidence in telling what it ought to know is false. The process is fabrication pure and simple, whether we choose to call it unconscious and irresponsible, or conscious and unvarnished. Such action reflects on the capacity and intelligence of the subliminal, and to that extent creates suspicion of its ability really to account for the successes by telepathy. When it comes to disposing of the indeterminate cases, we force telepathy into a dilemma. If the indeterminate incidents are admitted into the class of the true, we by so much enlarge the evidential facts beyond my own knowledge and the extent of the telepathy required to meet the case, giving it instantaneous power over the memories of widely separated and unrelated parties. On the other hand, if we class them among the false incidents, we have to assume defective powers in telepathy that are incompatible with those shown in obtaining the truth, so that the only theory that is consistent with the facts is that which assumes the possibility of error in accordance with what we know both of the difficulties in the way of

communication and the finite powers of the human mind, especially in the field of memory.

These general arguments against telepathy may be reinforced by a few specific instances of mistake. I shall refer here to only a few of them, as the whole subject comes up in a later topic, and in an entirely different aspect.

The first interesting illustration is the passage in the sitting for December 24th (p. 317), in which my uncle shows his curiosity to know who Dr. Hodgson is. On the telepathic theory there should be no difficulty in this. Dr. Hodgson ought to be known by this time by both the supraliminal and the subliminal of Mrs. Piper. In fact both G. P. and Rector recognise him without failure on all other occasions. But here they must be supposed either to be ignorant of him or to be intelligent enough to simulate the actual facts of the case, so as to make their spiritistic claims more cogent, and thus contradict the uniform consistency of their character as honest personalities. That supposition requires us to add a rather amazing hypothesis to telepathy in order to use the latter at all.

Again, take the complicated passage in the communications of my cousin, Robert McClellan (p. 422). He had evidently tried to give the name of his wife, Lucy McClellan, and some incident with it, but had to leave before he succeeded, and Rector told him to "go out and come in with it again," and then explained to me that my cousin had said something about Lucy, also remarking, against all excuse from telepathy except to make it: "magnitude incompatible with its error, that this message was not for Miss Edmunds, who is Dr. Hodgson's assistant secretary, and whose name is Lucy. In a few minutes, responding to Dr. Hodgson's request to state explicitly who this Lucy was, Rector said that my father and sisters had brought her here several times, thus implying that she was a would-be communicator. Now the facts are: (1) That the person who was alleged to have been brought several times by my father and sister to communicate was my aunt, if we can assume that it was any relevant person at all; (2) that I knew perfectly well what "Lucy" was meant, and only wanted the surname given for completeness; (3) that this Lucy is still living. In the face of such facts telepathy is in inextricable confusion and contradiction.

A similar mistake is committed in regard to this name in one of my brother's communications. He had to leave just as he succeeded in giving the name Lucy (p. 465), and Rector, evidently remembering that Dr. Hodgson had asked for explicit information regarding the name, said at once, "I got it all but the Hyslop." This was perfectly absurd from my standpoint, but quite natural and excusable for Rector. The facts are: (1) that there is not and never was such a

person as Lucy Hyslop; (2) that my brother was trying to say Lucy McClellan, the name of the wife of Robert McClellan, her deceased husband, and one of the communicators. Both the name of this Lucy McClellan and the fact that she is still living were in my mind and memory all the while, so that there is no excuse for telepathy in the case. A finite spirit might commit such an error in interpretation, especially as my brother had a few moments previously mentioned my sister Lida.

(4) There is another difficulty which I cannot but regard as a most serious objection to the telepathic hypothesis. It is the difference between communicators in the matter of clearness while the data in my mind from which telepathy is supposed to draw are the same for all. (Compare *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 362.) My father, my brother, my sister and my uncle James McClellan were clear communicators, but my cousin Robert McClellan and my uncle James Carruthers were exceedingly confused. The data in my memory exist there in the same way for all of them, to say nothing of the incidents not there at all, but in the memories of persons at a distance. But a faculty that ignores all distinctions between the supraliminal and the subliminal, between what is recognised when recalled, and what is wholly forgotten and unrecognised when recalled, and between the known and the unknown to the sitter, can plead no extenuations in behalf of limitations determined by any known differences of temperament or feeling in regard to the different communicators. We cannot plead any social habits and affections. But if we could plead them it would make no difference, as the uncle with whom I had spent so many delightful hours in conversation on all sorts of subjects does not give me a word and does not appear at all. Nothing is obtained but a statement by my father implying his death.¹ Also my mother, endeared to me by affections and memories that have

¹ I refer to several allusions in which the death of this uncle, the husband of my aunt Nannie, was implied, but not stated. On December 24th (p. 316), just after my uncle Carruthers had communicated, father said, "I wish you would tell the girls that I am with them in sorrow or joy. What is their loss is our gain." The use of the plural in both the noun and the pronouns, the word "sorrow," and the connection of the message with the aunt Eliza who had just lost her husband, indicates a probable reference to my aunt Nannie's bereavement. Were it not for the probability that the name "Mannie," in the sitting of December 27th (p. 342), more probably refers to my stepmother than to my aunt Nannie, I might suppose a similar reference to this aunt's loss in the sentence, "Tell them to trust in God always." But the exclusive reference to aunt Eliza in the promise of comfort in her sorrow makes the interpretation doubtful. Then at the sitting of June 1st, in response to my question put to father, whether he had seen anyone in whom aunt Nannie was interested, the reply came: "Yes, I intend telling you about him before I get through, James." But not a word came during the next four sittings, though he died four weeks previous to my uncle Carruthers, and I was actually prodding Mrs. Pipers's subliminal both telepathically and by direct suggestion.

affected my whole life, communicates so little that it is not worth while to give her a separate place in the summary of facts. On the other hand, my cousin, with whom I had far less to do, and between whom and myself only one letter ever passed, is a frequent though not a clear communicator. And my uncle James McClellan, about whom I knew very little, though always fond of him, especially for the chance to see the cars when we visited him, told me mostly things that were true and yet unknown to me. Scarcely anything of evidential note existed in my memory, or in that of any living person, regarding my brother Charles and my sister Annie, and yet they were among the clearest communicators from the start, and what they communicated in many instances was not associated with them in my memory. This difference, therefore, between communicators is precisely what might be expected from the existence of a personal equation in a disembodied spirit affecting its ability to communicate, an equation that has absolutely no evidence for its equivalent in the memory of the sitter. On the contrary, the evidence is strongly against its supposition in the facts mentioned above.

(5) There is another objection to telepathy independently of the question regarding its magnitude. It is the peculiar inconstancy of the communications, and the changes from one communicator to another, representing, apparently at least, the existence of conditions which might more naturally produce aberration in spiritistic than in telepathic messages. We can see no natural reason for the interruptions and changes of "communicators" on the telepathic hypothesis, or for the confusions and alleged explanations of them by the conditions of communication at all, if spiritism is not true. From what we have seen of experimental telepathy it is not accompanied by any such fluctuations of ability to communicate by the agent, or to receive information by the percipient in simulation of spiritistic realism, as are marked in the short intervals of communication from a given person through Mrs. Piper. There is just enough of failure and confusion, rise and lapse of telepathic access, in ordinary experiments, to suggest that perhaps if we knew more about it we might discover the same phenomena in it as in the case under our study. But at present there is not the slightest clear resemblance, except in the general fact of fluctuation, between the inconstancies and changes of communicators in the Piper case, and what might be called variations in experimental telepathy. There is nothing in the conditions of incarnate life, so far as we know it, to favor an intermittent character for telepathic acquisition. Of course we have to recognise that the *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, at least in general, favours telepathy as much as spiritism, because we know nothing more empirically of the conditions for one of them than for the other. But I think everyone will admit the greater probability at least, if not the certainty,

that the conditions of communication from the dead in a transcendental world would more naturally exhibit difficulties and the necessity for intermittent messages than the conditions of telepathic communication between the living. The reason is apparent, and that is that on such a supposition we should have one more world, and its complications to reckon with, than in telepathy. This ought to be self-evident, were it not for our ignorance of telepathic conditions, on the one hand, and for just enough of what may be called inconstancy in them on the other, to suggest the utmost caution in declaring with any haste or confidence that there is a qualitative difference between the Piper case and experimental telepathy. The supposition of their essential difference may turn out false under further study, but it consists much more with what we know and must necessarily expect from the physiological point of view of the disturbing effects of death, assuming the existence of a soul, than with what we should expect from secondary personality and telepathic access. Until this distinction is removed the probability that intermittent messages are more consistent with spiritism than with telepathy must remain.

The cogency of the argument from inconstancy is just this. By supposition telepathy cannot sustain its acquisition continuously, but must be conditioned by something like the limitations to continuous action that are claimed for spirits. But when we look at the facts it is but a change of communicator and not a change in the telepathic access. If the telepathy can be continuous it is absurd to alternate the communicators. The facts of continuous access to the sitters' or others' knowledge is sufficient proof that telepathy cannot claim the immunities that go to the supposition of spirits without first showing that the limitations exhibited are due to something else than the mere fact of telepathic action.

There is also an important concurrent fact in our favour which confirms the position here taken, and it is ostensibly connected with spiritistic phenomena independently of the Piper instance. This fact is that the large number of apparitions purporting to be phantasms of the dead show no tendency on the part of the supposed spirit to remain long under "material" conditions. They are quite uniformly represented as vanishing in a short time. Whatever the explanation of them they have this very singular and perhaps significant resemblance to the intermittent and brief communications in the Piper phenomena, the manifestations in her case varying with circumstances and conditions having no apparent relation to any known "material" causes, and about which we are hardly entitled yet even to speculate. But the resemblance in this one particular between the experimental and the spontaneous phenomena which assume the aspect of spiritism is at least to be remarked as indicating their consistency, and in each case it

seems to present greater difficulties for the telepathic than for the alternative theory, if we are to admit that the conditions are more complicated in the one than in the other.

(6) There is another strong objection to the telepathic hypothesis. It is the inconsistency between the hypothesis assumed to account for the difficulties of the telepathic access, and the fact that this access is just as often easy and prompt, exhibiting all the readiness and pertinence of ordinary conversation. In nearly all the sittings I remained passive, and avoided asking questions as far as possible, in order, first, to prevent any influence from suggestion upon the facts given, and, secondly, to allow the communicator to tell his own story, which we have learned is a way to prevent confusion until experience on the part of the communicator facilitates ready messages. When I asked questions the communicator was usually allowed to answer them at his pleasure, to choose whether he should do it at once or at a later time. This method avoided confusion and suggestion at one stroke. But the facts given under such circumstances are more likely to be explained by telepathy, on the ground that the medium has to take time and effort to pick out the right facts in my memory. In this way the confusion may be interpreted as a device of the subliminal to gain time. This supposition, of course, is purely *a priori*. But if in extremity it is advanced we have to meet it. Consequently, I propose a formidable difficulty to this way of looking at the matter, especially after having assumed such enormous powers as we found necessary if telepathy be our resource. If, therefore, you can get the communicator clear enough to carry on a *lôte-à-lôte* conversation involving either an exemption from confusion or an immediate answer to your questions, a double object is gained. First, you are drawing, or seem to be drawing, upon a fund of knowledge that is not left to itself to work its way into expression, but is started in the natural channel of an independent memory by an appreciative mind, and, second, you show that confusion is not necessary to the selective process, but is a mere incident of the conditions that render communication difficult. Thus you do not conceive the problem as one of fishing about in the sitter's memory with pains and effort for the right facts, but as the spontaneous recollection of another subject, as in ordinary intercourse. Hence, if you still resort to telepathy, you have to reverse your judgment of the limitations assumed to account for the hesitating answers to inquiries, an assumption made in contradiction with enormous powers supposed for other purposes, and thus we should have to conceive it as capable of the immediate acquisition of the facts. Thus there would be no excuse for the theory of confusion, and the necessity of arbitrary selection of the incidents from the oscillating processes of mental action and memory, whatever such imaginary processes are.

Now my last sitting especially illustrates this view of the case. It is a perfect type of telephonic conversation. I suggested topics about which to talk or to send messages, and the responses, representing often pertinent incidents of a very special character and wholly outside my memory and knowledge and comprehending every shade of complexity, indicate such action as would impose a still greater strain upon telepathy. The play of an independent mind so distinctly imitated is very far removed from the notion of a subliminal, either self-deceived or intentionally deceiving others, fishing around under difficulties for facts. In reality the difficulties in communication, under the stress of the consciousness that the communicator was enjoying his last opportunity for some time, were apparently far less than before, and the conversation was almost without a break, the interest being heightened by my resolution to break the long silence that I had maintained. This being the case we cannot apologise for telepathy on the ground of impeded acquisition, but have to assume powers in it which make its mistakes and limitations appear absurd and inconsistent. One can understand from ordinary psychology why a man endeavouring to communicate at a telephone under great difficulties should halt at the irresponsiveness of the man at the other end. But if the receiver does enough to stimulate attention and interest at the communicator's end, the difficulties would be less embarrassing, and the intercourse less arbitrary except as the receiver made it so. This describes in telephonic phraseology and ordinary psychology just what took place in my last sitting. This difference between sittings without questions or suggestion of topics, and those conducted on the plan of mutual conversation is a very important fact in determining the range of power which must be attributed to telepathy in order to meet the case, since it is exactly the same kind of fact which we meet in actual life, while the extensive powers assumed for telepathy are not what we observe in actual life. It brings into clear light the incompatibility of such a power with the mistakes and confusion observed, while the spiritistic theory, on any principle of continuity and on the assumption of the known powers and limitations of the human mind, reveals no difficulties in the case that are not naturally explainable in a perfectly rational way, even if a little *a priori* and defective in evidence of the conditions that it has to assume on the "other side." The mind of the communicator being finite and admittedly liable to errors, and not requiring anything more remarkable or miraculous than the ordinary processes of consciousness, would most perfectly consist with any amount of confusion and error.

(7) There is another important objection to telepathy. If there be any supposition whatever that is necessary for that hypothesis to make, it is that the *point de repère* for the telepathic acquisition from

living consciousness, and for the application of its omniscient selection, must be the name or memory of the person who is to be represented as communicator, so that it can appropriate all the associates with that name and personality, though it actually discriminates against the mere thought of the subject about the person represented. Telepathy has to have some rational power of discrimination and selection in order to effect its simulation of personal identity. The only plausible supposition within the range of known psychology for this cue to work on is that it is the name or the sitter's memory of the person to be represented. But this assumption is completely wrecked on the fact of intermediaries that have no associations whatever in the memory of the sitter with the incidents selected and sent to prove the identity of some one else. This was a special characteristic of the communications by my brother and sister, and occasionally by my father. Rector in a few incidents acted the part of intermediary, and so also did G. P.

(8) Another point may be made against telepathy in its failure to utilise its opportunities for producing more than it does from the memories of distant and unknown persons. If telepathy be the process explaining the phenomena, and if it has transcended the knowledge of the sitter in the instances mentioned, it can instantaneously select any person in the world that it pleases and from that person select with perfect discrimination the one fact needed to complete a message obtained only in part from the sitter. Knowledge of this kind, or, whether we speak of it as knowledge or not, a process with this power, ought to be able as easily to dispense with the memory of the sitter altogether, as presumably on this theory was the case in Dr. Hodgson's sittings while I remained in New York, and to make out its communications from any number of persons not present and thus avoid suspicion for its weakness. But in no case while I was present did it appear to consciously and regularly simulate any such powers. The *point de repère* for association was, not the sitter's natural expectations or point of view, but the natural interest of the communicator in the incidents that pertained to his memory of the individuals to whom he wished to identify himself. This is the natural law of association. When A. meets B. his recollection and conversation take the direction, not of his intimate life with C., but of what pertains to B. Meeting D. it will be different from both B. and C. These three persons would in some way have to be connected in their experiences in order to have any natural play of association about them when one of them is in mind. If C. never knew B. he is not likely to be thought of when A. who knows C. talks with B. Now telepathy would have to be intelligent enough to discover this peculiarity in ordinary mental operations and imitate

it here in the selection of the persons and incidents at a distance in order to avoid doing what I have said ought to be expected of so immense a power. While it is playing the rôle of the infinite in the simulation of personal identity by its correct selection of the *point de repère* in relation to the sitter, why does it not keep up this rôle in a way to defeat the objections, which it should know can be and are raised against spiritism in the choice of most of its messages from the mind of the sitter? It could as easily reproduce personal identity by access to distant minds as by relying so generally on that of the sitter, and at the same time escape the accusation made against it. But in spite of its supposed power to defy space and temporal coincidence it goes just far enough to show that it contradicts its reputation for infinite capacities by assuming the limitations of spiritism. It can discriminate with infinite shrewdness for its purpose in the treatment of the sitter's mind, but is not astute enough to play the game in reading distant minds which would tend more to acquit it of the suspicions that hamper its effort to prove spiritism! If, while it is rummaging with instantaneous precision about the whole universe of consciousness, it would only show its ability to disregard the sitter's mind altogether and reproduce personal identity without reference to the principle of finite association and the *point de repère* most natural to a human spirit, we could accord the process the right to suggest greater difficulties than it does. But it is precisely the extent to which it actually fulfils the conditions of the spiritistic doctrines in all its multitudinous and detailed complexity that deprives it of its controversial rights. It imitates spiritism in the reproduction of personal identity, but its action is such a fast and loose playing between finite and infinite powers that no one can tell whether it is entitled to respect for one or the other. Just when it seems to be proving its immensity it shows such limitations that its pretensions break down, simply because it stops short in its acquisitions from distant minds at the point which enables spiritism to account for the arbitrary limitation of the process, which is not arbitrary at all if we are dealing with discarnate consciousness.

(9) Another consideration, also, that will have to be accepted under the telepathic hypothesis is the fact that telepathy is only one of the processes that must be combined in order to account for the phenomenon as a whole. This function is a mere adjunct to other powers quite as extraordinary as itself. That is to say, as against the single hypothesis of spiritism, telepathy has to be combined with various other assumptions to account for the facts. There must be assumed an original histrionic capacity, joined with a fiendish ingenuity at deception, whether conscious or unconscious, for giving personal form to the facts telepathically acquired, a form completely imitating the synthetic activity

and intelligence independent of the brain from which the information is presumably obtained, and apparently independent of the brain by which it is expressed. The main features of this dramatic play of personality will be considered again in detail when I can urge its positive meaning for the alternative theory. But it may be alluded to here for the sake of indicating that there is nothing in the passive access of experimental telepathy (*Cf.* references on p. 126) to favour or justify such a supposition as this wholesale power to convert telepathic acquisitions into the perfect simulation of independent personalities. Even in hypnosis the subject seems to be wholly, or at least almost wholly, the instrument of foreign suggestion, and though the secondary personality may display the original action of the subject's mind in response to some suggestion, to make a speech for instance, it yet exhibits no trace of a tendency to appropriate the thoughts of others present, but draws upon its own resources and very generally, if not always, shows some of the limitations in language or range of thought characteristic of the primary personality. The histrionic power of hypnosis, even when it represents the spontaneous activity of the subject, is still too mechanical to compare it hastily to the phenomena of the Piper case. On the other hand, in the experiments in telepathy, upon which we have largely to rely for our conception of the nature and range of the process, there seems to be no trace of this tendency to dramatic imitation of any other personality than that of the percipient himself. Hence when we are applying telepathy to the explanation of the Piper case we are obliged to discard the conception of a merely passive access to the knowledge of others, present or absent, and to conceive the process as combining with it the independent synthetic and organising action of the medium's brain or mind in completely reproducing the personality of another being than itself, not in external appearance, of course, as that term is too often understood, but in terms of the states of consciousness which the alleged communicator can be proved to have had. Add to this also the amazing amount of auto-deception as well as hetero-deception that is involved, though it be all unconscious, or even the honest opinion of the medium's subliminal, and extend this supposition to the whole census of apparitions representing phantasms of the dead so as to include the subliminals of all other persons, and we have put a dangerously infernal agency at the very bottom of things from which it is impossible to recover any morality at all!

The mere statement of such suppositions would be sufficient to refute them were it not a fact that some of the phenomena of secondary personality show, to some extent at least, both this ingeniously original power of constructive mental action and the tendency to some form

and amount of deception, which two facts seem to defy alike the ordinary canons of morality and the objections to the limitation of the telepathic access to merely passive attainments. (Cf., "Case of Le Baron," *Proceedings*, Vol. XII., pp. 277-297; Vol. XV., pp. 466-483; also the Newnham case, Vol. III., pp. 8-24; *Studies in Psychology*, University of Iowa, Vol. II., *Some Peculiarities of Secondary Personality*, by Professor G. T. W. Patrick; *Psychology of Suggestion*, by Boris Sidis, pp. 245-268, *et al.*) These are sufficient to show the recognition of a fact that prevents us from wholly denying histrionic capacity and deception in secondary personality. But we must not forget that secondary personality is complicated with suggestion in these cases, or in most of them, so that the responsibility for histrionic appearance may have to be shared, in part at least, by the operator. Besides, both the deception and the histrionic play show the inconsistencies of mechanical phenomena, and in this respect indicate almost a complete contrast to the Piper phenomena, to say nothing of the general qualitative and quantitative difference between her case and those admitted to suggest difficulties. There are no such limitations in it as in the cases quoted. It has a complete semblance to reality which the others do not have, and they on account of that defect betray their spurious nature.

These general objections to telepathy could be multiplied by the mention of several which are positive arguments for spiritism. But these will come in their place. Minor points could also be considered, but I shall leave their development to the reader after mentioning some of them in a few sentences. First there is the curious fact that time relations, as we understand them, seem to be obliterated, which ought not to be the case with omniscient telepathy. If the subliminal has so accurate a knowledge of time relations as the experiments of Professor Delbœuf and Dr. Milne Bramwell would seem to imply (*Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 414-421, 605; Vol. XII., pp. 179-192), and if telepathy have half the power that is attributed to it, why cannot it obtain, occasionally at least, from the memory of the sitter specific dates quite as easily as tricks of phraseology? Why is it that the subliminal appreciates nothing but a before and after, or the most general relations of time? We should expect this on the spiritistic theory, if Kant's doctrine of space and time be true. Then there is another consistent habit of the communicator in breaking over the line and occasionally making relevant remarks about conversations and conditions of life on the other side that telepathy cannot reach without admitting spiritism and that secondary personality cannot reproduce without forfeiting its claim to superior intelligence, if the statements exhibit those intrinsic absurdities by which secondary

personality so uniformly betrays itself and its limitations. Then, again, what are we going to do with Emperor's prayers when we consider the religious condition of some of the sitters? My early childhood, of course, leaves my subliminal accessible for recollections of this sort, and so does much of my later experience. But then these petitions are not even pretended to be messages to me from any one and so are a piece of supererogatory display, so far as the main purpose is concerned.

On the other hand, there is a class of phenomena in this record, quite frequent also in other Piper records, that affords a peculiarly effective argument against telepathy and its adjuncts, represented either as like ordinary secondary personality or as variously deceived and deceiving. These phenomena are the communications about persons and things not relevant to the sitter at all, but for some of which there could have been as much excuse for referring them to me as in the case of the lady claiming to be my mother in the sitting of December 23rd (p. 308) where the facts were all false. I shall enumerate these incidents briefly with references, and leave the detailed study of them to the reader.

The first interesting case of this is the communication on December 24th, regarding a little girl who was said to be looking for her mother (p. 319). The girl's name as Margaret Ruth was given, and the opinion ventured that it was possibly the child of Dr. Hodgson's sister. On December 26th Rector said spontaneously, and without query from Dr. Hodgson, that this little child was not his sister's (p. 330).

G. P.'s allusion to some affairs of his brother Charles in my first sitting, December 23rd (p. 305), is somewhat similar to this about the little girl. But his messages about John Hart and Dr. Meredith, May 31st (p. 440), are especially good instances of irrelevancy to me and apparently of G. P.'s knowledge of the fact. No less important for the same view are the trance personalities' specific communications and arrangements regarding persons concerned in experiments and sittings not connected with my own. All these are given in the natural manner of reality, and free from the confusion of messages that come from those in my family (*Cf.* pp. 222-238).

In these cases the trance personalities are perfectly conscious of the irrelevancy of the messages to me. Compare also the reference to Miss Edmunds (p. 442). Why are they not equally conscious of the falsity and irrelevance in other cases? The only answer to this question that can sustain any consistency with itself is either that their intelligence is so infinite that it can produce just the proper appearance of the finite which we wish to use in favour of spiritism, or that it is not so supernatural as the necessity of using it in the successes for escape from

spiritism would imply. That they should be all unconscious might be applicable to the discrepancies between the successes and failures, but that they should thus be conscious of the irrelevancies and consciously honest at points where they would have as much or more excuse, on the supposition of acute knowledge, for the deceit that must be supposed elsewhere, is incompatible with the assumption that they can play any consistent rôle in their game. Supposing them finite, limited and honest in their knowledge, as they certainly appear superficially, both accounts for the character of the phenomena, and distinguishes them from such secondary personalities as exhibit no proper traces of spiritistic zeal and consistency.

(To summarise the argument: If we are to suppose telepathy and its adjuncts as the explanation of these phenomena the theory must be held to cover the following facts with all their suggested difficulties.

- 1 There is first the wonderful selectiveness shown in its unflinching discrimination between my own personal experiences *alone* and the experiences that were common to me and the supposed communicator.
 - 2 Then there is the far wider discriminative selection from all living memories of the facts pertinent to the identity of the person represented. The inconstancy of the communications and the dramatic intermittence of different communicators, facts quite natural to the necessary difficulties of communication itself.
 - 3 There are also various inconsistencies and unnecessary complications on the telepathic theory:
 - a First between the occurrence of confusion and mistake on the one hand, and the remarkable telepathic power on the other, that must be assumed to account for the successes;
 - b between the usual *point de repère*, which is the proper personality connected with the incidents communicated, and the use of intermediaries;
 - c between the successes of some communicators and the uniform failure of others, though the facts in the memory of the sitter and other living persons are the same for all of them;
 - d and between its range of assumed power over all living memories and its limitation usually to what would be the natural law of association as exhibited in the recall of reminiscences in conversation.
 - 4 Lastly, there is the self-conscious communication of irrelevant matter, recognised as irrelevant, and thus made incompatible, not only with its action in what is false, but also with its apparent omniscience at deception in other respects.
- Such a power to imitate just what we should expect of a finite intelligence acting under such limitations as must be supposed on the spiritistic hypothesis is a very large one. I do not say that such a supposition is impossible, as I am aware that some prefer to protect their scepticism by leaning that way. Dr. Hodgson has stated this supposition which some may prefer to hold when conceiving that Mrs. Piper's mind, or brain as the case may be, both in its normal and super-normal conditions, is in constant relation to the supraliminal and

subliminal knowledge of all living persons, and perhaps to some facts once in a living mind or brain, but not longer so, and gotten by some process of clairvoyance from the ether or impressions on matter. (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 393-396.) This theory is at least as large as the spiritistic! I mention it only to call attention to the fact. But I may add that if we are asked to produce a second Piper case before the spiritistic interpretation shall become respectable, is it not equally necessary to produce a second case of this rare combination of theories before feeling any assurance regarding their application? Moreover, would it not be as easy to account for a second case on this theory, as it is to account for the one in hand?

CHAPTER IV.

THE SPIRITISTIC HYPOTHESIS.

(All that has been said in depreciation of the telepathic theory is so much presumption in favour of spiritism, if we assume that we have only two alternatives with which to deal. But in addition to these negative arguments there are several positive ones. I shall first summarise them and then discuss them at length. They are: (1) The unity of consciousness exhibited by the communicators, or the satisfaction of the criterion for personal identity. (2) The dramatic play of personality. (3) The mistakes and confusions. (4) Certain mechanical and coincidental features in the automatic writing of the medium.)

(1) *The Unity of Consciousness and Personal Identity.*

In regard to the first of these considerations, I can even demand the assent that the facts in this record perfectly satisfy the criterion for personal identity on any theory whatsoever. It is not necessary to assume the spiritistic theory in order to understand the pertinence of the facts to the question of their original source. The difference between the theories of fraud and spiritism consists in the mere question whether the facts have been artificially acquired, or whether they are the result of supernormal acquisition from spirits. The source of the facts in the mind of the person whom they purport to represent cannot be disputed without impeaching the veracity of the persons affirming their truth, and hence the only question is that which regards the method of obtaining them. The testimony to personal identity remains the same in any case. That is to say, the facts represent the personal experiences and consciousness of the individual from whom they purport to come. But having recognised this circumstance, it will be easy to realise their spiritistic import after being convinced that fraud is to be thrown out of account.

In ordinary life the criterion of personal identity is complicated with physical phenomena, upon which we usually rely, but which are in fact not the final test of it. But in the problem before us all the accidents upon which we rely in a sensible world for at least the first suggestion of personal identity are wanting in the determination of the same fact in an assumed discarnate spirit. No material or sensible

data are accessible. Our criterion must be facts that force the supposition of the unity of consciousness between the past and present existence of the alleged communicator. The incidents communicated, their psychological connection, their emotional interest or pertinence to the person they claim to represent, and the general manner of their expression ought to indicate that unity of character which we should recognise in the person given, or by which in daily life we should instantly recognise their proper subject and source. This conception of the case is represented in my experiments on the "Identification of Personality," where the incidents chosen from the memory of a common life achieve their purpose in a very short time, and represent just what we find in the Piper phenomena minus the supernormal (pp. 537-623). In this record of my Piper experiments, however, it is unfortunate that the general reader is less qualified than myself for appreciating this unity, because he does not know as well as I the pertinence of the facts, and has to use his imagination more than I have to do. But the notes in which I have given the facts from my own knowledge, instead of my opinion as to the conformity of the messages to my knowledge, ought to give a sufficiently clear conception of this pertinence and so to make this exposition of their unity quite intelligible. It is sufficient to remark then that the true facts in the entire record, representing experiences that are demonstrably not the original experiences of Mrs. Piper, will be intelligible enough to the majority of men for them to understand their unity and spiritistic suggestiveness, no matter what theory they prefer. Hence I shall not resort to any lengthy process of explanation at this point as to what personal identity is in any metaphysical sense. I shall be content with the simple view that it is a stream of consciousness that is aware of the past and that can, under the proper conditions present facts which the sitter can verify and cannot conceive to have been the experience of any one else. In presenting the argument, I shall call special attention to the facts that illustrate the case and indicate their cogency.

We must remark, however, that the problem has gotten far beyond physiology. Only the psychologist can any longer deal with the complexities and significance of the Piper phenomena. We are dealing with an intelligent unity in phenomena in which we are either unaware of the conditions affecting them, or must assume them to be abnormal and yet capable of reproducing the psychological facts of a normal unity. To assume that the brain conditions are normal is to cut out by the roots any view but the spiritistic. To assume that the brain conditions are abnormal, we have to contend with the fact that there is no irregularity in the mental phenomena of the subject corresponding to the disintegration of personality as observed in insanity and secondary personality generally, but a reproduction of the normal

personality of some one else Hence the problem is wholly removed from the sphere of physiology, and it is left to psychology to deal with the significant unity of phenomena that require to be explained by some other process than anything with which physiology is acquainted. The problem is not one of any known brain conditions, but of the psychological unity of mental phenomena that must be referred to wholly unknown physiological laws and conditions, or to hypotheses consistent with the known laws of consciousness, namely, a subject unity like that which we know in actual life and consistent with the finite suppositions with which science is accustomed to deal. So far as the present knowledge of physiology affords any evidence the subject unity may not be anything else than the individual's brain, unless we insist that the inconvertibility of consciousness with its physical conditions forces us to suppose a subject other than the brain, a view which I do not feel compelled to take, though I admit the possibilities of it. But in all the cases of ordinary life, whether the personality be primary or secondary, the connection between the two streams is such as to preclude any attempt to treat the one as reproduction of the personal identity of another individual. The unity between the two is the fact that forbids this. But when the phenomena have a psychological unity that represents both another's personal identity, and this of one not living, we have to recognise that our problem is not physiological, or not physiological alone, but first psychological, in the determination of the nature and the unity of the facts independently of the brain of the medium, so far as any known physiological laws are concerned; so that the contest must be between a synthetic unity reproducing the personal identity of an unknown individual not living, and the capacities of secondary personality with its universally recognised limitations in the field of physiology. Consequently, I shall examine in the concrete the incidents of the present record and exhibit their complex unity in terms of what we know of memory and consciousness in psychology and then merely ask if we have any analogies in psychiatry and its physiological assumptions and disintegrating personality to suggest any rational way out of spiritism as a legitimate hypothesis.

Let me take first the confused passage in which my father described all the incidents that took place at his death (p. 327). I take a confused case at the outset purposely. My notes show that there is sufficient correspondence between his statements and the facts for us to recognise that the circumstances precluded chance as their explanation. The exclusion of chance suggests intelligence, if only that of fraud. But as this alternative has been excluded, the incidents represent just the unity which we should expect of the alleged subject supposed to have survived.

But there are two incidents in the group that are of special interest in the consideration of their psychological unity for any other view than the spiritistic. The first of these is the reference to congestion, in the question, "Was it congestion, James?" I saw, the moment I recognised the pertinence of this allusion to congestion, that I had an opportunity to test the telepathic hypothesis, assuming that I was not to admit chance in this one particular; for I supposed that my father never knew that congestion took place in his spasms of the larynx. Hence I wrote to the physician who attended him in his last illness, without telling him any facts in the case, to know if he had ever told my father of his congestion, or said it in his hearing, and the emphatic reply was in the affirmative (*Cf.* p. 356). Here I could not get the unity of telepathy as the only alternative in the explanation. The facts represented a wider unity of consciousness than I had supposed and were just what the spiritistic theory requires. The second fact is the appreciation of my question in a wholly different sense from the one I had intended, and yet in the more natural interpretation which it bore. I had asked "What was the trouble when you passed out?" I had in mind the disease which my father thought he had, and as my word "trouble" was strictly incorrect, the reply surprised me, as supposing that my question referred to some personal differences between myself and my father. His reply correctly indicated that there had been no such personal differences. When I explained my meaning in the term "trouble," the subject was taken up with the strictest interpretation of the temporal clause in the question. I again supposed that this reply was wrong, as I had in my mind the catarrh that he had imagined to be his disease. But the moment that this idea was driven out of my head, I saw the entire pertinence of both the message and the natural interpretation of my question. Now my question may be treated as a suggestion to any subliminal to choose between two alternatives in the interpretation of it, and I do not care to dispute that view at present. But I must emphasise the unity between the mental processes that both interpret most naturally my question and immediately reproduce facts that are not necessarily suggested by the interpretation of it as equivocal. The spiritistic hypothesis explains them in a very simple manner, while any other theory has to combine at least two, and perhaps more, processes in order to meet the case. If the right interpretation of my question—and both interpretations may be considered right—had been followed by an entire mistake as to the facts about his death, the supposition of secondary personality would cover the case. But this is not the fact. We have either the unity and simple action of a single process of consciousness, and so most naturally a spiritistic phenomenon, or the unity of two wholly different processes, the existence of one of which is not

admitted in abnormal physiology or psychology at all, except in deference to the necessity of escaping spiritism, and even this admission has to explain the fortuitous or fortunate combination of such independent functions as telepathy and secondary personality without supposing any normal or abnormal brain equivalents in evidence to justify the assumption. The argument is purely *a priori*, while the spiritistic theory requires no complexity but that of ordinary consciousness and the necessary difficulties of communication in any case.

A more striking example is the cap incident. To say nothing of its excluding telepathy from my mind, which it most probably does, as not representing anything in my knowledge, it embodies three points of considerable importance. (1) There is the frequent allusion to it both when I was present and when I was absent. (2) It was wholly unknown to me when first mentioned, and discarded as useless on the first occasion of its mention (p. 387). (3) It had a singular pertinence for my father's identification to my stepmother and bears distinct evidence of this purpose. The fact represented a very trivial and very exceptional incident in his life. Now though the name "Nannie," which was wrong, was connected with it, I had already suspected what it meant, and when I asked later (p. 478) who made this cap, the answer involving an allusion to Hettie's mother, though elucidating some confusion, indicated a unity in the case in a most striking manner. There is in the case not merely the pertinence of the single fact that my father had accidentally possessed such a cap as is referred to, but the persistent interest in it, apparently for a purpose that is entirely rational, and the final correction of the name associated with it at first and the additional indication of the relationship of my half-sister to the person intended—both circumstances representing a mental fact or facts independent of my own interest in the case and representing precisely the unity that should belong to surviving consciousness and that is not reproduced in any of the evidence that we have of the functions and capacities of telepathy. There is both a double act of memory in the case and the synthetic action of an intelligence independent of my own in the way the facts are woven together to make the meaning clear. The two memories are, first, that of the personal experience itself, the ownership of the cap, and second, the repeated reference to it during the sittings, representing an interest and intelligent process out of proportion to the kind of interest I took in it, but quite consistent with the purpose of the communicator, who, after all, proved that he was right in the stress he was laying upon the incident. This memory from sitting to sitting is wholly at variance with the photographing process of telepathy as experimentally illustrated even when it involves a mixture of the percipient's experiences in the reproduction. It is the natural action of consciousness

as we know it. This characteristic is frequent regarding incidents about which there was a desire to know if I had forgotten them, generally showing an interest independent of mine and out of proportion to mine, just as the case should be, if we are dealing with an independent intelligence.

Take also the consistency of the mental attitude toward my brother George throughout the whole series of experiments, whether I was present or not. This feature, however, was not an intentional act of memory, as in the case of the cap, where purpose is so evident, but it was the natural action of a mind concomitant with the incidents chosen to communicate, which perhaps I can detect more easily than the reader, unless he can see it in the facts by which I endeavour to make this characteristic clear.

Take again the answer to my question about the medicine which I bought for him. This was given with substantial correctness as "Himi" (Hyomei), and the spontaneous addition made that strychnine was also taken. This I knew nothing about at the time, and verified from three sources, and did not learn that the two medicines were mentioned together in one of his letters to me until long after this verification. The Hyomei was a fact in my supraliminal, and the strychnine only in my subliminal, this circumstance not making the slightest difference in the success. Then in Dr. Hodgson's sitting the Hyomei was correctly described as a vapour (p. 391) and alluded to more than once in both his and my sittings. The independent memory here, throughout the experiments, repeats the characteristic noted in the case of the cap and shows the complex unity of pertinence, emotional interest, and double memory. Now if the unity of the incidents were that of telepathy I should in all expectation have gotten arsenic also, but unless the "serris" (p. 336) be introduced as an attempt to get this, and it can be taken as the attempt to give the strychnine, there is no effort to complete the associated facts in my subliminal. On the contrary, morphine was given, which was false (p. 384). Much less is there the slightest trace throughout of obtaining what was the chief matter of our constant correspondence, namely, politics. These little incidents in the letters about medicine or other small affairs are very infrequent, but if we are to suppose what telepathy illustrates as its habitual function in our experimental investigations, it should reproduce the phenomena either as a whole as in the mind of the agent, including here the arsenic and discussions about politics, or compound them with the matter in the mind of the percipient. But nothing of the kind is done. The selection and dissociation of a normal consciousness is performed, and only those facts given which had a special interest to my father in his life with reference to his disease. The unity of these incidents, therefore, is that of a spontaneous and independent

intelligence acting consistently with a known past and carrying on the natural processes of consciousness, as opposed to the mechanical and passive reproduction that ought to characterise telepathy, when it does not interfuse the memories of the percipient with the facts telepathically acquired. That is to say the unity is not one of my memory, even when I can be said to know all the facts in one form or another, but is a unity outside my conscious mind produced by processes that clearly indicate another personality.

Still another illustration of this unity is the mention of the names of my brothers and sisters. Putting aside the first sitting, which is too confused to consider, the names of my brothers and sisters were given correctly. All except one of them were in the form in which they were used in life, and this one, namely, Hettie, was the correct nickname for my half-sister. Though father never used this, it was the natural abbreviation of Henrietta. The giving of it was associated with the assistance of G. P. (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 375, Tillie for Matilda). But these names were not given all at once. They were distributed throughout the sittings and connected with incidents pertaining to them in life, giving again the double unity and pertinence of synthetic character and the memory of a terrestrial past supposedly terminated by death and of time relations that are not so terminated, but which are most natural on the supposition that the content connected with them is real and not artificial. There was, besides, usually the proper emotional and intellectual interest associated with each one mentioned, and this was especially sustained throughout in regard to the two for whom my father had been particularly solicitous in life.

There is a most interesting incident in this mention of the names of the family that makes the spiritistic theory far more clear than any other. This fact is the curious, but natural and correct distinction between the communication of proper names in the family and the same outside the family. This seems to characterise the habits of all the communicators in so far as any demand existed for it. Not once does my father give the surnames of any of the family, except twice his own. He simply gives the Christian name, as he always did in life when speaking of them, and just as all persons speaking of their children or members of the family would do. But he just as naturally and in conformity with his own and the usual custom gives, or tries to give, the full name, Christian and surname, of those outside the family when he has occasion to speak of them. The same habit is noticeable in my cousin. He speaks of my brothers as "Robert Hyslop" and "Frank Hyslop," but never gives the surname of his wife or children. He does not say to me "your brother Robert," as my father gives relationship instead of surname, but he gives the full name. He calls my father "Uncle

Hyslop" once to distinguish him. It is not necessary that this habit should be absolutely uniform, as certain persons in the attempt to communicate might very well recognise the importance of giving the full name at the outset and on all occasions requiring it. This dealing with names in accordance with the natural habit in life of the communicators is the action of an independent mind, and not the passive reproduction of telepathic photography. This is evident from the fact that the names of my brothers and sisters together with the associated incidents are the same in my memory for all communicators, and telepathy ought to get the same form unless we attribute a larger power of knowledge and distinction than is conceivable; it must simply have all knowledge possible and be able to adjust itself rightly to any degree of naturalness and complexity not represented in the sitter's mind, but still true to habit outside that mind. That is to say, the subliminal of Mrs. Piper has already recognised this habit of the human race, and in addition to its infinite telepathic power, can vary the organic unity of the facts gotten from any mind to suit the habits of the person whose name she acquires with his relationship to the sitter! When such fine distinctions as I have just remarked are observed, by the communicators, in conformity with their actual habits when living, we have a phenomenon that is intelligible only on the spiritistic hypothesis, and any other theory does not explain at all, but only makes the problem insoluble by appealing to a power that can do anything because we choose to say so, when in fact we do not know that the infinite can do anything. We do know that consciousness in its actual life does this very thing, and we do not know what telepathy is at all. It is a mere name for causal connection, and as a known process by which to explain the synthetic unity of consciousness it is *non est*. The scientific requirement to appeal to known causes for explanation is better satisfied by the spiritistic than by the telepathic theory. That is, in one we appeal to a known and in the other to an unknown cause, telepathy being the unknown.

Again one of the most remarkable illustrations of this unity, independent of what was most natural in my memory, is the system of incidents connected with the conversation that I had with my father two years before his death on this very subject of spirit communication, and that are reproduced in all the main particulars (pp. 30-34). The facts are: (1) Our conversations on the subject; (2) My doubts about it; (3) The intimation that I had explained much by hallucination; (4) The implication that I had used the "thought theory" to explain spiritism away; (5) The Swedenborg incident; (6) The promise (not strictly true, but possibly intended) to return to me after death; (7) The reference to hypnotism; (8) The allusion to the "young woman who had had some experiments

and dreams"; (9) The allusion to "some kind of manifestations (apparitions) you were in doubt about"; (10) That these took place on my last visit to him.

The general unity of these incidents is indicated when I say that they do represent accurately just what we did talk about on that occasion except the promise to return. But the most important feature of it is the Swedenborg incident. The reason for this is the slight place which it had in my memory, being absolutely forgotten, and verifiable only by the explicit testimony of my stepmother, and the natural interest which the communicator shows in a work which he has suddenly discovered to be like what he found in Swedenborg. That interest is also enhanced by the fact that my father had all his life, as he actually says here, according to Rector's interpretation (p. 386), shut his eyes to the facts that pointed in this direction and kept his mind steadily toward his dogmatic theology. It was, therefore, perfectly natural and an indication of independent intelligence for him to seize on the incidents of our conversation and present them as here actually realised in these communications, illustrating the doctrine of Swedenborg, who was the only spiritualist of whom he knew anything whatsoever. He did not know enough of its modern phases to despise the doctrine, and saw even Swedenborg in his best light. That emotional characteristic of the whole set of incidents on this point gives the clue to both the complexity and the unity of the case. When we consider the very little knowledge that I had of Swedenborg, this being limited to turning over the pages of his books once or twice in my life and but for a few minutes, and to the historical incident of the Stockholm fire, we can see more distinctly how unnatural is the unity of the case from my standpoint, and how much more natural it was from that of my father, who had actually talked about Swedenborg with my stepmother after my departure, thus showing his interest at the time in the connection between Swedenborg's doctrine and the subject we were discussing. Making that connection again here, wholly as a pertinent illustration of the nature and object of these experiments, without anything but my subliminal to work upon, is a suggestion of independent intelligence that can hardly be rivalled by any set of phenomena, especially as it took two independent minds on this side to get any unity in the case in regard to this special incident. But even then it does not get the characteristic of interest that evidently marked the communicator's consciousness, but only the unity of fact representing the truth of the incidents, while from the standpoint of the communicator there is both the persistent interest in the idea connection and the discovery of its present application. This last is not a feature of my memory at all, but the spontaneous act of intelligence

other than the passive access of telepathy and so the organising unification of facts in an independent mind and memory. That is to say, we have the appropriate appreciation of a fact evidently thought about more in life than I was aware of and interposed here in perfect simulation of real intelligence.

This unity outside my mind again is illustrated in the incidents communicated by my cousin Robert McClellan (p. 442), in which the statement calling his sister his aunt created nothing but confusion for me, until I learnt that it was his habit uniformly during his long illness to call her this in deference to the habit of his children, she having nursed him during some months. It happens to be a case also in which it was impossible for me under any circumstances to have known the fact, as all the events occurred years after I had even seen them together, and nearly two years after I had seen either of them. All the relations expressed in the message were natural and true, but the one incident that makes that unity rational was the single fact that I did not know. (*Cf.* pp. 231-235.)

I shall take one more illustration of this characteristic. It is one of the finest in the record. I refer to the cane incidents (pp. 397-8). In the sittings by Dr. Hodgson the allusions were confused and could have obtained no meaning at all for one who did not happen to be familiar with the facts, that give the clue, or who does not understand the treatment of confusion in communications. But in the later personal sitting the unity was indicated in an unexpected manner, and my investigation revealed facts that I never knew. I saw, as my notes indicate, that in Dr. Hodgson's sittings two canes were possibly in the mind of the communicator. To clear this up I took the indirect way of asking a question first about another incident connected with the cane I had in mind, and after obtaining the proper recognition I asked who gave him this cane, and the reply showed a memory of the previous communication whose meaning I had conjectured, and the reference to Dr. Hodgson as the one to whom he had given the communication. The allusion to the "ring" on the cane is perhaps equivocal, as it may refer to the "gold bug" that I wanted given, and that was drawn, or to the tin ring which had been used to repair the broken cane which was most probably the one referred to at Dr. Hodgson's sitting. Now in my mind these three canes were not associated at all. I cannot now recall seeing the broken one, though it is probable that I had seen it, but less probable that I had seen it after it was broken. I have a vague recollection that my aunt who gave me the money to get the cane which I sent my father told me his old one was broken. But I remembered only the ebony cane of many years ago, and the one I gave him, neither being in any way associated together, and much less with the one that mine supplanted. Here then are three

things that are not specially connected in my mind, but which were so connected in the mind and experience of my father, and there was every reason in the world for his supposing that the mention of them would prove his identity. The synthetic unity of the incidents connected with those three canes would be difficult to duplicate by any process imaginable in this universe, but a human or divine memory, using the last to assume that an infinite process not human might do it. The various ways of using the cane indicated were incidents of which I was absolutely ignorant, so that again we get a unity that consists of several interesting facts: (1) The pertinence of the facts to the personal identity of the communicator; (2) The unity between those that I did know and those that I did not know and some wholly forgotten; (3) The unity of the memory between the various sittings; (4) The unity of facts, a part of which, and the most important part, was obtained when I was not present, with the facts obtained when I was present; (5) The unity of facts and interests on the part of the communicator which did not exist in my mind, even when the incidents singly were known to me in most of the cases. All these characteristics are simple enough on the spiritistic theory, but incomprehensible on any other. The last feature is the most forcible against telepathy, as it makes it necessary to confer upon that process a power to wholly disregard the law of association in the mind of the subject from which the facts are obtained, and at any distance in space, and weave them into the proper unity to reproduce the real personality of another in all its complex significance. In experimental telepathy, as I have all along remarked, the telepathic process reproduces what is in the mind of the agent, associates and all, and does not select unconnected incidents from this memory and reproduce another personality. But in the Piper case we must suppose that telepathy can enjoy *ad libitum* power to change from the purely receptive to the constructive process of reproducing personal identity, and without any regard to the limitations of time and space, as this incident especially shows. Now such a theory does not explain. It simply makes the problem larger and the cause inconceivable.

I could pass through all the more complex passages of the record in the same way, and they would but illustrate the same characteristic that I have indicated in instances having interesting and important variations. This characteristic is the natural unity of consciousness, represented in the terms of memory and association as known, and which we might suppose to exist in a discarnate spirit, a unity that did not exist for my consciousness in the form that is presented in the record, either in my expectations or in my recognition in all cases, but which is found on examination to be most natural to the communicator. This unity also represents exactly the differences of choice in the

incidents that we remark in common life and experience. A. never recalls exactly the same incidents that B. recalls in their common life in all their details. The point of interest always varies sufficiently with the personal equation to originate surprises and facts that one party has forgotten or even did not know, especially in the selection of incidents determined by the difference of interests in the events. A. recalls a boat ride with B. and the fact that they smoked a particular kind of cigar. B. remembers the ride but not the smoking. Again A. recalls a conversation with B. about the sale of his farm and a visit to a friend to whom he was going when he had the conversation. B. recollects the conversation, but knows nothing about the visit and only learns it by inquiry after being told it. This is what we have in the incidents discussed and taken from the record. They are the phenomena of independent intelligences, and not of some all embracing mind or infinite telepathy cooped up in a woman's brain.

It may be useful in this connection to call the reader's attention to certain significant incidents which I was at first inclined to attribute to mediumistic manufacture, but which turned out on careful investigation to have some, I would say considerable, evidential importance. I refer to the cap incident (pp. 387, 406), the special pertinence of the hymn, "Nearer my God to Thee" (p. 389), the strychnine (p. 337), the expression "Give me my hat and let me go" (pp. 307, 313), my father's visit to me (p. 440), the paper cutter (p. 379), the reference to Swedenborg (pp. 30-34), all the details of the Cooper incident (pp. 51-54), and especially the reference to the Cooper school (p. 420), and perhaps a number of less specific allusions. Incidents like these, which are often not recalled by the sitter, and which are as often repudiated as preposterous, are precisely the kind which demand the most careful examination. The mere failure to recall an incident is an insufficient ground on which to reject it as false or even improbable. The memories of communicator and the sitter, as above remarked, may not necessarily coincide in the details of their experience. This is perhaps a commonplace of reminiscences. But it will be interesting to remark that a frequent *facsimile* of such incidents occurred in my experiments on the Identification of Personality in which the communicator often felt assured that he would succeed in absolutely establishing his identity by a certain incident which was not recalled at all by the receiver, and he was often identified by evidence considered less specific and suggestive than what he had chosen to be final and conclusive. As illustrations of this disparity of memories let me refer the reader for comparison to the following incidents in those experiments. See Questions 3, p. 555; 8, p. 558; 17, p. 574; 21, p. 579; 15, 18, 22, p. 585; 12, p. 590; 10, 15, 17, p. 593; 2, 4, p. 596; 14, p. 601; 15, p. 613. Much of

Experiment VI., Group A, p. 559, and practically the whole of Experiment X., p. 572, in the same group, illustrate this peculiarity. Such facts, taken in connection with the evidential import of the incidents at first attributed to secondary personality, and later found to have significance, rather indicate a psychological interest and unity independent of the sitter's mind, and do much to strengthen the spiritistic theory.

But there is another aspect to this unity which I have not mentioned, but which is as noticeable in the instances discussed as in those that are yet to be produced. Hitherto I have emphasised the unity that lies outside my mind and have raised the questions appropriate to such a phenomenon. But there is another aspect of this synthetic unity which notes the circumstance that a number of independent facts are selected to constitute the whole incident, as it was stated in the statistical summary. Our experiences in life represent an indefinite number of objects or events connected together in a single whole. The separate objects or facts have no necessary connection in our minds. There is nothing in the name Adams, for instance, that necessitates any one's thinking of the Presidency, and nothing in the two to suggest that President Adams would necessarily indicate a true combination. Hence when we are forced to study statements and incidents in a record of this kind we can best test the hypotheses of telepathy and chance by examining this synthetic unity of the facts given. If it consists more easily with independent intelligence than with any other supposition we cannot rationally adopt any other theory.

Let me first take the incident about the old horse Tom (p. 423). There are four independent facts in this instance, facts that cannot be put together as they are without supposing intelligence. The facts are: (1) The name Tom; (2) the statement that it referred to a horse; (3) the name of my brother George; (4) the implication that my brother was connected with the disposal of the horse. Either of these names would as easily consist with the idea of a horse as the other, and neither of them would suggest in a guessing mind the unity that they actually have in this case, and this is heightened by the evident demand of Rector that the communicator be certain of his meaning. One of the facts I did not know. But the unity that they possess exists in not more than eight living persons, and perhaps less. It was not complete in my mind. Hence we cannot apply photographic telepathy, whatever that may mean, to my mind alone; but the instantaneous selection, from some other living person unknown to the medium and at the distance of one thousand miles, of the one incident to give the case the completeness it has, without marring its truthfulness, is a fact beyond comprehension except on the spirit

hypothesis. The process is then more than telepathy, according to the necessities of telepathy itself. The medium has, by supposition, not only to secure her facts in an isolated form, but to construct the appropriate unity. The only escape from this is the assumption that the telepathic process is dodging about through the world and selects each whole from the individual mind that possesses it. The statement of that supposition condemns it, especially as it is made in a purely *a priori* manner to cover facts, the utmost of which we know is that they must be explained. Then if it is a receptive process acquiring the facts from my mind, why not take scores of associated incidents in my mind about this very horse, instead of going to the minds of others to complete the whole. It is, instead of this, the constructive act of an independent intelligence, even if we suppose the incidents selected from the memory of the sitter by telepathy. The incidents are selected out of a larger whole in that memory and interwoven with the fact that I did not know, and all to impress me more favourably with the hypothesis of spiritism! How much easier to suppose that it is nothing but the natural operation of a finite and surviving consciousness selecting in the ordinary way of memory what it wants for establishing its identity. There are no miracles in this view, and scepticism has not to be burdened with a belief in the supernatural.

A precisely similar incident is that in which my aunt Nannie is said to have helped in bringing up us children after the death of my mother (p. 449). The independent facts constituting the whole are: (1) The old home; (2) the town of C.; (3) the name of my aunt; (4) the death of my mother; (5) my aunt's living with us after that event; (6) my aunt's help in bringing up us children. The pertinence of the reference to the "old home" is found in the fact that it tacitly recognises and implies to me, quite definitely, the distinction between his home after 1889 and the place where he was born and lived until the year mentioned, the change of residence having been mentioned at a previous sitting of Dr. Hodgson (p. 406). As said in the note (p. 449), the phrase "little town of C." is not correct in the letter, but as proper names always give difficulty, and the sound of "C" is one of the elements of the right letter in the Indo-European language from which the correct name, Xenia, is taken, there is no difficulty for me in recognising the intended meaning. All the other factors are exactly correct. The general complexity of the incident would not be greatly altered by the omission of the first two factors, but the omission of the others or a change in the relation of time expressed would disturb its integrity very considerably. As it stands, the conjunction of independent facts involving the right relations of time and action, and representing events extending over two or three years' time, makes a consolidated whole that is just what

the surviving consciousness of my father would produce. The factors are the salient points also in the incidents of the years involved, and exhibit the selectiveness that is appropriate to identification, while the message shows the proper emotional attitude toward my aunt.

Still another illustration of this synthetic unity of independent factors is the passage in Dr. Hodgson's sitting for me (p. 401), in which reference is made to this aunt, my brother George, and the anxieties of all three of us about that brother. The passage includes incidents about other matters which I shall admit into the whole because they are all given in one breath, as it were. The independent facts are: (1) Allusion to the rough country roads; (2) the "coach" (should be carriage); (3) reference to my aunt's motherly advice; (4) emotional attitude toward that aunt; (5) name of Ohio, this being his old home; (6) name of Bartlett; (7) name of my brother George; (8) the principal of the school; (9) father's talk with this principal; (10) the fact that the talk was about my brother; (11) my father's confessed trouble about this brother; (12) the statement that father left (died) with this worry on his mind; (13) the fact that we three shared in anxieties about this brother. There are also several unverifiable factors in the passage, and I have omitted these because they cannot be in any way considered evidential. Here then are *thirteen* independent factors in a sustained message, one of them (Bartlett) doubtful in its import, but twelve of them true and synthetically connected in the actual life of my father, the incidents about my brother covering twenty years of my father's life and emotional concern. Those regarding him represent an extraordinary combination of incidents and pertinence, and they must try the telepathic theory very severely because they have had, on that supposition, to be selected individually from my memory and woven together into a systematic unity by an original constructive power so as to reproduce adequate evidence of personal identity. Still more astonishing must be the mention of facts pertaining to the alleged transcendental world which could neither be gotten from my mind by telepathy nor verified. This is a strange slip for such an assumed power to be guilty of, considering that it must deceive us as well as be deceived itself! It requires something else than telepathy to play the part of secondary personality and imitate omniscience both in this and the truth of the incidents, especially when the allusions to what is going on in the transcendental world represent truly the characteristics of my father and his proper emotional attitude toward the difference between me and my brother, and his appeal to religious methods of adjusting this difference, precisely as he would do in life. In presenting this unity it is also important to note that the time and thought relations have a direct connection with each other in the life

of my father, while the incidents as mentioned were not so associated in my memory. The direct connection of the talk with the principal of the school about my brother with the idea of a college suggested by my question, remembering that I was not present, and the fact that this talk about my brother occurred soon after sending me to college, are matters that supply much psychological interest to this unity. A similar reference to the same thought at an earlier sitting and in another connection is suggestive (*Cf.* p. 338).

If I had only isolated and simple coincidences to deal with, such as the mere names of the family, or coincidences without synthetic elements in them and connected with proper names, and if I had to fill them up with meaning from my own apperceptions, the argument would be very different. We may tolerate and explain the defects of such incidents, if we have gotten enough to establish our case for spiritism, but it is a different thing to build it up from coincidences that are too slight. Thus, in my first sitting, there is quite a number of pertinent names—Annie, Charles, Mary, Margaret, possibly Lillie for Luella, and Elizabeth for Eliza. But relevant as they may be, especially with the description of who the Mary and Elizabeth were, naming their relation to my father and mother, they cannot be treated as conclusive. Of course the fact that in the whole series of seventeen sittings the right names and relation to me are given of the members of the family, all the living and three of the dead, without any proper fishing or guessing at others, is an evidential consideration. But this treats the matter collectively and not distributively. But in this first sitting there is too much admixture of irrelevant matter to give the correct names any weight, unless there are synthetic elements connected with them. This does not occur until near the close where several correct facts, connected with the illness and death of my brother Charles, are indicated. Only at that point did the facts assume any value. In all the other sittings a name hardly occurs without the indication of some synthetic incident, calculated to identify the person intended, and without the mention of a surname. Some exceptions occur where a mistake is made fixing the wrong name to a given incident (pp. 428, 454). Sometimes this synthetic character involves a whole congeries of facts, as already exemplified. But it is more frequent that some one incident is linked with another or with a name, such as a relationship by which the asserted or suspected identity can be recognised. For instance, I am asked in one case whether I remember my brother Charles. In another I am asked. "How is Frank now?" Lida is given as the name of my sister, James McClellan is called my uncle, and "Uncle Clarke" is said to have married my father's sister. In all these instances the synthetic

element adds immensely to the force of the name, as it equally excludes guessing and brings an incident into the field of evidential value. In many cases there is no difficulty in recognising the person meant by the mere incident given, as it is so specific and peculiar to the individual, connected with it in the memory of the sitter, as to exclude the possibility of illusion. Compare the references to "Nannie" which I have treated as mistakes for Maggie, my stepmother (pp. 69, 342, 365). But wherever this synthesis occurs, and it is an element in nearly every incident to which I have attached any evidential value, it constitutes the natural requisite for proving personal identity, as it duplicates exactly the phenomena by which we establish personal identity in ordinary life, when we have not the physical accidents to help us or to determine our judgment. It is interesting to compare this with the means of identification in the experiments imitating the Piper case (pp. 537-623), where the identification was almost uniformly correct *without* this synthetic element, except as it occurred in the accumulative and collective force of separate incidents. But as a general rule, if not uniformly, incidents leading to identification did not present this synthetic character, so that in the Piper case we have an *a fortiori* argument of great strength for evidential significance. All this is indefinitely reinforced by the increased complexity and constantly synthetic unity of the phenomena passing as spirit messages, as they represent an organising intelligence which has to be assumed, not only in addition to telepathy, but also perfectly in command of all the association and disassociation necessary to reconstruct into a synthetic unity the elements that make up an evidential whole, that is true to reality in all instances except those that are due to the difficulties of communicating and those that are natural lapses of memory. These lapses and mistakes should not occur at all, if that organising power which is external to the brain from which the facts are obtained, and which goes by the name of telepathy, is half so wonderful as it is supposed to be.

Let me take the following instance in which this synthetic unity is very complex and exemplifies not only what has already been illustrated, but also the dramatic play of personality and the personation of two independent memories in the same incident, so that the organisation of the facts into one whole leading to the identity of two persons involves a wonderful selection, past all comprehension on the telepathic supposition. It is the remarkable passage in which my "uncle Clarke" gets somewhat, though not badly, tangled, and is helped out by my father by an incident pertinent to himself and not to my uncle (p. 442). In this incident the following facts are crowded together all in a few sentences: (1) Name of my sister Annie; (2)

statement that she is my sister ; (3) my own name in full ; (4) name of "aunt Lida" ; (5) statement that she is my aunt ; (6) name of my sister Lida ; (7) statement that she is my sister ; (8) statement that she is still living ; (9) mention of my father by himself ; (10) his allusion to the name of my "uncle Clarke" ; (11) statement that Lida was the member of his family whom he had not mentioned. All these are true facts, and I have omitted from this catalogue the two names (Pierce and cousin Annie) which are not correct ; because the name Pierce, though it is evident who is meant (p. 442), is not necessarily a part of the main incident whose unity I am presenting. The name "cousin Annie" is probably a mistake for my "cousin *Nannie*," who was very intimate with my uncle and his family (p. 536). Pierce, however, assuming my interpretation of it, is pertinent, and the mistake of cousin Annie is a perfectly explicable factor in the unity remarked. But the *eleven* independent facts and relations—all correct—make up a synthetic unity which it would seem impossible to parallel by any means except the spiritistic. This is especially true when we see the organising intelligence deliberately endeavouring to draw distinctions between persons not associated together anywhere in my mind except at the sittings, and then inserting the interruption by my father who takes up *in a remarkable relative clause* the allusion to my sister as the one that he had up to this point failed to mention. The allegation that my uncle was confused was not a telepathic acquisition from my mind, because I thought him unusually clear, but the thread of connection between the mention of my sister's name and father's memory of the fact that he had not yet mentioned her, is just the kind of thing that ought to happen if we are dealing with spirits. In this remarkable passage we find two independent personalities kept distinct in spite of the mere relative clause connecting them, and in addition a memory of the accusation I had made, that one member of the family had not been mentioned who is here correctly indicated. The only rational interpretation of such a phenomenon is the spiritistic.

I could go through the whole record in the same way, but it would only multiply illustrations without making the argument any clearer. The reader can work out the application of the principle to other cases for himself after these examples. They will all represent a consistent coherence and true synthesis of facts that might be independent of each other but for their truth and pertinence for identification of the persons who are represented as communicators. The whole organisation of the synthesis is independent of the mind of the sitter, as they are not wholes of his past personal experience in the form in which they are presented as messages, but would have to be selected individually as elements and interwoven into the accurate

true incidents that they are by a power which is infinitely vaster than anything we know in the physiology and psychology of both normal and abnormal phenomena. But they are unities of consciousness perfectly simple on the spirit hypothesis, especially when we observe the natural mistakes that ought not to occur at all with such a power as we may be tempted to assume in order to escape the spiritistic theory.

(2) *The Dramatic Play of Personality.*

By this dramatic play of personality I mean that kind of action and change of content and characteristics which we should legitimately expect and demand either in any change of communicators, or in adjusting the incidences of communication on the "other side," and which occurs naturally in ordinary conversation between two or more persons. It is not easy to define this peculiarity, as it must be indicated only in certain apparent irrelevancies and confusion in the course of a narrative where we note apparent incoherence or an interruption of the messages, and the appearance of another communicator. The drama on the stage represents it, and so will any instance of conversation between two or more persons, but in these normal cases there are the physical accidents that always initiate as well as indicate the change before the psychological peculiarities display themselves. But in the present experiments there are no physical accidents whatever, except that at times movements of the hand or changes in the handwriting may indicate a change of personality or communicator. But very often or generally the indications of it are either the confusion of the present communicator or the nature of the message. We have only the psychological and logical content to exhibit to us this play, and it is represented by statement and conversation partaking often of the nature of intercourse that cannot appear appropriate at all, except as something going on between interlocutors beyond and behind the ordinary stage of activity. That is to say, the whole phenomenon of these communications partakes of the appearance of several distinct personalities acting together for a definite end, and in the progress of their work they meet difficulties and obstacles which give rise to interruptions, explanations, directions and reciprocal conversation with all the marks of distinct and real personalities, instead of the mechanical play of the ordinary secondary personality, as we know it in its various natural and artificial forms.

This argument from the play of personality I consider one of the strongest that can be advanced for the spiritistic theory in so far as it verifies a previously formed hypothesis, and I shall examine it at considerable length on that account. I cannot consider it, however, apart from the unity of consciousness displayed

by the incidents evidencing personal identity, but only as confirming the position taken by that argument. It is not enough that there should be dramatic play of personality without evidence of personal identity. The latter is the primary problem and subordinates dramatic play to itself. The phenomena of secondary personality, though they rarely display such elasticity and simulation of reality as the dramatic play in the Piper phenomena, are yet in some cases too dangerously near it, in the characteristics that should make us cautious, for us to stake the case upon this second argument alone. But in spite of the radical difference between the Piper phenomena and those of secondary personality generally I do not think that we should elevate the argument from dramatic play into the first rank. The criterion for personal identity must be satisfied, primarily, as the condition of any future life for existing beings, and secondarily as the fact that gives added meaning to the dramatic play, while the latter is a consequence which we ought to expect on the supposition that we were dealing with spirits instead of Mrs. Piper's subliminal. I give the argument great weight, much greater in the estimation of the Piper phenomena as a whole than in my own sittings alone. But I do not give it the first importance. It is simply a corollary of the argument from personal identity, as something which we should be entitled to expect in a change from one communicator to another, or in the action that represents anything like an attempt to give unity and purpose to the management of an exceeding complex system of conditions. It is this feature of the communications which, in my mind, plays such havoc with the telepathic hypothesis, while supporting the spiritistic. It complicates telepathy too much with the assumption of omnipotence or omniscience on the part of Mrs. Piper's brain. We have already seen how large that supposition must be made to meet the conditions of acquisition, but when this dramatic play of personality has to be included in the functions of the medium's brain along with telepathy we shall find that we are adding one infinity to another merely to escape a simple hypothesis which only applies the known laws of mind to explain phenomena that bear the character of evidence for personal identity.

In discussing this second argument, or illustrating the dramatic play of personality, it will be best to take the order of the record and watch its development as we proceed. I shall improve the opportunity to call attention on each proper occasion to the incompatibility of the facts with any telepathic theory that is supposedly represented in either experimental thought-transference or spontaneous apparitions and coincidences.

The first feature to be remarked in this dramatic play is the general place of *Imperator* and *Rector* in it. Every sitting is marked

by the action, if only for a time, of one or both these personalities. I do not enter into any speculation as to what they are, as a pre-condition of a spiritistic conclusion, however much we might desire to have the question of their nature determined. Their recognition as anything more than secondary personalities of Mrs. Piper's organism must be determined by the issue of psychical research, as I have no information leading to their identification as they appear in the communications of the present record. If the spiritistic theory be accepted as the most rational account of the phenomena here purporting to represent personal identity, we may well accept Emperor and Rector to be what they claim to be, namely, disembarnate spirits. There is much in my sittings, more independent of them, to suggest their genuinely spiritistic character, and this without insisting upon the evidential incidents that are so necessary in any adequate scientific proof, and that are so apparent in the various individuals who are the communicators to me, and who are trying to establish their identity. This evidence is the distinct, consistent, and intelligent part they play in the whole phenomenon, representing as complete a unity of consciousness for each one of them as the most rigid sceptic could demand of any real person whatsoever. The whole content of their communications, their manner and their character, are out of proportion with anything we know of Mrs. Piper, or of secondary personality generally. But I shall not assume that their personality is exempt from the same evidential considerations that are applied to the other communicators, and so must suspend the issue until the case is made out for the latter, as the main argument must depend upon evidence for identity. Of course, if we assume that Emperor and Rector are the secondary personalities of Mrs. Piper, we have large enough powers of intelligent action assumed to make it all the more difficult to transcend the telepathic hypothesis. Hence if a man choose to reverse the argument, he may wish to say that we should suspend judgment upon the identity of the communicators other than the "controls," until some decisive hypothesis has been reached concerning the latter. That is to say, instead of subordinating the character of Emperor and Rector to the issue of the identity of others, we may have to settle the choice between spirits and secondary personality in their case in order to justify the abandonment of telepathy in favor of spiritism in the case of other communicators. Of course telepathy is out of court in the personality of Emperor and Rector, and in lieu of evidence for their identity we might assume that they are merely secondary personalities with remarkable powers that might include sufficient telepathic capacity to satisfy the problem. But suggestive as this objection and way of putting the matter may be, it is right here that the dramatic play of personality comes in to both corroborate the unity

of consciousness and identity for other communicators and to offer evidence for the spiritistic nature of Emperor and Rector against secondary personality, and in spite of the lack of the evidence for identity in their cases. It is simply the want of evidence for identity in their cases that suggests secondary personality, as in the usual simulation of spiritism. But the slightest study of the communications of Emperor and Rector, especially in matter not yet published, will readily disillusion the observer regarding the right to make this assumption too easily. The phenomena which they have exhibited ever since they supplanted Phinuit are too spiritistically real in their appearance to be dismissed hastily, and when we understand this dramatic play, which it is by no means easy to do without a series of sittings in order personally to see it work we shall quickly discover reasons in its realism to justify its subordination to the identity problem of persons whose identity it is possible to establish. The beginning and close of each sitting will indicate why this assertion can be made and sustained.

Now in order to understand this play of personality rightly we must form a clear conception of what the Piper phenomenon purports to be, and of its *modus operandi*, as described by these chief figures themselves, Emperor and Rector. It must be remembered distinctly that the phenomenon does not represent itself as an *immediate* communication with the discarnate spirit, whose identity is at issue. This was not often the case even in the Phinuit regime, and can be said never to be the case now. This fact is in favour of its claims, as it consists with the whole superficial character of the affair and diminishes the chances for accusing it of deception without making this so archly fiendish as to baffle all hope of finding it either intelligible or finite in its capacities. But whether so or not, it consistently represents itself as only an indirect communication with the spirits whose identity is at issue. Hence it purports to be a coterie or group of discarnate spirits, with Emperor at their head, endeavouring to reveal immortality to man, supervising the conditions, and regulating the rights and occasions of communication between the terrestrial and a transcendental world. One of them, usually Rector, serves as amanuensis in writing the messages purporting to come from the communicating spirit. Sometimes between him and the communicator are one or more intermediaries through whom the message must come before Rector obtains it and writes it for the sitter, just as if several persons were necessary to manage a telephone. Compare the interruptions of G. P. (p. 211). This situation would naturally give rise to the dramatic play of personality and much else besides, especially if the machine used had any tendency to express automatically what was going on among the group in the mutual conversation

and directions that might take place in the management of so complex an affair with its difficulties and misunderstandings. Any change of person or actor, or confusion in the communicator, would reflect itself in characteristics and statements which would represent the distinctive features of varying personality.

This is exactly what we observe in the record. The communications show precisely the differences which we should expect to find when different persons communicate. The personal equation should and does count in the results as distinctly as would be expected. It ought to be apparent how this tells against telepathy, as there is no alteration in the conditions of Mrs. Piper or her powers in such a matter, nor is there any alteration in the data in the memory of the sitter from which the facts are presumably drawn by the telepathic process. But of this again. The main point at present is the distinctive marks of different personalities represented in the various communicators, in the change from one to the other. For instance, the messages from Rector are perfectly regular when no other person is communicating, and no confusion is apparent except as incident to disturbance in the "light," as they usually call the medium, or the conditions for communicating. His communications are almost wholly uninterrupted and free from confusion. This is true on any theory whatsoever. The difference seems to correspond to the differences of real persons in regard to their familiarity perhaps with the conditions of communication. It is marked by a distinctness and freedom from artificiality that never seems to occur in the phenomena of hypnosis and secondary personality generally, especially when the physical accompaniments of such phenomena involving external changes of expression and character so often betray their subjective source, while here in the Piper case there is nothing of this kind. This difference remarked is a suggestive one, and must be carefully studied before rejecting its significance in the interests of spiritism.

There are two special features of this dramatic play that claim attention. They are: (1) The mental and moral characteristics of the different personalities concerned, and (2) the reproduction of those interruptions, apparent incoherences and confusions, and interplay of conversations, remarks, directions, cautions, etc., which would occur under some such conditions as the phenomena purport to represent, namely, situations in a spiritistic world that are exactly similar to those in actual life.

In regard to the first of these features, the difference between Phinuit and the two present "controls," Emperor and Rector, is extreme. Phinuit was in many respects a conceited and vulgar personality; not always so, but often enough to create a dislike toward him. In situations trying to his temper he often displayed that

manner which showed no special refinement such as actually characterises Mrs. Piper, and still less did he comprehend the problem as it presented itself to the sitter, so that he assumed a browbeating temper, scolding like a vixen at times. He was so proud of his powers that he was ready and willing to undertake almost any experiment to show himself off, until he would discredit his own claims by phenomena that exhibited no bearing on his own identity or on that of anybody else. There was absolutely nothing of the religious nature about him. He was a subject quite suitable for purgatorial discipline. He had a sense of humour and was ready to joke and play tricks. It is the very opposite with Emperor and Rector. They are nothing if not religious. Their whole phraseology and style of thought are intensely religious, and represent this characteristic in a very lofty manner. They are, or seem to be, as lacking in the sense of humour as a Puritan, and exhibit a moral and religious seriousness that has no equal outside the church of the most orthodox type. They take their mission far more seriously than Phinuit, appreciate its importance morally and religiously very much better than he did or could, and exhibit no disposition to show off in remarkable performances. They never condescend to wit or satire, but are as solemn as undertakers. Yet it is not an artificial solemnity, but one characterised by a keen and profound conception of the moral seriousness of life and its meaning. Emperor's temper represents, in its philanthropic sympathy for man, as nearly as anything I know, the character and purposes of Jesus Christ. The main evidence of this last statement is in records not yet published. There is not a trace of this in Phinuit. Besides, Emperor is dignified and imperious. His name describes his character exactly. He insists rigidly, as generally justified by results, upon conformity with his orders, but his disposition to charity, in spite of this, for the weaknesses and shortcomings of man is commensurate with the infinite pathos of human life. In this Rector follows him, but in the most obsequious obedience and deference. They address the sitter in the scriptural second person. Phinuit never did so. Their contrast with G. P. is just as marked, without in any way identifying him with Phinuit. G. P. is a secular type, a jolly man of the world, intellectually dignified and refined, but nothing of Puritanic piety and cant in him. I do not use these terms in any bad sense, but only to indicate that he does not expose himself to the criticism of the sceptic who does not like religious phrases. He is not above a "By Jove," or "confound it," which you would suppose might shock the sensibilities of Emperor and Rector who freely affiliate with him. There is not a trace of the solemn and unctuous seriousness about him, but he is a thoroughly companionable clubman, thoroughly human, as Phinuit was in an entirely

different way. He has the intellectual refinement of Imperator and Rector without their piety and unction, and all the humour without any of the vulgarity of Phinuit. He stands midway in character, as he does in history, between Phinuit and Imperator with Rector. But whatever we may think of these personalities they are in all their distinctness and reality just what makes the individuality of different persons in real life, and the parts they play are carried out with the same invariable consistency and pertinence to their claims that we observe among living men in the everyday affairs of actual thought and conduct. These are not telepathic phenomena. They do not in the least represent acquisitions from the minds of the sitters, but are the characteristics of independent intelligences, and far more conceivable on that hypothesis than on any other, as the farther development of the argument will show.

I leave these traits just described to be studied in the record by the reader and without further comment. But I wish to emphasise the fact that only those who have made themselves familiar in some way with the Piper phenomena, and who have very closely investigated the internal connections and disconnections of the communications, representative of these mental and moral distinctions of personality, can appreciate the second aspect of this dramatic play, upon which I intend to concentrate the most of my attention. I simply suspend judgment on any conclusion that may be considered from the point of view represented by the personal characteristics of the parties just described, and turn attention upon the facts in the record that both illustrate their peculiarities in it, and indicate a play of personality involving far more than their individualities and complicated with those of other communicators. This greatly enriches the argument.

This aspect of dramatic play is particularly noticeable and interesting in my first sitting (pp. 184-190). I shall examine this feature of the case very fully in this sitting, because it is the one instance of general confusion which would have led me to discredit the spiritistic nature of the phenomena, had I stopped short at that sitting, in which I did not discover the dramatic play until later sittings threw their light upon it. I was not familiar enough with the *modus operandi* of the case to understand the nature and importance of this characteristic, in spite of the care bestowed in three readings of Dr. Hodgson's Report (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII.). But as later sittings enabled me to understand this dramatic play, it came into more special notice and prominence in this sitting, and must receive that careful examination which will show both the internal unity of this sitting with all others and the dramatic exhibition that suggests its spiritistic character without the evidential pertinence of its incidents which is weak. It is all the more interesting to

remark this play in the first sitting, because I had to reject it as worthless evidentially at the time. There was nothing in the whole sitting, except some of the statements of my brother Charles near the close, that I felt could possess any claims to being either telepathic or spiritistic. I afterwards learned that some names and statements were pertinent that I had rejected. But within my knowledge at the time and without the light of later experiments I had to treat the sitting very much as Dr. Weir Mitchell, Professor Peirce, and Professor Norton were disposed to treat their single experiments (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 460-462, 482-3, 525-6), except that the sitting effectually excluded illusion and suggestion from the explanation of the phenomena, and I had gone especially to test these hypotheses. But it did not impress me as doing more than this. It appeared only as a mass of confusion that had no other intelligible feature in it than an attempt to find out who I was and to determine who should be the communicators, as was quite natural under the conditions. But these very facts enhance the interest that attaches to the study of the dramatic play in it.

It will be important to remark by way of introduction that this dramatic play of personality takes two different forms of a general character. One is a dramatic adjustment to various situations in the connections between a terrestrial and a supposed transcendental world, and the other is a dramatic *interplay* between the personalities in this transcendental world. Both may have distinct aspects, an evidential and a non-evidential. The non-evidential consists in the play that produces statements and incidents which are conceivably explicable by secondary personality. The evidential play consists in those instances which reflect both the separateness of independent personalities and the transmission of data not referable to the experience either of Mrs. Piper or the alleged personality intermediating the communication. The latter is the more important and might well claim an independent value. The former, however, may have no other value than external consistency with the main hypothesis, confirming what we should logically infer from it.

But there must be no misunderstanding the importance which I attach to this discussion of dramatic play. Though distinguishing between the evidential and non-evidential aspects of it, I shall not claim for any of it an independent value for the spiritistic theory, but use the phenomenon only as a verification of an hypothesis suggested on other grounds. In every form it is extremely useful for determining the limitations of telepathy as this is known or supposed experimentally, and hence for that purpose I need not distinguish nicely between the evidential and the non-evidential illustrations of the process. Not to encumber myself, however, with the difficulties of

making out an independent evidential case on the ground of dramatic play, I am willing for argument's sake to accord it no other importance than the confirmation of the hypothesis necessary to account for the evidence of personal identity. Hence the only vantage ground that I reserve for myself is the objective *facts* in the lives of the communicators, leaving a margin for individual opinion in regard to this dramatic play, in those who have not had the personal experience of a series of sittings and the study of the data which such experiments elicit. I am confident, however, that the dramatic play will be appreciated at a high value by all who take the pains to understand it in its details, even though they are not tempted with the conviction that the spiritistic theory is the correct one. My object, not being one to proselytise or to convince others that spiritism is necessarily true, is attained if I can only secure the admission that this hypothesis is to be reckoned with in the problem instead of ridiculed without consideration. I can well afford, therefore, to make a chivalrous concession of the argument from dramatic play to those who are so infected with the generalities of secondary personality that they will not take the pains to distinguish the differences. Hence it is with this concessive mood in view that I examine so carefully the least evidential sitting in the record, partly in deference to the condemnation which I had to pronounce upon it evidentially and partly as a reproach to those who were so ready to indulge in negative opinions after but a single sitting and who would not admit the *a priori* difficulties which are patent on the face of the problem. The evidential illustrations of it outside the first sitting will be so much gain for the spiritistic hypothesis, though I need not accord them more than the function of realising what we must expect of the supposition advanced to account for personal identity.

The usual preliminaries which characterise the Emperor *régime* are conducted, as generally, by Rector in this first sitting. The record will indicate this clearly. The first incident of interest is the remark of Rector that G. P. is coming. Then between sentences that represent some of G. P.'s thoughts and some of Rector's, there is a statement that he will leave G. P. to answer questions, that is to do the writing in the communications. Then G. P. immediately "steps in" and addresses Dr. Hodgson in the usual way after Rector bids us "good-bye," having said that he must give his attention to another "light" present (a remark whose significance was not explained and that is not intelligible to me). The change of personality is marked by two features. There is first the change from the scriptural to the ordinary use of the personal pronoun, Rector using the former and G. P. the latter. Second, there is the entirely unconventional, free

and easy manner of G. P.'s mode of address, which is an invariable index of his personality. It is the use of the pronoun that enables us to distinguish in the messages of Rector, after saying that G. P. was coming, the influence of Rector's thoughts on the communications. But it is Rector still that dominates and actually explains the purpose of G. P.'s presence. But whether we choose to attach any value to this or not, it is clear that the personality is changed when Rector abandons the "machine" and leaves the writing to G. P. This G. P. now carries on a conversation with Dr. Hodgson after making a reference to a desire to see who has come to greet him, meaning evidently myself, and goes on to speak of things about his brother. This has no relevancy to me, and bears no characteristic of telepathy from any one, certainly not from me. The whole passage was absolutely unintelligible to me, but was clear to Dr. Hodgson, though it represents no intelligible telepathic content. This aside, however, as we may assume that it is really telepathic, yet it is absurd on the part of the telepathic subject to go at any other task than the one for which this sitting was arranged. Why direct its energies to Dr. Hodgson when it knew, or ought to have known, that I was the person to deal with, a fact that is acknowledged in the curiosity to see who had come to greet him? All that followed, relevant to Dr. Hodgson, is a piece of nonsense, supposing that the telepathic subject or percipient has any discriminative power at all. The telepathic percipient is there by supposition to deal with me and not with Dr. Hodgson, and if it is the victim of mechanical methods of procedure why does this characteristic not appear constantly instead of the intelligent adaptation to a situation that betrays just what we should expect on the spiritistic hypothesis. The scene is realistic and expressive of a supersensible situation and independent intelligence carrying on processes wholly distinct from the attempt to acquire facts from the sitter.

This play is deepened in the immediate order for Dr. Hodgson to leave the room for a minute. The representation is that there is a lady who wishes to speak with him, and on his leaving the attention is directed to me.

Now on any telepathic hypothesis, involving the assumption that Dr. Hodgson was a disturbing influence, his departure ought to have been followed by clearer communications and access to my memories. But this was not the case! The messages at once became exceedingly confused, contrasting with what they had been up to this point.

Much of the confusion was due to the necessity of repeating the written words because I was not familiar with the automatic script. But this is appreciated from the outset, either as if the supposed telepathy was not hindered by my being a stranger, which contradicts with the confusion, or as if the situation was as real as it is represented.

When Dr. Hodgson returns the conversation which goes on with him is perfectly intelligent, and so is the attempt to meet the difficulties under which I must decipher the writing. Finally, in reply to an appeal by Dr. Hodgson for his remaining, G. P. yields with reluctance and only after the explanation that the difficulty occasioned by Dr. Hodgson's presence is due to the attendance of the latter's friends. But G. P. says that he can prevent confusion only on condition that he be able to keep away these friends.

A long series of communications follows with a number of pertinent names and suggestive indications of relationship, though in spite of Dr. Hodgson's absence they are confused almost beyond tolerance. But Dr. Hodgson returns just before my brother disappears, and then occurs a most interesting statement by G. P., who stopped writing messages from my friends and explained that the confusion was due to the presence of three persons who were all trying to speak to me at once, and a lady is allowed to have her trial after G. P. grants Dr. Hodgson's request to remain. This lady claims to be my mother, and in spite of Dr. Hodgson's presence, which is presumably disturbing, she delivers a series of communications that are as false and irrelevant to both of us as they are clear. They were perfectly free from confusion and without hesitancy in proper names. I repudiated the pertinence of her statements, but it did not alter her assurance that she was right and that I was her son. This is telepathy! I reject it a second time, and am met with the same persistence. I do it a third time and G. P. expresses his ignorance entirely, indicating that he is merely telling me what he hears, this not being from my mind at all! Now, if Dr. Hodgson's presence is disturbing, how is it that other minds in the world are not disturbing when the telepathy is at a distance?

The explanatory interruption in response to Dr. Hodgson's question involves a reference to me in the third person, as the communicator's friend, and is followed by a statement directed to Dr. Hodgson in the second person, all explaining the difficulties of the situation which was understood by neither of us until the issue made it clear. But G. P.'s appreciation of the case on my side, and the difficulties with which he had to contend on his side, is a most interesting feature of it at this point, as it recognises the desire that I shall "hear" him, assuming that I shall have my difficulty with the reading when the fact is that I cannot understand the messages, while he apologises for the confusion by telling Dr. Hodgson that he cannot "half hear" when he is present. He begs him to retire, and then explains to me the reason for his confusion, this being the simultaneous talking of two spirits, one of them representing what is in my mind and the other not!! This is then followed by

an appeal to the communicator, apparently, to come and listen and a message is begun which is suddenly interrupted with the remark addressed to some one on the other side to help him keep the communicator's thought clear. This is neither taken from my mind nor directed to me, the whole process being absurd and unnecessary on the telepathic, and quite possible or probable on the spiritistic.

But the passage beginning with the explanation to Dr. Hodgson is an interlocution in which A., speaking to B. about C., speaks correctly of D. as B.'s friend, while explaining his own ignorance as to its being an assured fact, giving this as a reason for allowing the confusion to go on until D. can be the judge of what is correct. Immediately he asks D. in the proper grammatical form to listen to him while he also asks C. to retire for a reason that is plausible on the supposition that some one is present who should be excluded, but which is not so on any other assumption. This is the play of an individual mind in a situation such as the present is described to be. The mental synthesis is neither Dr. Hodgson's nor mine, so that if we are to give any unity to the whole affair nothing is more evident than the insufficiency of telepathy to account for it. But passing this by as uncertain, it is sufficient to remark that this independent interruption of the communication, the evident intelligence of it, and the peculiar logical unity and characteristic fitness of it to the situation, are consistent and suggestive of spirit action, and are so much so, that it will require the most extraordinary supposition of secondary personality to supplant it. The interplay and adjustment to an exceedingly complex situation that follows, and that is wholly superfluous on the telepathic access, which has already shown its admission to the desired reservoir, is past all praise for pertinent appearance of the spiritistic. The dismissal of Dr. Hodgson, consistent with the whole history of the Piper case, the explanation of the confusion that is consistent with the ignorance of my identity and with the confusion immediately preceding, and the disappearance of the lady after my insistence that she was an intruder, to be immediately followed by that remarkable suggestion to the communicator claiming to be my brother that he come closer to listen, and then, as if the greater proximity to material conditions effected an unconscious state, to be prodded and kept clear (*Cf. Experiments in Hypnosis*, p. 635), are all a part of a complex whole that is apparently incomprehensible on any other supposition than that it is real. This is no freak of telepathy, as the data necessary to make that explanation relevant are wholly wanting. There is nothing representing such a situation in our minds. We may resort to secondary personality and its fabrications, as all scientific minds should do if phenomena indicative of personal identity were not present, but assuming that the business of the medium's subliminal in these

experiments is telepathic, this acting is absolutely superfluous and only complicates what might be kept simple, except as spiritistic realism determines complications which are not of the medium's own making.

From the point at which I indicate that the lady claiming to be my mother is an intruder, to the close of the sitting, there is no interruption that is not intelligible on the natural interpretation of the case, but the communications proceed, such as they are, with desirable smoothness and unity, except that it requires the light of later sittings to discover this unity and exclusion of foreign intrusion. But in the effort to get this condition and to secure the right communicators, the dramatic play of personality coincides with just such a situation as my precautions must create on the spiritistic theory. In this situation we should most naturally expect confusion and interference until something could be ascertained, in some way, regarding my identity, and the legitimate reason obtained for shutting out all impertinent communicators. From the telepathic hypothesis the play gets neither unity nor rationality in its confusion. We should have to combine with that theory a number of others quite as large and quite as wanting in evidential support in order even to obtain a proximate explanation. The spontaneous diversions and apparent incoherences are a part of an intolerable confusion on the telepathic theory, but of consistent and intelligible unity on the spiritistic, representing it, as it must be, in the form of communication under difficulties.

The close of the sitting was marked by an incident of some interest in this very connection. Dr. Hodgson remarked that we should have to go, saying this to G. P., and he replies: "Wait until I get [Imperator] to take this young man away." I then arose from my chair and walked past Mrs. Piper to the other side of the room, when the hand wrote: "He walked right in front of him. Why does he do this?" This was followed by a few more communications from my brother, which were suddenly interrupted by G. P.'s remarks to Dr. Hodgson that he hoped to "get the lady clear again." All the rest explains itself. But this play is not that of telepathy, as I did not know or think I was walking in front of a "spirit!" I might very well be asked by the secondary personality why I had walked as I did. But if we attributed to telepathy the knowledge of my walking as I did, two insuperable objections arise to this supposition. First, this quick access to my consciousness is in flat contradiction with the whole sitting and its dramatic play, which are represented as conditions involving great difficulties, and the confusion supports this beyond question. Second, the statement that I walked in front of a spirit was not of a fact in my mind. Then, again, why, if telepathy is the process, does G. P. "hope to get the lady clear again"? If he refers to the lady who *claimed* to be my mother and was not this,

not only have I shut her out definitely and thus precluded all excuse for considering her again, except on the supposition that, as a spirit, G. P. imagines the difficulty to be in a lack of clearness; but also telepathy, after having gotten the pertinent names for communicators, ought to be able to tell that the names which have no application to me are irrelevant, especially after I have repudiated them! There is therefore an internal contradiction in the telepathic hypothesis at this point. It has the power to get the right names and incidents and none to distinguish and to prevent the giving of false ones, though this weakness is not specially discernible in later sittings! It knows enough to be right, but insists on doing the wrong which it does not know enough to prevent! On the other hand, if he refers to my real mother, all the facts were clear enough in my memory and active consciousness at the time to remove all excuses about her not being clear.

My notes call attention (p. 362) to another feature of this dramatic play in which the communicators are the actors rather than the trance personalities in connection with them. I shall not examine it at length at present, as the notes ought to suffice. But I shall allude to one or two accidents of it. The main feature of it is the fact that I had supposed there was absolutely no trace of my father in it, nor of anyone else in the family except my brother and sister. But the incidents of later sittings show with tolerable distinctness the probability that both my father and my uncle are communicators in this sitting, though they were too confused for me to discover or suspect it at the time. One of the facts, too, represents an automatism on the part of my father which was not an intended message at all, but just the remark, absolutely unknown to me as a habit of his in life, that he would make on the sudden discovery that he had to go out of doors on some errand. The remark was: "Give me my hat" (p. 307.) As the various communicators discovered that the sitter was an interested relative, the play of effort to reach me would naturally show just the tendency to dismiss the lady falsely claiming to be my mother, and to test the qualifications of those who agreed on my identity to take her place. The confusion then that prevents me from suspecting any other communicators than those who succeed in giving their names is just what would occur in the process of determining who should be allowed to monopolise the "machine." My ignorance of the incident about the hat, and the pertinence of other indefinite incidents, all subject even to the hypothesis of guessing, and the transition from person to person without intimation to me, taken with my unfamiliarity with the whole affair, writing and all, prevented my suspecting a unity which later events enable me to give to the sitting very distinctly. The play is, then, that of several relatives talking all at once into a "telephone"

which they have suddenly discovered leads to their friends, and it is allowed to go on until the parties who are managing the "machine" ascertain who has the ear of the receiver. This becomes measurably clear before the sitting closes, and the second sitting opens with a perfectly distinct exclusion of all communicators whatsoever but my father until the proper interval justifies the admission of another relative. The action is exactly as if the trance personalities had discovered my identity and the right of the communicators to speak, and then shut out disturbing agencies, and with them the confusion that so marks this first sitting and that prevented my suspecting the identity of more than my brother and sister. But there is nothing to suggest telepathy in the development of this dramatic play, as its whole procedure indicates limitations in the trance personalities that ought not to exist on the telepathic hypothesis with its supposed large powers, to say nothing of two true incidents that I did not know, namely, "Give me my hat," and the name of my father's sister Mary.

In the first sitting we have found that the whole dramatic play assumes the character of an attempt to find out who I am and who shall be permitted to communicate. Now in spite of the doubt in G. P.'s mind at the close of the sitting regarding the lady whom he hopes to keep clear, the opening and continuance of the second and all later sittings presents the appearance of the trance personalities' having decided, in the time elapsing between the first and second sitting, who I was and who should communicate. The peculiar dramatic play of the first sitting, therefore, is abandoned and the communications of the second are opened at once with the appearance of assurance that they had found the right communicator, and all intruders are shut out. Whether the facts are as I have represented them on the "other side" is not the question. That must always be a matter of conjecture. But the differences between the dramatic play of the two sittings can be described in no other language, if they are to be understood in their apparent character at least. Accepting, therefore, the representation that the trance personalities have in the meantime assured themselves of my identity and secured a reason for suspending further experiments in that direction, we can easily understand the change of dramatic play which is exhibited in this second and all later sittings, and the assurance with which this second sitting starts out in the recognition of the right communicator. The assumptions which we have to make regarding the dramatic play in this situation are only the difficulties of the communication itself, and we find that the results conform to this conception of the case. But the dramatic play of the first sitting changes its character in the later sittings according to this

very idea of the situation. It now takes the form of a change of communicators with only such a part in it of the trance personalities as either the change and intervals may indicate, or as the conditions of communication necessitating a change may prompt or render opportune.

It appears that communicators cannot long stand contact with material conditions, and must retire from the "machine" for a respite, to use the language of the sittings, which can be done on any theory. In the interval of this change from one communicator to another a sentence is often thrown in that is wholly irrelevant to the message, whether this sentence comes from the communicator or from the amanuensis. This may even be true of interruptions in the communications from the same personality. This characteristic often determines both the confusion and the dramatic play, and unless we perceive this fact we shall lose a large part of the significance of the Piper phenomena as a whole.

The first part of the dramatic play in the second sitting occurs between the trance personalities after the usual greetings, and is indicated in statements that inform the sitter of the coming communicator. There is the representation of excitement in the hand of the medium, and the written order for calm. The answer, "Yes, I will," by the communicator is not a message to me, but an automatism of the "machine" indicating an interlocution going on with the parties in the transcendental world. Immediately the communications begin, and are interrupted only by language that first indicates disturbance, namely, "I want my head clear. I am choking," and then the statement, "I am going; will come back soon." Without any other intimation the communicator changes from my father to my brother, as both name and content indicate. The language that follows shows that a slight altercation takes place between my brother and some one who appears to treat him as an intruder (p. 314). He rather passionately appeals for permission to speak and gives a reason for it, which evidently convinces "the powers that be," for they allow him to communicate. In the midst of this Rector suddenly intronits the statement, after a little delay, "Listen, friend, have patience with me," and then, as if in explanation to me or Dr. Hodgson, "Imperator is here, and we will keep them quite calm." From my standpoint there is no excuse for any of these diversions from the communications. There is no apparent reason for the altercation with my brother in the telepathic theory of the case. He had been a welcome communicator the day before, and telepathy, by supposition, had admitted him as a possible communicator. Why not proceed with him to-day as before? Nor is there any trace of disturbance that makes it apparent that Rector's remark just quoted is called for. Both passages represent a situation

wholly outside the mind of the sitter and without excuse from telepathy. One can imagine that the altercation was in favour of my "uncle Charles," especially as my brother and my uncle here pass under the same name. The ready submission of the objector to my brother rather indicates the discovery of a mistake. This, of course, is purely speculative, but I indulge this mood for the moment to make intelligible what cannot be understood from the standpoint of either telepathy or secondary personality. Its whole character imitates some intelligent purpose so obtrusively that it must get the credit of this idea on any theory whatsoever, and we can appreciate it only by representing the process as one beyond the mind of the sitter and imitative, at least, of a reality which is certainly expressible in spiritistic terms.

This dramatic play takes on a realistic character of another kind in the messages which follow. My notes show that I have had some difficulty in deciding whether all of them come from one communicator, my uncle, or a part of them, the first part, from my father. The fact that indicates the difficulty is the confusion occurring at one point in the passage which is pertinent to my uncle in all but one statement. After the indication of his inability to remain longer in the words, "Mother, mother, going," etc., my father appears and attempts to continue communications regarding this uncle, though indicating that it is he, and not my uncle, that is doing it. There is a distinct and natural allusion to the statement a little earlier that he would be back soon. The interesting part of the communication is the fact that between the two there seems to be a concerted effort to indicate the presence and identity of my uncle who had died so recently. Both show the same natural solicitude for the comfort of my aunt, the wife of this uncle and sister of my father, her Christian name being correctly given. But this allusion of father to the uncle contains a train of thought not at all characteristic of the uncle and soon reverts to affairs not related to my uncle at all. It starts out, however, with the intelligent recognition of what was clearly enough indicated by the content of my uncle's message, though this uncle did not attempt his own name.

Now the death of my uncle was such as to give the content of his communications some interest. He was injured by an accident on the railway, and died a few hours afterwards. I learned accidentally that the allusion to my aunt's discouragement and despair had more specific importance than usual. I treated it at the time as indicating the natural sorrow that attends such a bereavement, but did not know or suspect that this grief was so near a dangerous result to herself. Hence the interest shown by both communicators in trying to assuage sorrow was especially natural under the circumstances and shows

some indications of the recognition that there were special reasons for speaking of my uncle. On the telepathic hypothesis there is no reason for my father to speak in this way of the matter, as there was nothing specific in my memory associated with the death of this uncle. The change of communicator usually results in a change of matter in the messages pertinent to the identity of the communicator from the standpoint of the sitter. But here the natural sympathy of the communicator with his sister in her sorrow suggests an independent intelligence. That is to say, we have a dramatic play in this case representing two personalities dealing with the same content with just the modification that suits their personal relations to the case, while my father makes the right suggestion in speaking of his sisters as "the girls," and in this plural recognises the misfortune which his other sister, Nannie, had met just a month earlier in the loss of her husband almost as suddenly as the sister Eliza referred to in the communications. The dramatic play has thus a psychological unity in diversity corresponding to the situation itself, and not correlated with any memories that are associated in my mind.

This dramatic play occurs in a still more interesting form when this uncle appears the second time (p. 317). The message began :

"What can I do to make Eliza feel that I am not dead? (S.: Tell us who are with you, and that will help Eliza.) Yes, all, you shall know each one in her. You are not Robertson [?] are you? (R. H. : Is *that* Robertson?) You are not George are you? (S : No, I am not George.) (R. H. : I am not. . .) No, James, I know you very well, but this other one. . . did you know the boys. . . do you know me?"

At the time I took the "Robertson" to be a mistake for my brother Robert. But the last sentence of the passage indicated clearly that the mention of my aunt was by my uncle, and that "Robertson" was a reference to father, to know if I was "Robert's son." My father's name was Robert and my uncle always called him this. (*Cf.* reference to "Robertson" in the first sitting p. 310). The question, then, "You are not Robertson (Robert's son) are you?" and "You are not George, are you?" George being the name of my oldest brother, reveal the communicator's discovery that Dr. Hodgson is a stranger. My reply shows that I supposed the question expressed a doubt about myself and not as directed to Dr. Hodgson. The response then that followed my statement and that of Dr. Hodgson, "No, James, I know you, but this other one. . . did he know the boys? . . do you know me?" becomes wonderfully pertinent and significant. My uncle never knew or heard of Dr. Hodgson and it would be natural enough for him to wonder whether my brother George happened to be with me, though telepathy ought to have corrected any such impression. Nor did Dr. Hodgson know

anything of my uncle. The death of this uncle had also been concealed from Dr. Hodgson. The whole situation, therefore, was a perfectly natural one, and the dramatic play has all the verisimilitude of reality in it.

The absurdity of telepathy in this case ought to be apparent at a glance. After twelve years' work and acquaintance with Dr. Hodgson Mrs. Piper's subliminal does not know him, but queries whether he is not my brother George! And this in spite of the fact that he is constantly recognised by Rector and G. P., and is known by Mrs. Piper's supraliminal! Moreover, telepathy with its supposed capacities for discrimination in my memory ought never to make such a mistake, but should know at once that Dr. Hodgson was not my brother. His name should have been gotten from my memory as readily as that of my brother and his relation to me. But instead of this we have that play of real persons and display of ignorance which is absurd on the telepathic theory. Nor will it do to say that its powers united with secondary personality were great enough to discover the facts and merely to simulate this ignorance, as the same power should discover the danger to which it is exposed in such an attempt at deception. The telepathic infinity in this case runs into the finite and leaves itself without any defence, as it becomes a tissue of contradictions. Notice the inter-lucations in the use of the pronoun "you." The only natural and rational interpretation is the spiritistic theory, which has absolutely no contradictions in it, but represents both the natural unity and consistency of the phenomena, as well as an explanation in terms of the known laws of consciousness.

This remarkable passage is followed by some clear communications from my father which terminate in a lapse into unconsciousness and a confusion such as tend to follow any period of sustained communication. This is indicated by the reference to the trance personalities and by the expressed desire for me to wait until he returns. The language is: "In a short time they tell me I will be able to recall everything . . . recall everything I ever did. . . You could be . . . my . . . does not . . . I will have to go for a moment, wait for me." Then at his disappearance Rector takes up the time communicating in regard to a little girl for the purpose of finding her mother (p. 319). The incident has absolutely no reference to me, and does not even pretend to have it. This claim would have been no more inconsistent and irrelevant than the attempt in the first sitting to connect a lady with me who had no relation to me at all. There might even have been some excuse for palming off a little girl on me, as my sister was a little girl when she died and her existence was a matter of memory. The incident, therefore, whether true or false, is not telepathic, either from my standpoint or from that of the trance

personality. It is precisely what should take place on the spiritistic theory, the play of personality being perfectly natural at this juncture. It is all the more interesting in connection with my father's admonition to wait for him, as if the communicator feared that I might not wait while he went away "to recover his breath," so to speak. The assumption that I might not remain is a natural one when we consider the uniform difference between the conception of time as felt by communicators and that which the sitter knows. The reasons for this are only open to conjecture and cannot be made any part of the explanation of the phenomena. But the illusion on the part of communicator regarding my situation and freedom from the difficulties that he experiences in attempting to communicate is inexcusable on the telepathic hypothesis. That capacity should know its own conditions and my exemption from perturbing circumstances, and be as careful to be right as it is in the incidents by which it reproduces personal identity. A discarnate spirit, unfamiliar as my father was with experiments of this kind, or merely conscious that the difficulties in communication existed on our side, though not tending to produce anything like asphyxiation, might very well suppose, especially under syncope of any form, that I might not wait for his return. But there is no excuse for telepathy to palm off on me conditions and expectations that it should know very well were not true.

The third sitting contains few instances of this dramatic play which the reader cannot study sufficiently and intelligently for himself. But two of them are interesting enough for remark.

The first of these is connected with my question to know the trouble when my father passed out (p. 327). I had in mind the securing of information in regard to the nature of the disease from which father *thought* he suffered. He had thought it catarrh, and we knew it was probably cancer of the larynx. But the point of interest here is the interpretation put on my question, which is adverse to what was in my mind, and the peculiar emotional appreciation indicated when I explained my use of the word "trouble." He naturally enough, but in contradiction with telepathy of any sort, supposed that "trouble" referred to some personal differences between us, and correctly indicated his doubt about the existence of any such difficulties. Then on my correction of the interpretation, there was a second contradiction with telepathy in his assumption that I was asking for the events that occurred in the moments of death, when I said that I meant "sickness," though his interpretation was again the proper one when we consider the rational meaning of the temporal clause in my question. Then, with this understanding of my desire, the attempt to narrate the incidents of that supreme moment is accompanied by a most interesting interlocution between my father and Rector with interjected remarks

to me also by Rector explanatory of actions on the "other side," of which I could have no knowledge. First, Rector explains that father has taken off the condition which he is trying to describe, apparently asks me a question as to "what was meant by his eyes," and then says to the communicator "speak plainly." The confusion that follows is indicated by Rector's farther explanation of the situation and then a statement of what the communicator's action is, saying: "He places his hand over his . . . heart . . . beat," then by Rector's reaching to touch Dr. Hodgson, as if in that way he could aid the communicator, who now goes on with some clearness for a time, when he disappears again, and Rector takes up the incident of the little girl mentioned in the previous sitting (p. 330) just as the change takes place to my brother as a communicator, and Rector forewarns me of the fact. The inapplicability of telepathy to all this ought to be self-evident from the statement of the facts, as it is the play of an independent intelligence and memory relating to events already on record in the previous sitting and pertinent to Dr. Hodgson, though not matter of knowledge to him, and the reference immediately changes to me in the announcement of my brother. The realism of this is apparent.

The next illustration of this play is in connection with a phenomenon which resembles ordinary automatism, and with a recognition of the trance personality of some disturbance in the process of communication. Immediately following a perfectly clear message from my father, and wholly irrelevant to it, was written out the question: "Do you hear her sing?" (p. 332). This was repeated in response to a statement by Dr. Hodgson, "No, the words are not clear, Rector." Then Rector said, after Dr. Hodgson's "No" to the repeated question: "Friend, there is something and we will be obliged to ask thee to move." I changed my position, and was at once asked to return. I had alluded to my sister Annie a few minutes before and I took the reference to singing to be to her. But whether correct or not, the matter of interest is Rector's discovery of the incoherence and irrelevancy of the message, which was not conceived by me as necessarily such, as I knew the frequent and sudden changes in the communications and the equally frequent allusions to events, intelligible or unintelligible, on the "other side." I recognised the irrelevancy of the question to the import of the previous message, but was not confused as to its possible meaning in reference to the previous allusion to my sister. Hence there is no excuse on the telepathic hypothesis for this procedure, and similar incoherences on other occasions did not prompt any such interruptions on the part of the trance personality. We can admit telepathy only on the supposition that it discovers my recognition of the confusion in

connection with father's message. But this would prove too much, for the reason that there is not a single other interference like this when I was far more confused as to the meaning of the message than I was at this time, while the statement of Rector suggests that there was a disturbance in the "machine" (*Cf.* p. 332). Moreover, telepathy would involve the supposition that there was an influence upon the communications from my supraliminal states for which there is not one iota of evidence in this record, nor in any study and watching for this effect which I made purposely throughout the sittings. We may explain this automatism as we please, but it is not telepathic, though any secondary personality that we may suppose could have successfully interpreted the question as referring to actual singing on the part of my sister, as often illustrated in pseudo-spiritism, instead of deliberately indicating by its treatment of the incident that it was nothing of the kind, but mere disturbance in the "machine."

In the last of the first series of sittings the first noticeable feature of this dramatic play is the unusual appearance of Imperator and his statement of the reason for preceding Rector. The necessity for restoring the "light," as the medium is called, is a queer trick to be played by a telepathic subject or percipient! But immediately Rector takes Imperator's place and the communications begin (p. 335). After a few messages, Rector says, as if directing a person where to stand, "Speak clearly, sir. Come over here." The communicator answers, "Yes," as if indicating the intention to obey, and then accosts Dr. Hodgson with the question: "Are you with James?" On Dr. Hodgson's affirmative reply, my father responds with an evident and intelligent allusion to the understanding that he was to communicate with Dr. Hodgson in my absence. He said: "Well, will you help me to return later if I wish to return? If so, I will try and free my mind now." On Dr. Hodgson's favourable answer, he went on: "Well, I will not feel troubled then, because I have no further talk with him now," etc. The appreciation of the situation is perfect here. It represents the consciousness of the fact that this is the last chance, for the present at least, of a personal interview, and his satisfaction with the promise to continue the attempt to prove his identity. This and the direction of Rector where to stand are realism and are not telepathic, no matter how we endeavour to explain them.

The messages then continue smoothly for a moment when the strange colloquy takes place, explaining that the communicator speaks too fast, and indicating also that my father had said all he wished. Rector says in the midst of a communication: "He speaks too rapidly, fearing he may forget something," and there follows the broken sentence, ". . . had said all I wished," as if indicating to Rector the latter's misunderstanding of the situation, while in fact

showing his consciousness of some disturbance and failure to appreciate the situation as Rector explained it to us. This is a perfectly intelligible situation, exhibiting all the independent intelligence that any one can imagine and without a trace of excuse from telepathy.

The next piece of dramatic playing is found in the communication I made to my father (p. 339). I had kept him sending messages to me without reciprocating, as I was avoiding every form of suggestion. But I here resolved to reveal myself, and at the same time try to elicit some evidences of his identity as connected with his religious life. I wrote out a long passage to be read to the hand and in it explained why I had not asked many questions. But before reading it, Dr. Hodgson explained to Rector what I wished to do. Rector wrote out in response that the letter would have to be repeated for the reason that my father could get the statements only in fragments. This was understood, and I began when the permission was given. The passage in which I stated the reason for this work and summarised our long correspondence, after my apostasy from orthodoxy, was designed to call out some evidence of his identity in the direction that was the most important aspect of his life. His reply to the first part of the communication was correctly appreciative and representative of an actual fact in our conversation on this subject. But when I had read the passage alluding to what I had always told him, Rector, catching the spirit of it, at once stopped listening and wrote, "Perfectly. Yes. That is surely James." The dramatic feature of this can be understood only in connection with four facts. (1) The appreciation of the sentiment by Rector; (2) The recollection of what Rector said about the necessity of repeating the communication; (3) The fact that the reply of father is made to Rector and not to me, indicating that he understood it and recognised in it exactly what he knew of me in our correspondence; (4) The implied uncertainty as to my identity until the present moment, which ought not to have occurred on the hypothesis of telepathy. The representation is that of a scene on the "other side," and not of events acquired from my memory. Rector's action is that of an intelligence that fears, after reminding us of the necessity of repeating the message to my father, that its importance will not be appreciated for lack of getting it, and we can imagine that he asks, as it were, "Do you hear that?" and gets the answer which he writes down, though it is not directly addressed to me.

The remaining features of this sitting explain themselves to the reader and do not require analysis. Their intelligent appreciation of the situation, created partly by my communication and partly by the fact that it was the last sitting I was to have at that time, can be

perceived without discussing it. What it implies about the difficulties of telepathy is apparent, whatever else we may have to entertain to explain it.

The next five sittings, which were conducted for me by Dr. Hodgson while I remained in New York, show this dramatic play of personality in a peculiar and pertinent form. The understanding at the beginning of my sitting on 26th of December (1898) was that Dr. Hodgson should receive communications for me. The object was to shut out direct thought-transference. The first part of the sitting was taken up, as usual, with the business part of the affair with the trance personalities, in which we can study this dramatic play with great interest for its absolute exclusion of telepathy and the representation of independent intelligence. But after completing arrangements for future sittings, Rector remarks that if Dr. Hodgson has nothing further to ask he will bring my father to communicate, and there at once begins a curious feature of the sitting and an exceedingly interesting aspect of the dramatic play. Dr. Hodgson expresses his readiness, and the drama begins. Rector holds the hand out in space, pointing to the communicator, apparently conversing with him, and then writes; "No, he is not . . . but it is his friend . . . very well. No, not James, but Hodgson. Yes. Come." Dr. Hodgson gets the package, whose purpose has been explained, but which ostensibly is intended to influence the "holding of the spirit" and its attention, and Rector writes: "Give it me, friend." The delay on Dr. Hodgson's part is filled in by Rector's monition to the communicator: "Be patient, kindly," and after Dr. Hodgson has placed the spectacle case on the table, my father indicates the proper appreciation of the situation and says: "Yes, friend, I am pleased to meet you, I wish to speak to James, but I understand he is not here, but sends you in his place. Am I right?" Dr. Hodgson replies in the affirmative, and the communications begin (p. 370).

The interesting feature that follows generally is the use of the pronoun referring to me, which is in the third person, and assumes that I was not present. The whole play is realistic, and it is absurd to suppose it telepathic, as the very opposite of what my father assumes is the fact in Dr. Hodgson's mind. Rector knows the correct situation, but it is superfluous to play a merely dramatic part here when the communications are to represent facts that cannot by any means be obtained from Dr. Hodgson's mind, and if they are to be secured from my mind in New York, the colloquy and explanation by Rector is absurd, and if assumed to be a conscious or unconscious effort by him to deceive, the fact contradicts his whole character ever since he appeared with Imperator in charge of Mrs. Piper. The attitude of my father appears

more puzzling, as it would naturally be supposed that he would remember the arrangements made and also be able to recognise Dr. Hodgson again, if his earlier statement that he could see my spirit in the body had any meaning whatever for recognition. But this difficulty is explained after all in the statement a little later that he was a little distance from Dr. Hodgson, but hoped to come nearer soon (p. 372). Hence in spite of its apparent difficulties the play becomes consistent enough, even if not altogether intelligible. But it is clearly not amenable to telepathy from Dr. Hodgson's mind, as there is a distinct reference to me at various times in the third person, involving the implication that the communicator was presenting the facts to another person than to me. There are times, however, during some of the five sittings when the communicator slips into speaking to the sitter, Dr. Hodgson, in the second person as if talking to me, which is still more absurd on the telepathic hypothesis, as the secondary personality must know better than to mistake Dr. Hodgson for me. Moreover the play is more natural and explicable on the spirit theory than any other, as that of secondary personality and telepathy cannot safely indicate in one breath its complete knowledge of the arrangements for the present situation and in the next impersonate an ignorance of them that destroys its own pretensions.

There is nothing farther in this first of the five sittings by Dr. Hodgson to be especially remarked except the interesting colloquy between Dr. Hodgson and my father in the attempt of the former to explain to him just what I wanted and what was necessary to prove his identity. All this explains itself to the reader and does not require analysis. But the main fact of interest to be remarked in connection with this explanation is the persistency with which my father in all subsequent sittings sticks to the understanding of the problem which this explanation gives him. Up to the present one he was less careful to limit himself to incidents in his life, but showed a tendency to make non-evidential remarks, and the incidents were such as merely his own judgment would select without as clear a view of the problem before him as the explanation made it. His whole attitude toward Dr. Hodgson is perfectly appreciative of his task, and once later he alludes to it in terms that unmistakably indicate his memory of the fact (p. 460). One matter of interest in it is the promise of Rector to explain the whole case to father in detail, an incident that helps to sustain the dramatic character of the affair. After the explanation by Dr. Hodgson begins there is very little of the sitting that partakes of the nature of evidential communication, but it shows the completely *tête-à-tête* nature of the conversation between the two parties in the drama, and while its extension beyond telepathy goes without mention, the play of independent intelligence is as real as life

and would never be suspected for anything else but for the fact that the evidence for personal identity is so difficult to obtain in the face of what we know of secondary personality, which often does so much to simulate spiritism, though it has not yet reproduced such phenomena as we have in the Piper case.

In the second sitting of this series this dramatic play takes another form than is usual in this record (pp. 375-377). It represents the appearance of a third trance personality, familiar to other sitters, but having no such specialised functions in my sittings as Emperor and Rector, at least in the work as it appears to us. This new trance personality calls himself Doctor. All three trance personalities appear in the preliminaries to the communications from my father. Emperor writes first and gives a remarkable prayer and explains his entrance on that occasion. Rector then appears only to greet Dr. Hodgson for a brief period, bids farewell, and Rector at once announces his own return and the communications begin. The consistency and realistic aspects of these remarkable passages can be seen by the reader without comment. But there is one point of interest that must have attention called to it, so that we shall observe the pertinence of the main characteristic of this dramatic play to the nature of the communications that follow.

Emperor states that his object is to "restore the light." Rector examines the situation and says things are "infinitely better," Doctor tries the "machine," and Rector intimates that they wish to have "Mr. Hyslop," my father, "come closer." Presently Emperor sends through Rector that "it will be impossible for Him to answer for Mr. W. this day, as it will necessitate our using too much light for him, and we must give it for this kind gentleman, viz., Mr. Hyslop." Here is a series of statements and ideas that represent an organic unity of purpose and co-operation in spite of the changes of personality, and the study of the results of the sitting shows a vast improvement over the first and second sittings. (*Cf. Statistical Summary*, p. 119). The whole play when examined in its essential feature lying below the surface of the record shows this intelligent unity, and it goes without saying that it is not telepathic, but a representation of events and conditions in a transcendental world beyond experience. We may treat it as we please, but it is not the reading of any human memories relevant to the immediate problem before Dr. Hodgson.

The dramatic play in the communications with my father have the usual characteristics, with some modifications, or points of special interest. The first noticeable fact is the impression he has that I am present. He begins addressing me, saying, "Good morning, James," (p. 377), and goes on using the second person for some time. He has forgotten that he is communicating with Dr. Hodgson. But the

dramatic play is interesting. When he mentions the mark near his ear which he expected me to recall, Rector interrupts him with the request: "Tell me, friend, that I may show it to him." There was evidently some special effort required to meet Rector's request, as the record shows, for in the attempt some interlocution has to go on between Dr. Hodgson and Rector, when all at once Rector stops Dr. Hodgson's message and writes, "He is saying something. Wait until I hear it clearly." There immediately follows a confused message regarding a pen and a paper cutter, with a most interesting exhibition of the difficulties involved in the communication. Rector was not sure that he got it rightly. Presently father had to say "Let me go a minute and return. I am very blind and begin to feel strange." Rector then takes up the interval of a minute or so with a statement of his good opinion of father, and promises a very successful communicator in time. Father returns and discovers for the first time in this sitting that he is not communicating to me at all. He says: "Here I am. Yes, I see, you are not really James, but his friend. Glad I am to know you." From this point, being clearer, he speaks as if telling his incidents to an intermediary for me. The rest of the dramatic play in the sitting explains itself, and simply repeats such characteristics as I have indicated, namely, the intromission of questions and explanations into the process of communication. But one incident is worthy of attention because of its length and irrelevance to any telepathic hypothesis. Dr. Hodgson had prepared to read one of my questions and did not know that my father had left the "machine," when Rector interrupted him with a communication about Mrs. M., one of the earlier sitters. The matter in this colloquy has no reference to the issue with my father, but intelligently adjusts itself to the interval of his departure from the "light" for a respite.

The intromission of irrelevant matter into a message about Mrs. M. expressed in the automatism: "Yes, it contains my cutter" (p. 380), and involving interruptions, explanations, cautions, etc., and the play of distinct personalities, has a most interesting analogy in an experience reported by Miss X. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., p. 494). Miss X. had only a few minutes before parted from a friend who had been talking to her about psychical research. She picked up a shell and holding it to her ear heard in the form of auditory hallucinations the conversation of the few minutes before in the apparent voice of her friend, and intromitted into it the expression, "Are you a vegetarian then?" She immediately wrote to her friend telling him the circumstances, and asked him if he was responsible for this irrelevancy. His reply showed that he had met a friend some minutes after he left her who told him he was dining at a certain restaurant, and Miss X.'s friend at once asked him if he was a

vegetarian. This remark coincided with the intromission into her hallucinations of the very sentence the gentleman had used. Now this instance is not spiritistic in its contents, but in spite of this fact it unequivocally favours independent personalities for the different parts of the whole, and affords no relief for telepathy in so far as that would enable us to dispense with real distinction of personalities. In this case before us the intromitted message is traceable to a foreign and objective source, and represents two personalities instead of one only. That is to say, in spite of the fact that the intromission, which indicated its irrevelancy at once, was in the same form as the purely subjective experience of Miss X., yet it had as a verifiable fact a personal origin in another subject, and indicates two persons instead of one. To have found no objective source for it would have left the incident at the mercy of the explanation of secondary personality. But as it is, we have a distinct illustration of distinct personalities in a message which might have been interpreted as the product of Miss X.'s brain, and consequently an example of what we may be entitled to infer in the Piper case, especially as the dramatic play is so emphatically that of independent intelligence.

It is perhaps hardly a feature of the dramatic play to note in the third sitting by Dr. Hodgson that there is a singular use of both the second and third persons in the communications to me, but the incident is so closely connected with that use that it may be mentioned as throwing light on the whole affair. Father's messages begin with a clear conception of the situation, as representing Dr. Hodgson in the place of myself. He asks pertinently how I am, and whether Dr. Hodgson has really seen me or only heard from me "through what we used to call letters" (p. 385). A little later when he asks in the second person: "Can you recall anything about my beliefs in God?" he speaks as if he thought he was directly addressing me. But as he knew from the letter that Dr. Hodgson was reading that I wanted some answer from him, it is perfectly rational to suppose that he was still clear as to the situation, but was answering with the understanding that he was dictating communications to me. There is a most interesting confirmation of this supposition a little later, and just after the allusion to the skull cap (p. 387), when he says, "Answer this for me, James, when you come again," recognising, in spite of the second person, that I was not present. This interesting incident must make us cautious about raising objections on the ground of the mistakes in the identity of the sitter. But immediately Rector interjects a message which purports to be what he knows my father is trying to communicate, and it represents a pertinent fact, and then as if suddenly called to get another message exclaims: "Wait . . . what is he talking about?" and then speaks to Dr.

Hodgson for something to "hold the spirit." This, of course, has its vraisemblance to the tricks of ordinary mediums, but as it represents the real dramatic play so well, I can refer to it without presuming as to its origin. But there is not much in this sitting that represents the dramatic play in any form not intelligible to every reader. Nor is there anything in the fourth sitting that demands special comment after what has been explained concerning the general action of the play.

In the fifth sitting, however, the incident of the canes indicates some features of the dramatic play that should be mentioned, (p. 397). In the attempt to communicate something about a cane, whose identity I did not know or recognise until I made my investigations in the West, Rector interrupted the writing by movements of Mrs. Piper's hand, which I found to be a probable attempt to describe the uses to which the cane had been put. The details need not be repeated here, but Rector apparently does not understand the mimic actions on the "other side." Assuming that the action really represents references to my father's various habits in the use of the cane, we can see how absurd it is to suppose telepathy of any kind when the "control" fails to get the right idea, though he can describe what he sees and conveys nevertheless the right idea of the communicator. The representation is that of independent personalities, and shows how one of them communicates an evidential truth which he does not understand himself. That is not telepathy, as all the other communications are consistent with the supposition that the personality writing them has also the correct ideas of them, but also is able to interpret them when not otherwise clear. In the present case, however, the trance personality cannot obtain a simple fact by telepathy, and cannot interpret rightly the movements in an attempt to describe an event perfectly intelligible to me and to all who know how that particular cane was used. It requires, possibly, the supposition of some kind of a "body" to make the dramatic features of this incident perfectly clear to our imagination, but as that is a supposition which I cannot seriously entertain here because of our limitations in making any statements about a transcendental world intelligible (*Cf.* p. 290), I can only represent the action as it is given, and assuming that it is realistic enough to suggest a spiritistic origin, lay the stress upon its tallying with the facts as I found them to be in my investigation. The main point is to see that neither telepathy nor secondary personality is compatible with the incident. There is a finitude about Rector's powers here that is not consistent with their range at other times on any other hypothesis than the spiritistic.

In my last eight sittings this dramatic play is usually not so distinctive a feature of the communications, except as it is represented

in the change from one communicator to another. The usual alterations, colloquies, remarks, explanations, etc., take place between the communicators and the amanuensis—Rector or other writer, as the case may be—on the one hand, and between the amanuensis and the sitter on the other. If this fact is remembered it will not be necessary, in urging the argument for the spiritistic theory on the ground of this dramatic play, to treat it at length in these last sittings. I shall therefore notice only those exceptional instances of it that the general reader would not be able to observe so easily as I can, owing to my familiarity with the facts that make the communications so pertinent and evidential.

The first of these instances is of a type not found to any extent in the previous series of sittings. It is the employment of a substitute for the communicating. This occurs several times in this series. Occasionally father has given a message that was evidently intended to do what another had failed to effect. Once my brother Charles (p. 455) communicates for father, and once my sister Annie (p. 451) communicates for my cousin Robert McClellan, as the incidents in each case indicate. Sometimes, too, the communicator represents the incident that he is telling as having been mentioned to him on the "other side." All this represents a play of personality that supposes an entirely new range for telepathy, if it is to be assumed at all.

The first instance is by father when he asks if I "remember a little bridge we used to cross in going to Church," and on my assent he adds that "mother just called my attention to it" (p. 435). This brings in a pertinent incident that is put into the mouth of another person on the "other side" for whom it was more natural to mention this bridge than it was for my father, and it was not associated in my mind with either one of them more than with the other. This feature is illustrated again by some statements by my brother Charles (p. 440) while my father rests a moment. He alluded to my half-sister and to some things that he says father asked him to say, and remarks that "his voice troubles him a little when trying to speak," a strange statement from the ordinary point of view, but consistent with what I knew of his illness, as father had been unable to speak above a whisper for three years before his death. His conditional clause, "If you are still in the body, James," has strange implications in it, and all that is said here is not telepathy, especially this last quoted statement, because telepathy must be supposed to know positively that I am in the body. My sister Annie indicates a similar fact when, in communicating for my cousin, she speaks of my father knowing the "Lucy" mentioned better than she does (p. 452). A still clearer instance of the same is brother Charles's reference to the accident to the chimney, about which he never knew, and to the fact that he "heard father talking about it to mother

some time ago" (p. 455). But the interesting part of the play is the innocent and yet fortunate recognition of the communicator that his acquisition of the facts was from the "other side." If he had mentioned them as personal recollections the circumstances would have had to be set down as false, but, fortunately for the spiritistic view, he rightly refers them to the very persons that would be supposed to know, and, stranger still, he states that it was father that spoke to mother about the accident. Mother died fifteen years before the accident, and father was the only one that could tell her about the fact, though she knew well enough the existence of the chimney. The difficulty of telepathy in such a case ought to be apparent. The whole conception which the incidents represent is that of action in a transcendental world arranging for the communication of facts more or less without reference to the person whose knowledge and experience they were, but with a distinct reference, nevertheless, to the identity of the proper parties. The organic unity which the facts obtain is that of independent intelligences recalling and collecting their own memories pertinently to the one object of personal identity, and exhibiting none of the characteristics of telepathy as we know it experimentally.

I shall give in full one of the best instances of this transcendental play and references that show how more than one personality is concerned. It is again the work of my brother Charles, and represents an exceedingly complex psychological situation (p. 462).

He first gives his name and then alludes to his having been sent by Emperor to take father's place. Evidently, however, his entrance had been preceded by a question by Rector to know what my brother said, as the question, "What is it?" appears and the phrase, "My step-sister" comes as an answer, when as an explanation to Rector, who apparently did not know the situation for the time, he gave his name and stated on whose authority he came. At once, on being accepted as *persona grata*, he says, giving the name of his step-sister, whom he in fact never knew, "Hettie I did not remember." He then corrects this to half-sister and explains his error, with an allusion to the assistance he is getting from Emperor. He then reports a statement from father, explaining why he has come to communicate, a remark which at once requires us not to attribute the facts to the wrong personality. I am then asked if I remember my uncle James McClellan and "Frank . . . speak Hyslop," the last phrase representing a tendency to fail in completing the name of my brother, which is effected by Rector's prodding demand that he speak (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 464, Phinuit's order: "Don't go to sleep"). My brother then remarks correctly that my brother Frank is still living and says that "father spoke to

me of him a few minutes ago." The remark calls into notice the fact that father had a special interest in alluding to this brother, as he was an invalid at the time of father's death, and my brother Charles never knew him. Immediately Charles explains father's difficulties in communicating, and alludes to "Dr. Pierce" as a friend of my "uncle Clarke" and to the fact that he is still living, thus again introducing another personality into the play without appropriating the facts to himself. The allusions to father's war stories and to his injured leg are similar incidents. They refer to facts that Charles never knew personally. This continues through a number of instances, until the name of my sister Lida is given and the reference is made to father as having greater knowledge of her than himself, as was true. He also said that father "often speaks of Lucy," but the effort to complete this name failed, while the dramatic play was heightened by the introduction of my sister Annie, also on the "other side," to assist him. But both failed, and Rector wrote in explanation a most remarkable sentence, because it shows beyond question that he was both unable to read my mind and did not understand whom my brother was trying to name. He said: "I got it all but the Hyslop." It was Lucy McClellan that my brother was trying to name, and Rector evidently thought it was "Lucy Hyslop," no such person existing, and simply inferred from the identity of my brother that he was endeavouring to give the name of another Hyslop. Hence he was wholly wrong, as neither I nor my brother would naturally be in the circumstances. This mistake on the part of Rector was corrected soon afterwards, as Mrs. Piper was coming out of the trance, when she uttered the name of "Lucy McClellan," as if the error had been discovered on the "other side," and a special effort made to correct it. The difficulties of telepathy in this incident and in the compound play of personality on the "other side," combined with features of the same play with this side, ought to be self-evident.

The next and last instance of dramatic playing that I shall discuss at length is the most interesting and remarkable in the record. It grew out of the attempt to give the name of my stepmother correctly in response to my request for it. The incident represents the difficulties of communication more clearly than anything else in the experiments, and it is characterised by calling in G. P. to help out with what Rector could not accomplish.

As previous notes intimate (*Cf.* pp. 69, 342, 365) I was in doubt about what was meant by the name "Nannie" in connection with incidents that really pertained to my stepmother, who was always called Maggie by my father. Hence I resolved to clear up this question without asking directly for the name. Dr. Hodgson knew my object, as we had talked it over before going to the sitting, but

I did not tell him the details of my plan. On father's appearance (p. 478) I assured myself of his presence, and at once asked him, "Who made that cap you referred to so often?" The answer "mother" was equivocal, and after my further interrogation to know "which mother," as soon as he understood that I meant my stepmother, "my mother on this side," he at once answered, "Oh, I see what you mean. Your mother is with me, but Hettie's mother is in the body." This perfectly satisfied me as to who was meant by the "Nannie" referred to so often in connection with the cap, and I at once asked about a trip with her out West, intending to get incidents which would still more clearly identify her without getting the exact name. But owing to my ignorance of the "Cooper" incident, and to my having wholly forgotten the fact that on the return from that trip my father visited me in Chicago, I had not identified the journey, but supposed that he was referring to the trip in 1861 with my mother and myself. But as a consequence some confusion arose, and after my saying that I could not recall any previous mention of the trip which father asserted he had told about before, there was a determined effort to give my stepmother's name, and some interlocution goes on between those on the "other side" until finally father asks if I referred to the time when we met with the accident (*Cf.* p. 372), and on my saying that I did not mean this, he at once indicates by his next statement that he understands to what I refer, and goes on to say with astonishing correctness and pertinence: "Well I am sure I have told you of this before. Think over, and you will recall it. I am not sure I mentioned her, but I had it on my mind when I referred to the trip I took just before going out West, do you not recall it?"

I was perfectly satisfied with this statement, as it made the case perfectly clear in its reference to the trip "just before going out West," and I was on the point of indicating my satisfaction when Dr. Hodgson, who did not know the facts as I did and could not know why I was satisfied, interrupted me and called for G. P., to whom he explained that there was some confusion in my father's mind about the name of my stepmother. G. P. appreciated the situation and said "Well, I will assist him. Do not hurry." Father then began an explanation of what he had been trying to do and how he became confused by my question, all of which was throwing light on the identity of my stepmother without giving her name, though there was evidently one attempt to get it. I was purposely avoiding interruptions, experience having convinced me that, under the circumstances, the communications should take their own course. But Dr. Hodgson still thought I was not satisfied with the situation and that the confusion was continuing. Consequently he began to indicate to G. P. that there was still some confusion, when I explained that I

understood the communications perfectly, and they continued until father left the "light" for a respite. My sister Annie took his place and spoke for a few minutes announcing his return at the end. Father was still confused regarding what I wanted, and began to speak of the trip to which both of us had referred, trying apparently to let my stepmother's name slip in with his statements. This appeared as "HAT . . . HAR . . . No." I shook my head at this, because it was not clear. Father then expressed his desire to speak of other things and asked me to tell him exactly what I wanted. Dr. Hodgson then spoke to "Rector or George" to explain what I wished, saying that there was "a locus of confusion with reference to James' stepmother still," and Rector replies "Not so, it hath nothing to do with mothers of any sort, but it hath to do with trips, which is confusing him somewhat, and I would not worry him about trips but let him answer when he returns again." Dr. Hodgson then explained our difficulty more carefully, saying that the name of my "mother in the body had never yet been rightly given," and Rector replied with the question: "Has it been asked for?" Dr. Hodgson then explained just what mistake had been made regarding it, saying that we had gotten it as "Nannie." Rector replied, with a perfectly appreciative and correct answer in the statement of facts (p. 483), but Dr. Hodgson, not knowing or understanding the pertinence of Rector's explanation, answered: "No, Rector." This was calculated to make confusion worse confounded, and Rector gave up with the message "I cannot understand it" and yielded to G. P., who, after Dr. Hodgson explained to him what I wanted, said, apparently with some sharpness: "Well, why do you not come out and say, 'Give me my stepmother's name,' and not confuse him about anything except what you really want?" Dr. Hodgson and I explained that the name had been directly asked for, and he replied somewhat humorously: "Has it, very well, if she has a name you shall have it, G. P., understand?"

Dr. Hodgson then repeated his allusion to "some peculiar difficulty about getting her name," and G. P. replied: "I do not think so, H.; but I do think he would refer to it in his own way if let alone. I know how you confused me, by Jove, and I don't want any more of it. I am going to help him to tell all he knows from A to Z. No doubt about it H., no one could be more desirous of doing so than he is. Is that clear to you?" My father then begins a long and interesting message, at the close of which G. P. returns (p. 486) and says: "I will speak for a moment and say I do not see any reason for anxiety about Margaret." Dr. Hodgson asked, "Who says this?" and received the reply: "George." I then asked him to tell the rest, and the reply, somewhat evading or misunderstanding my question, was: "He said, I suppose I might as well tell you first as last and have

done with it, or James may think I do not really know. Go tell him this for me. You see I got it out of him for you, H., but you no need to get nervous about it, old chap."

Now when we sum up all this we find that at a crucial point where Rector was right and Dr. Hodgson was wrong, Rector gives up, baffled in the attempt to understand the situation, and another personality, G. P., appears for the purpose of clearing matters, and exhibits a half humorous and impatient temper while scolding Dr. Hodgson, a temper as different from Rector's long-suffering and patience as any trait could be, and then with the persiflage of a man of the world goes about his task of unravelling the confusion. He succeeds and reports with ease the name that I wanted, intimating at the same time and indirectly the difficulties that the communicator has in telling his incidents! The incompatibility of all this with either secondary personality or telepathy ought to be apparent without comment. Assuming telepathy we have the strange situation that, after its marvellous achievements in both incidents and proper names, even in this very passage, telepathy is unable to get the name Margaret by any effort, and yet does get it with ease when G. P. is called in! We are then laughed at for making so much fuss about it! To us all the fuss appeared on the "other side"! But what is the use on the telepathic hypothesis of all the supererogatory efforts here made in the complicated machinery of several personalities to get what is at last gotten with the utmost ease, and we are scolded and ridiculed for our "much ado about nothing"!

As the sitting comes to a close a feature of this dramatic play appears and adds importance to the remarks just made. G. P. says to Dr. Hodgson: "I am glad to meet your friend even though you fail to say anything about him. I am George Pelham, and glad to see you." I replied: "I am glad to meet you, especially as I know your brother in Columbia University." The quick response came: "Yes, Charles." "That is right," I said, and the appreciative reply came: "Good. I'll see you again. *Aufwiedersehen.*"

Now on the telepathic theory all the previous play is an acutely arranged subliminal fraud, at the same time that the assumed ingenuity betrays limitations inconsistent with its pretended powers, and their exposure is made easier than ever. There were opportunities during the previous fourteen sittings to ascertain that I was acquainted with this brother Charles, and to use what information I knew of G. P. himself to spontaneously refer to this brother by simply asking me, in ostentatious ignorance of the real situation, whether I knew this brother, and then to send pertinent messages to him drawn from my subliminal. But not a trace of this is to be found. On the contrary, G. P., in spite of the earlier allusion to my connection with a

college and lectures, spontaneously, and in spite of the marvellous memory that has to be attributed to the subliminal on the telepathic hypothesis (pp. 160-170), here represents truthfully his entire ignorance of me, and in the natural surprise of a real person at once mentions his brother and shows the appropriate emotional interest in the situation. But telepathy could not get the name "Margaret" without terrible confusion, though it could get the name Charles without the slightest difficulty, and in spite of the fact that my mental condition with reference to both names was the same with the exception that the former was more distinct in memory! The internal contradictions of the telepathic theory were never more evident than here. When telepathy, assuming it, exhibits the facility of its operations in so marvellous a manner, there is no need of confusion, and of actions that at once discredit its pretensions and threaten with denial the belief which it aims to foster! But if we look at this realistic play of personality as just what it purports to be we discover its entire unity and self consistency. The operation of finite agencies under difficulties that must be admitted in any case is far more intelligible and consistent than this infinite complexity of all sorts of powers, large and small, and immeasurably contradictory, to say nothing of its incompatibility with all that we know of secondary personality in its best estate.

I may, at this point, very effectively gather up several other interferences of G. P. which I have not discussed collectively in their bearing upon this dramatic play. They show a peculiarly unique feature of these communications, indicating very clearly just what we are entitled to expect on the spiritistic theory, and not on any other. In these sudden interruptions G. P. appears as an intermediary to interpret, correct, or transmit something which Rector, the amanuensis does not "hear," and by signing his own initials to the message, or statement, he reveals just the evidence of another personality and independent intelligence which would be so natural on the spiritistic theory, but not to be expected *a priori* either of the telepathic hypothesis or of its combination with secondary personality.

After my first sitting, on December 23rd, 1898, there is no definite hint of G. P.'s presence at my sittings until that of May 30th, 1899. The statement of my father on May 29th (p. 419), "I am speaking to some other man who is speaking for me," might possibly imply the presence of G. P., though possibly Rector was intended. But on May 30th my cousin, Robert McClellan, gives G. P.'s full name—George Pelham (pseudonym)—and remarks that he is assisting. A moment later, right in the midst of a communication from my cousin, whose messages were badly confused, G. P. suddenly interjects the

statement: "Look out H., I am here. G. P. + [Imperator] sent me some moments ago" (p. 428). Then again a few minutes later, while Rector was struggling to get the name McClellan clear and could only get McAllen, G. P. shouts out, so to speak, as an intermediary to aid Rector, "Sounds like McLellen. G. P.," and my cousin acknowledges its correctness by saying: "Yes, I am he."

At the close of my cousin's communications G. P.'s presence and influence are evident in the sentence declaring: "The machine is not right, H.," which Dr. Hodgson took to refer to the need of a fresh pencil, and he accordingly gave one. This occurs in the interval between the departure of my cousin and the arrival of my father (p. 429).

In the same sitting (p. 434) the name of my half-sister was given. There was considerable trouble with it on Rector's part, as he stumbled about between the false attempts "Abbie," "Addie," and "Nabbie," until G. P. suddenly interrupted him with the statement: "Yes, but let me hear it, and I will get it. G. P." He then gave the name "Hattie" and followed it with "Harriet," when I acknowledged that it was nearly correct, alluding to the "Hattie" in particular, but without saying so. I asked that it be spelled out. Then immediately was written: "Hettie. G. P.," spelling it in capitals, and I expressed satisfaction with it, recognising that this was the proper nickname for Henrietta, which she was always called. But as if still uncertain about it, the fact being that father never called her "Hettie," G. P. continued: "Ett [?] Hettie. G. P."

The form of this message is precisely like the previous one, "Sounds like McLellen, G. P.," and the use of "Hettie" for Henrietta is precisely like the communication of Tillie for Matilda in 1892, probably by this same G. P. (See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 375).

In the sitting for May 31st (p. 440), just as Rector remarked that it was my father who was communicating, explaining that "he seems a little dazed," G. P. suddenly interrupted with the statement: "I am coming, H., to help out. How are you?" and made some brief communications with reference to two of his friends, both of them unknown to me. Dr. Hodgson knew one of them intimately and the other only by name. Then G. P. follows this with the announcement that my father and mother are present to communicate, but a singular verb is used instead of the plural. The plural, however, is immediately added and followed by the statement: "If I fail grammatically, H., it is owing to the machine. Hear. Cannot always make it work just right." The communications from my father then proceed without farther interruption (p. 441).

Again in the sitting of June 6th, before my father appeared, and just as Rector had explained how we should ask certain questions when my father should announce himself, G. P. suddenly interjected

a greeting and some questions directed to Dr. Hodgson, the colloquy being as follows :—

“H. — how are you? I have just been called upon to lend a helping hand. You see I am not wholly isolated from you. (R. H. : Good, George, were you here last time?) For a few moments. I helped a man named Charles, but I did not get a chance to say How de do, H.? (R. H. : All right, George.) I am going after the elderly gentleman. Look out for me. (R. H. : We will.) Got those theories all straightened out yet, H.? (R. H. : Pretty fairly.) I am going. Aufwiedersehen. G. P.” (p. 468).

My father then appeared with the appropriate message, “I am coming, James,” and we began carrying out our plan of asking for incidents that were unknown to me. But it is apparent to the simplest observer that G. P.’s interruption and conversation with Dr. Hodgson had no relevancy either to me personally or to the general purpose of the situation.

Another sudden interruption, signed by G. P.’s initials, occurred on June 7th. It was in the midst of the confusion incident to the attempt at giving the name of my stepmother. My father, evidently appreciating his difficulty in the situation, remarked: “I feel the necessity of speaking as clearly as possible, James, and I will do my best to do so.” G. P., probably fearing that my father was not yet clear enough to do what he wished, suddenly cautioned him with the advice: “Wait a bit,” and as Dr. Hodgson interpreted the word “wait” as “said,” G. P. repeated the phrase, signing it: “Wait a bit. G. P.” Father then proceeded with his explanation of the mistake about my stepmother, all the parties on the “other side” assuming, apparently, that he was clear enough for the task (p. 481).

In all these interpositions of G. P. the marks of an independent intelligence are very indicative. There is in them nothing like the character of either the inexperienced communicator or Rector, the amanuensis, nor is there any definite resemblance to either secondary personality in general or to intercommunication between two personalities in the same subject. They are the interference of a spectator and helper on his own responsibility, when he sees that he can effect a clear message that is misunderstood or not clearly obtained by Rector. Such dramatic play, involving the personal equation of the real individual G. P. as known when living, and here kept distinct from that of Rector and others, is a characteristic not easily explicable on any but the spiritistic theory, especially when it includes the transmission of evidential data.

The last sitting is a drama intelligible enough to be understood without comment, though it is between Rector and myself, and my father and myself. The play of personality is not of the same sort

as that which I have analysed so carefully, but it is the action of an independent intelligence under circumstances involving such prompt answers to my statements and questions as the reader will find it difficult to explain on any other hypothesis than the spiritistic. The *l'ête à l'ête* conversation that this last sitting represents is opposed to the supposition that the difficulties alluded to in the last case of dramatic play are anything but spiritistic.

(3) *Mistakes and Confusions.*

The third argument for the spiritistic theory is based upon the mistakes and confusions. By mistakes I do not mean the positively erroneous or false incidents, but only such as might be construed as the natural errors of memory and interpretation, as we know them in living minds. Still one may ask, when attempting to stretch telepathy sufficiently to account for the phenomena by its special and selective omniscience, whether positive errors are not a contradiction in such an hypothesis. A capacity which can discriminate so effectively between the true and the false in most of its acquisitions, and which can select and present the truth in instances that are often far more complex than those in which it is erroneous, ought to know enough, no matter how devilish you make it, to avoid deceiving you by telling what is not true. It ought to know what is false and not to run any risks in its policy of deception, conscious or unconscious. A finite intelligence can be supposed to commit errors of this sort, but such unflinching discrimination between my own personal memories *alone* and those that are common to me and the alleged communicators, and the selection of facts unknown to me from the proper memory of some one else in the world, at any distance and absolutely unknown to the medium, make error of any sort a flat contradiction with such an assumed capacity as is necessary to meet the conditions of the case, and especially inconsistent should be the representation of incidents as true that such a power ought to know are false, and which, when discovered, are sure to bring discredit upon its intentions. On any supposition, of course, we have to reckon with the presence of the true with the false, but it is far easier on the spiritistic theory to admit the possibility of error than on the telepathic, because we know that in finite minds truth and error live together and we understand why they do so. But a telepathic power that can organise from the scattered memories of various living beings, unknown to the person who is supposed to exercise it, all the elements that go to establish the personal identity of some one that is dead, is not a power that can commit the simple mistakes of a finite memory and consciousness with impunity. Having started on the mission of doing what ordinarily seems impossible it must be consistent and not discover any weakness

as we know it in the living. Otherwise its pretensions are exposed to suspicion, and we should turn to the hypothesis that in normal life can reconcile the facts of error with those of truth, and this hypothesis is the one that gives unity to the phenomena by supposing limitations that are consistent with all the facts. If the false preponderated, we might well measure them off against the theory of chance to account for the true, or balance the evident limitations of telepathy in such a case with the equal limitations of secondary personality. But the errors are proportionately so few, and when not so few are so simple as compared with the complexity of the true, that the limitations involved in the explanation of the false reflect too seriously upon the immense powers that have to be assumed to account for the true by telepathy. That is to say, its evident finitude conflicts with its apparent infinity. But I shall not dwell upon this in a general way, as my purpose is to deal with it in detail and to interpret the positive errors in the light of those merely partial errors which show just that unity and degree of limitation which put the telepathic theory to its severest test, and provide the natural escape from the supposition of secondary personality in regard to the false. The mistakes, therefore, upon which the present stress will be laid are those cases in which the communicator is nearly right, and in which, from that very fact, the limitations of the telepathic hypothesis are unequivocally proved, and once admitted will both serve as an apology for the totally false incidents and turn the scientific understanding toward the spirit hypothesis as the only one that can rationally account for the truth and error combined, owing to its merely repeating the laws of mind as actually known, while the use of telepathy must be an appeal to the unknown in stretching it to cover the complexities of the whole case. Where the evidence in the positive cases of truth coincided with real limitations to telepathy between living minds we could well expect errors and confusion to be consistent with it. But when the quantity and quality of the matter which has to be explained by telepathy, if that is the theory to be proposed, are so great and so complex that it demands such amazing capacities of mind reading, of the near and remote, as defy the rationality of mistake and confusion, we are bound to pause and reflect. Where the evidence shows a practically omnipotent power of discrimination, selection and acquisition, mistakes of a kind that ought not to occur on any such supposition must contradict the hypothesis and favor the theory in which mistakes are natural and probable.

This argument can be put in a still more effective way. Finite memories in the actual world commit so many mistakes that psychical researchers are afraid to admit human testimony involving the facts alleged to prove a future existence. Why, then, be any more exacting

of supposed discarnate spirits? We ought to expect *a priori* that a discarnate memory should be defective in its communications from a transcendental world, and this for two very important reasons. (1) If the physiological theory of memory be true, we ought to obtain absolutely nothing whatever of a spirit's past existence from the spirit itself, assuming of course that it can or does exist. (2) The conditions of any communication at all might very well disturb either the integrity of memory or the message, or both, for the time being at least, sufficiently to make the communicator commit very many mistakes.

The physiological theory of memory is usually couched in such terms as to imply the entire dependence of that function upon the brain, even by those who do not think the brain sufficient to account for consciousness at large. This would naturally imply that dissolution must efface all memory of the past, even if the subject still survived. The physiologist, therefore, who concedes the brain theory, cannot expect anything as a message from a discarnate world, even when he believes, in contradiction with the principle that all rational belief depends upon evidence, that there is such a world. I am not disputing that theory of memory, as I am willing to concede its truth if the evidence can be produced in its favor, but I insist that such a theory must destroy all rights to believe in a discarnate world at all, even if such exists, simply because the belief is without evidence, and its reality, when supposed, without interest of any kind. But modifying the doctrine so that brain functions are supposed merely to affect the integrity of memory, not to condition its existence, we should then naturally expect some disturbance in its power of recall in a discarnate form, supposing this survival possible. Consequently we have no right to prejudice the case by the *a priori* assumption that spirit communications should be freer from mistakes than the deliverances of consciousness in the abnormal conditions of actual life. But again, assuming that the physiological theory of memory is altogether false, the conditions intervening between two disparate worlds must, on every principle of rationality, affect the communications in some way, so that mistakes should occur, and these of a kind that ought not to occur on the telepathic hypothesis, as that supposition has not to assume any but terrestrial conditions to deal with. No matter how clear the memory may actually be in its own medium, any contact with abnormal conditions must affect its integrity, for the time being at least, according to the physiological theory. That ought to be a truism, so that mistakes and confusion, more especially on the spiritistic theory than the telepathic, should be expected and actually strengthen the evidence if they occur in the form which the nature of the case enables us to expect.

Also we should expect errors if personal identity survives. What we know of the mind shows it to be finite, and it would have to be finite after death if the general law of continuity holds good at all. Consequently, the very supposition of identity would make mistakes of memory, inference, and judgment or interpretation, the most natural things in the world. The memory should show the same characteristics, successes and failures, strength and weakness with which we are familiar in living persons and the observations of general psychology. Any other supposition involves such a change in the capacities of the mind as would most likely destroy the consciousness of its identity. The ordinary supposition that spirits, assuming here the possibility of their existence, have transcendent powers of knowledge and memory, is really in conflict with the notion of personal identity, and puts the very existence of them beyond the reach of science and legitimate belief. Of course this loss of identity might be the fact, but even when we suppose that the subject of the present consciousness survives, the supposition of this loss of identity would cut up by the roots both all rational belief in the existence of any such beings and the interest that any sane man might have in a transcendental existence if believed. If there be no personal identity, or consciousness of it, supposing that the subject of incarnate consciousness survives, we can have no more rational interest in a hereafter than if we were actually annihilated, unless we meant to assume with Plato, on the one hand, that the present life affects the destiny and action of this subject without the memory nexus, as we observe in certain connections between the supraliminal and subliminal streams of consciousness in normal life, and on the other, that our altruism must be strong enough to conform to moral rules that reap no benefit for us, but only for a subject in whose life we cannot participate in any interested way. This may be the correct view, if you like, but it is not consistent with the moral law that recognises the rights of the individual in its sacrifices for the *socius*. But as we cannot appeal to the moral ideal that might be anthropomorphic, or that is liable to this charge, in support of a scientific truth, we must adjust our morals to the facts of the universe, whether we survive or not. Nevertheless, it is legitimate both to indicate that inconsistency and to show that the expectation of such transcendent powers of mind as are usually assumed implies a change in the capacities of the individual that must involve the loss of the personal identity which is supposed. From every point of view, therefore, we must grant that, on the supposition of personal identity at all, the communications should show the mistakes and confusions of ordinary life, multiplied and intensified both by the conditions of communication and by the absence of the physiological conditions that affect the action, even when they do not absolutely

determine the existence, of memory. Now, as a matter of fact, the resemblance between the phenomena of incarnate memories and those of the alleged discarnate minds is remarkably exact. Besides showing personal identity in what is unmistakably true, the incidents often exhibit just that error which we should at once classify as an illusion of memory in actual life, and consequently furnish us both a natural explanation of the phenomena and the evidence of their inconsistency with the assumption of omnipotent powers on the part of the medium's brain. Hence to decide the case against spiritism on the ground of mistakes and confusions is to make the following assumptions: (1) that the discarnate life, supposing it true, involves certain perfections which, in fact, are inconsistent with the personal identity that the believer in a future existence usually maintains; (2) that physiological conditions in the present life do not affect either the integrity or the action of memory; (3) that transcendental conditions, even when the memory is perfect, do not influence the fact and the nature of communication. Now either all of these assumptions are false, as I hold them to be, or we have a contest between the purely physiological theories of memory (discarding the psychological theory as in any case *sub judice*), and the contradictions in the telepathic hypothesis. I am assuming for the sake of argument that the physiological theory of memory is inconsistent with any other theory of consciousness than the materialistic, though this may not be the case as a fact, as I should be inclined to maintain on ordinary psychological grounds. As memory is absolutely necessary to the consciousness of personal identity, though it might not be necessary to the identity of the subject itself, it is the condition of establishing the identity of a discarnate spirit, supposing its existence. But a purely physiological theory of memory both eliminates all hope of proving the existence and persistence of a soul, and shuts us up to telepathy to account for the coincidences in these phenomena that exclude chance as an explanation. If then we ignore the force of the psychological theory of memory against the physiological theory of the same, the whole question narrows itself down to the adequacy of telepathy to account for the facts. If it is not adequate the physiological theory of memory is not true, but vulnerable from two points of view instead of one only. If telepathy covers the case the situation is just what it is between the psychological and the physiological schools. But in any case the issue centres in the capacities of telepathy, all other controversies being suspended on the termination of this issue. Consequently the problem is to see if the mistakes and confusions in the Piper phenomena are consistent with the suppositions that have to be made to explain the incidents that are not mistakes, or whether it is not more rational to suppose survival as only an extension of the

principles that we already know in the action of finite consciousness. This question will have to be discussed in the concrete, and finally settled by the individual himself.

I have already alluded to the nature of this argument in discussing both the unity of consciousness and the dramatic play of personality when the occasion made it useful to do so, and hence the general import of it ought to be detected in what has been said, especially in that part of the dramatic play which is ostensibly undertaken to avoid error itself. But I shall not repeat at length these incidents, as a mere reference to them is sufficient to remind the reader of their pertinence in this connection. I may call attention to the individual instances of mistake and confusion in the midst of any sustained dramatic play, but it will not be necessary to repeat the whole case for the reader to understand the force of what I am contending for here. What we have to do at present is to keep clear the magnitude of the telepathic powers that have to be assumed to explain the true incidents, and simply ask whether certain mistakes and confusions are at all consistent with that supposition, and so whether the spiritistic hypothesis is not the simpler and easier one as well as more in conformity with the known laws of the finite mind and of scientific method.

I have already alluded to certain mistakes and confusions in the first sitting that I had, as I was discussing its dramatic play, but I have not fully indicated their significance. The incident that calls special attention to the feature which I wish to discuss at present is the appearance of the lady who claimed to be my mother. The names and incidents connected therewith were false in so far as relevancy to me is concerned. As I have already remarked (p. 186), telepathy, when it shows such remarkable powers in the acquisition of the sitter's memories, ought not to make such an error as this insistence that the lady was my mother. The medium's experience in supposed telepathic processes ought naturally to suggest surprise at such tentative endeavours as are found in my first sitting. All this groping about and attendant confusion is incomprehensible on any theory that makes experience worth anything in the development of power, and so renders equally plausible the hypothesis which has to encounter the natural difficulties imposed by the test conditions which I was observing, unless we maintain that the medium has to begin her education in the telepathic access on each occasion of a new sitter. This supposition discounts the influence of experience with others, but scepticism in the absence of adequate knowledge of the real capacities of telepathy enjoys some impunity in proposing an objection of this sort. We might suppose that on the admission of a new sitter it requires some time to cast over the whole mass of memories and to obtain the clue to the proper selection of incidents. This is all very

ingenious and obtains such force as it has, and that is not much, from the limitations of our knowledge in regard to the process of what we choose to call telepathy, but it is *a priori* and we have a right to exact of its advocate empirical evidence both within and independently of the Piper case for its assertion, and an application of the hypothesis to details, because the facts so thoroughly satisfy the criterion for personal identity that spiritism can undoubtedly explain the phenomena, so that the only excuse for any other hypothesis must be either that it explains the phenomena more easily, or that it is a probable alternative that demands exclusion before rational conviction is left without a choice. What there is in telepathy to supply the grounds for either of these alternatives must be left to those who are able to furnish scientific evidence for their contention. But there is no special immunity in assuming that the theory is apparent or probable on the face of it, nor that the opposite theory demands any more credulity than a conception which is little more, or perhaps nothing more, than a name for general coincidences whose content is ignored in the application of it. That is to say, the coincidence between variations, based on the personal equation, in experimental telepathy and variations on a similarly supposed basis in the Piper phenomena is not sufficient evidence of their identity in abstraction from the peculiar and striking psychological content which distinguishes them so radically, no matter how much difficulty the statement of the supposition may give in a formal argument.

But there is another objection to this assumption that experience has to begin over again in each new sitting. *This is not always the fact.* Perhaps it is not often so. It is very frequent that the first sitting is as good as any other. I might even say with tolerable accuracy that the difference between the first and other sittings is not great enough in most cases to attribute it to any other cause than the natural difficulties of establishing the proper connections for communication such as the spiritistic theory would require, so that we have to suppose telepathy always duplicating just what the opposing theory demands. That sort of process should suggest to any one who has a sense of humour the dangerous proximity of his assumption to the spiritistic theory itself. Again, this doctrine that each new trial demands time and experience to segregate the facts necessary to imitate personal identity necessarily breaks down on the variations between sittings themselves. The experience counts for nothing unless other conditions are favourable at the same time. But conditions that subordinate experience to themselves are entitled to a more important place than experience itself, and suggest greater consistency with spiritism than with any alternative theory. In support of this contention the reader may find it interesting to compare my sittings

for June 6th (p. 467), 7th (p. 477), and 8th (p. 487), and also Dr. Hodgson's sittings for February 16th (p. 384), 20th (p. 391), and 22nd (p. 396). See also the Statistical Summary (Nos. III., IV., and V., p. 119, and Nos. VI., VII., and VIII., p. 120). In these there is no special evidence to confirm the general theory of experience, but much to suggest the influence of very different conditions upon the result. Further suspicion against the influence of experience in either form is aroused by the incidents of the first sitting, in spite of the judgment which I originally passed upon it. If we do not accept the incidents as evidence of telepathy we are confronted with the contrast between this and the second sitting where the evidence of something unusual is quite apparent. If we do accept the existence of the supernormal in the first sitting it takes that form which does not suggest anything like the gradual development of its powers. The giving of the names of my brother Charles and my sisters Annie and Margaret, the allusion to the death of my mother's sister with its right relation in time, the intimation that both my father and mother were dead, all the various specific incidents identifying my brother Charles, and two or three approximately correct names and incidents have their cogency increased by two facts that show how large the supposed telepathy must be, in spite of the assumption of its need for education in the individual case. These two facts are the name and relationship of my father's sister and the important statement "Give me my hat and let me go," both of which represented incidents unknown to me and hence extend the supposed telepathy so far under conditions imagined to involve limitations to the process that we may well wonder whether our theory of experience and groping about in the memory of the sitter is not a mere subterfuge. The supposition has no other strength than the fact that the limitations of telepathy have not been positively assigned. Ignorance, however, is not proof. I grant that the *argumentum ad ignorantiam* is a legitimate resource for raising the standard of evidence, but it does not involve an explanation. On the contrary, it complicates explanation by necessitating the extension of an hypothesis without regard to the proper unity of the phenomena. Of course a man who finds a certain formal resemblance between telepathy and what is supposed to be spiritistic may not be easily convinced against his will, and it is not a part of my task to insist upon this result. I am more interested in the anticipation of the sceptic's objections than I am in convincing him on this point. But I think a dispassionate examination of the facts, as indicated, will result in the recognition of the spiritistic position on this particular question as at least equally credible with the telepathic, while in other issues, and possibly in this also, it presents superior credentials for favourable consideration.

There are three general facts that show there is no excuse for confusion in the telepathic theory. The first is the circumstance that at no time did any amount of experience suffice to secure communications with certain persons who were even more entitled to recognition on the telepathic theory than some that were admitted. I could name two instances very easily in my sittings, and it is all the more striking when we know that one of these two was implied in two of the messages given (p. 316). The second is that telepathy can show no special reason for the short time that it is possible to communicate. The third fact is the circumstance that telepathy has no excuse for the differences between "communicators," one being clear and the other confused. Consequently the spiritistic theory has the advantage of being far more consistent than telepathy with the conditions that we should be entitled to suppose and with the facts as we know them. Concrete illustrations will indicate this better than generalisations.

Any reader can compare the communications of my father with those of my "uncle Clarke," and see for himself the very striking difference between them. My uncle never got his name through rightly, and only in one or two passages did he even get the facts clear (pp. 90-95, 423). Nearly all his efforts ended in hopeless confusion, and much the same is true of my cousin Robert McClellan. Several times he got some important matters clear and definite, and was always better than my "uncle Clarke." But he never became as clear as his own father (p. 470), nor so clear as my brother and sister. Now the data in my mind were the same for all these personalities and also for persons who never appeared at all, so that telepathy is absolutely without excuse for its confusions and its failures to produce certain other persons. One or two instances of confusion or of difference in clearness might be attributable to the "conditions" under which telepathy acts, but that this characteristic should invariably distinguish one communicator from another involves such a stretching of the hypothesis of "conditions," all unknown, that we may well ask whether what we know of the personal equation in different men, on the one hand, and the admitted fact of necessary difficulties in any case of communication, on the other, does not consist far more readily with spiritism than with the *a priori* elasticity of telepathy and its "conditions."

I wish to lay considerable stress upon this failure to get my uncle's name. In the case of most of the names the difficulties either did not show themselves or were soon overcome. The names of my half-sister (Henrietta) and my cousin (Lucy McClellan) gave some difficulty, the latter especially, but were obtained at last correctly, if we can regard "Hettie" as correctly representing Henrietta, though she was

never called by anything but Henrietta by my father and the family. There was also a little difficulty in getting through my cousin's name, Robert McClellan, but it was not much. My uncle's name, however, that of Carruthers, never came rightly. The exemption from difficulties varies, as I have shown, with the communicator, or with the conditions possibly under which the messages are delivered. But the reader will notice that very often proper names are given promptly and without a struggle, and in all cases with two or three exceptions, which I did not try to have completed, were gotten correctly at last. Now there is nothing but a very natural psychological reason, connected with the certainty of difficulties and obstacles in the way of spirit communication, for mistaking the names "uncle Clarke" and "uncle Charles" for that of Carruthers, the right name, especially after his Christian name James, had once been given. The mistake in this case, as it must appear to the cautious scientist, is so great that I should have no right whatsoever to suppose that this particular uncle was meant, were it not that time and again incidents, names, and relationships were indicated by him and about him that were true of no one else in the world, even when taken singly, to say nothing of their collective pertinency. This is strengthened by the natural approximation to his correct name. One can see very easily how "Carruthers" might be confused with the name "Charles" in the telephone, and also how a more careful effort to make it clear by laying the stress upon the first syllable "Car" might lead to the name "Clarke" by suggestion, and as the representation of the communications in the whole history of the Piper and similar cases is uniform in its comparison with something like telephonic processes, we have in the spiritistic theory a better approximation to an explanation than in the telepathic, which ought not to get into trouble with an aural memory when it has the visual to draw upon also. The mistake is perfectly conceivable on the theory of spiritism, especially when we consider the effect of unfamiliar language in these communications. Compare the phrase "United Presbyterian" (p. 492) and experiments through a tube (p. 624), and also my own mistake mentioned in a footnote (p. 240). A *quasi* omnipotent telepathy which can reproduce all the complex incidents on which I have commented in the discussion of the dramatic play of personality, and so easily defy the limitations of time and space, ought not so utterly to fail in this name when it so nearly achieves success on the analogies of both the known action of the telephone and the represented action of spirit communication. The assumption of telepathy requires us always to explain why it is constantly reproducing characteristics in all their variety and complexity, adaptation and intelligent unity, that ought to be found in spiritistic phenomena.

Another illustration of a very simple mistake that represents a natural illusion of memory is that in which my father mentions a "flute," which he refers to my brother Will, the correction of which makes it the *guitar* that belonged to my brother George (p. 461). In this also there was a very pretty piece of dramatic playing that is most interesting in its mechanical features. I shall notice this again. But the important fact for remark now is the circumstance that the mention of the "flute" and the reference of its ownership to the wrong person has no excuse on the telepathic hypothesis, as the incident in the form in which it is first told was false. Moreover, before I had recognised the meaning of the message it was spontaneously corrected to "fiddle," an instrument that more nearly resembled the guitar that was finally indicated by action of the hand, but it was still technically wrong and not derived telepathically, unless we suppose this function liable to the same apperceptive errors as ordinary judgment. How easily it might be an illusion or error of memory on the part of my father under any conditions whatsoever, incarnate or discarnate, is indicated by the following facts. It was about 1878 when my brother got the guitar, and it was about 1880 when he took it with him into another part of the State, almost totally abandoning the use of it there, and my father never saw it from that date to his death, sixteen years, unless when on a visit there in 1889. He was never in the least interested in the instrument when my brother was at home, except to say that he thought my brother would never do anything with it. Hence it is not an unnatural mistake to mention the wrong person as owner, especially when it is also known that the brother mentioned was closely associated with the other in all the incidents and relationships involved in its proper ownership. But whether the error be attributed to an illusion of memory as an apology for it is not the chief matter of interest, but its conflict with the telepathic hypothesis which has been so successful, according to supposition, in far more complicated incidents, and here is able to come near enough to suggest what was in mind, but is wholly false in the details.

The explanation of this confusion of the flute with a guitar is not so easy, as it involves some knowledge of supposable transcendental conditions of existence for which there is little or no evidence in this record. The attempt here to recall the name of the instrument by imitating the manner in which it was played, and the similar attempts to describe the uses of the cane (p. 400) by reproducing the movements involved, and to indicate the "gold bug" on the cane that I gave my father by drawing it (p. 495), are illustrations of possible actions, if the conception that the soul involves a *facsimile* of the bodily form be correct (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 301). Let us at least imagine this state of the case in order to represent the supposable

effort here to communicate with me. We see that Rector is finally reduced to the necessity of imitating the mode of playing the instrument as the only resource for correcting the original mistake. But how did the error occur at first? Assuming that the communicator had forgotten the name of the guitar we can imagine that he himself acted as if holding such an instrument upon his shoulder and picked it with his fingers, and the suggestion to Rector was that of a flute, which, on the communicator's denying it, was corrected to "fiddle," then "vial" for violin, and again on dissent, to actions that would convey to me the idea of what was meant. The mistakes, therefore, on this construction become perfectly natural and explainable on the spiritistic theory and incomprehensibly complex and absurd on the telepathic. The difficulty that strikes one is the assumption of anything like the "astral body" doctrine which is apparently so necessary for this representation of the case. We are so accustomed to the Cartesian conception of a soul which refuses it any property of extension that we endeavour to conceive it after the idea of Boscovich's points of force. But there is no absolutely necessary obligation to accept the preconceptions of Cartesian dualism in order to eliminate the associations of matter for conceiving a world transcending sense, as is well illustrated in the phenomena of X rays, where we have a whole universe of force that does not reveal itself to sense perception in anything but its effects, and it is an invisible world of force in a definite relation to extension. There is therefore nothing but the superstition of Cartesian authority for clinging to the idea that the soul cannot occupy space, and the "astral body" theory, divested of its absurd theosophic assumptions and unwarranted speculations, may, for all that we know, represent the truth. But we cannot assume it, nor can we any more assume the theory that must represent it as a point of force or spaceless reality. Either may be true, but must be proved or rendered rational by the necessity of supposing one or the other to explain facts. There is evidence, such as it is, in the records of psychical research to make it possible, if we assume a soul at all, that either it or the "spiritual body" occupies space, and on that assumption the dramatic representation in this guitar incident becomes intelligible, but on the telepathic hypothesis it is impossible to obtain any intelligible unity to the phenomena, and it is perhaps equally difficult to imagine their occurrence on the supposition that the soul is a spaceless reality, though I can conceive it possible by means that it is not necessary to elaborate, as it is only the difficulties of telepathy, not the legitimacy of either the Cartesian or the theosophic conception of the soul, that I am endeavouring to enforce. Telepathy ought to obtain guitar as easily as either flute, fiddle or violin, and so simple a mistake is incompatible with the powers it is usually supposed to

display. But the mistake is doubly interesting in the light of the historical fact that in my positive knowledge father was far more familiar with the flute, fife, fiddle or violin, and organ than he was with the guitar, both in regard to the matter of names and the instruments. He knew absolutely nothing about the guitar except as in the possession of my brother.

Another illustration of a somewhat similar confusion and mistake, is in the set of incidents connected with the communications about the canes (p. 397). The mistakes in this instance are not due to anything exactly like lapses of memory, but are much more like the confusion of two similar incidents in association and memory, and to imperfections that belong to the transmission of the messages. An illustration of the first feature of this instance is in the sentence which apparently speaks of *one* cane, but which is false on that supposition, though true supposing that the communicator was trying to speak of *two* canes that answer to the different parts of the sentence. It was false that father ever had a curved handled cane on which he had carved his initials, but it was true that his children had twenty-five years before given him a gold-headed ebony cane on which his initials were carved, and I had given him a cane with a curved handle about one year before his death. But it turns out that the elaborate description of the various uses of the cane, an account which I could not understand at the time, was not intended to refer to this curved handled cane that was suggested to me, but to another curved handled one that had been broken and mended with a ring of tin (p. 533). Hence it appears as if two canes were here in mind, and if the representation that is generally given of the imperfections of the messages be true this conjecture that the attempt was to mention both canes has its possibilities. But without apologising for the case at present, the difficulty that is presented to telepathy in this complicated incident is that of being able to discriminate so clearly in all important instances and yet falling into hopeless confusion at a very simple discrimination in this instance. It is also farther complicated with the fact that, whatever association is permitted to it in the acquisition of incidents, in this case there is the fact that I knew nothing about my father's habits in the uses of the cane as indicated. Hence we have to suppose, in this attempt to apply telepathic association to explain the confusion of like memories, that this associative power can instantly reach out into space and secure what I did not know to finish the picture of what I did know, no distinction being drawn in telepathic acquisitions between the known, the remembered and the forgotten, as well as the unknown. This involves instant *rapport* with any living person with the implied infinite power of discrimination between the right and the wrong facts. With such a power there

ought not to occur such a simple error as the confusion of the gold-headed and the curved-handled cane, nor after the easy and clear access of similar facts at any distance should there have been this pantomime process describing the uses of the cane. The facts ought to have been clearly given. But when we know the facts about the cane, and recognise that the description which Rector gives fits exactly what I ascertained in regard to my father's habits on such occasions as my notes describe (pp. 415-416) we have an intelligible phenomenon. Of course it takes the "spiritual body" theory to make this intelligible in descriptive language to our imagination, though the very confusion and difficulties of communication in such incidents may be due to the falsity of that doctrine, and I do not care to urge it as in any way necessary or indispensable to the occurrence of the phenomena.

The next instance of mistake is much like the one just discussed in one of its aspects. It is the case of referring what was true of one brother to another of whom it was not true, though in all but the *character* of the incidents that the communicator had in mind the main circumstance applied to both. I refer to notes for details (p. 516). But it was an instance in which the communicator, when living, had taken objections to the social affiliations of two brothers, the grounds and reasons being very different in each case. Here is a situation for natural confusion in any mind, where either the memory is imperfect or the conditions disturbing to the communications, whatever the memory. The events were contemporaneous and of the same general character, but different in their specific marks. Association would naturally bring both into consciousness, and difficulties in the communication might do the rest, or there might be a momentary illusion of memory in the recall of the events, and any sensitiveness of the communicating "machine" might reflect that illusion or a part of it. There is much in the record to illustrate the influence of precisely the factor just mentioned (pp. 324, 430). But whether or not, it is certain that the lapse of twenty years, as was the case in this instance, with the unquestionably difficult conditions of communication would easily produce such a mistake as we find here. Nor can we say that it might be precisely the error that telepathy would make in its attempt to use the law of association, for it showed no tendency to commit such a mistake in the tax incidents (p. 493) which represented a situation similar to this. The distinction was clearly made between the latter by the communicator, and obliviscence on my part resulted in the confusion on my side until my correspondence showed that the communicator was right. Moreover, in all other instances in which telepathy is supposed and in which association is a necessary factor, its command of that function is so perfect by the terms of its success in getting the

rightly connected incidents, that its mistake in such a case is an evidence of weakness that discredits it as an explanatory hypothesis.

In support of the naturalness of this mistake in both instances above described, and of its explicability in terms of a personal consciousness other than the medium's brain, I shall narrate exactly parallel instances in my own experience. They show that if I had been a communicating spirit at the time I should have committed the same error.

On September 4th last I was reading Miss Alice Johnson's paper on "Coincidences," and when I came to the case of the boat race which I had reported myself (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., p. 253), I noticed the fact that I had completely forgotten that I had reported it, though I recalled it presently, but thought at the same time that it was the same boat race which figures in the "Experiments on Identification of Personality" (p. 579). I instantly recalled the persons that took part in this experiment and it was some minutes before I discovered that the instances were entirely different. The interest in the fact lies in the circumstance that if I had been a communicating spirit at the time, I should not only have confused the two boat races, but I should have sent through the wrong names in connection with one of them. A precisely similar case was the confusion of the 23rd Psalm with the 133rd, as noted in another instance where I did not discover my mistake for more than six months, and then only under the correction of my wife (p. 612).

One of the most interesting illusions of this kind on my part is the following, and it will not be less interesting to know that the discovery of it destroys one of the illustrations that I had originally quoted against the spiritistic theory in the first draft of this discussion.

When I was re-reading the Report of Professor Lodge after my sittings (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., p. 520), I was struck with the resemblance between the incident there told of an accident with a boat and a reference to a boat by my father (p. 478). I at once noted the fact, and, without comparing it with my record, accepted my memory of it and raised the question whether it was not a good piece of evidence for the unity of the two *régimes*, the Phinuit and Emperor personalities. In my first draft, therefore, of my report, relying wholly upon my memory of the incidents, I said, "The incident which my father narrates about the upsetting of a boat and his sister helping him to dry his clothes is almost exactly duplicated in all its details by a similar communication to Professor Lodge in England in 1889." But in the revision of this draft I was induced to examine my statements in the light of the record and the following mistakes occur in the above statement placed in quotation marks. My father says nothing of the upsetting of a boat and nothing of his sister's helping him dry

his clothes, though the language "helped me out of the difficulty" might be so interpreted in this and other ways from the context (see p. 478). Nor does my father say, as was indicated of the sister in Professor Lodge's incident, that she had "screened" the accident from the knowledge of others. The source of the illusion on my part was as follows:—

The incident narrated by my father does not indicate that a boat was upset, but at another time my brother Charles mentioned in his message about a boat that it had been overturned (p. 464), and also father, in his incident about the broken waggon and wheel, said that his sister Eliza had "tried to cover it up, so it would not leak out, so to speak" (p. 470). It is perfectly clear, therefore, that my memory had confused three different incidents in making up the identity of my case with that of Professor Lodge. Now if I had been a communicator under the circumstances I should have transmitted or made a statement which the sitter would have had to condemn as false, or reconstruct from his own knowledge of the facts into three different incidents. Compare the incident of the "chest," etc., Note 93, p. 534.

I must mention still another illusion of memory on my part, of precisely the same kind as the above. It occurred while Dr. Hodgson and myself were revising together the record, and comparing it with the original automatic writing. The expression "the whole city" occurred in connection with the reference to the incident of the fire (p. 324), and I recalled the burning of Chicago which had interested and affected my father very much. Dr. Hodgson asked when this occurred, and I replied that it was in 1873. Dr. Hodgson remarked that he thought it was in 1872. I replied that it must have been in 1873, because it had occurred after I started to college, and this was in the year 1873. The incident that made me think so was the recollection that I had remarked the smoky appearance of the country at the time, and the locality in mind was that of the college which I was attending. In a moment I recalled that it was my father who had remarked in my presence at the time of the Chicago fire that possibly the smoky atmosphere, though we were three hundred miles from Chicago, was influenced by that conflagration. The moment that this memory occurred to me I found that my previous impression must be false, as father's observation applied to the old home locality, which was fifty miles from the place where I was attending college, and this latter place he had never seen. For a moment I was puzzled to account for the lapse of memory. But the next moment I recalled the fact that during the dry fall at college a large forest fire broke out that did very much damage, and the smoke in the surrounding country reminded me precisely of the smoky sky and atmosphere that we observed at the time of the Chicago fire. I have often thought of the

two incidents together. I looked up the matter and found that the Chicago fire occurred in 1871. My memory, then, was partly wrong and partly right in its recollection. There was a distinct connection between the two events, but it was mental and not chronological or otherwise objective. Here again, therefore, if I had been communicating, I should have confused the incidents of two separate events in my communication, though I should have been correct in the subjective connection given them, a fact, however, which the sitter might never have ascertained or appreciated.

In the messages of my sittings we have exactly the mental situation of these cases duplicated and the identical error committed. The little resemblance that the incidents have to telepathy, especially the last, is shown by the statement about "catching the fish on Sunday" and connecting it with my brother Frank, which, if it be pertinent at all, represents two facts that are false. First, that the fishing was on Sunday, and second that "Sunday" is a word that my father never used, as he absolutely and always used the word "Sabbath." He forbade its use on our part. At best the incident is only partly true, and if altogether false is certainly not telepathic. Then, if telepathy has such good command of the memories and associations in the minds of others, the word "Sabbath" ought to have been obtained here from its association with my father's name, and especially as this usage is also Rector's, who has to be treated on the telepathic hypothesis as Mrs. Piper's secondary personality.

While I am indicating illusions of memory on the part of the living that are duplicated in these sittings I may as well indicate two more, which will show the need of some charity for spirit communications. In my conversation with one of the persons living and named in this record, I was asked by him: "How is your sister Eliza, who lives in Philadelphia?" Now my sister by the name of Eliza, or Lida, was never known or heard of by this man, and she does *not* live in Philadelphia. It was my aunt Nannie who lived in Philadelphia, Pa., and it was she that he referred to in the question. When I told him that he was mistaken in regard to the name, he could not believe it, and it was some time before I could make the matter clear to him. About an hour later his wife, who had not been in the room during this conversation, asked me: "How is your Aunt Eliza, who lives in Philadelphia?" I found that she also meant my aunt Nannie. Now my aunt Eliza lives in Ohio and not in Philadelphia. Both of these aunts, Nannie and Eliza, had recently lost their husbands, one of whom, James Carruthers, was a communicator in this record. It is not probable that either of the inquirers had heard of his death. The other, the husband of aunt Nannie, was a minister of some standing in his church, and his death was known to the inquirers, as I found by

interrogating them. Both were thus mistaken in regard to the name and place of residence of the person of whom they were inquiring. If a discarnate spirit had committed it, no apology would have been allowable for it, except that telepathy, in spite of its amazing and elastic achievements, might slip in this way, but a human intelligence never!

There were several mistakes in the use or relationship of proper names which had already been given rightly by certain communicators, the error sometimes being by the person most naturally expected to make such an error. For instance, my deceased brother Charles, who never, when living, knew or heard of the Lucy McClellan mentioned in this record, and with whom, of course, the name was never associated in my mind, called her his aunt, when she was his cousin (*Cf.* "step-sister," p. 462).

There is another remarkable illustration of both the dramatic play of personality and at least apparent mistake that should be examined in detail. It is the case in which my cousin Robert McClellan endeavours to speak the name of his wife, which was evidently not understood by Rector (pp. 442, 508). My cousin Robert McClellan made a reference apparently to his "dear relatives" and exhibited his usual confusion. But Rector tells the communicator at once to "speak slower, I cannot hear it," and then says to him: "Well, go out then and come again with it," and receives the reply, "All right." Rector then says to me: "Yes, but I did not get what he said last. He said something about Lucy, but it was not for thee, friend," evidently alluding by the word "friend" to Dr. Hodgson, because he at once explains to Dr. Hodgson that "the Lucy is not Jessie's sister," meaning Miss Lucy Edmunds and her sister Jessie, who had at some previous time communicated with Miss Edmunds, Dr. Hodgson's secretary. He then said directly to me that the "Lucy" was for me. Assuming that it was my cousin Robert McClellan that was communicating, I asked him what relation this Lucy was to him, hoping he would say his wife, and received the irrelevant answer, "Mother said it only a moment ago, and she is on father's side, and he comes and speaks of her often." Dr. Hodgson then asked Rector to "state explicitly who this Lucy is," and Rector replied:

"Did not hear it. All right. We will see about it as both Annie and her father have brought her here several times, and aunt Nannie will know well. (I shall ask aunt Nannie about it.) She is a cousin of thine, friend. Dost thou not hear? (Yes. I hear clearly). But do not remember. (I remember one cousin Nannie and one aunt Nannie). Yes, she is. Aunt Nannie is in the body and cousin Nannie is in the spirit. (Yes, your . . . what relation is this cousin Nannie to you?) She is my sister. (R. H. *Whose* sister?) LUCY'S" (p. 442).

Now I can make both the truth and the possible confusion in this passage clear only by an elaborate explanation which will show it perfectly intolerable on the telepathic hypothesis. First let me name the *dramatis personæ* in the case. There are my cousin Robert McClellan, the communicator; my aunt Nannie, who is also his aunt Nannie; my cousin Nannie, who is his sister, and whom he constantly called "aunt Nannie," during the long illness in which she nursed him, in deference to the habits of his children; "cousin Nannie," which I interpret as a mistake of the "machine" for "Annie," referring to my sister, the communicator's cousin; and Rector.

I did not at the time understand the communicator's reference to his mother and the statement that "she is on father's side." Hence Dr. Hodgson's request to state explicitly who this Lucy was. Now when Rector said: "Both Annie and her father have brought her here several times," he most evidently had his mother, my father's sister, or possibly his stepmother in mind. Now, again, when Rector says: "Aunt Nannie will know well," he makes a statement which will be true whether it refers to the aunt of both the communicator and myself by that name, or to his sister whom he called "aunt" as explained. Both would know what I was expected to know here. But when I said that I should "ask aunt Nannie about it," I had in mind the aunt of both of us, and hence a most interesting possible confusion begins. The answer: "She is a cousin of thine, friend," is absurd in relation to what I had in mind. It was correct as referring to his sister.

Suppose the statement "Aunt Nannie will know well" refers to my aunt, and the answer to my question, if the "she" refers to her, is both absurd and false, and telepathy has no claims. If the phrase "aunt Nannie" refers to my cousin's sister, as explained, and the "she" is supposed also to refer to her, the statement that she is my cousin is correct, but it is not what I had in my mind at the time, nor does it represent anything that I knew of, as the discovery of the communicator's habit of calling his sister his "aunt" was an unknown fact to me at the time, and one that it was not possible under the circumstances for me to know, as my notes show (p. 508), and telepathy would have tremendous odds to face, as it would involve the instantaneous act of acquiring the fact in the distant West from an unknown memory. Assuming then that the communicator had his *sister* in mind, called "aunt" as explained, and that he did not understand my reference to aunt Nannie, the aunt of both of us, his answer: "she is a cousin of thine, friend," made by Rector is correct. I had in mind in my statement: "I remember one cousin Nannie and one aunt Nannie," the former the sister of the communicator and the latter the aunt of both of us. Supposing the communicator to have in mind the same persons, his answer that: "Aunt Nannie

is in the body and cousin Nannie is in the spirit," is only half true and is half false, so that telepathy here breaks down. Supposing that he had in mind his sister, when speaking of "aunt Nannie," as explained, and my sister Annie, his cousin, when he said "cousin Nannie," he is perfectly correct in his statements, but the name "cousin Nannie" is false and not gotten by telepathy, as I have no cousin Nannie on the "other side," while I never knew that he called his sister by the name of "aunt." Again, supposing that he had in mind the aunt of both of us when he said "aunt Nannie," and my cousin, his sister, when he said "cousin Nannie," he would have been right in the statement about the aunt of both of us, but wrong about the other, as she is still living, so that telepathy breaks down with this. But if he missed getting the word "cousin" in my question, and had in mind his sister, as explained, when he said "aunt Nannie" his answer is correct, but the act is too much like real communications with mistakes to appeal to telepathy, as she was *my* cousin, his sister, and called "aunt" by him as explained. On this interpretation also the statement that she was Lucy's sister is true to the extent of being her sister-*in-law*, the name of the real sister to this "Lucy," his wife, having been given later (p. 452). If again he has in mind the "Nannie" who is aunt to us both the answer to my question, whether the word "cousin" is caught or not, is absurd and false, and telepathy is again lost. The consequence of all this is that telepathy and the standpoint of that hypothesis only leads to hopeless confusion and contradiction, and we have to choose between making the case spiritistic or nothing at all. But the mere names and the approximation to the truth in any form of the confusion we may choose to suppose prove that the passage cannot be repudiated. Hence the following statement of the case will make it clear.¹

The supposed confusion occurs wholly from assuming the standpoint of my mind for understanding the case. Let me, therefore, reconstruct it with the interpretation of my questions as they might have been understood on the "other side" under the conditions described, and we shall see how simple it is on the spiritistic hypothesis. To do this I shall have to alter my questions to suit the assumptions involved, which the reader will see are warranted from what I have said. I shall also throw the aunt of both of us out of

¹ After attempting to understand the complicated analysis and explanation of this incident, the reader will appreciate Rector's situation as well as his own if he will compare the passage in the Theatetus of Plato, where the latter gives the student an example of the complications with which he has to deal in the problem of ascertaining the truth about the nature of knowledge. Jowett's translation of Plato, Vol. IV., p. 255. Third Edition. For the benefit of American readers I shall refer also to the smaller American edition of Jowett's translation of Plato, Vol. III., p. 397.

account, as it was a mere chance that the statement about her knowing the names well was true and it is not necessary so to interpret it.

Let me state again the *dramatis personæ* of the reconstruction, and avoid the false use of the terms and names from the point of view of my mind. We shall then have the communicator's mother ; my father, the communicator's uncle ; Lucy, the communicator's wife ; the "aunt Nannie," his sister and my cousin, as explained above ; and my sister Annie, the communicator's cousin and by mistake of the "machine" called "Nannie." I start with my question directed to the communicator. The following will be the reconstruction :

"(But what relation was Lucy to you?) mother said it only a moment ago, and she is on father's side, and he comes and speaks of her [Lucy] often.

(R.H. : Yes. Rector, kindly get George to state explicitly, if possible, who this Lucy is. Last time I think you wrote it several times, but when I was out of the room, perhaps the time before, and our friend here I think did not read it at the time.)

[Rector :] Did not hear it. All right. We will see about it as both Annie and her father have brought her here several times, and sister Nannie will know well.

(S. : I shall ask Nannie about it.)

[Rector :] She is a cousin of thine, friend. Dost thou not hear ?

(S. : Yes, I hear clearly.)

[Rector :] But do not remember ?

(S. : I remember one cousin Nannie [communicator's sister] and one aunt Nannie.)

[Rector or communicator :] Yes, she is. "Aunt" [sister] Nannie is in the body and cousin Annie is in the spirit.

(S. : Yes, your . . . what relation is this my cousin Nannie to you ?)

[Communicator :] She is my sister.

(R. H. : *Whose* sister ?)

[Rector :] Lucy's. [In reality sister-in-law.]

The last answer ought to have been "*mine*," meaning the communicator's sister, but he evidently disappears from inability to communicate, as he had to do before and Rector answers for him with an attempt nearly successful, to identify this Lucy. Throwing out Rector's slight mistake we have a perfectly intelligible story from the standpoint of an assumed communicator, and absolutely nothing on any other supposition but what is correct enough, though confused, to prevent us from repudiating it. Telepathy disappears in worse confusion than its supposed powers can endure for a moment, and we must choose spiritism or nothing as our theory. It would not alter the case to suppose that Rector when he said : "Aunt Nannie will

know well," had added the word "Aunt" as interpreting my cousin's possible use of Nannie to mean my Aunt Nannie previously mentioned. It would only increase the confusion in the mind of the trance personality which is supposed to be so good at telepathy !!

Two of the most interesting instances of mistake are those in the use of the word "library" to denote the sitting-room and "Sunday" to denote Sabbath by my father. He never called the sitting-room his "library," according to the memory of all the family. I never heard it, especially as he had no special shelves even for his very few books. As to Sunday, my notes and previous remarks explain this (pp. 432, 67). Father was religiously scrupulous about saying Sabbath, and it would call forth a severe rebuke upon any of us to say Sunday, and we never did it. In fact it has been only during the last few years that I have adopted the use of Sunday, in deference to the environment in which I move. But assuming intermediaries, as the case represents their constant intervention and assistance, we find a circumstance that is a centre shot at telepathy, besides explaining the source of confusion and mistakes. The effect of these mistakes against telepathy would be the same without the assumption of intermediaries, because, with the enormous powers attributed to telepathy and necessary to explain at least 75 per cent. of the messages, if spiritism be excluded, the absence of hesitation in the language under all conditions of acquisition should be followed by as accurate a selection of the right words in these simple instances as in any other, especially as Emperor and Rector themselves naturally use the word "Sabbath" in their communications. In one of these instances (p. 432) the use of the word "Sunday" was accompanied by hesitation before the word was written, as the record shows. Now, in this very sitting we are told directly that George Pelham is assisting my father (p. 435), and there are several indications of the fact by G. P. himself (*Cf.* pp. 211-213), and from what we know of him he would never use the word "Sabbath." The hesitation could then be due to his failure to catch the meaning of my father's message, which would most naturally be expressed in the word "Sabbath." There is no direct evidence that G. P. was an intermediary in the other instance in which the word "Sunday" was used, but we are not always informed of who the intermediaries are besides Rector. In one case, I should never have known that G. P. was an intermediary in the case of some communications from my brother, had it not been for G. P.'s own statement the next day, in which he said that he had helped a man by the name of Charles the last time (p. 468). But this one instance of the influence of intermediaries in the message containing "Sunday" shows how the phenomenon can be explained, while the fact of the error which tends to disprove personal identity both displaces

telepathy and, especially in connection with the hesitation accompanying it, confirms spiritism. It is much the same with the use of the word "library," which was not natural with father. It is very common to use the term for "sitting room," which is the natural expression for my father, and it might be that "library" is the natural term for Rector in expressing the idea here involved, especially if it is the usual form in England, as he purports to be one of the "controls" of Stainton Moses. This conception of the case is well borne out in the message delivered to Dr. Hodgson about the "coach" when referring to the rough roads and country (p. 401). "Coach" is a word that father would never use except in reference to a certain vehicle in the cities, which he never visited more than half-a-dozen times in his life. The word he always used was "carriage," and he would laugh at himself as well as be laughed at, if he used "coach" to express what is conveyed to me by that term in the message mentioned. But the usage in England is very different, as I understand it, and if Rector is to be treated as influenced by his connection with Stainton Moses, or personally acquainted with English habits of expression, we have both an explanation of the variation from my father's usage and an index of the limitations of telepathy (Cf. Phinuit's expressions in England, *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 517, 519, 520, 521). This process makes no use of the associates in my memory, as has to be supposed in other cases, but acts precisely as an independent intelligence would act, that is, misses in the game of deception that has to be attributed to it the simplest resource for its consistency and defence. The spiritistic theory, however, gives both unity and consistency to the whole phenomenon.

Another type of mistake has already been alluded to in the discussion of the dramatic play of personality, but not fully examined in its importance. It is illustrated almost exclusively in Dr. Hodgson's sittings for me, though it appears occasionally in the communications of my uncle and cousin when I am present, as it appears that they have to seek the aid of intermediaries more generally than father. But in Dr. Hodgson's sittings for me the communicator naturally mistakes my presence at times and addresses Dr. Hodgson as if he were addressing me personally. Of course it is not absolutely necessary that we should suppose him unconscious of the situation, as a man might address another in this way with distinct knowledge that he was employing an intermediary. But the evident understanding at the outset until corrected that he was to communicate with me directly on this occasion, rather favours the supposition that the communicator was not perfectly clear as to the real situation, and it would be natural to use the second person as he did, until he later and suddenly awakened to the fact that he was speaking to Dr. Hodgson.

In one remarkable passage, however (p. 387), "Answer this for me, James, when you come again," he combines the address to the second person with the consciousness that I was not present, so that we must be cautious in supposing that the confusion about me is greater than it may be when using the second instead of the third person. But whether conscious or unconscious, it involves precisely the mistake that telepathy ought not to make. It should play its part more consistently. If this power of dramatic play and simulation of reality were one-half what it must be in order to escape the spiritistic theory, there should be no such mistakes as the confusion of the second and third persons in the communications. We can sustain telepathy only on two suppositions in the case. First, that it knows enough to thus commit the mistake purposely in order to imitate more thoroughly the requirements of the spiritistic theory which demand the probability of such errors. But this contradicts its limitations in all mistakes in which it selects words or facts against personal identity, though consistent with the influence of intermediary and independent intelligence. This shrewdness of telepathy is not present in crucial situations testing its supposed qualities. Secondly, we may adduce the gratuitous hypothesis that there were alterations of *rapport* between Dr. Hodgson in Boston and myself in New York. But the facts cannot be studied with this conception in view without discovering some striking contradictions, to say nothing of its naturally preposterous and unsupported nature as a supposition. For instance, in the first sitting with Dr. Hodgson, in spite of the explanation of the situation to the communicator, he addresses me instead of Dr. Hodgson, though the supposition is that the *rapport* is with Dr. Hodgson, as most of the sitting is taken up with an explanation of what the communicator is to do. In the second sitting for about the first half of it he addresses me, until after an interval of respite he suddenly discovers, as it were, that he is talking to Dr. Hodgson, and then proceeds to speak to him of me in the third person. But all this while, whether the *rapport* be constantly in one place or alternatively in Boston and New York, the facts communicated remain from the same source, and the play of personality changes to suit the spiritistic theory. Comparison of the situations in the first and second sittings by Dr. Hodgson will show how natural the procedure is. In the first the communicator starts with the preconception that he is sending messages direct to me, but in the second, after Dr. Hodgson's explanation in the first, the communicator gradually becomes aware of the situation that he can command better, and he does not have to think merely of the messages and the person for whom they are intended, but he can also hold in mind the fact that they are directed to another person. It requires an extra effort of

attention to keep the complexity of the situation in view, and consequently to distinguish rightly the persons involved while occupied with the delivery of messages. The whole action, therefore, is that of an independent intelligence with all its limitations and difficulties, instead of telepathic powers which never know when to play consistently the rôle of the infinite.

I shall not go over again the mistakes connected with the name of my stepmother, and the confusion in the attempts to get it rightly. My notes and the discussion of the dramatic play of personality illustrate this fully enough, and the slightest observation ought to recognise the absurdity of all this enormous effort to secure so simple a name by telepathy when other names far more difficult had been obtained so easily. This absurdity of the telepathic hypothesis in the instance present is especially noticeable when we recall the fact that, by supposition, telepathy was able to avoid the use of the word "aunt" when saying "Nannie" for my stepmother, thus carefully enough distinguishing between two persons with entirely different names and yet could give only one of them!

(4) *Automatisms.*

The last type of phenomena illustrating confusion is represented by what I have called "automatisms" in my notes.¹ They occur generally at the close of some period of communication, or when some

¹ Apropos of the possible causes of mistake and confusion, in so far as the conditions affecting automatism on both sides may produce them, I may refer to some observations of Mr. Douse, who had the task of reading nearly a thousand answers of candidates at a certain University Examination. They illustrate the influence of normal automatism in a variety of ways affecting erroneous spelling and abbreviations. Mr. Douse calls them minor psychological interferences. He makes the following introductory statement before classifying the phenomena observed.—(*Mind*, N. S., Vol. IX. pp. 85-93).

"The average age of the candidates was over nineteen years; and except some half-dozen (who are here left out of account) they were all excellent spellers. Being set down to write, under pressure and against time, compositions of their own upon given questions, those young people may be considered to have been involuntary subjects of a psychological experiment, with the advantage to the experimenter that they were totally unaware of it. Their comparatively few and far between mistakes were at first passed as sporadic eccentricities; but when mistakes of a similar character, and some of identical form, appeared again and again in the answers of different candidates, it seemed to me obvious that they must be due to a common cause or common causes; and this became demonstrable as soon as I had jotted down and classified a few scores of them. Speaking generally, the cause of the perturbations, except as regards one class, was found to be a momentary withdrawal of attention from the point at which the pen had arrived in the process of writing, and its transference to some neighbouring point in the line of ideas which the mind had evolved or was striving to evolve."

There were five classes of errors observed by Mr. Douse which he named and of which he gave numerous illustrations. In a footnote, he remarks that he observed precisely the same mistakes in *different* persons and marks the illustrations according

condition of syncope comes on, or whatever we may call the condition for lack of better knowledge. They are not intended as messages to the sitter by the communicator, but nevertheless they slip through by some means or other. I shall choose a few instances for illustration. In the sitting for December 23rd, 1898 (p. 307), there was the absurd and irrelevant message written out: "I say give me my hat." This would have been meaningless to me, had it not been for my brother's observation that it was a very common expression of my father in situations when he was suddenly required to meet some emergency and go out of doors or do some errand. We must remember that he could walk only with great difficulty, and often asked for some such service to save himself time and trouble. Supposing him in danger of a sort of hypnotic state when communicating, if anything like syncope occurred that necessitated his retiring from the "machine," we can well understand how the familiar phrase might unconsciously obtain utterance, and it occurred twice under similar circumstances. It occurred in the first sitting (p. 307) just before my brother Charles alluded to my father, who apparently could not yet communicate, and was repeated under somewhat similar circumstances at the second

to the number with the Latin words *saepe* (frequent) and *bis* (twice). The following summarises instances in each class.

(1) *Prolepsis*, or "assimilation from ahead." Skekel for shekel, spooned for stooped, pronounce (*saepe*), pronoun (*saepe*), tabernacle, "The general ruled is followed," etc.

(2) *Metapedesis*, or "overleaping." Possive for possessive, preced (*bis*) for preceded, combing for combining, remembrance for remembrance, vocabulary for vocabulary.

(3) *Metallage* or "cross compensation." Silibants (*bis*) for sibilants, patalals for palatals, phamplets (*bis*) for pamphlets, padoga for pagoda.

(4) *Opisthomimesis* or "assimilation from the rear." Biship, synonymns, household, "The verb does not agree with both of the subjects, both (but) only with one," "Again in doing a certain again (action)," etc.

(5) "Contamination." A candidate, as often happened, would spell "Teutonic" nine times correctly, but the tenth time he would write "Tuetonic" through the unconscious influence of the very similar Tuesday; similarly "villian" (villain) was affected by "ruffian"; "goldern" by "leathern"; "Lords Templars" by "Lords Temporal," and once "The troubled Tiber chaffing with her shores."

In Mrs. Piper's automatic writing we often observe such mistakes in so far as they are automatisms, but I cannot classify them under the heads above enumerated in all cases. They also occur with the sitter in taking his notes or copying the communications. For instance, while writing this very note, in the first draft of the very next sentence, by "Prolepsis" I wrote "collecting *they* (them) over a wide area, of experiments, *they* are," etc. But whether classifiable or not, as they may be by collecting them over a wide area of experiments, they are automatisms that often give rise to an apparent error in the messages. Sometimes the error is so apparent from the context that it hardly needs to be reckoned as such. I shall mention a few.

Often Mrs. Piper's hand inscribes "right" for "write," and *vice versa*, and "too" for "to," and *vice versa*. Once in my record Rector wrote "Arthur" for "after" (p. 424). The case of "Frad" for "Frank" (p. 338) illustrates another form. It was written so that a part of the "N" was made as in "FRAN," and then finished as

sitting (p. 313). At the third sitting (p. 332), the strange incoherency, "Do you hear her sing?" occurred. Again at the fourth sitting (p. 336): "Where is my coat?" I would treat the reference to his pen (p. 378) as an automatism, though a more definite and intelligent allusion was made to it later. But all these phenomena do not show the slightest resemblance to what the general trend of our assumed telepathy indicates. These automatisms exhibit no conscious effort to indicate personal identity, as telepathy must be supposed to do, if tolerable at all. They are just such wandering flights of consciousness as we should expect of a mind labouring under mental conditions that fade now and then into delirium, and that may be equally affected by physiological and psychological influences acting in the organism of the medium. The intervals between communicators are often marked by traces of automatism, as if there were intermundane or other influences at work to disturb the process of communicating. Hence they are intelligible on the spiritistic, and not on the telepathic hypothesis.

The automatisms representing Rector's questions to communicators, remarks to them, and communicators' remarks to each other, are not only

the letter "D," and then "FRED" was given. The crowding of the thoughts together, as in "Opisthormesis" above, might thus account for the confusion of the two canes, the curved handled one and the one with the initials carved in the end (p. 397). We can imagine also how "Campaign" might become "camp" (p. 371). See also the possible confusion of "Maggie" for "Nannie." The spelling of "Hyomei" as "Himi" (p. 336), while a natural phonetic error, illustrates the difficulties in the case of unfamiliar words, though afterward in Dr. Hodgson's sittings on my behalf, without any previous indication from either Dr. Hodgson or myself, the word was spelled almost correctly, namely, as "Hyomi" (p. 391). The mistake of "Charles" for "Carruthers" (pp. 422-423), especially when we remember that it was pronounced in the family as "Crothers," as in "brothers," is perfectly intelligible. This remark also is reinforced by the interesting fact that, after writing the name correctly myself all my life, once in writing my notes on this record I spelled it "Carthers" and preserved the instance as an illustration of how the name "Charles" might be given for this uncle.

A most interesting instance of automatic mistake also is Dr. Hodgson's writing "there" for "here" in my first sitting (p. 309), and repeating it in the revision. Similar also to those above classified was the printer's mistake in setting up "Miss Hodgson" for "Dr. Hodgson" after the name "Miss S." in the previous sentence (p. 346). Another instance of the same import as the first of these two was the addition by Dr. Hodgson of the words "Sounds like" before the word "bone" (p. 327) after the expression "Sounds like bone" had been written once, though the words "sounds like" had been used but once by the trance personality. This, of course, had to be cut out of the detailed record as not a part of the original automatic writing.

I may remark also an interesting automatism of my own which is very frequent. In writing a word containing the letter "e" I often dot it for an "i." This, however, I never do except when it is liable to be mistaken by the reader for an "i." While writing rapidly I fail to make the loop, and the appearance of the letter is unmistakably that of an "i." Now, the interesting part of it is that, although I am thinking only of "e" at the time, the motor action of the arm is adjusted to the appearance of the letter in the field of vision, and I discover my mistake only after it has been committed.

different in kind from those that come from a regular communicator, but they expose more evidently than the others the weakness of telepathy as an explanation of the whole case. They represent the sensibility of the "machine" to perfectly intelligent conversation on the "other side," which there is no necessity for our getting, except to discredit the hypothesis of telepathy. They are usually clear and intelligible statements which we can easily understand as representing a dramatic play out of our sight, and are in no respect either passive reflections of telepathic messages or the reproduction of the sitter's memories. The spiritistic character and pertinence of all this ought to be evident at a glance, though it could have little or no weight without prior evidence of personal identity. But when it supplements this evidence and does not constitute any intended part of the process involved in getting that evidence it shatters the telepathic theory by attributing to it the elasticity of many very different processes.

Perhaps the same use can be made of Mrs. Piper's deliverances as she emerges from the trance. But I shall not discuss them at length, and the reader can study them for himself. They are especially rich in confusion and automatism. But the important fact about them is that they are the only instances in which any traces of secondary personality in the ordinary conception of the term can be found. This is a fact of very great significance, since it represents an abrupt break from the condition in which messages are easier, clearer, coherent, pertinent, and unassociated with anything that we know of secondary personality, to the condition in which messages are very incoherent and the indications of secondary personality are very marked. This ought not to be the case if the main phenomena were not preferably spiritistic, at least in the perfection of their representation of that hypothesis.

CHAPTER V.

DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS.

The first thing to be said in regard to the difficulties and objections to the spiritistic theory is that, from the standpoint of my own sittings alone, there are no serious obstacles to the doctrine. If I had to judge the case by my own experiments and record alone, I do not see how I could avoid the conclusion that a future life is absolutely demonstrated by them. The clue even to such difficulties as have to be discussed has been obtained from sources outside the Piper phenomena, and but for them I should have nothing to suggest the cautiousness that I have maintained. The evidence for personal identity in this record is so overwhelming, that when we dismiss fraud from consideration and reckon the mistakes and confusions in the favour of spiritism instead of difficulties and objections, we should not naturally suspect telepathy as the most probable hypothesis in the case. The spectre which that doctrine raises is of the Society's own making in phenomena wholly outside the field I am considering here, and obtains its cogency far more from our mental habits than from the facts of this record. If the mistakes and confusions preponderated, the case might not be so cogent; at least it would not appear so to the average mind, though the scientist might well suspect whether that might not be the proper result to be expected, considering the abnormal conditions of all sorts under which work of this kind has to be done. But astonishing as it must be to any one who would *a priori* suppose that difficulties in communication would be insuperable, even on the assumption that anything like a spirit existed, the mistakes and confusions bear no suspicious proportion to the clear and significant truths, even in the communication of the most complex incidents, and consequently they not only become subordinated to the conclusion which is necessary to explain the pertinent matter, but also serve the spiritistic view by virtue of the limitations which they suggest in a hypothesis that these limitations contradict. To all who are not perfectly familiar with these phenomena and who ignore the fact that obstacles to any form of communication must be admitted, and this to a larger extent for spiritism than for telepathy—to all these the imperfections of the messages and the positive errors will appear a difficulty. But I think the true scientist, whatever his attitude toward this subject, would expect error and confusion, even on the supposition of existing spirits, and might expect them to an extent

that would exclude the possibility of any proof whatever of their existence.¹ The assumption, of course, would be *a priori* and worthless in case experience or facts proved it false, but it is the most natural one to make until the evidence at least modifies it.

It will be apparent, therefore, after what has been already said on the subject of mistakes and confusions, why I treat their significance as the reverse of an obstacle to spiritism. Hence such suspense of

¹ As an illustration of what the scientist ought most naturally to expect in alleged communications from discarnate spirits I may be permitted by the Kantian idealist to quote that Coryphæan authority in modern philosophy. He had frankly and candidly faced the issue in problems of this sort and actually outlined the whole method of psychical research a hundred years before any practical attempt was made to apply it. It was the experience of Immanuel Swedenborg that prompted him to do so. The letter to Fraulein von Knobloch in 1758 shows how seriously he considered Swedenborg's phenomena, though we should to-day discriminate between various types of them more sharply than Kant may have done. But Kant recognised very clearly that any communications purporting to come from a transcendental and discarnate consciousness, if in any respect genuine, must contend with pathological conditions, and he represented these conditions as necessarily more abnormal than experience has shown them to be. Let me quote Dr. Edward Caird's account of Kant's doctrine, especially as there is no evidence in our list of membership that Dr. Caird is influenced in his statement of the problem by any preconceptions that our work might have produced, and yet no clearer statement of the general problem could be imagined. In his "Critical Philosophy of Kant" (Vol. I., p. 150), after imagining the possibility that there is a world of spiritual consciousness which may affect our moral consciousness in some way, Dr. Caird says, representing the conception which Kant took: "The only difficulty that remains unexplained is, how we are to reconcile the existence of such a spiritual community with the fact that we are so seldom conscious of it. For the spiritual world is present to man, if at all, only in occasional glimpses, which, besides, have often a somewhat uncertain and even irrational character. This, however, is already explained by what has been said of the nature of the consciousness of man as contrasted with that of purely spiritual beings. For what we experience as spirits will not naturally enter into that consciousness which we have of ourselves as men; or if it does so enter at all, it will only be under abnormal conditions, and even then the intimations from the spirit world will necessarily take the form of the consciousness into which they intrude. Spiritual realities will be pictured as objects and events in the natural world, and all the imperfections of the medium will affect the vision. For men in general such perceptions will have something of the character of disease; and if there are a few exceptional individuals who are so constituted as to be continuously conscious of spiritual influences, their minds will be so much drawn out of proper balance as to the things of this world by the confusing presence of another, that they will often be regarded by other men as insane. In this way it only needs a little ingenuity to explain all the facts of ghost-seeing in accordance with our primary assumption as to the relations of the two worlds. 'For metaphysical hypotheses have wonderful pliancy, and it would show a great want of ingenuity not to be able to adapt *this* hypothesis to every story of supernatural visitations, and that without taking trouble to investigate its truth, which in many cases would be impossible, and in yet more would be discourteous, to attempt.'" (Cf. Kant's "Traüme eines Geistesehers," pp. 336-349, Hartenstein's edition. See also Goerwitz' translation of the same. Preface, pp. i.-xi., and Introduction, pp. 1-33.) With such a view as this before us our problem is simply one in which the evidence for personal identity must be sufficient to overcome the objections from telepathy, and mistakes and confusions will stand in favour of a spiritistic hypothesis. [Cf. Appendix VII., p. 643.]

judgment as I have to entertain in the phenomena of this record must come from outside sources.

The first objection which I have to meet is one that is constantly advanced by scientific men, or by men who are everywhere presumed to be such. It is not an objection from the standpoint of the intelligent psychical researcher, nor from that of this record, which deals exclusively with the problem of personal identity, but it is the objection of those who wholly misunderstand the nature of the primary question at issue. Nevertheless it must be stated and met. It is that spiritism cannot be accepted or proved until we know something about the conditions of life in the transcendental world alleged as a consequence of these experiments and other similar phenomena. This demand is made by two classes of minds. There is first the average person who is interested in the *form* of this life rather than the fact of it, not having any doubt about the fact, or any appreciation of the materialistic doctrine which makes any such life extremely doubtful. Then there is the scientific (?) mind which follows in the wake of this false idea of the common mind, and though it is not infected with the same morbid interest in either the fact of survival or the kind of life it promises, is nevertheless possessed of the same preconceptions of what the problem is. The objection, therefore, must be considered very carefully, and it can be viewed from two wholly different conceptions of the term "*proof*" as bearing both upon the problem of personal identity and upon that of the conditions of life in a transcendental existence.

The first conception of "*proof*" to be noticed is that of any process by which certitude of conviction or knowledge is obtained in the mind of the person who acquires the conviction. This may be effected in two ways: (1) By the ratiocinative process, or the syllogism; and (2) By personal experience, insight, perception, or realisation in consciousness. Ultimately this latter process is the expression and source of the "*proof*" we are considering; for in all cases in which reasoning can figure as producing personal conviction the function of immediate apprehension is involved in the appreciation of the cogency of the reasoning itself. The subject of the conviction must appreciate the identity of the conceptions with which the ratiocinative process deals, so that *personal realisation in consciousness* is the first and the last criterion of the "*proof*" in question.

But for a man to demand this form of "*proof*" from me or from the Society is essentially unscientific and unreasonable, because by its very nature it can be obtained by no one except the man who asks it. He asks us to produce a personal experience for him which involves killing him to get it. He wants to be relieved of responsibility for his convictions and yet insists on a criterion which necessarily implies

that responsibility. It is the duty of the man who makes this demand to do his own proving in the conception of the case defined. This form of "proof" cannot be supplied by any one except the subject, even in present life, to say nothing of any supposed transcendental world.

I shall not deny any man the right to set up so high a standard for the determination of his own personal convictions, as I not only admit that right, but also admit that it is not safe for most persons, without the most thorough acquaintance with scientific methods, to accept any other standard than personal experience, though this may be exposed to fallibility. Our sanity depends upon putting the standard of conviction very high. But we must not confuse this right or duty with scientific method. We cannot make our personal conversion the criterion of truth or the measure of what is meant by scientific method. It may be our only personal defence against illusion, but science does not have to guarantee any man against the abuses of his own judgment. It supplies data and asks for the best available hypothesis to explain them. The individual may be as rigid as he pleases in the exaction of evidence, but he must not make his personal conviction any duty of mine before I have either convinced myself or satisfied the demands of scientific method as it is understood in all the sciences.

Hence the second form of "proof" is precisely this method. It simply collects facts under suitable conditions for the determination of rational hypotheses between which we have to choose. The "proof" in this case still leaves the responsibility for belief in the subject of it, but it permits the data to be furnished by some one else, and the issue stated so that the question is merely whether the facts come under an old, or require a new hypothesis. It is simply Inductive Method, as usually defined, and determines the degree of probability in proportion to the application of the Canon of Agreement, or that of Difference. I shall assume that the reader is familiar with this. I am concerned only in making clear that men shall not demand of this or any other work in the determination of truth that it shall employ any other means than the facts of present experience to solve any of its problems. They had better remain unsolved, if we are to leave any and every individual to determine the standard of science by his mere "will to believe or disbelieve," valuable as this is for security against the illusions to which we may be exposed in new inquiries. Still, old doctrines are not so sacred or so well founded by virtue of mere age or habit as always to escape the illusions of another type that may be as dangerous as any against which we try to protect ourselves. Consequently, "proof" in scientific parlance is the presentation and production of present facts that enable us to calculate the probabilities of the course

of nature, whether every person is able to see them or not. But it does not impose any impossibilities. It does not require us to supplant the process of individual experience, nor does it require us to make the realisation in consciousness of any fact the test of all rationality. It suffices if it can unify experience in terms of probabilities when it can do no more.

Now, in the application of this method to the phenomena of spiritualism our problem is simply to collect the facts and try hypotheses, no matter whither they lead. Now, when it comes to collecting facts or statements purporting to represent a transcendental world we must remember that there are two wholly distinct problems involved which ought not to be confused. The first is the existence of such a world, and the second is the conditions that characterise it. What will "prove" or render possible or probable the first will or may leave the second untouched. Taken in the special form of spiritism the two problems are (1) the *existence* of spirits, and (2) their *mode of life*. Unfortunately it seems that the majority of mankind, scientific and unscientific alike, have such a morbid interest in the latter question that they wholly ignore both the place which it should have in the truly scientific mind and the necessary insolubility of the problem in any such terms as they have been accustomed to represent their knowledge. Our chief complaint against the average spiritualist is that he assumes to know and describe the conditions of a life for which we have no experience or immediate data to make it intelligible. It ill becomes the scientific man to put himself on the level of the people that he affects to despise. But he does so when he asserts or assumes that we must know the conditions of a transcendental life before we can accept it as a fact. All our intelligible knowledge is represented by some form of sensory, or at least terrestrial experience. We cannot suppose any sensory phenomena in a discarnate soul with its loss of the very conditions of such, though, if we knew more than we do, we might find other means of getting impressions. But this assumption is too precarious to build an hypothesis upon it. Whatever the experiences of a discarnate soul, supposing it a fact, we have no means in the media of our scientific knowledge to determine how we shall think them. It would require the presence of a spiritual body even to suggest anything analogous to our sensory impressions. But a surviving soul, assuming that it has any consciousness of its past, could very well express or think in terms of its terrestrial life, and it would have to do so if there were any possibility of proving this survival. Hence the problem of personal identity is the first question to be settled. What claims to be a spirit must be made to prove its veracity by proving its personal identity, and it can do this only by narrating its own terrestrial history

in a way to break the theory of telepathy. The facts also must be verifiable. But when it has established its veracity, it does not follow that we are to accept any statements regarding transcendental conditions of life as intelligible. Veracity and intelligibility are not convertible. We may accept the veracity of a spirit after its identity has been proved, and yet, without rejecting the truth of its statements about spirit life, refuse to treat them as in any way important or intelligible for us. Statements about a discarnate life are, of course, worthless as evidence, because they are unverifiable, and even if veracious are in addition not necessarily intelligible. It is thus strange that men pretending to be scientific express their willingness to be converted to spiritism, if we shall only tell them what the conditions of life are in which a disembodied soul lives. They avow their readiness to accept a doctrine on both unverifiable and unintelligible evidence. I for one refuse to do this. I have no interest in the conditions of such existence until I get there, unless they can be made intelligible to me. I refuse to be drawn aside from the only rational problem of science, which is personal identity, because within that field the facts, being reminiscences, may be both verifiable and intelligible. This limitation of the problem may make it insoluble in the estimation of some people. So be it; nevertheless, I admit no problem as prior to that of identity, and I consider any demand for unverifiable data and statements to involve a point of view worthy only of those whose follies and fraud have made it all but impossible to discuss a hereafter with patience or respect. The man who sets up for a scientist should be the last to sympathise with such a position, and should know both his method and the nature of the problem sufficiently to escape illusions on so fundamental a question. Spiritualism ought not to have a rival in the follies of the scientist who merely shelters himself under the shadow of a great authority without intelligence, and thus converts his own standard into credulity.

I have said nothing of suggestion as a difficulty in the case, because I do not consider it a factor in the results worth examination. There are a few isolated instances, to which I have called attention in my notes and remarks as occasion required, in which suggestion is a conceivable explanation. But these are too few to allow them any weight in the whole, which the reader can easily see is unaffected by such suspicions. Were any large number of specific incidents influenced by my questions or statements the criticism might be considered. But they are too infrequent to justify the waste of time and space in their examination.

I could, however, construct an ingenious theory of suggestion out of certain cases by taking them in connection with later messages and thus indicate a source of impeachment. Thus I might say that my

remark made in the letter sent to Dr. Hodgson and read to the hand on February 22nd, 1899 (p. 400), regarding my aunt Nannie's care of us is the suggestion of that name and allusion to her keeping house for father after my mother's death, made on June 1st, 1899 (p. 449). I might also suppose that my request to finish the name begun with the letter "F" on December 27th, 1898 (p. 338), was the source of the "guess" at "FRAD" which I identified as Frank, but which could as well be taken for a jump at Fred, which is actually given later where Francis was mentioned, on May 29th, 1899 (p. 425). But when such sporadic instances are examined they will appear as mere quibbling in comparison with the vast majority of cases that are free from all suspicion in this respect. Hence I shall not waste any time discussing such ingenious speculations that are mere evasions of the pertinence attaching to more evidential incidents.

The next objection that is to be met is one that is perhaps more general than any other. It is the triviality of the incidents communicated and the poverty of the life, or arrested development, which they are supposed to indicate. The reply to this charge, however, is sufficiently clear, both in my refusal to recognise the assumption that the facts are any indication of the condition of the soul, and in my remarks on the Experiments in the Identification of Personality (pp. 537-623). We saw in these experiments that living, and presumably rational men choose the most trivial incidents for the purpose of identification, and that we are equally bound to reflect on their sanity, or express repugnance to their conditions of life, when we are tempted to sneer at the occupations and mental status of spirits. No idea of the persons can be formed in those experiments from the character of their messages. They naturally selected the incidents which association recalled for establishing identity, and these were necessarily trivial. But what has been said of the problem of psychical research, and of the conditions of communication in any case ought to show that we have no right to judge of the phenomena by any other standard than that of personal identity, no matter what theory we have to account for them. If the mental conditions necessary for communication are possibly abnormal, as might be most natural, though this is not apparent in the case of Imperator and Rector, for reasons of experience presumably, there would be an additional reason for the triviality of the messages and the confusion which the unscientific mind misjudges. But whether such conditions exist or not, the only incidents that should influence any man who can lay the slightest claim to a scientific comprehension of the problem will be those which cannot be duplicated in any living consciousness, or that at least are not common experiences. Trivial facts are the only thing that will satisfy these conditions.

It would be a far more pertinent query to ask why telepathy should thus limit itself to trivial incidents than to raise the question regarding spirits. The presumably easy access of this power to the sitter's and others' memories, the supposed intelligence of the process in connection with its adjunct, secondary personality, and discrimination between the relevant and irrelevant matter, and the absence of all reason to suppose that telepathy must duplicate the mental conditions apparent on the "other side" for communicating, ought to qualify it for the reproduction of the important matter that we should most naturally expect of normal personality. A process presumably so intelligent ought to produce what is wanted and not to betray the limitations so apparent in the results.

I must summarise several important facts that may be considered as a reply to the accusation of triviality in the messages. They are partly a denial and partly a justification of the triviality. I state them briefly. (1) The facts are not all trivial. Many of them are quite worthy of the best intelligence, even when not attempting to establish personal identity. (*Cf.* incidents of conversations on spirit return, pp. 30-34, religious remarks, pp. 401, 456, and hymn incident, p. 389.) (2) Many of the trivial incidents were in response to my own questions and involved the satisfaction of my own demands. The irrationality must be on my part. (3) Many of those that were spontaneously trivial follow upon an explanation to the communicator of what he is to do, and he is told to remind me of little things in his life. (4) The probable abnormal condition of the communicator's mind in the act of communicating, and the difficulties of the act.

The last consideration is a most important one and the evidences that it is a fact must be enumerated. (1) That there must be difficulties in the way of communicating is an *a priori* necessity in the case whether we choose to admit the existence of spirits or not. Any world of energy transcending sense must yield a difficulty in connecting it with sensory experience, no matter what we conceive that world to be. (2) The alternation of communicators which ought not to occur on the telepathic theory. (3) The character of the communications at the point of change from one communicator to another. (4) The confused and fragmentary character of many of the messages. (5) The absolute failure and inability of some communicators to communicate although they should be as naturally expected as those who do appear. (6) The statements of the communicators themselves (*Cf.* pp. 643-645, 428, 449) both in regard to their confused state of mind when communicating and their clearer consciousness when not communicating. (7) The analogies of hypnosis and secondary personality, in respect both of the contents of the messages and the appearance of a disturbed memory.

In reference to the matter of triviality the student will appreciate the rationality of it much better if he will consult those passages and incidental remarks of the chief communicator which reflect his conscious understanding of my purpose. This only gradually dawned upon him and as it was explained to him, so to speak, first on the "other side" apparently, and then by Dr. Hodgson in the first of his sittings on my behalf. As a good illustration of the appreciation shown in attempting to satisfy my demands compare the answer to my request on June 6th (p. 470, *Cf.* also pp. 434, 460). One special statement is worth quoting, as it intelligently recognises in a *spontaneous* way both my object and the triviality of the fact mentioned, thus anticipating and answering the very objection under consideration. On June 8th (p. 490) my father, referring to my stepmother, asked me: "Will you ask her about the paper knife, not because I care for so trifling a thing, only as a test for you."

It would appear, therefore, that I entertain no objections to the spiritistic interpretation of the case. While this is true in regard to my own sittings; while I should be inclined to treat them as conclusive, if I had not studied the subject in its wider phases and if I could regard the phenomena as quite as well isolated as any physical phenomena obtained under similar conditions of exclusion, yet I shall not refuse to admit the existence of problems which require some suspense of judgment regarding spiritism, strong as it may seem to be on the surface of such facts as are here recorded. But nevertheless the fact is that I have to go wholly outside of my own sittings and record for difficulties and objections of any sort, and these are of various degrees of weight, some of them being easily answered, as I think, and some of them too well supported by the facts of secondary personality to be dismissed without careful consideration, even if we do not regard them as really applicable to the Piper case.

Now as my own spiritistic preferences were not determined by my experiments alone and by the exclusion of other phenomena of like import, on the surface at least, but were simply the "straw that broke the camel's back" after studying Dr. Hodgson's Report, which brought the issue very sharply to view and which left me without any satisfactory reply to his position; as it was the total record of the Society's work, supplemented by my experiments, that disturbed my allegiance to materialism; so it is the whole field of alleged spiritistic phenomena, and especially the whole of the Piper case as previously published, that I felt obliged to reckon with before being too sure of the conclusion which is so strongly supported by my own sittings. Consequently, as I understand the problem, there are two general sources of difficulty and objection which are both respectable and deserving of careful

consideration. They are, first, the earlier reports on the Piper phenomena, and, second, the character of certain alleged spiritistic phenomena which suggest very large capacities for secondary personality, to say nothing of a large field of genuinely supernormal facts which cannot be rightly termed spiritistic for the lack of traces in them of evidence for personal identity.

Taking the Phinuit *régime* in the Piper case we have certain phenomena which suggest caution in the acceptance of the spiritistic theory, since they indicated the identity of living persons rather than that of the deceased. They are those experiments in which Phinuit would undertake to furnish the names and incidents in the lives of persons intimately connected with some old rag or trinket of whose ownership and history the sitter might be entirely ignorant. Phinuit also did not seem to care whether the person represented in the ownership of such articles was living or dead. (*Cf. Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 458, 525, 535-6, 537 and 584; Vol. VIII., pp. 20-27, 101-3, 106, 109, 115, 129, 140-1, 145, 154-5, 160-6.) There is some system in obtaining communications with your friends, and, through them, in calling up a relative, since we can imagine some form of telepathic influence on a spirit to attract it, though this conception is tenuous enough to frighten us in applying our standards of belief. If we could suppose the possibility of our friends being about us in a world which simply prevents their communicating with us except under unusual and abnormal conditions we can conceive why we establish rapport with them by going to a medium. This supposition, however, is the question at issue, or if not the question at issue, is still as precarious as any we can imagine. But when it comes to tapping any past consciousness that you please and about which you know nothing, simply by putting some old rag in the hand of a medium, the thing becomes so incomprehensible, if not preposterous, at least to me, as to stagger anything but credulity. I do not dispute the possibility of explaining such phenomena on the spiritistic hypothesis, if that is once secured, as we are too ignorant of the laws of any supposed transcendental world to say what discarnate spirits can or cannot do, if it is once granted that they exist. But the problem is not one of explanation merely. It is also one of evidence, and the existence of spirits must be proved before utilising them for purposes of explanation, and as the phenomena so often indicate absolutely no traces of deceased personal identity we find them to be difficulties in the way of accepting spiritism. But we do not dispose of the marvellous nature of the thing by refusing to recognise it as spiritistic. It is even as incomprehensible on any other view. It would not help matters to call such performances clairvoyance with the intention of excluding spirits from account—for that alleged process, if true, is far more unintelligible than the assumed agency of spirits. Spirits at least have

this advantage, that they represent a consciousness with some known powers conceivably enlarged in a transcendental world, where possibly telepathy, a sporadic fact with the living, might be the normal mode of communication and might immensely extend their resources for the acquisition of knowledge, especially when we look at the case from the idealist's doctrine of space. But clairvoyance and telepathy as ascribed to incarnate minds, are absolutely unknown in their mode of action, and are little more than names for facts which require a cause and which cannot be explained by any agency that science ordinarily recognises. By some extraordinary hypothesis, for which there is some evidence, but not enough to dogmatise upon, or upon which to ask the sympathy of scientific minds not thoroughly acquainted with the whole problem, I admit that we could give a spiritistic explanation to such phenomena as I have alluded to, and this might be done as Hartmann actually does it, by a sort of monistic pantheism which does not require us to take space into account in tapping the infinite. I have already said that I do not regard the pantheistic view as in any respect inconsistent with spiritism in its fundamental postulate, namely, that the stream of consciousness which passes for a person in this life and which must be as much an emanation of the absolute now as after death, may still survive and have its memory as at present. Or telepathy once granted for any world whatsoever, it might also be qualified to secure the right person connected with the trinket in any number of supposable ways, even on the assumption that as persons we are thoroughly individuated, as the atomic theory would require. But in the absence of any knowledge that spirits exist at all, the supposition of finding any one we please in this easy manner is so extraordinary that we should naturally ask whether the attitude of agnosticism is not safer than spiritism. I confess that any attempt to explain such phenomena without spiritism only makes matters worse. Hence I can but recognise agnosticism, which is simply the attitude of caution and insistence on the most rigid canons of evidence, as the only rational alternative to spiritism, if we are to give such phenomena any importance at all.

But it is right here that a very significant objection can be raised against the recognition of these phenomena as indicative of anything in the supernormal field. The sceptic may refuse to admit that they are sufficient in quantity and quality to invite any other explanation than chance and guessing. Some of the real or apparent successes in the recorded experiments of the kind mentioned might be less suggestive after these suppositions were applied to them, so that we may not resort to the supernormal in any shape. But this is to cut them off completely from use as objections to spiritism in the case of the Piper record where chance and guessing are pre-empted at the outset. The spiritistic theory in this instance will become overwhelming the

moment that we repudiate the value and significance of the coincidences in the experiments under consideration as furnishing objections. I am not able, however, to agree in discarding their value. Some of the incidents should have to be scrutinised with chance and guessing in view, and also perhaps illusions of identity on the part of the person who recognised them. They were, however, not only careful experiments, but contain, when taken as a whole, and more especially in certain important instances, coincidences with specific contents in too many cases to dismiss them as accidents. There are in them clear instances of supernormally acquired knowledge, and so must be retained either to create difficulties for spiritism or to indicate the existence of certain problems in it which we should like to see solved before committing ourselves unreservedly to it. The sceptic, however, will remove the objection to spiritism founded upon them, if he discredits their supernormal value. On the other hand, I see no hope of getting any leverage with which to begin their explanation until the existence of discarnate souls is admitted, though the facts indicating something supernormal are no evidence of the spiritistic theory. Hence it will be apparent why I do not intend to treat the phenomena as in any way insuperably opposed to the belief in spirits. They are difficulties *in* the theory, not against it.

But there is one class of phenomena in these experiments referred to as suggesting difficulties that perhaps raise the strongest objection which we have to meet. They are the instances in which Phinuit apparently, not certainly, read the minds of certain persons at a distance, merely by having a trinket of some sort in Mrs. Piper's hand and that belonged to the person whose mind was supposedly read. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 139-159; see also references above, p. 126.) This was done in some cases in which the medium had no knowledge of the owner of the article, nor did the sitter, Dr. Hodgson. There is no pretence of spirit communication in the contents of the messages, as they actually represent the present or past consciousness of living persons, and show no traces of any other personal identity. The facts represented largely physical actions which the person from whom they were presumably obtained were performing at the time or had performed shortly before. Now there is no satisfactory evidence in such phenomena of the existence of spirits. If you have once proved their existence you are justified in admitting them as the possible, perhaps the most probable, explanation of such facts, but the incidents are no evidence of that hypothesis in so far as it is affected or determined by the problem of personal identity, and it is this last issue that I maintain must be satisfied first. Consequently, without prior proof of identity we must, at least, feel charitable for telepathy, or something

like it, and this on a vast scale. Now just in proportion as we feel obliged to accept telepathy in these and other coincidences transcending time and space limitations in the mind of the sitter, apparently hunting up some unknown person from whom to extract the information, to the same extent we must admit the possibility that telepathy might account for the reproduction of personal identity in the facts pertaining to those who have died. This has always been the reasoning that held me to scepticism regarding the spirit theory, and I know that Dr. Hodgson was restrained by the same fact from his conclusions for a long time. I suspect too that it was this circumstance which induced his effort to see whether the facts made it more probable that Phinuit was a discarnate spirit than that he should be merely the secondary personality of Mrs. Piper, representing her telepathic and clairvoyant powers. But legitimate as this may be, we cannot escape the duty to make the spiritistic theory good against real or apparent objections of this sort.

But I do not regard the difficulty here raised as at all an insuperable one. I think it possible to explain the phenomena on the spiritistic theory, if once assumed, though the evidence for it has to be very different. That evidence is much stronger to-day than it was when the first two reports were published on the Piper case, and adds its weight to the argument for a spiritistic interpretation of the phenomena under consideration. But independently of this later evidence there are two resources for limiting the importance of the objection advanced. There is first the elastic and indefinite meaning of the terms clairvoyance and telepathy. I have already shown that they are mere names for an unknown cause. They are convenient weapons for scepticism, and serve a most useful purpose in keeping the standard of evidence as high as possible, but they are not in truth explanations of any sort. We get into the habit of assuming *a priori* that they mean necessarily processes between living minds on the ground that the evidence does not prove spirits, and we forget wholly that we are so ignorant of the real *modus operandi* in the case that it does not occur to us that possibly the agency intermediating the whole effect may be spirits. I do not advance this supposition as probable, and if I thought the mere suggestion of it was calculated to diminish the stringency of the canons of evidence I should be sorry to have mentioned it. But it is legitimate to remark the limitations of the appeal to telepathy, which rather creates than solves problems. The second reply is based upon the possible spiritistic nature of Phinuit. If we shout telepathy we may well question the spirit reality of Phinuit, but we may in this way shut our eyes to facts which telepathy cannot explain, but which spiritism may cover and with them the other incidents in question. We may therefore turn the

problem completely around and ask whether the facts on the whole do not make it more probable than not that Phinuit was a discarnate spirit, and by this circumstance unravel the mystery about his performances. This hypothesis must not be hastily made, nor the canon of evidence be parted from in the attempt, but it is legitimate as a possible alternative to the explicable meaning of telepathy and clairvoyance when these are nothing more than appeals to an infinite of which we know nothing. Now I must say that, taking the whole Phinuit performances under careful scrutiny, the spiritistic theory to account for him is a perfectly rational one. I do not say that it is proved or even the most probable one, but that it is a rational possibility, and especially in the light of what the Piper phenomena have finally exhibited. In spite of his shortcomings and the total failure to establish his personal identity, the independence of his intelligence, the consistency of his claim that he was a spirit and obtained all his information from spirits, the mention of correct French names, which Mrs. Piper could hardly have ever heard, except on the assumption of fraud, and more especially the mass of evidence of identity of other persons than himself, and all the difficulties of telepathic hypothesis which I have mentioned as inherent in it—all these are strongly suggestive that he was what he claimed to be, and this once granted, the phenomena which seem to give difficulty become either explicable on the spirit theory, or a subordinate problem under it. To say the least, this is a possible alternative, rendered somewhat strong by the array of facts just mentioned, and as long as this is the case we are not forced to accept telepathy either as an explanation of the phenomena or as an unequivocal objection to spiritism. Nevertheless, though I regard the difficulty as one that is not against spiritism, but in it, I consider it an obligation to be extremely cautious in preferring the spiritistic theory against the possible difficulties, profound or superficial, as the case may be, that may be raised by the prudent sceptic on the ground of achievements that are not evidence of personal identity in any discarnate spirit, but that are so apparently amenable to the extended telepathy which is here assumed to be the rival of spiritism. But whatever difficulties the phenomena considered may have suggested in the old Phinuit *régime*, when his identity could not be established, and when the identity of others was less clear than in the later *régime*, they are less serious in the present conditions of the case, though we know nothing about the identity of Imperator and Rector. The dramatic play of personality which in no case can be explained by telepathy, and the prevention of interference and confusion from various communicators, with greater accompanying clearness in the messages and their illustration of personal identity, are so suggestive of spiritism as to diminish the original importance

of the various difficulties in the Phinuit régime and to give the spiritistic theory the preference.

One of the circumstances which at least seem to favor telepathy in the estimation of some people, or to suggest a suspicion in its favor, is the fact that it is almost uniformly your friends who appear as the communicators in these experiments, and hence represent what is most likely in the sitter's memory. Were the sitters called upon to identify persons of whose lives they knew nothing, and were they as successful in this as in those they do identify, the telepathic theory would have such an independence of the sitter's memory that it would make the alternative theory more plausible. But the general correlation between the communicator and the memory of the sitter is a suspicious fact in some minds, inasmuch as it makes the majority of the incidents on which the argument rests amenable to telepathy, at least as the safest precaution against hasty conclusions. But I regard the objection as sufficiently refuted by two facts—first, that such unknown persons have often communicated incidents which satisfy the criterion of personal identity, at least to the extent necessary to meet the difficulty considered (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 372-383), and, second, that incidents are often given which are unknown to the sitter, and which would have to be acquired, on the telepathic theory, in the same way as when the communicator is unknown to the sitter, namely, by a selection from the memory of some living person unknown to the medium or unknown to the sitter. But it is a very singular and inconceivable power to give it two such infinite capacities, one to get the right incident independently of the sitter's memory, and the other both the right person deceased and the right fact to represent his identity, both unknown to the sitter, to say nothing of the facts stated that evidently belong to no living person at all, and have yet their probabilities without verification, both intrinsically and on the veracity of the communications generally. The dramatic play of personality would be against the marvellous selective power of telepathy, or create a suspicion against it at least, even if all the facts belonged to the subliminal of the sitter.

I am not able to admit that the fact of communications almost exclusively from friends specially favours telepathy. We know too little of the laws and conditions of nature and of telepathy to assume any such theory about this matter. There is one thing, however, that we do know from experience with the Piper phenomena, and this is that the task of identifying any stranger to the sitter would be an infinitely more difficult one than with the known communicators when we have to contend with so much scepticism in regard to those that we do identify as our friends. I doubt whether I could be induced to prefer the spiritistic theory of any verifiable facts in the life of a stranger whose errors were greater than his successes in communication.

The fragmentary nature of the messages, the capricious choice of incidents from the standpoint of the sitter, the probability that we could not even find the persons living who could verify the incidents when given, and the possibility that there are influences that render it more difficult for strangers to communicate rather make it fortunate for scientific results that we do not have such data to deal with in any quantity, no matter what theory we adopt in the case. Now, if we examine the facts in the record we shall find interesting corroboration of what I have said regarding the possible influences in favour of communications from friends. If the reader will study carefully the sittings of Dr. Hodgson held for me he will observe a most interesting psychological fact that tells against telepathy and indicates a possible explanation of the natural selection of friends in communications. In these sittings my father, who is the communicator, appears to get tired, so to speak, of communicating, and asks to be excused, a thing that never occurred in my sittings except to rest a few minutes, as it were. In my last sitting even this did not occur. I held the attention by relaxing the scientific rigidity of silence, and by the demand that he should tell his own story, and employed his interest and attention so strongly that he evidently felt no discomfort or inconvenience under the "conditions." Here we have the natural effect of intense interest and attention to render the communication more sustained and clear, a perfectly natural phenomenon, and perhaps also the personal interest of the communicator in the sitter as the most important influence affecting the process. But how could this interest be maintained in a stranger? We know in actual life it is far more difficult to control the interest of strangers in conversation with us than that of friends. This is especially true if the stranger is asked to do something important in a few minutes or seconds to establish his identity! Just try this once. It is hard enough to sit down and select incidents rationally or irrationally with reference to secure identification, as my experiments on this matter showed, even when we have friends to deal with, and a stranger has a practically impossible task to perform, as the necessary *point de repère* for memory and association to work upon is lacking in his case, and in addition the influence of intense interest and attention to accomplish the desired result, as is so well illustrated in the comparison of Dr. Hodgson's sittings with mine generally, and my last with the others, as well as with his. Moreover, a single remark also regarding telepathy will suffice to dismiss the distinction that we may be tempted to draw between friends and strangers. If we are to assume the extension of telepathy in any case we have no rational reason for using the fact that friends are usually the communicators in favor of telepathy, because living strangers to both medium and sitter ought to offer no special difficulties

on the telepathic theory to the reproduction of memories of these strangers, so that the present discrimination between friends and strangers cannot be based on the greater facility of securing messages in one case than the other, but on the more naturally spiritistic nature of the phenomena. Nor will it help to say that the unwillingness to communicate with Dr. Hodgson is an indication of the fact that the messages were obtained telepathically from me in New York, and were thus more difficult and exhausting to secure, as this feature did not show itself in my sittings where many messages had to be obtained from other memories, on that supposition, than my own (*Cf.* p. 132). Moreover, the communications from my cousin Robert McClellan, which could have been very numerous if drawn from my own memory, were conceived from the standpoint of his own memory and attempt to identify himself to his wife. Besides it would have been more difficult for him even in life to remember much about me than for me to recall incidents in connection with him, as he was both much older than I am and we had too little to do with each other to fix many things in his recollection distinctly in relation to me. I have a great many recollections of him or in relation to him that he would not associate with me. The reason for this is connected with his father, my uncle James McClellan, on whose place my cousin lived after his father's death. I always delighted as a boy to visit the place for its proximity to the railway, where I could constantly see the trains passing. I had seldom seen him also, for the last twenty years, and little occurred on such occasions that could be remembered distinctly, as they were usually a night's social visit. Only the political speech to which I alluded (p. 429) was either likely to be recalled in relation to me or would have had any value as evidence for personal identity from my point of view, though the facts in my memory, subliminal or otherwise, are numerous enough for telepathy to have drawn more exhaustively upon them than it did. Hence it is significant that, in spite of his relation to me, the communications from him are conceived in strict accordance with what we should naturally expect in the ordinary laws of memory, and as if from a stranger whose chief interest was in his more immediate relatives and recollections. Take, for instance, his reference to my brother Robert, which shows a solicitude in him that was natural, but which I did not know was anything special until I learned in the West that he had taken particular interest in this brother for reasons that I cannot publish. Hence I refuse to accept the assumption that communications from friends are more favorable to telepathy than to spiritism. The contrary may well be the case.

There is another difficulty which presents itself to nearly every student of these phenomena. It is the amazingly incomprehensible

conditions of existence and employment that are represented in some of the communications. This difficulty does not appear in my own record, and hence were I dealing with that alone I should not have to consider any such objections. There is not a trace in my sittings of anything indicating the conditions of existence beyond the grave. I have to look elsewhere in the case as a whole to encounter difficulties of this sort. For instance, in one record we are told that the soul has an "astral facsimile of the material body." (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 301.) I have commented on this previously (p. 225). Frequent allusions are made to breathing and functions that are natural only in the present existence, according to our physiological suppositions; calling for old playthings; statement that a child is just beginning its letters, etc. Such things are not general, but they are frequent enough to make one with ordinary sense pause and ask whether they may not balance against spiritism and in favor of telepathy and secondary personality, and hence represent impossible facts as judged by the usual and natural assumptions of what consciousness must be when separated from a material organism, especially when our thinking is dominated by Cartesian conceptions of the soul.

I can say in reply, however, as I have said above, that there is nothing intrinsically impossible in the "astral facsimile" theory, however amusing, as it certainly is to me with my habits of thought. Even physiological science, where it has admitted a soul at all, has occasionally tolerated the idea that it might be of the shape of the body, and this without reference to the veridical character of apparitions. But there is also a way to reconcile both the Cartesian and the physiological conceptions. We may suppose that the "astral facsimile" is an ethereal body and the soul may still be a point of force inhabiting the ethereal body, as consciousness now inhabits the material organism. This is the way that the communications most naturally represent it, or require us to conceive it. Dr. Hodgson has stated this matter very clearly in his report (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 400). Of course I do not urge this view of it as true or proved, but as so possible from the limits of our knowledge regarding any transcendental world beyond sense perception (instance X-rays), that it cannot be treated as an objection, but only as a problem within the spiritistic theory.

But it is not so easy to remove our natural repugnance to the other allegations or implications about the conditions of existence in another life. Living in houses, listening to lectures, are rather funny reproductions of a material existence, and still funnier for beings that ought to be nothing more than points of force according to Descartes and Boscovich! In some instances the statements may be treated as automatisms and hence as not indicating transcendental conditions of life at

all, as in the case of a communicator calling for his hat (p. 307), or as distorted messages owing to the influence of the "machine" and its organic habits upon the form of the communication. Allusions to breathing and similar functions may also be treated as automatisms, or as the nearest description that a spirit could give of the state of consciousness which accompanies the difficulties of communicating. From what I have already said about the conditions of such an existence it is apparent that I do not consider myself bound to interpret them in the terms of our most natural understanding, but as the best attempts possible to express new experiences in terms intelligible to us. That is the communicator must put new wine into old bottles. Interesting evidence of this is the language used in describing the process of communicating. It is sometimes called "speaking," and sometimes "thinking," as if recognising in the latter case that it was telepathic in nature, that is, telepathy between the discarnate spirit and Mrs. Piper's subliminal. Imagine a person who never had the sense of touch and only the sense of sight communicating with another who never had the sense of sight but only that of touch, and we have some analogy with the situation between incarnate and discarnate consciousness, the difference being that in the case of supposed spirits there is a memory connection with the terrestrial world which makes *some* communications intelligible. Independently of this, however, the communications would be either impossible or worthless for establishing personal identity. The only common aspect of consciousness without this memory connection would be the emotional characteristic, and that is an impossible basis for establishing any intelligible idea of the real conditions that the language appears to describe. On this ground and analogy, therefore, I refuse to interpret all such statements in terms of our ordinary experience where they are so closely associated with sensory ideas. We may leave them as unknown quantities. Even if we could not suggest a method of explaining them away, they are not frequent enough to require a positive explanation in the absence of data to interpret them, while the predominant evidence which falls into line with our conception of personal identity, sufficiently allows us to draw a conclusion regarding the possibility of survival, and we suspend judgment on the unverified and unverifiable allegations which do not contradict the evidence, but which merely offend our *a priori* assumptions.

But there is a reply to the objection under consideration that is still more effective, and that brings the statements that offend us so much into the range of our intelligence without admitting sensory conceptions into the account. I shall appeal to the whole philosophy of idealism in support of the possibility that I shall present. If that system has any foundation at all, its position assigns so much even in

material existence to the action of consciousness that it ought to be easily adjusted to the spiritistic theory. Ever since Kant the watchword of that philosophy has been that we make our world. Such statements offend common sense as much as these puzzling allegations from a transcendental world annoy the common man and the philosopher alike. But however much we may dissent from it and however much the language is calculated to create misunderstanding in terms of empirical and sensory experience, it nevertheless contains the important truth (1) that sensations are not representative of the world that elicits them; (2) that all the disconnected elements of experience in time and space are organised into the unity of scientific and other knowledge by the subject's own action; and (3) that the spontaneous idealisation or creation of many objects of consciousness, not given in experience at all, represents some constructive and non-sensory mentation even in a material existence. Of course in our present conditions we are always brought up to face the non-ego when the problem of adjustment to an external world is involved. The nature of the case makes it constantly imperative to take our *πὸν στῶ* in the objective world and not to disregard it, either in thought or action. We can disregard it, however, in our dreams, and in those moods and occupations which employ us with the construction of our ideals. Now imagine the material world removed from its relation to consciousness and to the needs of life, and we have a condition in which Kant's dictum about the spontaneous action of the understanding would represent that function as having free play. Suppose then the two following conditions fulfilled in a transcendental world and then interpret the statements which give difficulty in their light to see how the matter may stand. (1) Imagine a rationalised dream life, or life of spontaneous idealisation and creation of ideas (poetry is this), and (2) their communication by persons to each other through telepathy, and we shall have a representation, in two actual facts of our knowledge, of what is possible in the transcendental world. We carry on such acts of the understanding under limitations even now, and we have also proved telepathy as an occasional phenomenon in a material existence, though not employing any material conditions within our knowledge for its effectuation. Taking then these two suppositions which represent known laws of mental action and adding to them that of personal identity on the evidence of such records as this, and we have, as strictly within the lines of scientific method, the rationality of the spiritistic theory. In addition we remove absolutely all the offensiveness of statements about occupations and actions in a transcendental world, as they have to be expressed to us in our language adapted to sensory experience and not qualified to suggest the real difference between the pure products of the understanding,

even though they are based upon antecedent experience, and the material objects which are usually denoted for us in our ordinary intercourse, where we cannot lose sight of the external world on any theory. I shall not develop this thought at length, but leave it to the reader, as my object is accomplished when I have shown the way even to make the apparently preposterous statements of discarnate spirits intelligible to terrestrial reason. Rightly applied, this hypothesis will give unity to more of the data of psychical research than appears at a glance. I shall not maintain that my hypothesis is true or proved, as I am as far from entertaining it as more than a possibility. It contradicts no known human experience or theory, but rather falls into line with much of our philosophy and common experience divested of its association with sense, and consequently ought to represent a fair reproduction of a spiritual world for any of those who have been willing to believe and describe it without evidence. To those who will not accept such a world without evidence, and I class myself among this latter number, the hypothesis violates no known fact of human experience, but rather depends upon it and only adds to it the conclusion that follows from the evidence of personal identity. In this it satisfies the canons of scientific method, as telepathy cannot do.

We may also ask, as a further objection, who Emperor and Rector are. Here we have two alleged spirits whose identity is absolutely concealed from us and apparently with "*malice prepense.*" Phinuit attempted to tell us who he was and failed to identify himself. Emperor and Rector do not even try as yet to satisfy our curiosity on this point. Now are we not obliged to determine whether they are spirits or not before accepting the veridically spiritual character of the personalities that seem to be verifiable? May we not, in the absence of evidence for their identity, assume that they are secondary personalities of Mrs. Piper's organism and representative of super-normal conditions which qualify her for telepathic acquisition of the data that simulate the personal identity of others?

Now it should be said in regard to this objection that it can be made from two points of view. The first will be from a thorough study of their performances, and the second that of secondary personality in others and without any knowledge of the Piper phenomena. This second point of view does not need any notice, as it is not worth anything until the man who is tempted with it acquaints himself with the case at hand. The first is more important. But if any man deliberately adopts that view as assured after studying the case at first hand, I do not see that I can dislodge him. As for myself I cannot study the dramatic play of personality, to say nothing of its complication

with telepathy, without appreciating the naturalness and the rational strength of the spiritistic theory more than I can the emphasis of analogies which are too general to affect anything except the superficial features of an argument. In addition to the wonderful dramatic play of personality that I have so elaborately discussed, just think of the memory that must be involved in conducting the right adjustment and connections of incidents, ideas, and advice necessary to give the psychological complexity and the unity of the phenomena that so successfully represent spirit existence, while hundreds of sitters follow each other from day to day in miscellaneous confusion. (If any man wishes to combine such a number of "miracles" in one act or brain, namely, such elastic range of secondary personality as appears in these trance intermediaries and others like G. P. and Phinuit, all with character as distinct as we ever knew it in life and capable of playing a real part wholly unlike secondary personality as we know it ordinarily, and then add to this an omniscient telepathy--- if any man does this, I can only say that I do not follow him into the *a priori* construction of such an hypothesis. He must give a detailed analysis of cases that are similar and yet that do not have any spiritistic content. This may be possible, but I suspend judgment until it is effected. The supposition appears strong as any appeal to the infinite must appear strong for the lack of any assignable limits to such powers. But these are not the customary modes of scientific explanation, which has a preference for the finite.

I may add, however, in further reply to this objection that, as I conceive the problem, I am not required to begin any theory with an explanation of who Emperor or Rector are. That problem I have already defined as, first, that of personal identity, but this does not obligate my proving the identity of everybody that comes along. If Emperor and Rector volunteered any evidence of their identity, it would be my duty to examine and weigh it. But unless they do volunteer it I am entitled, nay, bound to suspend judgment on that point, and be content with the supposition of secondary personality. It is even possible that it is exceedingly wise on their part, if they are actually discarnate spirits, not to make any claims as to who they are. My sittings show that it is a very precarious business to identify anybody that has been dead twenty-five or fifty years. Compare the case of John McClellan (p. 111), and Note 94 (p. 535). The memories of even one's children may not suffice to satisfy the law of science if a parent or relative has passed long before. (Cf. Footnote p. 111.) If Emperor and Rector should happen to belong to a past generation, the concealment of their identity would not only be a wise procedure until the identity of some one else was established, but it might also entitle them to the credit of fully realising the scientific problem that presents

itself to us. I have no positive reason to suppose that this possibility of their existence in some past generation is true, or even plausible. But there is nothing opposed to it in the nature of the case. Nevertheless I concede that as long as their identity is not given we must either assume that they are secondary personalities of Mrs. Piper or conduct the argument for the identity of others on a scale commensurate with the gravity of the problem. If the evidence for the identity of alleged communicators, beside Imperator and Rector, becomes so overwhelming as it appears generally in cases which we are capable of verifying, and if it transcends all normal expectations of the human brain and routs the theory of telepathy, so that spiritism is the preferable hypothesis, we may accept the facts as giving the retroactive right to suppose that Imperator and Rector are what they claim to be. But this does not commit us to their personal identity in any case, even if they should reveal it. They might be utterly unable to satisfy the criterion of scientific method in attempting the task, though any statement on their part would put the burden of rejecting the case upon us. We might believe them if desired, but we are not obliged to do so. I should have the right certainly to exact of them sufficient verifiable evidence for their identity before accepting their statements, whether that evidence be facts in their lives on earth or their performances and character as "Controls" in these experiments inducing confidence in their veracity. Hence I am willing, or may even think it necessary, to suspend judgment on this point altogether, even after accepting the fact that they are possibly or probably spirits on the ground of the evidence that presumably enforces the spiritistic theory in regard to communicators who can and do give verifiable facts. But we can never forget that Imperator and Rector as personalities follow George Pelham in the history of the Piper case as a personality. He it was that could at once do something to establish his identity and control communications. They do not appear as entire mysteries in the wake of Phinuit, but are preceded by a verifiable personality who was instrumental in producing them, and who actually counsels Dr. Hodgson to accept their directions in the management of the experiments. This fact with the whole testimony of their work is a powerful argument for their reality. But I shall not assume it in this discussion, and feel less obliged to do so for the reason that it does not make any difference where the problem of personal identity begins. We have in any case to face the fact of secondary personality and we may assume as many as we please of them as intermediaries, if only the evidence unmistakably shows such limitations in the powers of these personalities as will not consist with anything except the spirit hypothesis.

I should also treat their various statements about transcendental conditions and their professions of superior knowledge in the same way. These are their individual opinions and must be subject to the same rules of evidence that regulate the acceptance of any opinions. Complete liberty of judgment must be accorded us on this point to apply as rigid criteria as scientific method may demand, even when we conceive their opinions as either possible or probable. Their statements are not to be supposed false because we refuse to accept them as true on authority. They may be the personal opinions of the subjects who state them and cannot be put on the same plane as the verifiable facts of a terrestrial world. They may even be facts instead of opinions, but not being verifiable by us beyond the range of such incidents as are represented in their achievements in terrestrial conditions (diagnosis of disease, supernormal perception of character, etc.), we are entitled to distinguish between what are opinions and what we know to be facts verifiable independently of their testimony. This fact relieves us from all scientific use of data in the record which do not first prove identity, whatever we choose to regard as possible or probable in the personality of these intermediaries. If they could or did furnish satisfactory evidence of their identity, the case against secondary personality and its combination with telepathy would be that much stronger. That is freely admitted. But this does not affect the question regarding the proper scientific attitude toward communications that represent alleged facts in a transcendental world which cannot be verified, or that may be mere theories of a discarnate being whose range of knowledge, even though it be much greater than ours, is subject to the same general limitations, so far as my acceptance is concerned, as characterise all opinions of another intelligence. I do not contradict them where they do not contravene human experience, but neither do I feel bound to accept them, nor to class them with the verifiable facts which may serve as evidence for the supernormal or for the existence of a transcendental world. But the reservations on this point and on their identity may well impose upon us the duty to require more evidence for survival of terrestrial consciousness than would be the case if we could unhesitatingly accept the independent intelligence and teachings of these trance personalities, as this latter would presuppose that we had eliminated the question of secondary personality, at least in its most perplexing form.

But the problem of their independent personality is a very different one from the acceptability of their opinions or their personal identity. Their independent personality is prior to all questions, except the identity of those for whom the evidence is scientifically sufficient. Hence I refuse to consider their identity as any prior condition of the spiritistic theory. Their independent personality comes first, and even

this is subordinate to that of communicators who can make out a case for identity. Consequently the independent personality of these "controls" must be measured by the quantity and quality of the evidence that suggests preternatural intelligence. The real *point de repère*, so to speak, of the scientific theory must be the capacities of the human brain, the normal knowledge of Mrs. Piper, and the limits of secondary personality as already known. That is to say, have physiology and psychology any theories that will explain the phenomena without a resort to spirits? If the communications of others than these intermediaries bore no traces of personal identity, we should be obliged, of course, to stop with the hypothesis of secondary personality as sufficient to cover the whole case, no matter how we had to stretch it, unless we were audacious enough to consider the existence of transterrestrial intelligence as involved and not implying the continuance of terrestrial consciousness after death. But this would be an extremely dubious supposition, to say the least of it, considering the language employed and the exact adjustment to our conditions of thought. I do not even need to state how little tolerance any intelligent man should have for such a view. But the mass of evidence for personal identity in certain cases is a presumption for the independent personality of the trance intermediaries, and this latter then becomes wholly subject to the evidence with which we have to measure the capacities of the medium. The proper order for our problems is, therefore, the personal identity of any communicator whose incidents are terrestrially verifiable, the independent personality of the trance intermediaries, their personal identity, and the acceptability of their teachings. The solution of the first of these problems is offered in the facts of this record, and does not come under notice at present. The second question may be suspended as long as we like, inasmuch as we have in any case to reckon with the fact of secondary personality, and may assume this for the trance personalities, without setting aside the evidence for the identity of others, though the assumption requires us to be more exacting in the quantity and quality of the evidence than would otherwise be the case.

But there is much in the Piper phenomena to suggest the independent personality of these intermediaries. This ought to be evident to all who study carefully the dramatic play of personality of which I have made much in the evidence for the spiritistic view. There is also the wonderful intellectual and moral cleavage between Phinuit and the present "controls," Imperator and Rector; between these and G. P. and also between Phinuit and G. P., to say nothing of the same cleavage between all other communicators. The personalities are so numerous, so distinct, and so diversified in all the details of their make-up that, supposing them to be secondary personalities of the

medium, approaches the attribution of infinity to her. If the "controls" had never been more than one type of personality the case would be very different. We should feel more keenly the difficulties proposed by it. But there have been so many trance personalities involved in the "control" of the medium (Plinuit, George Pelham, Imperator, Rector, Doctor and Prudens) to say nothing of temporary "controls" (*Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 28-50 ; Vol. XIII., 295-335, 370-389 ; more especially pp. 300, 303-4, 316, 358), and all with that cleavage which consists with, or exhibits, such independence of each other as would be true of separate persons, so that the hypothesis of secondary personality simply attributes to Mrs. Piper's brain constructive and synthetic powers which are more easily conceivable on the spiritistic theory than on any other. If Mrs. Piper's subliminal is the Absolute let us say so. But, as Dr. Hodgson well remarks, we may as well call this another world and make it intelligible, as it is not intelligible in terms designedly used to deny a transcendental existence, but which on examination perform the Hegelian process of either becoming altogether meaningless or identifying a conception with its own opposite which it was intended to contradict. All this is worked out with a completeness by Dr. Hodgson that I need not repeat, but shall only refer the reader to his discussion (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 370-406). I may state, however, that I did not see clearly the meaning of his statements until my own facts induced the same conclusion independently of his language. All this, too, can be said while keeping in mind such cases as that of Dr. Morton Prince (*Proceedings*, Vol. XV., pp. 466-483), and that of M. Flournoy (*From India to the Planet Mars*).

It will be apparent, therefore, why I refuse to treat our ignorance about these trance personalities as anything like forcible objections or serious difficulties in the way of the spiritistic theory. They may indicate a problem which it is desirable to solve. But this does not subordinate the question of personal identity in the case of verifiable facts to either the independent personality or the personal identity of these "controls," whom we might find it difficult or impossible to investigate. Hence the only view which I feel called upon to favour is that the spiritistic theory is well supported in the case of the persons represented as communicators to me. All other questions are held in abeyance as involving a possible, if not a proved spiritistic interpretation, especially as they are consistent with it and possess some independent probabilities.

It may interest the reader to know at this point how little evidence may be necessary to establish identity with sufficient certitude and that this evidence may not be as specific as we have been accustomed to demand in our reports of the Piper case. I do not mean by this to

relax our vigilance in the matter of proof, but to indicate that when identity is established we have only to consider how far telepathy can account for the complexity of the phenomena. My experiments on the Identification of Personality show that identity may often become assured, and with good reason, upon evidence that was extremely indefinite and apparently unfit for the purpose, as judged by the standards we have usually adopted in this study. I was much surprised by the fact. The reader may compare the following references: Questions 2 and 9, pp. 563-4; 9, p. 570; 9, p. 577; 3 and 7, pp. 586-7; 11 and 16, pp. 587-8; 2, p. 583; 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, and 17, pp. 609-613, and especially *Question 7*, p. 619.

I come now to an objection which must necessarily carry more weight than any that I have considered, at least to those who are either devoid of resources for the justification of further scepticism or defective in the appreciation of the character and consequences of hypotheses that are absolutely without any scientific support independently of the Piper phenomena themselves. The objection was practically stated in the difficulty just dismissed, and considered somewhat in the discussion of the telepathic theory (*Cf.* p. 152). It is the supposition combining the functions of telepathy and secondary personality to explain the case, the one to give the significant data and the other the play of independent personality. That is to say, we may suppose that we have the fortuitous combination of capacities which usually or always have been separated in other abnormal cases. I think that any reader of the facts will admit that the whole case cannot be adequately explained by what we understand by telepathy alone in either its spontaneous or its experimental aspects, no matter what extension we choose to give it. The dramatic play of personality is not like anything that we know of in telepathy. Telepathy may involve a subliminal process like that of secondary personality, but as it is known in its experimental and spontaneous forms it does not exhibit the intelligent selectiveness and teleological unity that are so characteristic of the Piper phenomena. In its acquisition of data it resembles more nearly a mechanical process, or the automatism of abnormal association. For that reason we cannot assume that secondary personality in such a dramatic form as this record shows is a necessary part of the conditions connected with supernormal knowledge. On the other hand, from all that we know of secondary personality where it does not assume the spiritistic form at all, and even where it evidently tries to simulate it, though it displays the imitation of another personality than that of the subject, it never reproduces the life and experience of other subjects than the one delivering them, whether living or dead and absolutely unknown to

this subject. Hence it is equally apparent that secondary personality alone cannot account for the phenomena. But may we not combine these suppositions in this fortunate instance so that the function of one process may supplement the defects of the other?

The objection which this combination embodies, however, as it is stated here, is a purely *a priori* one, and I accept it merely as a concession to the precautions which the student may wish to entertain who is familiar with the phenomena of secondary personality elsewhere and often claimed to be spiritistic, but who has not minutely acquainted himself with the case before us. But I cannot allow the objection to have any scientific weight whatever unless he support the appeal to secondary personality by remarking features in this instance that justify comparison with other cases admitted to be neither spiritistic nor telepathic. That is to say, we must show that this dramatic play of personality is a sufficiently general quality of the secondary consciousness to invoke suspicion in this instance. We cannot permit the objection to remain *in abstracto*. It must produce evidence, and empirical evidence at that, for the one crucial point that will justify comparison.

The first analogy that would suggest itself to the critic in the attempt to supply this empirical evidence would be multiplex personality. We know that this is a fact, and that it often betrays no sign of spiritistic phenomena. The experiments of Pierre Janet (*L'Automatisme Psychologique* and *Névroses et Idées Fixes*), Dr. Morton Prince (*Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., pp. 79-98), and others *ad nauseam*, show that the same brain may assume different personalities where the cleavage is wonderfully marked and suggestive. Hypnosis can produce it in dual form almost at pleasure, and might develop it further if tried.

But I shall not illustrate it in detail, as I have done enough to indicate that I recognise it. But I reject at the outset any legitimate comparison between multiplex personality in hypnotism and that which we find in the Piper case, though I concede very frankly and fully the right of any one who has not studied these phenomena, but who has seen something of the spiritistic claims that have no better foundation than secondary consciousness, to defend himself against illusion by the supposition which I nevertheless reject. The resemblance is wholly superficial and rather in name than in reality. The term "multiplex personality" seems to cover both cases, but it does not correctly describe the same facts in each case. The multiplex personality of both auto and hetero-hypnosis does not exhibit any dramatic play. It may imitate another person under suggestion, or reproduce another apparent personality than the normal, but it does not imitate conscious intercourse between these dual or several streams of mental action teleologically adjusted to a common end. This last is the

dramatic play which I have discussed. *I must insist upon the radical distinction between either the imitation under suggestion of another personality than the subject, or the production, spontaneously or under suggestion, of a secondary consciousness drawing without knowledge or recognition upon the experience, habit, language, etc., of the normal stream, and that dramatic interplay of different personalities in the same subject that reproduces the intercourse of real persons with each other.* This latter is what I have meant by the dramatic play of personality and it is very different from dramatic imitation of it in any case. Psychologically the two are different, and this is true even on the assumption that they are both forms of secondary personality. The point is not to prove that the proper dramatic interplay of personality is spiritistic, but that it is different from the dramatic personality of suggestion, and that it is just what we should expect on the spiritistic hypothesis. The change from one personality to another in the phenomena of secondary consciousness may be as sudden as you please, but it is neither one of those *ad libitum* processes which always imitates the existence of real persons, nor a process which adjusts itself to a representatively complex and external situation which makes the acts teleologically intelligible in terms of a possible real existence, as in what I have described in the Piper case. It shows no trace of such complex and accurate adjustment. If it exhibits anything like adjustment at all, it is either absurd adjustment to a wholly imaginary world created by suggestion, or it remains passive and inert until some form of foreign suggestion, or inner caprice, alters its direction and mnemonic unity. Nor does it help the argument any to produce the alterations of heterosuggestion. These are the purely passive reflexes of the hypnotic operator, and show neither such spontaneity as we observe in the trance personalities of Mrs. Piper, with their intelligent and rationally teleological action, nor the representation of a consistent and intelligible situation outside the range of our knowledge. Hence I repudiate all but the most superficial comparison and resemblance between multiplex personality in hypnosis and the trance personalities under consideration, and I think every careful student of the case will agree with this view. The one point which it is necessary to find in the case in order to justify suspicion, namely, the dramatic interplay between different personalities in the same object, and adjustment to varying conditions simulating a transcendental reality, is not discoverable in the multiplex personality of hypnosis in so far as it has been studied.

But there is a more important objection to this comparison of the trance personalities of Mrs. Piper with the multiplex personality of hypnosis. The latter nearly always, if not absolutely always, shows a

point of connection and unity between two or more streams of consciousness which indicate *an identity of subject* in spite of the apparent plurality of subjects. The cleavage is purely a mnemonic defect, and is due to a suspension of the recognitive process. The facts belong to the same ego or subject without the recognition that they occurred in the stream of consciousness which as a whole seems lost. The amnesia is all but perfect, and may even be perfect in so far as definite recognitive processes are concerned. The retention and reproduction remain with an organising process that is minus the act of either localisation or recognition within the normal stream. This is very common in our dreams. I recorded one instance of a similar phenomenon in the waking state of Mrs. D. (*Proceedings*, Vol. XII., pp. 262-3), Miss X. records in her papers quite a number of experiences in which a message comes unrecognised from the subliminal into the supraliminal, and the phenomenon is a familiar one to a psychical researcher (*Proceedings*, Vol. XI., pp. 114-144). Take also the case of the hypnotised artist who was told that he was a certain physician and in his imaginary practice of medicine prescribed that his patient should go and paint pictures (Boris Sidis: *Psychology of Suggestion*, p. 257); also the case of Dr. Dana, in which the amnesic subject wished the lady to whom he was engaged to remain with him, though he had completely forgotten her name and his own with his whole life, and did not even know the meaning of the very word marriage (*Psychological Review*: Vol. I., pp. 570-580; especially p. 572). The best case is that of Ansel Bourne in our own records, where there were several connections between the auto-hypnotic and the normal stream (*Proceedings*, Vol. VII., pp. 221-257.) There is also a most interesting case in the experiments of Pierre Janet discussed by Mr. Myers (*Proceedings*, Vol. V., pp. 376-8). My own case also illustrates the phenomenon on a smaller scale. The hypnotic subject could not recall his own name or age, but recalled the names of his companions in both his normal and abnormal state very easily and of his normal life only a few incidents (p. 641). But not to continue cases in which the cleavage is almost perfect, the whole phenomenon of post-hypnotic suggestion illustrates this connection in the same subject, and it is too familiar to psychiatrists to require further mention. This interconnection between "the two or more selves" is generally admitted, and it is only the failure to *recognise* the connection that gives the appearance of a total cleavage and of a dual subject (Cf. Boris Sidis: *Psychology of Suggestion*, pp. 162-179, and Pierre Janet: *L'Automatisme Psychologique* pp. 73-91)

Now this unity is not a characteristic of the "multiplex personality" of the Piper case. The only interconnection (with the exception of facts to be noted presently) that is observable in it is a

facsimile of the interconnection between two minds self-consciously exchanging ideas. Rector does not appropriate the facts that belong to G. P., unless some natural hint of their foreign source is given, as we attribute the like to others in actual life. Phinuit and G. P. refer to each other as independent realities, and appropriate nothing from one another which does not resemble the conscious intercourse between two beings. No unconscious interconnection, as in the ordinary cases of hypnosis and secondary personality, seems ever to show itself. It has been uniformly the same throughout the history of the Piper phenomena (*Cf.* my brother and my sister communicating for others, pp. 100-108).

The only facts that seem to supply the necessary desiderata for such a comparison are those cases of secondary consciousness in which one of the personalities actually recognises another and distinguishes between the two as if they were really different persons (*Cf.* Pierre Janet *L'Automatisme Psychologique*, pp. 67-125, and 271-354; *Proceedings*, Vol. V., pp. 393-395, and Vol. XIV., pp. 366-372; Vol. XV., pp. 466-483). There is something like dramatic play in these instances; at least in respect to the apparent independence of the personalities and their recognition one of another as if real and not of the same subject. Nevertheless, we often find even in these the appropriation of another's memories, experiences and personal traits in a way that suggests the ordinary interconnection between apparently separate streams of consciousness, as characterises the general type of multiplex personality. The recognition is rarely, if ever, reciprocal. I have never seen it reciprocal. There is occasionally, at least, some resemblance to this play in our dreams. Karl Du Prel has remarked this fact also (*Philosophy of Mysticism*, Vol. I., p. 137).

But before admitting more force in these cases than may be permitted it is worth while to remark that recent experimenters and students very much discredit the genuineness of these trained Salpêtrière patients. But I shall not encourage scepticism on this point for the sake of denying the comparison between the cases and the dramatic play of the Piper phenomena. I shall assume their genuineness and press the resemblance as far as it will go, for the reason that we cannot afford to defend the spiritistic theory at the expense of facts which might possibly present a clue to the way out of it. Nevertheless, the existing doubt about them is legitimate vantage ground for caution against dogmatism in making the comparison, at least until the cases are examined.

But the best external evidence of this dramatic play, or at least simulation of it, is the fact of automatic writing with its accompaniments. A general reference to the many articles in the *Proceedings* is sufficient on this point. They show a personality of which the

supraliminal is unaware in the same subject, palming off on this supraliminal, knowledge which appears to come from some independent source, but which study shows originates from the subliminal. The automatic self simply plays hide and seek with the normal self. Hence putting together these cases of automatic writing and the incidents of apparently independent personalities in hypnotic experiments, may we not have sufficient dramatic play to give some trouble to the argument for spiritism from that characteristic? Assume also that, in the process of fifteen years' experimenting and careful directions under Professor James, Dr. Hodgson and others, Mrs. Piper has gradually, though unconsciously, become the subject of a thorough education into the more than usually perfect instance of multiplex personality in which the dramatic play can reproduce the realism that we observe in it.

Then if we can obtain after this any empirical evidence of a deep unity below this diversity of personality in the Piper case and thus satisfy the demand of physiology for one brain subject, with this underlying unity and unusually educated power to simulate independent personalities, we may find the spiritistic theory face to face with a serious difficulty, when we add telepathy to account for the objective facts of the record. There are some interesting facts in these phenomena which might be used to establish this very unity.

For instance, my brother Charles, in answer to my question as to what he died with, asks me: "Is scarlet fever a bad thing to have in the body?" (p. 330). Now I find this exact form of expression by another person back in the *Phinuit régime*: "Do you think consumption a bad thing?" (Vol. XIII., pp. 379 or 522). In my sittings my father repeats his expectation that he will be able to tell me "all he ever knew" (p. 325). G. P. uses the same expression in the *Phinuit days* (Vol. XIII., p. 432). My father's statement that I am "not the strongest man" (p. 333) is duplicated in a similar statement by *Phinuit*, made in 1894 to another person: "You're not the strongest man in the country" (Vol. XIII., p. 519). Again my father said: "If your father ever lived I am his spirit. I am he. *I am he*" (p. 475). Professor Newbold got the same phrase from another person: "If Fred Morton ever lived I am he" (Vol. XIV., p. 15). The incident which my father narrates about the boat and his sister helping him out of difficulty (p. 478) suggests comparison with a somewhat similar communication to Professor Lodge in England in 1889 (Vol. VI., p. 520). Again in the *Imperator régime* some such statement as, "May God have you in His holy keeping" is very common and also the phrase "keep you in His holy keeping." *Phinuit* uses the expression in 1889, "God keep you in His holy keeping" (Vol. VI., p. 525). This is all the more remarkable because *Phinuit* has no specially religious characteristic, and this is the first instance and the only one in which

I have remarked anything like piety or cant in him. A communication from Professor Lodge's uncle speaks of the uncle's going "gunning" at one time, a word which Professor Lodge says is "rank American." (Compare also the words "push" and "pull," p. 340.) These are all that I know, though they are probably more numerous. But such as they are they seem to reflect just the possible unity which is necessary for a background to the diversity of personality which appears in the Piper case and which assimilates it to multiplex personality generally, so that if we can only add the most extended capacity for telepathy to this we should seem to have at least a plausible escape from spiritism.

In reply, however, it must be said that the cogency of these incidents for establishing a unity between the various "controls" in the Piper phenomena is greatly impaired by the following considerations. The expression "not a bad thing" is too common in general usage to attach the slightest value beyond chance coincidence to its occurrence in two cases so far apart. Were it not so common an expression in precisely such emergencies we might sustain a suspicion, and if it had been a common way of alluding to sickness or disagreeable facts throughout the history of the Piper case the coincidence might suggest a doubt. But this single instance of it is worthless evidentially for giving unity to the different *régimes* involved, especially as the admission of its significance for any such view would so eliminate the necessity of considering chance in the coincidence of psychical research generally as to make the case at large far stronger for spiritism than the sceptic is willing to concede. We cannot safely discard chance in this problem. The same can be said of the coincidence in the expression about my comparative strength and the incidents about the boats. The mode of expression is a very common one and scarcely anyone is exempt from such an escapade as is described in the boat incident. It is not surprising that both should occur. In fact, it might be surprising that this duplication does not occur more frequently than it does, if only on the ground of ordinary physiological analogies that a nervous system should reflect the effects of its experience even in transmitting the facts that belong to the consciousness of others. We cannot attach any special value to the Americanism, "gunning," as it does not necessarily represent the use of an American word by an Englishman who never knew it. If we had to suppose that Professor Lodge's uncle was the direct communicator the case would be more plausible. But the expression is one of *Phinuit's* and represents his way of putting a message that might have been very different. This modification of a message by the "control" is a most common incident. (Compare use of the word "Sunday," p. 432.) Now *Phinuit*, whether we regard

him as a real spirit or the secondary personality of Mrs. Piper, was American in his experience as a "control," and it would be natural from all that we know either of the action of a real consciousness, or from the natural influence of the medium upon any transmitted fact, that such a word might be taken to express a thought that the "control" either obtained in fragments or had to express in its own way. Besides there is actually on record in the communications themselves the statement, purporting to come from Mr. E., that Phinuit likes to pick up just such words and phrases for use (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., p. 517). This statement is born out also by a number of terms that could be selected from the reports, such as a "nine-shooter," "get out," "skip," "gave them a tuning," "slumped through," etc. (*Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 510, 519, 520, 521). These latter instances do not illustrate the unity between the two *régimes*, but only the influence of the "control's" mind on the result, so that all such instances fall to the ground as objections. Besides this, the Emperor *régime* seems to be exempt from their repetition, observing, as it does, all the dignities of the occasion.

There is more apparent force in the other two cases, owing to the peculiar form of expression in one and to the essentially religious and Emperor type of language in the other, a feature that is quite opposed to the character of Phinuit. The expression, "have in His holy keeping" is too common in religious service and human memory to tolerate any secure argument for the unity of the different personalities under consideration. Besides, in spite of his irreligious temper, Phinuit is not averse to a "God bless you" at times, and might very well resort to so common an expression as the one indicated by mere chance, so that the coincidence has no evidential value.

We are then left to the first of the last two phrases for the argument to show the unity of the trance personalities, namely, the statement: "If I ever lived," etc. This instance is more striking and interesting because it does not represent so common an expression or form of putting the thought as in the other instances. But after disqualifying the other cases as arguments, it is a poor refuge to make so gigantic a conclusion as a unity of subject for the universal cleavage we observe in the case depend upon this one little exception and coincidence. Chance could not figure in anything if we allowed ourselves to attach causal significance to such a phenomenon as this. Even if the causal unity be there as a fact, we should require better evidence than we have in this instance to justify conviction. When we add to this both the influence of the medium's organism and that of the "controls" upon the form of the communications, as is marked in the thousands of cases where this unity of trance personalities is not even suspected, we have a rather invulnerable

argument against attaching much value to this one coincidence, in spite of the fact that it belongs to two *régimes*. Dr. Hodgson will deal with this feature at length in a later report. But when examined it does not give any unity to the different personalities, but only shows the limitations under which different personalities work, and the suggestion of its possibility is actually so weak evidentially that I should not even mention or discuss it, were it not that it is imperative that we search every nook and corner for difficulties in the spiritistic hypothesis. But the weakness of the case is evident when we observe the tremendous general cleavage between these personalities that are demonstrably no part of the medium's normal equipment. I shall have to leave the confirmation of this by the empirical data of the record to the reader, as it would occupy too much space here to even touch upon it. Especially is the case reinforced by the fact that if there be any unity at all between the various trance personalities, it should show itself far more frequently, as it does so in the ordinary cases of secondary personality, where the limitations of the normal self constantly reflect themselves in the secondary self, even when the latter appears the superior. What astonishes one in the Piper instance is to find that this supposed unity does not exhibit itself as it should if it exist at all. Casual coincidences will not show it, and there is no such common choice of expressions and language as so easily connects the primary and secondary selves in the usual cases of hypnosis, where, though recognition is interrupted or suspended, the main incidents of the general character, habits, and expressions will often, and perhaps inevitably creep out and betray the unity of the two selves. But the only trace of this unity in the Piper case is either this casual unity, whose significance we have to reject, or the unity of her own subliminal and supraliminal which is to be expected in all circumstances, but which does not reflect itself in the trance personalities in any suggestive way. The habits of the organism, whether physical or psychical, subliminal or supraliminal, ought to be found in the results, and might be expected, on all natural grounds of experience, to affect the perfect integrity of the separate personalities on any theory whatsoever. But the psychical streams represented in the various trance personalities exhibit an independence of these habits and a cleavage between themselves, as well as between them and the many communicators involved, that is far more perfect than any study of secondary consciousness would lead us to expect. A minute study of the case will bear this statement out beyond question, while it is absolutely necessary to establish a psychical unity between these personalities in order to get any fulcrum at all against the weight of the spiritistic theory. The strength of the case for this distinctness of cleavage is apparent when the small amount of evidence that I have produced breaks down, even

on a collective basis of argument, and more especially as it is not qualified even to suggest any marked influence from either organic or subliminal habits on the part of the medium. The organic and psychic unity should coincide in order to make out even a plausible case for secondary personality in the explanation of this dramatic play, while there should not be any such overwhelming distinctness of character and language between Phinuit, G. P., and Imperator as appear, and that does not coincide with organic and subliminal or supraliminal functions derived from experience in some form. This is perfectly evident and conclusive in studying the remarkable difference between the trance condition and Mrs. Piper's emergence from it. The phenomena of secondary personality are frequent in the latter, but never noticeable in the former, unless hunted for with the utmost care in sporadic instances which in no way suggest any unity in the various trance personalities. Observe the very pertinent fact that the trance personalities become objective realities in the third person to Mrs. Piper's subliminal as she emerges from the trance and catches messages only in broken fragments. The cleavage between the trance condition in respect of personality and that of the subliminal emergence from it is very different from the cleavage between the two subliminals which she exhibits in this emergence. In fact, the cleavage hardly exists in this latter at all. But it is most interesting to note that just where the ordinary phenomena of secondary consciousness begin to appear in Mrs. Piper the spiritistic begin to disappear, namely, the indications that we are dealing with realities other than subliminal mental states.

Having thus disposed of all empirical evidence in the Piper record itself in favour of the necessary unity between the various "controls," as a condition of appealing to secondary personality in dispute of the spiritistic significance in the phenomena, I go on to consider the objection from the dramatic colouring in other instances of secondary consciousness, a fact that is designed to classify this case inductively with all others. In what may be called the dramatic play of hypnosis, though it bears no essential comparison with the Piper case, as I have shown in the distinction between dramatic imitation and dramatic interplay between different personalities, there is yet a participation sometimes by one personality in the experience of another. This is seldom, or never, reciprocal. But secondary personality betrays a community of ideas that never occurs in the Piper case except as this community conforms to the conception and representation of conversation and intercourse between real beings. In the ordinary instance of secondary consciousness these data appear as stolen, or as common property, and acknowledgments are seldom made. The community is automatic and not self-conscious. But both the form

and the matter of the intercourse between the trance personalities of Mrs. Piper represent the reciprocity of sane and intelligent exchange of ideas. There always appears either a stated reason for this community in the nature of the situation real or represented, or the community is of a kind that betrays no resemblance to the indiscriminate access of one hypnotic personality to the experience of another. There is too much intelligence and natural adjustment to a possibly real and complex situation in a transcendental world, in our case, to compare it with the mechanical action of the usual secondary consciousness which does not even imagine a real or fictitious situation for intercourse between personalities, and consequently the Piper phenomena get such a unity of a rational sort as characterises distinct persons working like a collective whole to a common end. This is spiritistic. The ends of secondary personality are at cross purposes and are not unified at all in anything but their accidents. Not so with the Piper case. Its unity is fundamental with respect to its avowed end, namely, the proof of individual survival, but not in respect of the agencies that work together toward that end. Their personalities show no reciprocity of ideas or experience that is not like the intercourse of real beings in working for the same end. The contrast in this respect with the so-called dramatic play of pseudo-spiritistic phenomena is very striking, where, as I have said, we get the most suggestive evidence of any comparison whatever with the characteristic under consideration. The whole play of ordinary automatic writing is mechanical and shows all the limitations and the marks which usually circumscribe both the fact and the pretensions of a transcendental world. When it reaches the point of supposing such a world, it is haunted with the oracular obscurity and contradictions of the natural ignorance of any brain on such a subject, as well as the limitations of supraliminal experience. There is an organic unity in the Piper case that is established by its end, not by its mental states. Hence that comparison with others which the student of secondary personality is wont to make is to be dismissed, so that we are left without adequate analogies in general to reduce the uniqueness of the Piper phenomena. This does not mean, of course, that a man cannot adhere to the hypothesis of a combination of secondary personality and telepathy to account for them, but it does mean that the hypothesis is without adequate empirical and scientific evidence in its support. It is purely *a priori* and so based upon merely accidental resemblances. But such a judgment cannot be entertained as anything more than an evasion of its significance until adequate evidence is produced in cases unquestionably non-spiritistic to show a dramatic play so perfect and realistic as in the one under discussion. I do not know a particle of evidence for any such characteristic carried out

with such organic consistency and intelligence toward a single end and with such distinctness of personal intelligence and character as here. Pierre Janet's Léonie 2 criticising Léonie 1 with a full consciousness of the latter's life, and Dr. Morton Prince's X 3 laughing at X 1 while knowing all and more than X 1, do not in the slightest resemble the interplay of personality with its reciprocal exchange of ideas, as if real, that so characterises the Piper case. Consequently, I must adhere to the thesis that the only objection to the spiritistic theory which I can admit is extremely tenuous and dubious on the one hand, and involves such a combination of enormous powers and unconscious deception on the other, as defies all ordinary scientific suppositions in this direction. The sceptic's only resource in the last analysis is the unique character of the case, and a demand for its repetition in another instance before giving in his allegiance. But this is an abandonment of scientific evidence for his theory of secondary personality, while we have a vast mass of other phenomena pointing in the same direction and which are not discredited by this explanation of the Piper case, as they are of a spontaneous and experimental kind not connected with any exhibition of secondary consciousness even in appearance, though they are inferior to the Piper record in credentials. The difference, however, is one that cannot be described briefly to any man who does not take the pains to examine and study carefully the reports on the case. It is a difference which every one will have to see for himself, and I should not have taken the trouble here to discuss it at all in language that will seem to imply at least some resemblance to secondary personality, had it not been necessary to indicate to the reader that I fully reckoned with that hypothesis in making up my convictions. The accusation that it is merely what I have rejected will be made generally by persons who have neither studied phenomena like these in general nor adequately examined the special case before us. They cannot be refuted by any brief characterisation of the phenomena that I can give here, and hence I can only deny the analogy which they imagine and challenge them to reproduce it in the same form and extent without the evidence of personal identity, as a condition of revising the provisional hypothesis that I have accepted. It will require very little dispassionate study of the dramatic interplay of different personalities to discover the rationality of supposing them independent intelligences until the evidence for personal identity in the incidents of the record is dislodged, and when we observe the vast amount of evidence against any psychical unity in these personalities and that the dramatic play of personality is not imitative and mechanical, but intelligent and adjusted to a rational end, we shall be satisfied to use the comparison with secondary personality with very great caution, and only as a

defence against any exposure to illusion. But the moment we seriously examine the consequences to which the application of such a theory leads in its appropriation of brain powers without empirical evidence, and the amount of unconscious deception involved in the actual intelligence displayed by these phenomena, we shall wonder whether "spiritualists" have been the only victims of credulity.

I have spoken all along, however, of secondary personality and its combination with telepathy as if they were necessarily inconsistent with spiritism. The reason for this assumed inconsistency is the evidential problem in the case. But there is a way to look at secondary personality, whether with or without telepathy, as a condition of the proof of spiritism, even though its diversified forms are an obstacle in evidential matters. By this I mean that secondary personality may be a transitional state between normal consciousness and the conditions necessary for communication with a transcendental world.

We must not forget that secondary personality is not very clearly defined. It is an expression very largely for our ignorance in regard to many of its conditions and phenomena. We require some phrase for the activities that seem, superficially at least, to lie between the presumably mechanical functions of the brain which exhibit no organising intelligence and those which so completely imitate and reproduce all the phenomena of consciousness that they cannot apparently be classified with the former, while the absence of mnemonic connection with the normal state separates them from that class. But in spite of their apparent nature as a form of consciousness they are not accessible to introspection and study of the individual who experiences them, and hence they must remain more or less unknown to those who are best qualified to pronounce upon their character and causes. In addition, however, to this field of ignorance regarding the matter there is another aspect of it that is equally undefined, and that is so far favorable to the possibility that secondary personality may be a transitional condition to that delicate and complex combination of circumstances under which communications of an intelligible sort from the dead can be effected. This is the extreme elasticity of the conception which secondary personality represents. It connotes every condition of subliminal phenomena between somnambulant suggestibility in which the mind seems entirely passive and those spontaneous activities that completely simulate another personal mind than the normal. In this wide gamut every imaginable phase of mental action between normal consciousness and pure unconsciousness may be represented, and this, too, with interminable degrees of complexity. If the "subliminal" does not coincide with secondary personality it must represent a still wider field of nescience. But this question aside, the

extremely elastic conception which secondary personality involves, having no definable limits except those which circumscribe the nature, functions and experience of the subject itself, enables us to study its various phases with reference to the different degrees of spontaneity and receptivity of which it may be capable. With the dominance of its spontaneity, whether this consisted in a play upon the subject's own experience mnemonically separated from the supraliminal consciousness, as in automatic writing, somnambulism and hypnosis, or in the fabrication of a world of its own like dreams and hallucinations (*Cf. M. Flournoy's case, From India to the Planet Mars*), we should expect no communications from a transcendental world, even though the impulse of the subject to action came from that source, but we should expect only the various play of its own functions on the material of normal experience, divested of the inhibitions and environment constituted by the psychological conditions accompanying normal consciousness. But, on the other hand, just in proportion to the elimination of this spontaneous action and of the various influences that determine the limits of active secondary personality, we might obtain a condition susceptible of reflecting, like the sensibility of the physical organism, the influences of an outside mental world.

Now if we only add to this the possibility that in such a transcendental world the normal method of communication is telepathic, we can understand why, in the ordinary states of secondary personality where the conditions for telepathic communication even between the living are not supplied, spiritistic messages of an evidential character do not occur though the subject be aware of a transcendental stimulus, and that secondary personality might be a connecting link between a material and a spiritual world, and so abnormal to both. Unless it commonly accompanied telepathic phenomena between the living, we would expect that it should either be wholly eliminated or certain conditions realised before we could receive telepathic messages from the dead. In this connection it may be worth noting as possibly corroborative of this view that telepathy between living minds is extremely sporadic and capricious. It is subject to conditions that betray no evidence of reproducing the personality of any one, but conforms to laws like mechanical forces, namely, impressibility only to present active energies. Experimental telepathy, as I have often remarked here, shows no tendency to select teleologically, with a view to representing another's identity, the facts of the agent's or other living person's memory, but it apparently limits its access to present functional action, and eschews quiescent states, precisely as in the mechanical world where only *actual* energy effects anything. If then, we suppose that our messages conform to this law we must assume that

the telepathy is from the dead and less probably from the living, especially when it assumes the form and selectiveness of personal identity. Moreover the stages of secondary personality nearest the normal consciousness may limit telepathic access, when that occurs, to sporadic acquisitions in the material world, as its suggestibility is adjusted to such conditions; and just in proportion as we suppress or eliminate this secondary personality in its spontaneous and active form, and sever its connection from the influence of normal experience and memory, we may bring the subject into telepathic *rapport* with the transcendental world, and messages under these conditions would naturally reflect the influence of discarnate spirits. If they require to be in a secondary state in order to communicate, thus cutting them off from their normal spiritual life, we should expect them to communicate facts representative only of their past, and these perhaps of a trivial and confused kind, or even nothing but dream fabrications like our somnambulistic phenomena and the idiotic rambling like much of the the secondary personality that has so often passed for spiritistic messages.

I do not assume, or beg the question here as to the existence of such a transcendental world, for I know that this is the issue to be proved. I am only postulating it hypothetically for the better representation of the complex conditions that may be necessary for connecting it, if possible, evidentially with the known material world. Its possibility must be taken for granted because of our ignorance in regard to the negative. Hence we have only to extend what we know of both telepathy and secondary personality in order to conceive how the evidential problem may be solved.

But suppose telepathy may not be the mode of communication in a transcendental world, there is yet a resource for spiritism in the complications of secondary personality and that nice balance of its functions which may be necessary to establish *rapport* with the transcendental life. Now we very seldom find any conscious interpenetration of the several streams of consciousness in the phenomena of multiplex personality. The cleavage is almost universally absolute. Personally I know of but one exception and the facts of this instance are not yet made public. At any rate, it is so rare that we must expect a fortunate combination of circumstances to secure the interpenetration of two or more personalities consciously. Whatever the influences, therefore, that may be brought to bear upon the subliminal we must expect that they will not often reflect themselves in the supraliminal, or in actions and evidence properly belonging to the latter. Now if we remember two things in this situation, (1) that some motor effect or action, vocal or graphic, is essential in all conditions for our knowledge of the mental activity of the subject, and

(2) that in the usual suspense of normal consciousness, as in sleep, paralysis, catalepsy, etc., motor functions are also suspended unless by chance they are accessible to suggestion—if we remember these two facts, we will understand what a rare combination of circumstances may be necessary to the retention of motor functions, vocal or graphic, while secondary personality is reduced to the passive condition possibly necessary to the receipt of transcendental communications and their transmission to us through that retained motor action. In ordinary secondary personality we have the retention of motor functions possibly because it is active, but in reducing this condition to the same passive condition that sleep is assumed to produce for the supraliminal it would only be natural to suspend these motor functions also. Consequently we might often, in the complex vicissitudes of these phenomena, obtain a condition for the reception of messages, but no conditions for their motor expression. Whatever the mode of normal communication in a spiritual world may be, therefore, we require either that the interpenetration of the subliminal, by hypothesis accessible to communications, with the supraliminal which regularly controls the machinery of expression, or that condition of eliminated spontaneity in the transitional phenomena of secondary personality combined with the retention of the proper motor functions, so that we should be able to obtain evidential facts of any kind. The difficulty, of course, is to be assured of such a condition. But as it is *the content or subject matter* of the phenomena of secondary personality as ordinarily known, and *not the state itself*, or any knowledge of what it necessarily is, that has discredited spiritism as usually maintained, we are entitled at least to ask the question whether secondary personality may not really be what is imagined here to be possible, namely, a transitional state between normal consciousness and the conditions necessary for communication. If this be possible we cannot consider it as in any way opposed to spiritism except on the evidential side when its content fails to realise the demands of that theory. *Rapport with the discarnate is the desideratum.*

One remark here is borne out by the modern theory of hallucinations. This is that they are due to secondary stimuli. That is to say, they originate in a stimulus, but in one that is not co-ordinated with the sense apparently affected by it. To illustrate, an apparition in the field of vision may be caused by some stimulus in hearing or other locus of the sensorium, or a sound apparently heard may be due abnormally to an impression received elsewhere than the ear. In all such cases, the world of consciousness is not represented by the result of the stimulus as it is supposed to be in normal sensory experience. That is to say, the stimulus comes from one world and the representation is of another. Armed with this conception we may explain those cases of

alleged and apparent communication in which the content of the messages is hallucination, secondary personality, or unconscious fabrication. Supposing that the impulse or stimulus came from the transcendental world and the representation of the facts from the action of the subject's own mind, we can understand, on the theory of hallucinations, how the conviction that the phenomena are spiritistic should arise and yet that the content should be manifestly absurd and incredible. Possibly some of Swedenborg's experiences are explicable on this hypothesis, and if so, we can understand that the deception apparent in such mental action is not of the sort to justify the supposition that it is in any sense diabolic, but is purely automatic and unintentional, that is, subliminal automatism. I do not mean to imply that any such condition is frequent, since the field of secondary personality is so large in which it is not necessary to suppose more than the dream play of the mind on its own experience, and the natural automatism of the subject so qualifies the suspicion of fiendish purposes that we may allow such cases as are here imagined to be very rare, and admit them only where the subject matter shows a mixture of the veridical messages and evident hallucination. The suggestibility of the secondary state is so delicate and its sensory action, like that of dreams, so ready to explode into products of its own manufacture, that we must in some way expect to eliminate this spontaneity in order to effect the proper *rapport* for genuine communications. That is to say, eliminate the conditions that tend to produce hallucinations or the fabrications of secondary personality, and we may obtain genuine messages from a transcendental world while it will not be necessary to suspect the diabolic character of secondary personality as an escape from the cogeny of the facts.

Let me summarise the position here taken. I assume the following:

- (1) That the discarnate spirit is in a state of *active* secondary personality when communicating, possibly at times resembling our hypnotic condition in some of its incidents at least, and exhibiting various degrees of clearness and confusion, merging now and then into delirium, automatism, or complete syncope. This supposition explains both the *triviality* and the *fragmentary character* of the messages, together with the rapid movement of thought so evident in them. It also explains easily the occurrence of automatisms. Telepathy between the living cannot plead any excuse for its limitations in this way, because the powers that have to be assumed for it would give it access to any and all incidents of the sitter's memories, important and trivial alike.
- (2) That Mrs. Piper is in a state of *passive* secondary personality, a subliminal condition which reflects or expresses *automatically* the thoughts communicated to it. The evidence that this is her condition is almost overwhelming. The supposition, then, explains easily

the limitations of the whole case, and also the fact that the dramatic play of personality is more consistent with the spiritistic theory than with that of her secondary personality. Mrs. Piper can hardly be in an active and a passive state of secondary personality at the same time. (3) That there is some process of communication between these two conditions of secondary personality, whose *modus operandi* is not yet known. It might be athanato-telepathic in its nature. The evidence for this at present is insufficient. Or we might find an analogy in the combination of phonetic and electrical laws in the telephone, in as much as many of the confusions resemble phonetic errors. Much can be explained by this supposition that may not be due to the mental condition of the communicator. (See Appendix VII., pp. 643-645.)

There is one more difficulty to be considered that appears to have some weight in respectable quarters. It is closely connected with the problem of mistakes and confusions, and is comprehended in the same general causes. It is usually raised by the same class that takes offence at confusion. When some alleged communication is presented as coming from a discarnate spirit the usual questions are: "Why cannot a spirit be more explicit and definite? Why cannot it name certain specific dates or events at once that will immediately identify it? Why so much confusion and loss of memory? Why so much trouble about their names? A spirit ought to be able to announce its name at once and to know that it is imperative to do this at first." To many this represented disintegration of memory makes the whole affair appear very suspicious and creates a presumption for telepathy which we can easily conceive as capricious, and which experience seems to show is so.

This objection has in a large measure been answered in all that has been said about mistakes and confusion. But one aspect of it requires special notice. It is the tendency of certain presumably intelligent people to *a priori* decide what a given spirit ought to say to identify itself. They argue from what they imagine they would do in the same situation, without really knowing what such a situation is. Unless the alleged spirit tells a coherent story and indulges in lofty sentiments in clear language or exhibits some superhuman flights of inspiration, great truths, etc., they turn up their noses and substitute sneers for science. It is an objection that reflects more suspicion on the intelligence of the man who makes it than upon that of the alleged spirit. It is strange that an agnostic who has abandoned orthodox dogma on the one hand, and who has seen the terrible lesson in humility which the doctrine of evolution has taught man in regard to his origin against all the poetry and mythology of the past, should

clinging to the theological assumption of some idyllic existence and perfection for spirits in case they exist at all, and this without one iota of evidence! The fact is that scientifically or otherwise there is no reason to suppose the existence of spirits of any kind, much less that they represent anything much better than man is now. Every sane and intelligent man will take the evidence, good or bad, that he can get and affirm or deny the existence of spirits before saying what they ought to do as communicators or what estate they shall possess before believing in them. The chasm which is usually supposed to exist between an embodied and a disembodied spirit has no excuse for its existence except the imagination of unscientific men. After the doctrine of evolution it is absurd to take any cross section of this process and assume that the next stage of it will mark an immeasurable distance and degree of progress. It is flatly against all the laws and analogies of nature to do this, and absolutely inexcusable in the minds of men who make the slightest profession of science. The existence of spirits cannot be judged by any *a priori* ideas that appeal to our æsthetic sense instead of the actual evidence, and the best way to treat any objection to them on this assumption is to employ Gibbon's sneers and to jeer a man out of court. In this, however, I am not defending the insanities of this subject. I know that plenty of folly may like to apologise for itself under cover of just this language. But it is nevertheless a perfectly inexcusable illusion to indulge our judgments in the assumption that, if spirits exist, they can talk the language of poetry and inspiration. You may have an indulgent public in your favor when you trust fancy in its pictures of preternatural intelligence and powers, but science will only stand by and mark your faith. Evolution has destroyed the golden age of the past, and spiritism, with a similar lesson of humility, may destroy the illusory golden age of the future. From what we know of the influence of hypnosis upon the consciousness of personal identity and of physiological disturbances in the brain affecting the integrity of memory, so far from expecting any traces whatever of personal identity, even if the soul survived as an "energy," we should rather wonder that any intelligible message should come in the attempt to communicate. Both from our knowledge of physiology and from the necessity of intervening obstacles between incarnate and discarnate existence, all the material conditions of our present mental states and modes of communication being removed, we should rather expect spirits, even when they retained the consciousness of personal identity and possessed perfectly clear thought in their own natural medium, only to squeak and gibber like poor Polly in their effort to speak to us through such media as must be employed. The amazing thing is that there should be either any survival at all, or any traces

of it possible. Hence there is nothing to do but to handle without mercy every man who is so ignorant of the postulates of scientific method and of the immense difficulties that must of necessity be encountered in real communications from a transcendental world as to ask that spirits should speak the language or exhibit the intelligence of Plato, of Paul, or of Shakespere. When Pierre Janet could disturb the ordinary functions of memory by producing anæsthesia through hypnosis, or restore its functions by reproducing local sensibility, we need not be surprised at the incoherencies of communication, even if there were no intervening obstacles to its existence. But add the latter conditions to the former and the wonder is that the insanities of spiritualism are not far worse than they are. Physiology also shows in the localisation of brain functions that we have probably to distinguish between the centres for the higher psychical activities and the sensory-motor, putting the former in the prefrontal lobes and the latter in the area about the fissure of Rolando. (Mills. *The Nervous System and Diseases*, pp. 321-352.) The older view supposed that the motor action of the Rolandic area was unaccompanied by consciousness even of the sensory sort, so that sensations were associated with consciousness or the higher mental activities in general. The memory of both the sensory and intellectual processes would thus appear to belong together. But the newer view seems to make the physiological distinction between the locus of the intellectual and the sensory coincide with the psychological distinction from time immemorial between these two types of consciousness. Unless the sensory experience were taken up by the intellectual process and assimilated in its own way, it might be that any disturbance to the physical conditions of sensation would affect the integrity of recollection and recognition. Pierre Janet's experiments, showing an intimate connection between amnesia and anæsthesia and at least apparently coinciding with the natural implications of the latest results in the study of the localisation of brain functions, should throw some light on the possibilities of difficulty in the process of communication independently of the merely physical and other obstacles to it, even after the possibility of survival is granted. But I cannot go into the complexities of this subject without taking more time and space than this report will permit. I must rely upon the reader's knowledge of the fact that its complexities are great enough to justify the rebuke that science is entitled to administer to the pride and confidence of those who expect communications to be clearer even than in our telephone.

The difficulty with proper names which is a stumbling block to many persons in studying these experiments may have an explanation in the ultimate solution of physiological problems and their perplexities,

as indicated above. But in the meantime there are some facts that may explain it without any such appeal. It will be observed by the student that there seems to be a natural distinction between familiar and unfamiliar terms in the communications. The phraseology of them is comparatively narrow, and mistake or confusion often coincides with the introduction of a term that is not so common as others (*Cf.* phrase "United Presbyterian," p. 492). The suspicion is confirmed also by my experiments in artificial communication where the confusion and error coincided most generally with the use of proper names and unfamiliar terms (p. 624). If that be the case it would only be natural to encounter difficulty in them when communicating with incarnate beings from a transcendental world, even on the supposition that the communicator was perfectly clear in his own mind, which is probably not the case. (See my discussion of this question in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CII., March, 1901, pp. 635-639. Also *The North American Review*, Vol. CLXXI., pp. 745-746.) There are other facts that may contribute to the same conclusion. The psychological complexities of memory, involving the various relations between intellectual, sensory, and motor functions, the relation between different ideas and the visualising and auralising process, the mental habits of the individual in the use and recall of not only proper names, but also unfamiliar words, to say nothing of the difficulties of sending his ideas through a physical organism which he could not be expected to use as his own—all these are factors in the explanation of the communications and their contents on any theory whatsoever, and have to be reckoned with in telepathy as much as in spiritism. In fact the difficulties in connection with telepathy ought not to be so great as in the case of its rival theory, as telepathy eliminates both the psychological problems connected with the supposed spirit and those of a supposed transcendental world and is left to contend only with the physiological and psychological peculiarities of the sitter, in which case there ought to be no difference in the alleged communications from different persons. But these differences correspond with what we should expect in the known differences between individuals, so that both the facts of confusion in regard to proper names and unfamiliar terms and the manifold increased difficulties over those assumed on the hypothesis of telepathy are in favour of spiritism.

CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSION.

It is apparent from all that has been said regarding telepathy and the objections to spiritism that my predilections lie in the direction of the latter theory, and I do not require to engage in any lengthy restatement of the argument. I must simply explain what seems to me to be the proper scientific attitude to be taken toward such phenomena as are contained in this and similar records. The sceptical temper is familiar to all of us, and is the prevailing condition of general public opinion. To this there can be no objection so long as it is intelligent and scientific. On the contrary I think we are to congratulate ourselves on the tenacity and persistence of it, even in its unintelligent form. But all this scepticism is not conscious of the reason for its justification, and for various illegitimate reasons goes on denouncing "spiritualism" from the conceptions of its follies in the past. The history of "spiritualism" is undoubtedly a heavy incubus for the scientific man to bear. But whatever that may be, the real reason for scepticism, which is only a name for caution when it is not a demand for libertinism, is the momentous character of the conclusion and the tremendous consequences, philosophical, moral, religious, and political, that must follow anything like scientific proof of a future life. Faith no longer charms with her magic wand, except among those who do not accept or appreciate scientific method, but whose flimsy standards afford no criteria for defence against illusion and deception. Hence men who have been saturated, consciously or unconsciously, with the scientific spirit either give up the hereafter or insist that their belief shall have other credentials than authority. Consequently, every institution connected with social, moral and religious life must be profoundly affected, whether for good or ill, by such an assurance as that of a future life, the doubt about which has turned the aspirations of modern civilisation from the moral to the economic ideal. The consequences make it necessary that we should not be fooled in so important a matter as this. We can then well afford to follow scepticism to the utmost limits before yielding to spiritism, if only for securing sufficiently rigid standards of truth and maintaining the right of scientific method to determine the criteria of belief. Our first duty is to science, and in this we must give the right of way to scepticism, as the safest provision against illusion, until the audacity of the theories necessary to support it carries us beyond all evidence and rationality in the resistance to the alternative view. This is the

only legitimate reason for hesitation regarding spiritism, as the danger of misinterpretation even in its genuine phenomena is so great that the obligation to caution cannot be too stringent. The past reputation and the false conceptions of both its facts and doctrines are not a valid excuse for the evasion of phenomena that persist in thrusting themselves upon the attention of science, but are simply warnings against lowering the standards of truth and defence against illusion. We may think that the future life as presumably indicated by the evidence of spiritistic phenomena, even of the highest type, is poor and meagre at its best, and that nothing ideal can come of its proof. But however humiliating the facts may be—though they are infinitely less so than the unscientific imagination supposes—science has no excuse for evading the issue or following in the wake of popular delusions. It is the hard sacrifice of human pride and vanity that stand more in the way of a scientific and respectful consideration of these phenomena than anything else. I do not admit that the general interpretation of them is correct, when it repudiates the supposed life implied by them as unideal and undesirable, since we are not in a position to demand as yet any such construction of that life as may be necessary to pronounce upon its character with assurance either way. Personal identity is the first and only problem to attack at the outset. All others, if soluble at all, are infinitely more complex and difficult to determine. Personal identity is hampered by nothing but the conditions of communication, which, of course, are numerous enough. It can appeal to a veritable past. But such a thing as the mode of life in the transcendental world, in addition to the obstacles of communication, is burdened by the want in us of any means for conceiving this life intelligibly in terms of the experience upon which we usually rely for the regulation of our lives. We should never forget that the language employed may easily mislead us, and can be ultimately comprehended only by the higher faculties trained on the abstraction of sensory experience, and in constructing from the consistency and diversity of the data, by the higher intellectual processes, a general conception that is both consistent with itself and with the non-sensory consciousness of actual life, a conception that cannot be left to the unscientific imagination to determine. Unfortunately even the professional scientists too often accept the criteria of the plebs in this matter where their energies ought to be employed in correcting it.

It is apparent from all this that I give my adhesion to the theory that there is a future life and persistence of personal identity, that I am willing to make it provisional upon the establishment, by the non-believer in the supernormal of any kind, of sufficient telepathy, in combination with the other necessary processes, to account for the whole amazing result. All other questions I put out of court as not

relevant, especially as there is not one sentence in my record from which I could even pretend to deduce a conception of what the life beyond the grave is. I have kept my mind steadily and only on the question whether some theory could not explain away the facts rather than accept spiritism. But I think that every one without exception would admit that, superficially at least, the phenomena represent a good case for spiritism as a rational possibility. The fact of satisfying the criterion for personal identity can hardly be disputed by anyone on any theory whatever, whether of fraud, telepathy, or spiritism. Hence, after excluding fraud, the only question is whether it is more consistent with the data at hand to believe that they can be better accounted for by telepathy with its necessary adjuncts than by the survival of consciousness after death. I do not care how we conceive this survival, whether in the form of the traditional "spirit," or in the form of some centre of force either with or without the accompaniment of a "spiritual body," or again in the form of a continued mode of the Absolute. With these questions I have nothing to do as preliminary, but only as subsequent to the determination of personal identity. I am satisfied if the evidence forces us in our rational moods to tolerate the spiritistic theory as rationally possible and respectable, as against stretching telepathy and its adjuncts into infinity and omniscience.

The objections that I have presented have been considered only as so much respect to the real difficulties of the problem, as it must appear to both the casual reader and the student of abnormal phenomena who cannot so intimately appreciate the pertinence of the facts as can the sitter, and who justly clings to the rights of scepticism. These difficulties, however, do not impress me as in reality so formidable as they appear in the abstract. The only one that offers any resistance worth serious attention is that which supposes a combination of telepathy and secondary personality, but the force of even this objection arises from the extremely vague character of it, from certain accidental and superficial resemblances between secondary consciousness and the interplay of personality in the Piper case which the uncritical student does not easily detect in its real nature, and from the failure of the general statement of the argument to express definitely the vast implications that it must logically accept when worked out to its consequences in order to cover the facts. We merely show that secondary personality explains a number of abnormal mental phenomena which some unintelligent people considered spiritistic, and the habit of dispelling their illusions by that phrase enables us still to use it as a charm in the defence of scepticism, which in spite of its rights may easily adopt the tone of dogmatism. But if we once study the Piper phenomena with due care and patience we shall discover in the

difference between them and the ordinary facts of secondary consciousness a significance in the dramatic interplay of different personalities that reveals the most apparent realism in the whole performance. But even telepathy and secondary personality do not exhaust the suppositions that have to be made. The enormous deception involved in so persistent and consistent a representation of the spiritistic reality is of a nature to make one pause. A process assumed to be so intelligent and acute as it must be to reproduce personal identity in this manner must know whether it is deceiving or not. Nor can we stop with the Piper case in making this supposition. This is only one in many thousands of those that are continually producing phenomena with an apparent spiritistic import. The only difference between them and the case before us is that the latter more nearly satisfies the most rigid demands of science. But all of them represent a constant attempt to reproduce spiritistic phenomena, and if we are to use the theory of unconscious deception we have to extend it to the subliminal of all who have apparitions, mediumistic experiences, spontaneous coincidences suggesting a spirit origin, planchette and other writing, and possibly to the unconscious life of every one of us. Such a supposition baffles all credibility, scientific or otherwise. But it is the necessary consequence of the combination of telepathy and secondary personality, and perhaps of telepathy alone, so that there will no longer be any excuse for agnosticism holding out against a definite characterisation of the Absolute as the Devil!

But I regard the contradictions of telepathy as not only breaking it down, but also as disqualifying any and every form of secondary personality for a theory to meet the case. We cannot give telepathy, as we have known it experimentally, the power to meet the demands of the dramatic play as displayed here without conceiving it so great as to make its actual limitations and failures absurd, and in defect of the achievement to successfully realise the functions of the infinite in small as well as great things, there is no necessity for making any appeal to secondary personality at all, to say nothing of the difficulties against it without supposing that telepathy is its necessary adjunct. But as I am not dealing at present with the problem of secondary personality beyond the limits of my own record I shall not argue against it further. The crucial test of spiritism, in this and all other cases, must turn upon the question of telepathy to furnish the data upon which any secondary consciousness has to work. Until it is more fully studied we shall have to assume that secondary personality is equal to the task of explaining the dramatic play of personality and all the non-evidential data, and base our conclusion upon the insufficiency of telepathy to supply the objective facts in evidence of personal identity. If telepathy involves a contradiction between the

powers necessary to account for the true facts and the limitations displayed in its mistakes and confusions, we need not trouble ourselves too much regarding the question of secondary personality, though the unique and realistic interplay of personality in the various communicators is a vantage ground for further support of the spiritistic theory.

In considering the telepathic hypothesis and the problem of personal identity I have not treated all the facts as having the same weight, even when they were true. I have often been at pains in my notes to indicate just what truth, or approximate truth, was to be found in a message. I did not do this because the fact was evidential, but because I was concerned in showing that amid the confusion present sufficient meaning might be discovered to prevent considering the case as positively false. The facts upon which I had to rely for primary conviction were such that, with or without confusion, their pertinence was unmistakable. The approximate truths can only be confirmatory of what might be expected in the way of difficulties in communication. But the unity of consciousness exhibited both in the facts that were verifiable and in the memory of certain incidents from sitting to sitting in which the communicator had a special interest, especially when we observe the distinctness with which different sitters are kept apart in spite of the way they are sandwiched in for sittings, and the synthetic complexity of the facts given, are considerations that are too realistic to refuse spiritism some scientific charity. When I look over the whole field of the phenomena and consider the suppositions that must be made to escape spiritism, which not only one aspect of the case, but every incidental feature of it strengthens, such as the dramatic interplay of different personalities, the personal traits of the communicator, the emotional tone that was natural to the same, the proper appreciation of a situation or a question, and the unity of consciousness displayed throughout, I see no reason except the suspicions of my neighbours for withholding assent. But when I am asked to admit the telepathy required to meet the case, the amazing feats of memory involved in the medium's subliminal, the staggering amount of deception demanded, and the perfect play of personality presented, as capable of explaining the phenomena without spirits, I may say, yes, if you choose to believe this against all scientific precedents. But I am not ready to accept any such appeals to the infinite, especially when we have only to extend the known laws of consciousness to account for the facts instead of making such enormous suppositions for fear of losing our social respectability. Science is bankrupt when it has to appeal to the infinite. If that infinite remained self-consistent there would be less difficulty in tolerating its operations, but when it is a mixture of amazing successes and absurd failures I am not likely to regard it with much veneration.

I appreciate materialism, as one who once saw no way out of it and who had no personal interest in getting out of it. But this was when the known limitations of consciousness and mental action generally were correlated with the known limitations of the brain. Consciousness in such a view is regarded as a functional activity of the organism and its powers in all accepted physiology and psychology, presumably rational, are confined to what it can receive and do on the spot. But when it comes to giving the brain the power to spontaneously acquire, and intelligently select, from any confused mass of memories at any point of time and space in the whole universe of conscious and unconscious mentation, and to do this instantly, reproducing perfectly all the complex facts necessary to establish personal identity, I much prefer to go outside that brain for my cause, as I am not accustomed in the use of scientific method to apply the predicates of infinity and omniscience to that organ; nor to any individual mind. I may be mistaken, and if so I shall leave the correction to those who do not yet believe in telepathy. My preference for the spiritistic theory after facing the problems just indicated rests on a very simple basis, and it is that I am not prepared to build any altars to Mrs. Piper's brain, especially when I am asked to propitiate a diabolic divinity that I should much prefer to see in the *Lucretian intermundia*.

It is worth remarking in this contention that, in so far as explanatory considerations are concerned, spiritism has superior claims scientifically to telepathy. Spiritism is an appeal to known causes, the fundamental criterion of all scientific procedure; telepathy is an appeal to the unknown (*Cf.* Footnote, p. 128). We know just what an individual consciousness can do when it exists. In supposing its continuance beyond death we are but extending a known cause beyond certain concomitants and limitations of its terrestrial manifestation. As a phenomenon it is quite as intangible and invisible in its incarnate conditions as it can be supposed to be in the discarnate. We know it even terrestrially, in others, only by induction applied to certain physical movements. Hence when we advance spiritism to explain the Piper and similar phenomena we are but extending *known* causes precisely as Newton extended terrestrial gravitation to explain phenomena previously excluded from its operations. We are using the same cause to explain the unity of certain facts that we used to explain them when the person was living. It is telepathy then that appeals to the unknown, so that the spiritistic hypothesis has one scientific credential that telepathy has not.

In this conclusion, however, I am going to add a very important consideration which is the mainspring of the whole discussion and mentioned in various places only by implication, but which has not been definitely formulated as I wish to do it now.

This discussion is not designed primarily to convince the reader that the hypothesis which Dr. Hodgson and myself have adopted and defended is the true one, that it is the only one to be tolerated in the premises, but that it is entirely rational to suppose it possible, and that it explains the phenomena when it is assumed. I offer this record as some evidence for the spiritistic theory, but not as final proof of it. The process of forming the personal conviction that it is the preferable one, "the will to believe or disbelieve," must be left to the individual to determine for himself. I grant to others the inalienable right to make any suppositions they please in preference to the one defended here. But if they intend them for any other purpose than to indicate the conditions on which they are willing to be convinced of spiritism, if they intend that their suppositions shall serve as an alternative hypothesis to the one here advanced, I shall exact of them the production of the same specific and experimental evidence for the truth and explanatory power of their assumptions that we have presented in the Piper phenomena, before they shall be entitled to scientific recognition. It is all very well to insist on a high standard of evidence, and to demand that certain conditions shall be satisfied before accepting the truth of our hypothesis, or the fact that it is the only one possible, but you cannot make your personal conversion to this truth a condition or criterion of the explanatory power ascribed to the spiritistic theory. The validity of our hypothesis is not conditioned by its power to make converts to its truth, but only by its capacity for rationally explaining the facts. Or, to put this in the obverse form, it is no refutation of the spiritistic theory to say that you are not convinced of its truth, or to demand that we eliminate the infinite from it in order to establish it. The asserted alternate hypothesis must be supported by independent facts that make spiritism either impossible or superfluous. If spiritism were not actually explanatory of the facts this demand could not be pressed, inasmuch as the present record could then be quoted as evidence for telepathy. But the necessary admission that spiritism will explain the case imposes upon the rival theory the obligation to supply experimental evidence independently of this record to prove that telepathy, with its adjuncts, can reproduce as perfectly the personal identity of a living consciousness as Mrs. Piper produces that of the deceased.

To repeat them, the main object here is not to convince the reader that spiritism is the only hypothesis to be entertained, but that it is rational to suppose it as one of the possible explanations. To me it is, at present at least, decidedly the preferable one. At any rate, if it has relevant facts representative of personal identity to depend upon and suggesting an appeal to the infinite to escape spiritism, it becomes a legitimate alternative and working hypothesis among all that may

be proposed. On this ground we shall be able to retort upon those who make their personal conviction or conversion a criterion of the explanatory power of spiritism, or who advance alternative suppositions for explaining the phenomena, that they furnish experimental evidence involving, not the fact of telepathy as we know or suppose it between the living, but the kind of telepathy that will reproduce the unity of consciousness and personal identity in conjunction with the proper dramatic play of personality found in these records, but which would not permit in any case a resort to discarnate spirits to account for it. Until this evidence is forthcoming they can have no standing in a scientific court. In the meantime I am content to have suggested with Dr. Hodgson the nature and extent of the considerations which must be experimentally proved in order to refute the hypothesis which is here defended. When this result is effected it will be time to reconsider the position here taken.

APPENDICES.

Preliminary Note.

The reader will naturally desire to know how my sittings were appointed, and what was Mrs. Piper's previous knowledge of myself. I had met Mrs. Piper in the early part of the year 1892 at the house of Dr. Thaw in New York, at a meeting where some "mediumistic trick" performances were illustrated. (See *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., p. 307.) I did not make her acquaintance in any special way, but was only introduced to her. Some time afterwards, I had the latter part of a sitting with Mrs. Piper, entering the room and taking my place as sitter while she was in trance. I talked with her, however, after she came out, for some fifteen or twenty minutes. The following is the contemporary record of my sitting.

May 20th, 1892.

[Mr. J. H. Hyslop has fifteen minutes after Mr. Dow's sitting. See *Proceedings, S.P.R.*, Vol. XIII., p. 570.]

[Phinuit talking.]

How are you? You're a pretty good fellow. [Something about folks at home.]

Who's John? [I admitted that my name was John, though not true.] There's an old gentleman in the spirit belongs to him. Gentleman's father. Your father. He wants to call John. Who's John? You have had some difficulties. I want to help. He's all mixed up. Tell my son John I want to help him out of it. He wants you to answer.

There's a lady in the body has some trouble with her head. Who is it they call Mary? Very closely connected. She has some trouble in her head. You needn't worry. She gets nervous. A bright woman. [These incidents in the main are correct.] A little catarrhal trouble in the head. What's the matter with her foot?

A friend will help him financially as well as mentally. [Correct.] You do something. I don't know how to illustrate it, as it's something to do with the brain. [Touching head.] It has something to do with the development of the brain and with thought. [Correct.] You keep on and you will do well. You have developed it well. Sometimes you get all knotted up. [The reference to my mental confusion contains a very interesting fact. For a few weeks previous I had been reflecting on the relation between inhibition and responsibility, and on the day preceding the sitting it suddenly occurred to me that I could prove my point by the figures representing the relation between association time and will time. I spent the afternoon looking up

the matter, but found myself disappointed in the result, although thoroughly convinced that I was correct in the main principle. About a month later I solved the problem. But Phinuit's statement cannot be made a prediction, because, in connection with correctly indicating the recency of my thought and the present confusion, which exactly described the condition of the previous day, he merely indicated by the promise of success the confidence I had that I was correct.]

[In my original note I neglected to say that "Mary" is the name of my wife. (May 2nd, 1901.)—J.H.H.]

You're getting some very good ideas.

You're going to have a long holiday. Your lady is going with you. Over a small body of water. [Correct.]

[A long, distinct story now told about a Fred Ellis, who years ago fell into the water by a bridge, and was pulled out. Something about little sacks. Sitter has no knowledge of such person.]

So far as I am aware, I never saw Mrs. Piper again or had any communication with her till I went out to Arlington Heights on December 23rd, 1898.

The sittings which form the subject of my present report were arranged for in the following manner. I had written in August (1898) to Miss Edmunds for them, but had concealed myself under the pretence of wanting them for some one else. Of this I was very careful, but Mrs. P. was absent on her vacation, and the plan fell through. After Dr. Hodgson's return to this country I wrote to him for sittings, and, in order not to allow Miss Edmunds (who had never met me, and who had only corresponded with me) to know my plans, I asked Dr. H. not to tell her. The letter was forwarded to him unopened, he being at Bar Harbor at the time. In the course of the correspondence arranging the sittings, a vague letter of mine to him, misaddressed by myself to the office instead of to Dr. H.'s rooms, gave a chance for Miss E. to guess the case, but only to guess it from the handwriting, as the contents of the letter betrayed nothing. She seems to have suspected it, but says she did not breathe my name to any one.

I was also very careful not to tell any one in New York of my intentions except my wife, who was counselled to keep quiet, and also Professor Butler on Saturday, the 17th December, 1898, a letter to him asking for trinkets from some deceased friend having been mailed in the morning, if I remember rightly. No others had the slightest information of my plans. The whole responsibility, therefore, for fraud in the case will fall upon myself, Dr. Hodgson and Miss Edmunds. (See Note 1, p. 344.)

It will be interesting to remark, *à propos* of fraud in the case, that the first sitting is absolutely absurd upon the supposition. Much could have been found out about me and communicated to Mrs. P. by

Dr. Hodgson, either of my life in New York, or earlier in the West. If I mistake not, there is a bibliographical dictionary with a pretty full account of my career and work after entering college. I was not even identified by the alleged spirits claiming me as son and brother, and the apparent allusions to a brother and a sister who died long ago represent events which I could not verify if I tried, except from a rather meagre memory of my own, and from the testimony of two aunts who know nothing of them except by hearsay.

There is, of course, no interest in all this except for the careful reader and critic who may wish to know exactly the preceding facts and the relation which the contents of the first sitting sustain to them.

I append the statement of Dr. Hodgson.

I disclosed to no one the identity of Professor Hyslop, and I made arrangements with the trance-personalities for his first series of sittings by referring to him as a friend who wished to go four times. The following comprise all the passages dealing with the matter.

[Rector writing.]

November 12th, 1898.

. . . (I have two friends, one of whom wishes to see you four times in succession, and another who would probably desire to see you as often as ten times. They are both seekers, but I cannot say how far you might find them helpful or otherwise. You might say after the first time that they must not come, but they have both been helpful to my work on the earthly side, and if I could arrange for them I should be pleased for you to do what you can.)

Friend, we will always do the right, and if they are worthy persons and their friends sincere and worthy here, we will give them help and light. (Yes.) Nothing could give us more happiness than to help all worthy mortals. We desire of all things else to give and help all of God's children.

. . . [Arrangements for other sitters.]

(Then I think that Mrs. M. may wish two more days after that, but you can arrange with her later. Then come the four times which I should arrange with one of my friends whom you have not seen. He cannot easily come at any other time.)

Well, friend, we cannot agree to this. We must have some day between for restoration of the light for good results for him. (Yes. You will . . .)

[Hand indicates by slight movements that I am to wait as it is listening to invisible.]

Listen kindly. (Yes.)

We would prefer to meet him before we see Mrs. M. the last few times, earlier, owing to the supply of light.

(He cannot come, except at those times, until about five weeks later. Perhaps you would prefer that.)

We would, as we would have the best conditions for him (Yes. . . .) and during the week of his presence we would have none other. (Very good).

. . . [Arrangements for other sitters.]

(. . . and you will make fresh arrangements after that later).

Yes, but we repeat that during the presence of thy "four times" friend we must see no other.

(Yes. I understand. Later.) . . .

November 24th, 1898.

. . . (About Christmas time, just two days before and two days after the Christmas day, would it be possible for you to see the "four times" friend?)

It will be well. (Then I can tell him so, as there is no other time for him.) Yes + (Thank you.) We will arrange all here. . . .

How are you, H. . . . Anything I can do for you?

(Yes. That George?)

Yes. I . . . He + asked me to speak and ask you whether I could help you out a bit when your almighty friend arrives.

(Yes. I shall be very pleased to have your assistance.)

You may count on me, H. By Jove, I am glad to see you back, old chap, I can tell you. . . .

December 14th, 1898.

. . . (And on the two immediately following days after her comes the "four times" friend.) It is well.

December 15th, 1898.

. . . There is to be one friend on the first day after the Sabbath, and our friend C. on the second (Yes) and the third open (Yes) the fourth Mrs. Z. (Yes) and thy four times friend thereafter (Yes.) . . .

December 21st, 1898.

. . . What hast thou to say about our meetings here for thy friend? (Do you mean the four times friend?) Yes, we desire to send another messenger and will do so then. . . . We have arranged for a meeting with thy four times friend, the second day, also the third. (Yes.) . . .

—R. HODGSON.

The records which follow are complete, and no names have been changed in matters concerning myself or my friends. It will be noticed that in several places references are made, in conversation between the trance-personalities and Dr. Hodgson, to other sitters, and in some of these cases initials only or pseudonyms are given, instead of the real names.

The sittings, which usually lasted about two hours, from about 10.15 a.m. to about 12.15 p.m., were all held at Mrs. Piper's house in Arlington Heights, Mass., about half an hour by train from Boston.

Every word said by Dr. Hodgson or myself at the sittings is recorded, except¹ that in one or two instances, noted where they

¹ Except also such phrases as, "One moment, Rector," or "Wait a moment, please," used by Dr. Hodgson when it was necessary to turn over the paper, when the writing was being superposed, or when the hand was going over the edge of the writing pad.

occur, several words addressed to Dr. Hodgson were inaudible to him, and also that I did not myself succeed in recording absolutely every word spoken by myself during Dr. Hodgson's absences from the room during the first sitting. The record of the writing by Mrs. P.'s hand is also complete, except that I have only occasionally incorporated the word "Yes" when written by the trance personalities in acknowledgment of Dr. Hodgson's correct reading of the original writing. When the "Yes" is a response to a question, however, it is, of course, included. Dr. Hodgson recorded my remarks, which I tried to speak very slowly, partly that the record of them should be complete, and partly to facilitate the clear comprehension of my words by the trance-personalities. Besides recording my remarks as I made them, Dr. Hodgson also copied nearly all the writing by Mrs. P.'s hand as it was written, and shortly after each sitting we completed the record by a careful comparison with the original writing (see also statements on p. 14, and footnote on p. 29).

There are some cases of curious spelling by the "machine" which I have thought worth indicating in their proper places. I have inserted these, where they occur, in square brackets immediately after the words which they represent. For example, "lapse [laps]" (p. 407). This means that the word in the original automatic writing was written *laps*.

I should add perhaps that the punctuation is not restricted to that of the original automatic writing, where there is a deficiency of it. The marks in the original are practically confined to periods and interrogation points. A mark like a period seems to serve for the most part indifferently for any pause. The repetitions of words or phrases in the record were generally owing to our inability to decipher them at once when they were written the first time. Repetitions due to other causes will be noted when they occur unless their origin is obvious from the text (as for example in the emotional repetitions of my father near the beginning of the second sitting). Occasionally in the record of the automatic writing the brackets { } are found. In the original those brackets were made ().

The notes embodied in the records of the sittings are, except as otherwise dated, contemporary with the sittings; that is to say, they were written on the days of the sittings or shortly afterwards. Some additional notes made later will be found at the end of the first series of sittings (p. 344), and others, made later still, at the end of the third series. Page references to these later notes will be found in the course of the records of the sittings. I have preserved the chronological order to a large extent by this arrangement, and a comparison of my own notes made at different times affords, in my opinion, an instructive lesson concerning sundry difficulties not sufficiently appreciated by the

ordinary inquirer into the psychological problems before us. It will be seen, for example, in more than one striking instance, that whereas in my early notes I condemn certain statements as inconsistent with any origin from my father's mind, in my later notes, made after special inquiries, it appeared that these statements were entirely relevant and that they pointed distinctly to the identity of my father. I must warn the student then expressly that he cannot estimate the value of any incident in the detailed record of the sittings without consulting *all* the notes concerning it, the later ones as well as the earlier ones. I have taken special pains, in the appropriate places, to give all the references needful to notes elsewhere.—J. H. HYSLOP.

APPENDIX I.

This Appendix contains the records of my four sittings on December 23rd, 24th, 26th, and 27th, 1898, with contemporary notes, and also additional notes embodying the results of later inquiries.

SITTING I.—*December 23rd, 1898.**Introduction.*

Dr. Hodgson and myself arrived at Mrs. P.'s about 10 o'clock a.m. I had provided myself with a cloth mask, covering the whole face, such as is used at mask balls. This I put on before leaving the coach in which we rode from the station. Under this concealment I went to the door and into the house, upstairs, where we met Mrs. P. in her room. I was introduced to her as Mr. Smith. I merely bowed, without uttering a sound, and did not speak a word until after she had gone into the trance.

These precautions were taken owing to my having met Mrs. Piper in 1892, as described above (p. 297), in consequence of which it might be said that she had a chance to recognise me, though at that time I had no beard, while I now wear one. But the mask effectually concealed my face, so that no recognition was possible under any ordinary circumstances.

I had, under the mask, a good opportunity to study Mrs. P.'s reception of me. As I was introduced she caught sight of the mask, and, seeing its meaning, broke out into a laugh at Dr. Hodgson, and remarked that only once before had such concealment been used. The laugh and manner were apparently genuine, though she *could* have seen us from the window coming into the house from the coach. I could not detect any simulation in the laugh or manner. They bore every external trace of sincerity.

Presently, after dusting some articles in the room, Mrs. P. sat down upon her chair for the trance. Pillows had been placed in front of her for her head to lie upon while entranced. I sat some three or four feet away where I could closely watch the trance coming on. She sat quiet and no indications of the trance occurred for some time, say three or five minutes. Then I noticed a few slight jerks of the head, and some twitching of the right eyebrow, Mrs. P. picking the while at her finger nails. Both stopped in a few moments, and no trace of the trance was to be remarked. Mrs. P. then leaned forward upon the

pillows, closed her eyes, rubbed them, with her face somewhat flushed for a few moments, then opened her eyes, slightly straightened up, used her handkerchief, returned to picking her finger nails, and assumed a slightly fixed gaze. I then noted a gradually changing expression in her face. It had lost its flush, and there was something of a pallor in it, though very slight and only noticeable perhaps in contrast with the previous flush. But the most notable change in the expression was one that is hard to describe. The whole muscular appearance of it was less drawn than when I was introduced to her, and seemed fuller and more flabby, if that word can be used. Her mouth, also, was a little drawn on one side, and the gaze became more fixed. Her mouth soon opened and she passed easily without a struggle into the trance, with something of the appearance of a faint.

I then changed my position behind and to the right of her so that I could watch and read the writing, not a word being said by myself in the meanwhile. Nor was I at this or at any time during the trance either in contact with her or where she could see me, her whole face being turned away from me and buried in the pillows. Sitting there behind and to the right of her, I soon noticed the muscles on the hand at the third finger begin to twitch. Soon the whole hand began to shake and then reached out and down to write. A pencil was placed in her hand, and the twitching continued for a few moments, and the hand again raised itself in the air, but immediately lowered itself to write.—J. H. H. (See Note 2, p. 346.)

Record of Sitting, December 23rd, 1898.

S. and R. H.

[Rector writes.]

Rector: (R. H.: Good morning, Rector.) Good morrow friend of earth. We see old friend and we welcome thee here. We see all that thou hast done since we met thee last, and we are pleased with all that is coming to thee. Didst thou receive our messages? We know it will be better for thee as we have told thee before.

(R. H.: Yes. I have not yet seen the last visitor to you, but will see her this evening. And I have heard from Mrs. C. They wish me to be present with them to-morrow morning, but I said that I should probably have to be here.)

We think not. We will answer thee after we have finished with the . . . the other . . . other matters, and Ned has finished.

(R. H.: *Who* has finished?)

Ed . . . (R. H.: Oh, that other word is *Ned*?)

Yes. Then we will give our answer. We wish to carry out our arrangements with . . .

(S. to R. H.: Can't read a word of it.)

(R. H.: Yes. I understand. Yes.)

Mrs. Z. and then we . . . answer for thee here. [The word *answer* apparently superposed on the *we*. I have observed other similar cases, where the intention evidently was to obliterate the previous word.—R.H.]

Here comes George . . . here comes George. After we have finished there. (R. H. : Yes, I understand.)

He is smiling and holds his hands in greeting to thee . . . greeting.

Yes. All is as I told you and will ever be. What did you think when you got my message? All is well.

Now we have much to say to another light present.

We will soon leave George to answer for thee.

[Cross in air.] [repeated after listening.]¹

It is as we would have it. And now friend we leave [?] thee to . . .

Going. Good-bye. Rector.

[G. P. writes.]

How are you, old chap? (R. H. : First rate, George.) I want to see who has come to greet me *here*. Long time since I have seen you.

But every thing is as I saw it would be.

(R. H. : Yes. Are you talking to me, George?) Yes. (R. H. : Yes, it is.)

Yes. I have a great deal more to do for you yet.

I. S. D. wished to send Prudens, but could not make him clear. (I understand.)

We are going to speak presently to this other light. Hear [superposed on *other*] hear. I will go to New York and see if I can find his books for him. He left them there. I mean they are in the library, and I will direct him where to find them. I wish Carlie . . .

(S. : Can't read that.)

Charlie had not been in such haste. . . . He could have found out all about them from me . . . them from me. Now here is a lady, [recorded by R. H. and probably read by him aloud at the time as "there is a lady"] present who desires to speak. Will you leave me for a moment, Hodgson, and return soon? I wish to bring Prudens to take my place, if possible. Hear.

(R. H. : All right. I go.)

Hear. Return presently . . .

[R. H. goes out.] [S. noted his questions at the time.]

and let me see if I can bring Prudens, and I will stand up and help him out. (I can't read it.)

Try and hear us . . . hear us. (I can't read it.)

Try and hear us.

And I will bring [probably read aloud by J. H. H. as *try*] and make you understand me.

(Yes, I understand.)

I wish to bring your friends to you.

(Is any friend of mine there?)

¹ Whenever the word "listening" is used in the record after the manner indicated here it means that the hand appears to be listening to what a "spirit" is saying. (See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 399.)

Yes, and he wishes to speak to you *at once*. There are two. And one is a lady, and she belongs to you and she wishes me to speak to you for her. I want to reach you now. Do not hear me. I wish you to see her.

[R. H. returns.]

I must try and speak as clearly as possible to him, Hodgson. I will do my best to speak plainly.

(R. H. : Yes. Good.)

I wished to help this gentleman to find his friend on earth. I wish he could understand me clearly. Will you not try, kind friend, to hear me ?

(S. : Yes.)

We have a great deal to do for you and will if you will only try to hear us.

(R. H. : George, shall I go out again, and you try to write slowly and clearly so that he may be able to read ?)

I will try and do my very best to make myself understood by him.

(R. H. : Yes. Can you write still more slowly ?)

I will try but I am not alone, remember that, because there are others talking to me here, and I am anxious to help them and they are anxious to reach him, so I will do the best I can. I . . .

(R. H. : George, I can read this all right, but my friend here cannot.)

Well I will try again. You know how anxious I am to do all I can for you. . .

(S. : Yes. I believe it.)

even now, Hodgson. Although I am far away I will still do my very best in all cases for you.

[Meanwhile the writing has become slower and more legible.]

(R. H. : Well, George . . .)

God knows if there is any thing that I can do *I will*.

(R. H. : George, I will go out again, and he will make another attempt to read.)

I am sure we will understand each other soon.

(S. : I can't read all of it.)

And if I can I can do so much better because I can prevent confusion

(S. : All right) if I can only bring his friends without yours, H.

[R. H. goes out.]

(Can you find any friend of mine ?)

Yes, I do find a little girl who passed . . .

(Does she tell you her name ?)

I will ask her soon. (I don't read.)

I will ask her presently and . . . and she wishes to find you . . . she wishes to find you, and she is here with me now.

(What is last word ?) with me now. (Does she tell you her name ?)

Not yet. No you . . . not yet but she will. Do not hurry her. She is here with a lady and they both belong to you . . . belong to you, and the lady sees her gloves. [No meaning in the reference to the gloves.—

J. H. H.] [No gloves taken to sitting.]

(Who is this lady ?)

Do you remember anything about Margaret ?

(Last word I do not understand.) [By this remark I meant that I did not decipher the word Margaret.—J. H. H.] [I think I had an older sister

by this name who died when I was two years old.—J. H. H.] [See Note 5, p. 349.]

She . . . She is calling MOTHER. I am she and I see Lillie is . . . is [No meaning.—J. H. H.] [See Note 5, p. 349 and p. 331.]

(What is the last word?) Is with me here, dear little thing. Do you know who I am? Giv . . . Give me my gloves. (I do not understand last word.) Give me my gloves. Will will speak. Speak. I want you to give me my gloves. (Yes. Have you seen any one else?) Yes I have and she is also with me . . . and with me . . . I am with . . . I am speaking of Henry [?]. [See p. 22.]

(What is the last sentence?) I am with her. (With whom?) Yes I have A . . . A * * * [undec., possibly either Alice or Annie.]

(Is it Alice?) Alice. (Alice who?) I do not say Alice, I say Annie.

[Not deciphered by S.] [See Notes 3, p. 347 and 5, p. 349.]

(Have you seen any one else?) Do you remember anything about your Brother? (Who is the gentleman?) I say Brother. I am your . . . I know I am, and . . .

(When did you pass out?)

When did I pass out . . . only a long time ago.

(Any other member of the family?)

Yes, two. I have seen Annie, and mother, and Charles, and Henry.

(Is this Charles Henry?) No. Charles. (Did he pass out before you?)

Did he . . . No. I do not hear, did you say before?

[No note of what S. said here.]

Yes, *he did*. Some time before. And when I came he helped me. [See Note 18, p. 361.]

[I had a brother Charles and a sister Annie who died within twelve days of each other about 1865. Margaret, if I am right in the name, died in 1856 or 1858, two or four years old, too young to give any meaning to these statements except the correct coincidence in the names. The refusal to accept my suggestion here of the name "Charles Henry" is correct.] [See Note 5, p. 349, and also p. 22.]

(Can you say with what you passed out?)

Oh, yes, perfectly. Do you remember I passed out rather suddenly at last? Hear—do you hear? (Yes. I heard.)

I had trouble with my head [?] and it affected my heart. [Cf. pp. 327–329.] Do you remember the trouble I had with my head? Speak.

(Have you seen brother George?)

I spoke of him before. Will you tell me if you understand me *now*? Do you hear me? (I do not understand.) I say give me my hat. [Cf. p. 313, and Note 6, p. 350, Note 18, p. 362.] [No hat taken to sitting. I presented an accordion. Hand felt it.—J. H. H.]¹

¹ The use of articles worn or handled by the deceased when living is said to "hold them" in the act of communicating. I do not speculate as to what this means or why it should be done. We have simply found by experience that it is best to conform to this requirement and that the results are in some way affected by the "influence" of such articles, whether their use appears rational according to our preconceived notions of the case or not. (Compare *Proceedings* Vol. VIII., pp. 18–27 and 56–57.)

This was not mine but his. It belonged to George. [Not true.—
J. H. H.]

Not . . . and the little girl . . . I say do you hear me ?

(It belonged to some one else.)

It belonged to me . . . I say it belonged to * * [undec. *any better? my father?*] who is here. Charles.

(Is he with you ?)

Yes. I can just hear and that is all.

[S. asks if R. H. shall return.]

For a moment. [S. calls R. H.]

I used to play on this. [Possibly correct, but it can have no significance, because my fingers slipped as I carried it to the table, and the bellows fell, making a musical tone, which could be a clue to Mrs. P.'s subliminal. (About January 10th or 12th, 1899).—J. H. H.]

(Who used it ?) I am sure of it. I know we are brothers, and I know where . . . where I am. I can hear you scarcely, and that is all.

You will have to have patience with me, friend, for there are three persons here who are all speaking to me at one . . . at once. One is calling mother, and the other is calling Charles, and the other is calling for you.

(R. H. : Shall I stay now ?)

Better for a while until I see if I can keep the lady clear.

(R. H. to S. : Let the drifting incoherence end first.)

I want very much to reach my son, and I know I see some one who resembled him. I have four sons. Two are here, and I have his wife with me also.

(S. : That's all wrong.) [Five sons and one daughter living ; two daughters and one son dead, and one dead whose sex I do not know. My wife still living.—J. H. H.]

I do not hear all she is saying, but I will very soon.

Yes. Where is Albert ? (S. : Albert ?)

(R. H. : Is that Albert ?) [Do not know any Albert or Alfred.]

Sounds like Alfred. It is not quite right yet, but will be.

Do you remember anything about Mr. Morse ?

(S. : No, I do not.)

He used to know father well, and he has a sister with [*with superposed on sister*] sister with me.

(S. to R. H. : Doesn't mean anything to me. There's nothing with any possibility in the whole thing except Charles.)

And I am sure of him. I say I wish you to hear me. Do not try if you cannot. The name is Walter . . . name he Walter, and he is still in the body.

(S. : No. It means nothing.)

I hear him calling it now.

(R. H. : Who is calling it, George ?)

He says he is his brother. Of course, I do not actually know, only what I hear him saying. He seems very anxious to reach this friend in the body, and I know he will be clear soon as Rector is helping him. Won't you please try and hear me now, friend ?

(S. : Yes, I will.)

Do, if possible, because it is difficult for me to keep any one out who ought not to speak now.

Hodgson, it is too bad ; but I cannot half hear when you are present.

(R. H. : Very good. I will go out.)

Will you kindly return as soon as I can see what I can do with these two spirits present ?

[R. H. goes out.]

I cannot keep the lady from talking, neither can I keep the young man who claims to be your brother. Come here and listen. Do you remember anything about . . . Will you kindly help me to keep his thoughts clear ? (I do not understand.) Your Brother. I say do you know who Edwards is ? (No.) [Francis Edwin is the name of my youngest brother, though if the middle name was ever referred to at all it was often called Edward by my father. Edwin and Edward were interchangeable to him. (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.] But you must. (I can't read it).

But you do know me, and do you remember the fever ? I had a fever. (What fever ?) I had a fever, and they said it was Typhoid. (I do not get the last sentence.) They said I had Ty . . . Typhoid. Cannot you understand ? (Not yet). [Charles died of scarlet fever and measles.—J. H. H.] My throat. My throat. I had a very bad throat, and it took me over here. [See Note 5, p. 349]. (Yes). Because the membrane formed in my throat. And I did not know any one (Yes. Right.) before I left my body.

[The word "here" in the original automatic writing, in the phrase "took me over here," was written "there" by Dr. Hodgson in his copy made at the sitting, and was probably due to a kind of metathesis of my brother's point of view to his own. The automatic writing was perfectly clear and unmistakable (April 14th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

(Do you know any one now ?)

I am coming closer. Yes, I am coming nearer to you, and in a little while you shall know all about us all. I think [think] I have been here a good many years, and I do not know all of my . . .

(Have you seen mother ?) She is here with me. She is all right. She came here after I did. (Yes. Right.) And I saw her coming. And she could not eat. [Mother died after Charles. Statement about her not being able to eat is unverifiable (May 1st, 1901).—J. H. H.]

(Have you seen any one else besides mother ?)

Yes, I have. Do you remember she had a sister who was in the body when I . . . I passed out ? (Yes. Right.) But she came here too, and she came after mother. [Correct (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.] (Who is it ?) [See Note 5, p. 349.]

Then there is another one who is here and she is nearer to you than all the rest of us, and she will soon be able to tell you all you would care to know. And [written on top of filled sheet] and she is so glad to see you here, but she cannot speak as she will in a little while. [See Note 5, p. 349.] Where is Will ? (Is that Willie ?) Yes. (He is out West.) [Correct name of living brother.—J. H. H.]

You do not know . . . give him our love. And in a little while he will be with us. (Yes.) He has a . . . some time yet. I want you to

know who I am bringing to you. (Who is it?) She cannot leave until she is clear and can tell you what she has on her mind.

Do you know she came here last? Now do you know? (Yes.)

Do you remember who you used to call Ell . . . el [?] . . . not distinct . . . Where is Robertson? (What name?) Robertson. (Robert?) Yes. (Have you seen him?) I have not lately. Did you ask me if I had seen him? (Yes.) No, I have not.

[Brother Robert still living.—J. H. H.] [Cf. pp. 314, 317, 332.]

(Have you seen any one else who died lately?)

Yes. I am trying to help her to come to you. Do you hear? (Yes.) And I will tell her you are . . .

[See Note 19, p. 362]

(Time of year passed out?) I want to tell you everything I can remember. I think it was winter (Right) because I remember seeing it snow. [Right.] (Where was I?)

I think you were not with me. I do not think I saw you at all before I came here. [If this refers to the time of his death it is true. It had snowed the day of his death or the day before. I was sent to a neighbour on an errand on the day of his death and lingered too long, and when I returned, I was shocked by my mother's telling me that my brother Charles had died. I remember distinctly that the ground was covered with snow as I went on this errand.—J. H. H.] [Cf. pp. 24, 25.]

(Have you seen mother?)

Oh, yes. She says it is better so. If she . . . i . . . had not come soon it would have been worse. Do you hear me? Well, what did you mean by asking for George.

(I wanted to know if you remembered George.) [Cf. p. 307.]

Yes, but George is here. I say George is not here.

(Do you say George is *not* here?)

I say no, he is not, and I could not understand why you asked me if he was here. Neither is he coming for a while yet. He is well and doing well and so be it. [Correct about George.—J. H. H.] [The reader should remember that the amanuensis here is G. P., a person whose first name was actually George, and the omission of the "not" in the first statement may have been due to a misapprehension on his part as to the George meant in my question. (April 19th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I think you will remember Corrie? (No, I do not.) No wait a moment. (Is it Mary?) I say it is, and she was father's sister. [See Note 5, p. 349.] (I do not understand.) [*i.e.*, couldn't read.]

Cannot you hear me? Elizabeth. ("Elizabeth"?) Yes. Mary. Do y [on top of filled sheet] do you not remember? Listen. She was your mother's sister. Do you hear? (Not quite.) She was our aunt. She is our aunt. [See Note 5, p. 349.] (What aunt?) * * [Undec., probably Allen or Ellen.] And she will come to you again when I get stronger . . . stronger. I will . . . [Allan could have one possible meaning (Cf. p. 422) and Ellen two. (April 20th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

[R. H. returned a short time before this point and arranged sheets, etc., on other side of room preparing for departure, while S. continued to follow the writing.]

(R. H. : George, we shall have to go directly. This gentleman is coming again to-morrow.)

Wait until I get + to take away this young man . . . young man.

(R. H. : All right.)

[S. rises and moves across the room.]

He walked right in front of him. Why does he do this ?

(R. H. to S. : Better keep still. Yes.)

I will speak to you again and tell you all about the rest whom I . . . whom I have seen over here since I left so many years ago. Good-bye. They are taking me away.

Hodgson, I hope to get the lady clear again . . . clear. (R. H. : Good.) Good-bye, H. (R. H. : Good-bye, old chap.) Come . . . Come and meet us when you can.

[Rector writes.]

(R. H. : Shall I come with this gentleman to morrow ?)

Rector. Have Prudens clear soon. How can we manage the light without thee ?

(R. H. : I think it will be necessary for me to accompany him.)

+ He says so and does not think that thou canst complete thy work without coming. [The cross is usually the symbol for Imperator.]

The light is failing—failing. Come to us. Fail us not, oh friend. Thou knowest not our necessities. R.

(R. H. : I will be here to-morrow.)

+ All is well. May God be with thee both. + { R }

[When G. P. left, Rector came in with a sudden jerk of the hand, and then the writing became calm as usual. As soon as he was through, Mrs. P. began to come out of the trance. First I noticed much twitching of the hand and arm, followed by a noise like snoring. Presently the head was raised, the mouth opened, and the eyelids very slightly raised. She remained in this condition for a few moments, the tongue rolling about in the mouth and slightly protruding. Then this was followed by a decided gaze with the eyes set looking into space, and presently she looked about following Dr. Hodgson with a wild stare ; said "Oh ! dear me," and fixed a wild fierce gaze on me. I at once left the room for fear of frightening her with my mask as she came out.

As I read over the sitting carefully I found several places in which I had wholly misunderstood the connection and drift of it. In some places I had supposed that it was "Charles" that was talking with me, but I find that it must have been "Margaret." But her death somewhere between or about my first and second year makes the whole thing ludicrous. Nevertheless the allusion to mother, Annie and Charles, in the same breath, is interesting as a coincidence. But then there is no reason for "mother" alluding to her gloves. Then when

the person communicating answered my question whether "he passed out before you?" with a "yes," this would be wrong if it referred to "Charles," but would have been right if the communicator were "mother," as I thought it was at the sitting. "Margaret" (?) and my twin sister died somewhere about 1856 or 1858, brother Charles and sister Annie about 1865, and mother in 1869. This right relation came out later, as the report shows.

I noticed during the sitting the curious distinctness and evidence of the change from one personality to another. This is almost indescribable, but it was marked in the tone of language, except at the close, where the change from G. P. to Rector was marked by a muscular convulsion in Mrs. P.'s arm.—J. H. H.]

[Later study shows upon how much misunderstanding some features of this note are based. (March 10th, 1900.)—J. H. H.] [Cf. Note 18, p. 361 and pp. 21-16.]

SITTING II.—*December 24th, 1898.*

Introduction.

The entrance into the trance was marked by much the same symptoms as the day before. But this time it was the left hand that showed the twitching, and not the right, until the trance came on. There was some snoring also this time, as there was not before. After her head had fallen upon the pillows, and was arranged by Dr. Hodgson so that she could breathe easily, soon there appeared the twitching of the fingers and muscles which betokened the preparation for writing, and the arm began to try to move itself into position for this work, but Dr. Hodgson assisted it into place, at the same time putting a pencil between the fingers, when the writing began.—J. H. H.

Record of Sitting, December 24th, 1898.

[Rector writes.]

[Cross in air.]

Rector : (R. H. : Good morning.)

Good morrow, friends of earth. We greet thee again, and thou art welcome here. . . welcome. We bring Prudens and more light will be given. All is well. Fear not. Thy friend is [in] good hands, and all will be as we would have it. We bring him now. Good morrow, friends, all is well and will be . . . Prudens.

(R. H. : Good day.)

I will take this work and go on with all that is good, and unless it be I go at once. P—

[Difficulty in deciphering, hence the repetitions.]

. . . on with it . . . and . . . all that is good . . . and go on with all that is good. And unless it be we go.

We ask thee to follow . . . We ask thee to follow us carefully and hear what we have to say. . . What

[Excitement, followed by calm.]

Peace +

Yes. I will. [To invisible.]¹

James, James Speak, James.

(R. H. to S. : Say something.)

(S. : Yes.)

James, speak to me.

(S. : I am glad to see you.)

James, James. Speak to me. James. James. [Cf. pp. 324, 28.]

(R. H. to S. : Go on, say something.)

(S. : Good morning. Good morning. Tell all you wish.)

James, speak to me.

(R. H. to S. : Tell him to unburden his mind and remarks like that.)

I am not ill. Oh, oh, I want you so much.

I want you. I want everything. James. I want everything. I want everything. I want to see you. (S. : Yes, James is here.)

I want to see you. I want to tell you everything. I want you to hear me. I am not very near just now . . . just now, but I am coming, coming. I see you. I see your spirit in the body. They tell me I will soon be all right and able to help you. Oh, I did not quite know how it would be here. [Pause.]

Give me my hat and let me go. [See p. 307 and Note 6, p. 353.] I will not leave you till I tell you all I wish.

Where is Willie [?] (R. H. : Is that Willie ?)

(S. : Is that Willie ?) Where is Willie ?

I heard you, James, and I am glad. I heard you say something. What was it ?

(S. : Did you ask for Willie ?)

Yes, I did. Is he all right, James, is he, is he ?

(S. : He is all right.)

Is he coming soon. Yes, I know it.

Where are . . . do not work too hard . . . work I say, work I say, I say work. [Father was always giving me this advice. Cf. p. 430. (January 5th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I want my head clear. I feel choked—I choked. I am choking. [Interpreted as *shocking*.] I am choking.

I am going. Will come back soon.

Is James well ? (S. : Yes. James is well, and is here.)

Yes, I know it. I will ask you if you remember brother Charles.

(R. H. : Is that brother Charles ?)

¹ The expression "To spirit," or "To invisible," indicates that the passage to which it is attached was apparently addressed to some "spirit." At such points the hand of Mrs. Piper usually stretched itself out into space as if receiving or delivering a communication to some invisible presence.—J. H. H.

I say yes. I do not want to be put out, because I can help the rest to come. Don't send me away. Don't. I want to tell you about father. He sends back word that he is all right. Will you . . . Back [re-written, as it was not deciphered above] and glad of it.

Can hear perfectly now. Do you know what I mean and what I [am] trying to tell you?

(S. : Yes, yes. I know perfectly.)

He says it is no use trying to think anything is not for . . . for the best, because it is, everything. And we are all here together.

(R. H. to S. : Say something.)

(S. : Yes. I'm glad to hear it. Tell all. Tell all.)

I will. Don't worry, and you shall hear from every one of us, and after we find you we will all help you, and bring better and clearer thought to you.

I am . . . listen friend. Have patience with me. + [Imperator] is here, and we will keep them quite calm.

The trouble you had with your head a short time ago will not return. Do you remember it?

(S. : No, I do not distinctly remember it.)

Tired

(S. : Oh yes, I remember that.)

out.

[This phrase "tired out" was quite natural to father, and was probably used by myself in earlier life. But I should have said "worn out," and there were frequent occasions during the last two years when I uttered it. It is possible that I have sometimes used his phrase, but I remember frequently using "worn out" to my wife. However, I have no reason to interpret it as referring to this fact. The main point is to remark that the phrase was one of father's. Assuming that he was really the alleged communicator it could as well allude to my condition when I last visited him in [January or February, 1895] 1894, I believe. I was very tired then, and took down a few days after I left him with a long and severe illness. Its relevancy to this visit and the exhausted condition in which I was is perhaps indicated by the allusion to "lectures" later. I had lectured in Indianapolis on Psychical Research and visited him on this trip. He was much interested in what I told him about it, and showed a more receptive mind regarding it, though of an extremely orthodox belief, than I expected to find in him. His later allusion also to his belief that we might get some knowledge of another life fits in with this notion.

I do not say that the phrase "tired out" has any such certain meaning as is implied in this account. It is simply consistent with it, and is one of those little touches of personal *vraisemblance* of which this sitting is full.— J. H. H.]

(S. : Out is that word? tired out?) (R. H. : Yes, I think so.)

We do not intend it shall haven [?] happen again, and we know.

What is it? E * * [undec.] Elsie El . . . is . . . Elsie. (S. : I don't know that name.) Eliza . . . Eliza . . . (S. : Are you calling Eliza?) Yes. (S. : Yes, I understand.)

I am. James.

[This allusion to "Eliza" is very interesting. It intimates clearly what I was curious to know, and regards events that have happened since I arranged for the sittings.—J. H. H.] [My uncle had died three weeks previous to the sittings. Eliza is the name of his wife (April 24th, 1901).—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, what do you wish to say to her ?)

Give my love. (S. : Yes, I will.) And tell her not to get discouraged. (R. H. : Last word, Rector, please ?) I think he says discouraged. (R. H. : Deranged ?) [Dissent.] ("Discouraged.") [Assent.] She will be better soon. U D.¹

(S. : Yes. I understand.)

I often see her despairing. . . despairing. [See Note 20, p. 363.] Where is she now, James ? I will go there soon.

(S. : She is at home. Do you know why she grieves ?)

[Hand points towards invisible.]

(S. : Do you know why Eliza grieves ?)

Yes, because I left her. But I really did not leave her.

I wish I could you all I would like . . . tell you . . . ("tell you all.") I would . . . you would not think I had left entirely. I feel much better now. She thought she saw me in her sleep. [See Note 20, p. 363.] I was there. Father, father, father . . . going.

[Pause. Cross in air.] . . . going . . . going . . . be back soon.

(R. H. to S. : They cannot stay long at a time, but must get away from the machine to recover and then return. Verstehen ?) (S. : Yeh.)

[Pause.]

Oh, if you only knew how glad I am to see you, you would be glad, because it will be a help to me to go on in my life and keep her from feeling any pain.

(S. : Yes, tell all you can.)

Will you comfort her ? She ought not to be lonely. [See Note 20, p. 363.]

I am trusting [thinking ?] to Him to help me to speak plainly.

(S. : Yes, I will comfort her.)

I am glad, so glad. Are you still here ? I will look and see. I have not been here very long [true.—J. H. H.] and yet . . . [much difficulty in deciphering next sentence, and hence the repetitions.]

I would not return for all I ever owned, music, flowers, walks, drives, pleasures . . . pleasures of all kinds, but . . . ever owned, he says, music, or walks, drives . . . walks, drives . . . walks . . . walks, drives, or . . . kinds [?], books and everything. I do remember all here so well. What can I do to help you all to know I live still ? [See Note 20, p. 363.]

(S. : Tell me all you can of your life here on earth.)

¹ The symbol "U.D." has been adopted by the trance personalities for the word "understand." Hence it is put down in the record just as used by them. In a few cases, until advised otherwise by Dr. Hodgson, I myself used the symbol in speaking to the communicator.—J. H. H.

Oh I should have so much to do. Where there is light I will always be. Mother, mother, mother, mother, mother [?] . . . going . . . going . . . going. [A close re-examination of the original automatic writing indicates that the first of these words looks like "mother." The others look like "brother." May 20th, 1900.—R. H. and J. H. H.]

[Pause and listening.]

Do you miss me ?

(S. : Yes ; very much.)

Will you let me return again and help to free my mind ? Do you know uncle Charles. [See Note p. 422.] (S. : What uncle Charles ?) He is here. (S. : I don't know any uncle Charles.) And * * [undec.] No, I am thinking . . . let me see.

I think is not a real uncle ; you must remember what I mean.

[This evident consciousness of confusion after I had asked "What Uncle Charles ?" is very interesting. I was much puzzled by it, as I knew of no uncle by that name. The "No" after my denial of this knowledge is suggestive as partly indicating my correctness and the consciousness of the confusion immediately alluded to by the "communicator." But this is virtually cleared up by the phrase just afterwards, "not a real uncle," which I did [not] notice or think of until the next sentence was written. With the resemblance of the word "Charles" (slight resemblance only, and noticeable only to those familiar with these sittings) to this uncle's name, and the fact that he was *not* a real uncle, the incident has a perfectly definite meaning.—J. H. H.]

He used to be so nervous. [Correct, but with qualifications and differences of opinion.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, I remember. I think I know what uncle you mean.)

Yes. You see I must think of them all or you would not [knot] know who I was . . . It was me . . . [The "me" is natural for father.—J. H. H.] (S. : That is right.)

Do you remember father ? (S. : Yes, well.) Well, speak to him.

(S. : Yes, father, I'm glad to see you since I saw you last. How are you ?)

All right as right can ever be. I wish you would tell the girls . . . tell . . . I am with them in sorrow or pleas—(R. H. : "Sorrow or pleasure ?") or joy, it matters not. What is their loss is our gain. [Sounds like him.—J. H. H.] I hear you faintly.

(R. H. to S. : Better tell him to free his mind.)

(S. : Free your mind, father.)

I will, indeed, but have you seen the children yet ?

(S. : I have not seen them for two years.)

They are wonderfully good, I think.

[Father always thought well of his children, and very frequently spoke of them in this way to me, whom he took more into confidence than the others, only he *never* used the word "wonderful" or "wonderfully" in thus describing them so far as my memory goes.—J. H. H.]

I know, James, that my thoughts are muddled, but if you can only hear what I am saying you will not mind it.

Do you know where George is ?

(S. : Yes. I know where he is).

Are you troubled about him . . . he is all right and will be, James.

[Cf. pp. 402, 492.]

[The meaning of this is perfectly clear. I used to complain to father very much about my brother's neglect of business affairs put into his charge. We corresponded and conversed about it a great deal the last five or six years of his life. Father admitted the justice of the complaint, but always defended my brother and effected a reconciliation between us in regard to the continuation of certain business relations.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes. All right.)

Worry not.

(S. : No, I will not worry.)

But you do.

(S. : Yes. I have worried some, but I will not any more.)

Thank God. James, if you will only stick to this, you . . . stick . . . he [says?] stick to the promise not to worry, you will in time be contented and happy while still . . . con . . . contented . . . can you not . . . while still in the body. ["stick" was father's word for this idea, and he often used it. ["In the body" was *not* a phrase he would use. That lingo was wholly unfamiliar to him. He often reproved me for worrying, and I would try to make him believe that I did not worry about things, and he would as often reply in these very words, "But you do."—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes. Thank you, father, all right.)

Can you not give me something belonging to him ?

[S. is getting accordion out of parcel, while hand writes :]

He wants it so much, he used [to] play for you.

(S. : Yes, here it is.) [Accordion given.]

[This accordion was one that he had gotten when quite a young man, and he used often to play on it for us children at home. It was a well worn instrument as far back as I can remember. He also played on it during his lonely hours the last few years of his life. It is interesting that this remark that he had played on it for us was written before I had actually taken it out of the parcel, but it should be remembered that I had produced the accordion at the previous sitting (p. 307).—J. H. H.]

James, my son, I was too weak to speak to you before, but I know all now, and see you just as you looked before I came here. I have not been here very long, have I ?

(S. : No, you have not, only a short time.)

Don't you think I will always be your father . . .

(S. : Yes.) because I will. I will. we were very happy together, and you know it.

(S. : Yes, I know it.) [This is correct.—J. H. H.]

What can I do to help Eliza feel that I am not dead ?

(S. : Tell us who are with you, and that will help Eliza.)

Yes, all, you shall know each one. in her. . .

You are not Robertson [?] are you . . . (R. H. : Is that Robertson?)

You are not George, are you? (S. : No, I am not George.) (R. H. : I am not . . .)

No, James. I know you very well, but this other one . . . did you know the boys . . . do you know me? [Cf. pp. 92, 193.]

(R. H. : I did not know you, but I am a friend of James, and I am helping him to get clear communications from you, and he wishes that you would unburden yourself quite fully and freely to him ; he will be here again, and later on I shall be pleased to take messages from you to him when I am alone here, and our friends who are helping you over there think it desirable. Your . . . James cannot see you. Your thoughts are expressed in writing by this human organism which Rector or other messenger of Imperator uses, and therefore I shall be glad if you will free your mind and then later think over some striking incidents with your son so that he may feel strongly your presence by your recalling old memories.)

I thank you for helping me. I see better now, and I . . .

(S. to R. H. : That's the intellectual *see* now . . . instead of the sensuous *see*.) (R. H. to S. : Yes, yes.)

Will help him in every possible way to know all that we both knew. I could not hear very well before, but I understand it better now.

Do you recall your lectures, and, if so, to whom to do [to whom do you] recite them now? I often hear them in my own mind. [This word "recite" is very singular. It is like him.—J. H. H.] Give me some [thing] for the purpose of helping me remain here longer.

(S. : Yes, here it is.) [Giving accordion.]

My toy. I remember it so well. I left all so suddenly, yet I knew I was coming.

(S. : Yes, yes. I think so too.)

Do you remember what my feeling was about this life?

(S. : Yes, I do.)

Well, I was not so far wrong after . . . after all.

[Mrs. P. began to write over edge of paper, after the first *after*, and I moved her hand to the other side of the sheet. Instead of writing at once she suddenly put it on the accordion, a foot away, as if to orientate herself.—J. H. H.]

I felt sure that there would be some knowledge of this life, but you were doubtful, remember.

(S. : Yes, Yes. I remember.)

You had your own ideas (S. : That is characteristic) [in low murmur], which were only yours, James.

(S. : Yes. I know.)

Well it is not a fault, and I wish some of the rest had as strong . . . as good . . .

[This whole passage in reference to my scepticism about a future life is perfectly correct. My scepticism and abandonment of orthodoxy had hurt my father very much. It was long before he could get over it, especially as he had wished me to enter the ministry, though using no compulsion and no urgent persuasion upon me. I merely knew his intense desire. He knew my difficulties in this matter and on the question of immortality, on which he never wavered. Several words and phrases here are perfectly characteristic of him. "Well, I was not so far wrong," is word for word an expression of his which he always used, half triumphantly when he found his own

convictions turning out true after being controverted, and half conceding a right to the opposite opinion before it was refuted and his own verified.

In the next sentence, as soon as I saw the word "but" written, I was curious to see if he would say I was sceptical, the word "sceptical" being the one that came to my mind. I was much interested when, instead, the word "doubtful" came, as this term was more natural to him, and the one he always used in that connection. Similarly in the reference to my own "ideas." He often spoke to me in a half-complaining way, and more frequently to other members of the family and relatives that it was no use to interfere with me; that I was resolved to have my "own ideas." He recognised in me what goes sometimes by the name of stubbornness and sometimes the more respectable name of firmness, and he would always yield as soon as he saw that argument did not avail, but with some allusion to my "own ideas," never using the word *opinions*, which I should at least most frequently use.

"Well, it is not a fault" is also like him, and was often used in extenuation of some trait in others of which complaint was made and which had its two sides.—J. H. H.] [See Note 6, p. 352.]

In a short time they tell me I will be able to recall everything . . . [not read at once] recall everything I ever did . . . You could be . . . my . . . knew does not . . . I will have to go for [a] moment. Wait for me.

(S. : Yes, I will.) [Pause.]

Friend, there is a little girl here who is trying to find her mother and we are doing all we can to comfort her.

(S. to R. H. : The girl or the mother?) (R. H. to S. : The girl, I think.)

She is bright enough . . . enough . . . bright enough.

Who is *Ruth*?

(S. : I do not know *Ruth*.)

Not to thee, friend, but to thee [*i.e.*, it refers to R. H.]

[This refusal to recognise me and to connect the child *Ruth* with me was very interesting. On any theory of thought-transference there ought to have been confusion such as the name produced in me; for I could not assign the name any meaning, except that I could recall no *Ruth* in my acquaintance. If this feeling could determine the refusal to locate the child within the group of my memories, then telepathy could account for turning me off in this way. But then, if the incident has any relevancy to Dr. Hodgson, this hypothesis of thought-transference from my mind in connection with a desire on the part of the medium to "fish" must go by the board.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Is it a friend or relative of mine, do you think?) We do.

(R. H. : Rector, there is Mrs. Thaw's little . . .) [Hand dis-sents.]

(R. H. : Not that.) No, not she.

(R. H. : It cannot be . . . Oh, wait one moment, kindly. Is *Ruth* the name of the child? Is it *Margaret Ruth*?) *It is*.

(R. H. : It surely is not the youngest child of my sister *Ellen*, is it?)

We think it is.

(R. H. : This is very important. My . . .)

We will surely ascertain the truth and give answer at our next meeting, after talking with her. (R. H. : Yes.)

If there be light enough we will give thee more knowledge of her . . . be good.

She is trying to find her mother, who is still in the body.

[See next sitting, p. 330.—R. H.]

We see thy father returning to thee. Friend, he was, he says, the last to come here. [Correct (December 31st, 1899).—J. H. H.]

(S. : That is right.)

And he will recall every fact he ever knew. He says he thought even more, if possible, of you than all the rest. Do you think so? he asks.

(S. : Yes, I do think so.)

It is my feeling, James, and why not express it?

(S. : That is right, father.) (S. to R. H. : That's exactly like him, because . . .)

Do you recall the fact of my being frank?

[Father was always very reserved about expressing his feelings to us, and in his correspondence with me he would often half apologise in this way for his frankness. "It is my feeling, and why not express it?" is the very phrase of his letters to me, which I could prove had I kept any of my correspondence with him, except a few of his last letters. I have been in the habit of destroying all my letters for lack of space to keep them, inasmuch as my correspondence has been large. But the phrase and thought is his exactly. It is the same with the allusion to his being "frank," and the reader should note that the interrogatory form of the allusion to frankness suggests the working of an independent mind.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, I do.)

Sincerity of purpose . . . my sincerity.

I recall the struggles you had over your work well, very well. [All true, and is a long story.—J. H. H.]

Everything in life should be done with sincerity of purpose.

[This expression "sincerity of purpose" was a very frequent one with him when admonishing me of my dangers, both before and after my difficulties with scepticism. It almost broke his heart to see me going in that direction, as his fear was that I should in consequence of it lead a life of vice. The only thing that ever reconciled him to my apostasy was the knowledge that I did not fall in this respect, and that I was terribly in earnest about my opinions. When discussing them, as we seldom did, because I knew our great difference in point of view, he never having had the scientific education that I had, he would insist, when he saw the intellectual difficulties of his own faith—and he saw them, for he had a remarkably clear insight—he would insist that the great thing was "sincerity of purpose." Of course, he is apologising here for his own sincerity of purpose in admonishing me in these difficulties, virtually indicating that there was ground for my scepticism, which is here discovered after death. But in life

he always pleaded this "sincerity of purpose" when admonishing us against our own ways and convictions, as well as indicating that it was the chief thing for us to cultivate. Hence to meet this here with allusion to my struggles in life has an extraordinary interest and fitness, on any theory that can be adopted regarding it.

The expression below also is interesting. He used to caution me against having so many irons in the fire, using much the same expression as used here, namely, "so many different ideas."—J. H. H.]

I know well all the difficulties which you encounter. (S. to R. H. : Encounter's just the word he'd use, the word *difficulties* too.) [I would have said "had" or "met."—J. H. H.] But keep on as you have been and you will master them ere long. So many different ideas . . . different ideas . . . are not easily managed. But never mind, do not be troubled . . . (S. : I thought he was going to say what he said before, there) [that is, "worried," but the pencil wrote "troubled" instead of "worried," which was in my mind.—J. H. H.] about it, it will not last for ever, and I am getting stronger.

(S. : No, I will not trouble any more about it.)

Well, do you really think you underst . . . understand . . . stronger . . . [not read above] understand ?

And I will come again with more clearness with the help of this [pause] + man who wears the cross.

James my son, James my son, speak to me, I am going far away.

(R. H. to S. : Coming to an end. Yes—going—say you'll be pleased to see him again, and so on.)

(S. : Yes, father, I shall be pleased to see you again. I shall have to go now.)

I am too far off to think more for you. J. H. H. { R }

[As the sitting was thus coming to a close I was struck with the writing of my initials.—J. H. H.]

Friend, we ask thee ere we depart, when thou wilt return. We must restore this light a little before we can speak as we dr . . . speak as . . . desire.

(R. H. : We . . . to-morrow is Christmas day, and there will be no use of the light. Will the first day after the Sabbath be too soon ?)

We would in all cases where there are changes of persons . . . are changes . . . give the day before and after the . . . the day before and also the Sabbath if possible. If not, we will use the light as best we can, but with new communicators we *prefer it good*.

(R. H. : I . . . cannot myself tell. This friend was coming by your arrangement on the first and second days after the Sabbath, but . . .)

We will have it so. We do not think that thou hast U D us.

(R. H. : No, I fear not.)

Do we U D that there is only the Sabbath between our meeting ?

(R. H. : Yes, only the Sabbath.)

Well it will be for us ; and we will make it good.

(Amen.)

We go now, and may God's blessings rest on thee. + { R }

[Cross in air.]

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]¹

II. H . sh . . [Repeated again and again. R. H. thinks she is trying to repeat his name. Sounds to him like Hishon.] (R. H. : Hodgson ? Who is it ?) * * * Hislop.

I am he.

Tell him I am his father.

I.

Good bye, sir.

I shouldn't take him away, that way.

Oh, dear.

Do you see the man with the cross shut out everybody---

Did you see the light ?

What made the man's hair all fall off ?

(R. H. : What man ?)

That elderly gentleman that was trying to tell me something, but it wouldn't come.

(R. H. : You couldn't hear it ?)

[Mrs. P., as she was coming out of the trance, began to utter a name. I recognised this as "Hyslop" twice before Dr. Hodgson, and deliberately refused to say so with the hope that he would recognise it also. His failure was quite pardonable, because the first name mentioned two or three times sounded to me like his own. Besides, he was in a poorer position to catch it than I. When I told him what it was he recognised it at once, but his queries addressed to Mrs. P. had turned her pronunciation more toward his own name, as at first indicated. But as soon as I indicated what she was trying to say, doing this first by asking him, "Don't you hear what she is trying to say?" and then saying to him "Hyslop" (short sound of "y"), he saw and assented at once, and Mrs. P. then pronounced the name much more distinctly, though strangely enough she now pronounced it with the "y" sound instead of the short "i"; that is, "Highslop" instead of "Hislop," the latter being the correct pronunciation and the first one given by Mrs. P., though nearly every one adopts the former until told the proper one. In the neighbourhood in which I was brought up, and in Scotland, the name is often pronounced "Hayslop," and sometimes "Highslop." But father never used this last. For the most of his life he had used "Hayslop," when speaking to neighbours and others, but elsewhere and with his sisters it was "Hislop," and most especially during the last ten years of his life when all of us conspired to fix the pronunciation as "Hislop," father falling in with this, and so generally that in the community whither he had gone in another State to spend the last years of his life (1889-1896) it was always pronounced "Hislop," so far as I know, among neighbours and intimate acquaintances.

But it must be remembered in all this that I had never taken off my mask, and that Mrs. Piper had not seen my face since she had seen it some four or

¹ The Roman numerals I. and II., referring to Mrs. Piper's subliminal consciousness (see *Proceedings* S.P.R., Vol. XIII., pp. 397 and 400-1), are used to indicate what appear to be two stages of this condition, which, however, are not always very clearly marked. I. represents the stage nearest to her ordinary waking state and II. the deeper stage.—J. H. H.

six [over six] years ago, and that I had been careful not to say a word to her or in her hearing while she was normal, except on the occasion of this second sitting, when I spoke to her in an unnatural and a changed voice after entering the door. Some three hundred feet from the house, before turning into the street where she lives, and before even the house could be seen, I had put on my mask and at once went from the coach to the door. Mrs. P. was inside, and seeing me on the porch, where I stood for a moment, opened the door and asked me to come in, saying that she had a very good name among her neighbours and did not wish them to see me. I said nothing at first, but when Dr. Hodgson came in I made some remark in as sepulchral tones as I could command, and said no more until after Mrs. P. entered the trance.

I should also further add that during the whole time I was present in both sittings, both in her normal condition and during the trance, I did not have the *slightest physical contact with Mrs. P.*, except two or three times long enough in the trance to move the arm into position.—J. H. H.]

SITTING III.—December 26th, 1898.

Introduction.

Mrs. Piper passed into the trance as usual, and there is nothing to record in regard to that matter except the unusual promptness with which she entered it. As my name was announced at the previous sitting I did not deem it necessary this time to wear my mask, but it is interesting to record that nearly as little was known about my presence as if I had worn it. We were met at the door by the servant and went up to the room where the sittings are held without seeing Mrs. P. I sat down on the floor in a corner of the room behind the sofa to untie a package with almost my back toward the door where Mrs. P. was to enter. She entered and spoke indifferently to Dr. Hodgson. I looked up to speak, but her face was turned away from me and I quickly turned back to my work without speaking, and in a moment I overheard Mrs. P. remark to Dr. Hodgson that she had not seen me until then. I turned my head to look at her and found that she was not looking at me at all, but was in position for the trance. I then moved into my proper place and not the slightest attention was paid to me, and soon Mrs. P. was in the trance, apparently without the slightest clue as to who I was, even if she had known me well before. I left the sitting before she recovered consciousness, so that there was practically nothing still to identify me though I offered the opportunity for it by abandoning the mask. I do not say that she could not have identified me, but only that the conditions of the present (third) sitting were practically as good for concealment as in the two previous

instances, though this fact requires neither recognition nor emphasis, but only to be recorded, because the announcement of my name in the previous sitting made it unnecessary to practise any further precautions by wearing a mask.—J. H. H.

Record of Sitting, December 26th, 1898.

[Rector writes.]

Rector. (R. H. : Good morning.)

Good morrow, friends of earth. We hail thee once more with pleasure. + would ask thee whether or not thou hast U D His direction which He last gave thee.

(R. H. : I am not sure. Kindly tell me.)

He intends to arrange for thee to rest two whole days, viz., the first before the Sabbath, also the Sabbath, unless in a case similar to thy friend present. U D. (Cf. close of previous sitting p. 321.)

(R. H. : Yes ; you mean that the light should always rest on the day before each Sabbath and also the Sabbath.) [Cross in air.] Unless there be . . . there be . . . some worthy friend who is in great sorrow. [Cross in air.]

(R. H. : Yes. I understand, except in special cases. Yes, I think I understand clearly.)

Then in such cases He will return to thee or thine.

(R. H. : Yes.) All is well and will ever be. [Cross in air.]

Prudens and Rector will now bring these friends. Peace be with them and thee. More light from Prudens. All is clear, and I help him to find the light.

Oh, how thankful I am for this day.

James, James, James, speak my son, to me. I am coming, coming to you, hear . . . hear . . . Who will fill my place? [Cf. p. 313.] Where are you, James? Where are you?

(S. : I am here, father. is that you?)

[Excitement.] Yes, it is I, James, I who is speaking to you. It is I who is speaking to you.

(S. : Yes, I am glad to see you or hear from you.)

I wanted to ask you before I got too weak if you remember of the story I used . . . I used to tell you of a fire. [I cannot imagine what this means.—J. H. H.] [Cf. Note 21, p. 364, and Note 48, p. 503]

(S. : What story, father?)

When I was quite young. Does [?] James recall the fire I used to speak about . . .

Fire he says [in reply to question by R. H. if the word above was *fire*.]

It was the whole [?] city was it not? (S. : Yes, it was in the city.) It was, did he say?

[At the time of the sitting the words "the whole city" were interpreted as "in the city" and hence my acknowledgment as I thought, according to a contemporary note, of a special fire which impressed me when a boy, but which obviously had nothing to do with the statements of my father, the

acknowledgment, however, being made to encourage the communicator to continue. I employed this method very frequently. (April 16th, 1900).—J. H. H.] [See Note 21, p. 364, and Note 48, p. 503.]

(R. H. to S. : Speak low as I do, it's much more intelligible.)

I am glad to hear something of you. Do you know in a little while I will be able to recall every thing . . . every . . . tha I . . . will not . . . ever knew.

Where are my books, James? I want something to think over and I will keep quite near you. [Accordion given.]

Nearer [?] . . . I see clearly now, and oh if I could only tell you all that is in my mind.

It was not an hallucination, but a reality, but I felt it would be possible for me to reach you. . . hallucination [The reference of this is to something later, so that my interruption by the following question was out of place.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, I think so. Do you remember more about that fire?)

Oh yes, the fire. Strange I was forgetting to go on. [Not read at time.] I was nearly forgetting to go on. Yes. I do rem . . . forgeg . . . forgetting to go on with it . . . it. The fire did great damage, I remember, and I used to think I never would care to see the like again. I want you to hear, if possible, what I am saying to you, because I have it . . . it quite clearly in my mind.

Were the books destroyed? (S. : No, they were not destroyed, I have some of them at my home.) [Cf. pp. 325, 490, 473, 523.]

I wish you had them . . . I remember [?] all. I am thinking . . .

(R. H. : Slow, Rector, please.)

Didst thou speak, friend?

(R. H. : I said, "Slow, Rector, please." Get him to speak very slowly so that your writing may be slower and clearer so that we may follow. Ask him to be quite calm and think slowly and speak slowly to you, and not get too excited about his remembrances.)

Well done. He is a very intelligent spirit and will do a great deal for us when he realises where he is now and what we are requesting him to do. [*What* not written between *and* and *we*, but added afterwards when the sentence was read over without it.] Yes [to correct reading.]

James, are you here still? If so I want very much to know if you remember what I promised you . . . what I promised you.

(S. : Yes, I hope you will tell me what you promised.)

I told you if it would be possible for me to return to you I would.

(S. : Yes, I remember.)

And convince you that I lived [not read]; try and convince you that I lived. I told you more than this, and I will remember it all. I told you I would come back if possible, and . . . let you know that I was not annihilated. I remember, remember well our talks about this life and its conditions, and there was a great question of doubt as to the possibility of communication; that, if I remember rightly, was the one question which we talked over.

Will return soon. Wait for me.

(S. : Yes, I shall wait.)

[Here is an incident of more than usual interest. It cannot be understood without a lengthy narrative. Two chronologically distinct, but connected, events are here alluded to. One of them, our talk on the future life, etc., took place a year before his death, and the other, his possible intention to return to me (p. 356), occurred on his death-bed. I have already remarked in my comments on the second sitting that there seemed to be an allusion to a conversation which I had had with him on the subject of psychical research and its importance, just after my visit to Indianapolis, already referred to. There is an evident reference to this again here in the communicator's language. This is quite striking to me from the statement a little earlier about its "not being an hallucination, but a reality." He was not familiar with the term hallucination, though he knew its import very well. But in our talk about the subject of evidence for the hereafter I was careful to lay much stress upon the fact of hallucination and the difficulties that it produced for any claim to scientific proof. He saw it, but his faith was too strong to be moved by it, and I can see the half-triumphant tone of his present manner, as it always was in like situations verifying his own belief or forecast of any event, though not in any boasting or victorious spirit, but only the strong satisfaction that he felt, as perhaps all of us would, when we found a faith become an indubitable fact.

With this conversation in view the allusion to the promise made me is one of much interest. When I was sent word by my aunt (Eliza, the one alluded to in the first sitting) that father had suddenly come to his old home very ill, I knew that his end was near. I had been expecting such a crisis for months. I immediately sat down and wrote him an affectionate letter. I could not conceal from him my belief that his illness meant death. I ended my letter with the following sentence:—"I want you to come to me after it is all over." I had no belief in immortality at the time, though I did not disbelieve it. It has usually seemed possible to me, but the argument seemed to me overwhelmingly strong for materialism. Nevertheless I knew that there was no way either to prove immortality, or to show more clearly that it could not be proved, than the method of psychical research; and though I had never had, and believe I never would have, an apparition, I was not above Darwin's playing his bassoon to his plants, and ventured on this suggestion to father as he stood on the brink of the grave, so that if it succeeded I could personally record such a coincidence, and if it did not, record that fact. I had no apparition of him, and in fact never thought of my request half a dozen times afterward. But it is not a little interesting to find here [see below] the statement that he has been calling for me ever since his death. He replied to my letter on his deathbed, and I have it still, the last letter he ever wrote me. I do not remember whether he made in it the promise he here says he made to me. My impression is that he did not, because I remember keeping the letter mainly for the reason that it was his last. I shall see, however, what it says when I get access to it in New York.

It is evident, however, in the conception of the communicator that he has viewed the promise from the standpoint of *communication*, not apparition, and that his mind in thinking of the promise reverts to the conversation two years before, or thereabouts, when the whole question

discussed was about the possibility of communication between discarnate and incarnate minds. I explained to him what telepathy meant and what was possible if it was true. He saw it, and as at that time I could not accept more than telepathy and was cautious and sceptical about that, I expressed very grave doubts about communication with the dead. Hence there could not be a more pertinent statement, on the part of one who claims to be my father, than the one here made: "There was a great question of doubt as to the possibility of communication, that, if I remember rightly, was the great question which we talked over."—J. H. H.] [See also Note 9, p. 356.]

I am Prudens, and I give light. I am thy friend and thou wilt call for me when thou dost need help. P. (R. H. : Yes, thank you.)

Mr. H. returns.

(S. : That H is good.)

I feel better now, James. I felt very much confused when I first came here. I could not seem to make out why I could not make you hear me at first. I have been calling for you ever since I left my body. I can hear better and my ideas are clearer than ever before. I would like to hear you speak.

(S. : Yes, father, free your mind. I shall listen and understand.)

I will leave nothing undone, but will reach you clearly and talk as we used, when I could speak independently of thought. I have not yet found out why it is that I have difficulty in speech. [I misunderstood this, and hence the following impertinent question.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Do you know what the trouble was when you passed out ?)

No, I did not realise that we had any trouble, James, ever.

(S. to R. H. : Misunderstood my statement.)

I thought we were always most congenial to each other.

(S. to R. H. : Must correct that misunderstanding.)

I do not remember any trouble, tell me what was it about you . . . do not mean with me, do you . . .

(S. : Father, you misunderstand me. I mean with the sickness.)

[Excitement.]

Oh, yes. I hear. I hear you. Yes. I know now. Yes, my stomach.

(S. : Yes. Was there anything else the matter ?)

Yes. Stomach, liver. (R. H. : Liver ?)

He says and head.

(S. : Very well. Tell all about it.)

He has taken off this condition, but tells me he could not see clearly.

What was meant by his eyes ? His stomach and . . .

Speak plainly. . . [To invisible.] I do not get it.

Sounds like Bone [?] (R. H. : Can't read that.)

(S. : Is that *bone* ?) Bone [?] Bone [?] he . . . he is telling me. Wait.

He places his hand over his . . . heart beat [?]

(S. : Heart ?)

Yes, let me reach thee [not read] reach thee, friend.

[Hand moves over R. H.'s head.]

Think I am finding it hard to breathe . . . my heart, James . . . my heart, James . . . difficult to breathe.

Do you not remember how I used to breathe ?

(S. : Yes, father, you are on the right line now.)

Yes, I think it was my heart which troubled me most. . . I . . . and my lung . . .

stomach and heart. I felt a * * [undec.] and tightness of my chest . . . and my heart failed me. He says distressed in the region of the heart, but at last I went to sleep. Was it not congestion, James?

(S. : Not that I know of.) [I had the catarrh in mind in this answer. I should have had the death scene in view. (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

I will try and remember all about it, he says, yet I remember heart and head well.

[The confusion in the communicator's mind which my question "Do you know what the trouble was when you passed out?" created was a surprise to me. When he spoke of his ignorance about the cause of his difficulty of speech, I thought that he was alluding to the difficulties from which he had suffered for three years before his death, and especially on his death-bed. But on reading the passage now I see that it refers to the difficulty of communicating his thoughts during the sitting. But thinking that he was referring to his sickness I asked him what the "trouble" was with which he died, using here the spiritistic lingo, as I have done all along purposely, and it was a surprise to see the reply, which was natural enough with the context, and, what is quite as striking, characteristic of many of his letters to me whenever any difference of opinion arose. The word "trouble" was generally used by him to express perplexities and annoyances with others growing out of personal relations with them, and was not used by him to express sickness, but only the accidents of sickness when mentioned, so that his diversion here is very natural.

At the time of the sitting I shook my head and thought that the communicator was wrong when, in what follows the confusion awakened by my question, the communicator mentioned his stomach and, after much struggling, his heart, lungs and breathing. The last seemed like it, but the first three did not. I had in mind his throat trouble, catarrh as he called it, which in reality was probably cancer of the larynx. Hence I wanted to see if he would mention what he had thought his sickness was, and what he had so often called it. Hence my demurral to its correctness when I saw the allusion to his stomach, heart and lungs, and the "congestion." But when I came to read the notes over after the sitting it seemed clear that the communicator had interpreted my phrase "when you passed out" as referring to the final crisis, and the whole narrative took on another meaning. I saw that it described exactly the chief incidents that occurred during the last half hour especially, and less strikingly the last hour, of his life. These must be described as fully as possible.

For about two months before his death my father had suffered from loss of appetite, a thing that had never been characteristic of him, and during these two months he had little satisfaction from eating. During the week in which I helped to nurse him the difficulty from swallowing on the one hand and the weakening of digestion on the other led to the necessity for artificial feeding, but during the last twenty-four hours of his illness, even this process accomplished nothing. On my inquiry also there was found to

be very little hunger, until on the morning of his death. About seven in this morning he complained of hunger, and on bringing the doctor we were able, about eight or half-past eight, to raise him up in bed to give him some milk. But he could drink very little of it, and with this hunger, which is the frequent messenger of death, he threw himself back upon the pillow with the remark: "It is too late." His pulse still showed a reasonably good condition. He had himself, all through his illness, watched his pulse, and even during the spasms of the larynx, when we thought he would perish, there seemed to be no diminution of the heart action such as would be expected as death approached. This kept up well until about half an hour before death, which occurred about ten o'clock in the morning. I noticed a gradual weakening of the pulse and the speech until he could not move his hand or any part of his body. In the early stages of this oncoming weakness when I undertook to feel the pulse, he several times rather petulantly shook his arm as if to prevent my effort, a thing he had never done before, but rather exhibited, or even manifested on his own part, a desire to feel his pulse or to have it felt. But in this weakening condition he also reached out his hand for that of his wife, and, being utterly unable to speak, could only press it in token of farewell. Soon the breathing became shorter and shorter, and there seemed to be the most tremendous and agonising efforts to take a full breath. The doctor had told me that this shortening of the breath during the spasms was due to congestion, caused by the attack of the spasm, and he also intimated that it might at any time terminate his life. Finally the pulse became too weak to be noticed, the breathing too short to supply air, and the eyes assumed the fixed gaze of death, and one last effort was made to obtain a breath, the eyes closed, and I remarked, "He's gone." Then the lower jaw fell, and the crisis was passed. He had complained during the last period of the illness, especially during some of the last hours, of great pain in the head, but this was not limited to the crisis which I have just described. The whole narrative which this explains, and which claims to be from my father, pursues this description quite closely as any one can see.

The incident about the trouble with the eyes I cannot confirm, but may be able to do so from my mother, if it be true. It is also my impression that the doctor had remarked by the bedside that there was congestion in the lungs when any extreme difficulty occurred with the breathing. The conformity of the narrative, however, to the facts known to me is quite evident and remarkable.—J. H. H.] [*Cf.* Note 10, p. 350].

[The following letter was received to-day and confirms the statement which I have made above, that I thought congestion in the lungs had been mentioned to father or within his hearing.

Xenia, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. HYSLOP,—Father has been ill with La Grippe since Sunday, and though able to be down stairs now, still feels weak. At his request I write to say that you are right in thinking that he had spoken to your father himself concerning the congestion of the lungs—as well as to you. He sends his kindest regards and with me wishes you a Happy and Prosperous New Year—Yours sincerely,

Thurs. noon.

WILL DICE.

It will be remarked that the above letter has no date. But the envelope is marked *very clearly* "Xenia, Ohio, Dec. 29, 5 p.m., '98." This was Thursday as the calendar shows. (See Note 8, p. 356, and Note 10, p. 357.) (December 31st, 1898).—J. H. H.]

(S. : Do you remember what medicine I got in New York ?)

(S. : Do you remember what medicine I got in New York for you ?)

Yes, I do faintly.

Never mind . . . tell me about it later, when you feel clear. [From Rector to communicator.] Give him something . . . him something. [From Rector to sitters.]

[Accordion given.]

James, it was my heart, and I remember it well, and my eyes troubled me also. Do you remember this ?

(S. : No, I do not remember this.) [One of these incidents, that about the eyes, I did not know, and the other I was not thinking of. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.]

Do you not remember what the swelling meant ? [Not read at first.] He says swelling.

[The external surface of the throat was swollen, and it is interesting to note this question because it betrays just that kind of conception which I would expect him to entertain while thinking that his disease was catarrh ; for it appears to betray consciousness of a contradiction between what he knew of catarrh in myself and what he thought this was.—J. H. H.]

I remember taking hold . . . hold of my own hands and holding them together over my chest. [I do not remember this.—J. H. H.] [See Note 22, p. 364.] But strange I cannot think of the word I want. I know it so well too.

(S. : Do I know it also ?) [Hand assents.]

Oh yes, very well.

(S. : Did I ever have the same sickness ?) [I was thinking of catarrh in this question. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.] Yes, long ago. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, that is right. What did I do for it ?)

This is what I cannot think, and it troubles me a little, James, because I know it so well.

(R. H. : Rector, would it not be better for him to leave for a moment ?)

Yes, he is going. + called him.

[To R. H.] No, the little girl is not thy sister's child, friend. [See previous sitting, p. . . —R. H.] We will give thee more about her later, if we need . . . need for us to do so . . . need.

Friend, they have sent thy brother here for a few moments to wait thy father's return.

(S. : Yes. Which brother is it ?)

It is I. I have been here so long. Is Scarlet fever a bad thing to have in the body ?

[This is in reality the correct answer to my question in the earlier sitting. (See p. 309.) My brother died of scarlet fever. He was taken with both scarlet fever and measles at the same time according to the diagnosis of the physician, and my father and mother were told during the progress of the

illness that one of them would prevail over the other. This was very noticeable before his death, the scarlet fever overcoming the measles and driving the rash from measles down and out through the extremities, as it were. The sister who took sick on the day of my brother's funeral and died in twelve days had only the scarlet fever.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, it is. Tell more about it.)

I had it, and I woke in . . . When I waked up I found I really had been dreaming . . . found (S. : Yes, I understand.) Are you happy . . . happy while you are going on dreaming ?

(R. H. [S.] : Yes. Who passed out soon after you ?)

Mother [? brother] . . . is here also.

(S. : Mother, is that you ?) Yes.

Yes, we are all here. Do you know who Sarah is ? Anne [Anna ?]

[I did not know at the time that Sarah was the name of my twin sister who died when in her fourth month. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.] [See Note 5, p. 349.]

(S. : Yes. I know who Annie is.) She wants to see you. (S. : Well, I hope we can some day.) She says you dream while she lives, and she sends her love to you . . . love. Where is brother James ?

(S. : This is brother James here. I am brother James.)

How you have changed since I came here. [Compare *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 324.—J. H. H.]

Do you remember anything about my hair ? There is something I wish you to know. Do you, if you are my dear brother, recall anything about my hair ?

(S. : I am not quite certain.)

They took a piece of it away. Did you know this ?

(S. : I think you are right.)

I know I am. I know it well, James.

And I remember a little picture of me taken when I was very young.

[Correct.—J. H. H.] Who has it now ?

(S. : Who has it now ?) (R. H. to S. : That's what she's asking you.)

I cannot find it, and I have thought about it so much.

(S. : I think I remember now. Do you remember Aunt Nannie ?) [Excitement in hand.]

Well, I think [?] I do very well. I was named for her. [Not correct (April 18th 1900.)—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Rector, ask her to be calm.) [Cross in air.]

Yes. I think I do very well. I was really named for her.

(S. : Yes ?) Yes, I say. Has she it ? (S. : Yes, she has it.)

Give her my love and tell sister Annie tells her . . . Anna not Anna but Annie. And I am your sister. [See Notes 3, P.S., p. 348, and 11, p. 358.]

(S. : Yes, I remember you well.)

Do you not have anything to say to me ? I came here just after Charles

. . . Charles. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Yes, that is right. I am glad to hear from you.)

I tried years ago to reach you. + [This indicates the presence of Imperator.] I tried years ago through father. Did you know this ? (S. :

No, I did not know this.) I did. And if Auntie is still in the body she will remember this. Here comes father. [See Note 11, p. 358.]

Yes. James. I do remember something about your getting some quien [?] (S. : Medicine?) (R. H. : Quinine?) [Dissent.] [See Note 12, p. 358.]

It begins with D. (S. : Not quite. Can you spell it?) Oh, I know it so well, yet I cannot say it when I wish to.

(S. : Father, do not worry about it now. It will come again.) Yes, and I will tell it this friend if not to you.

I told him this. R. [*i.e.*, Rector told the communicator.]

(R. H. : Good.)

I am anxious for you to know all about me, and if there is anything that the children or I can do for you to know that we are all together again I will really keep my promise to you.

(S. : Yes, father, I am glad of that. I heard many good words from Annie, and they pleased me very much.) Yes, and she has been here longer than I have, James . . . She has been here longer than I have I James, and is clearer in her thoughts when she is trying to speak, but do not feel troubled about it. I will in time be able to tell you all. (S. : Yes, father, I think you will. Don't worry but keep calm.) I want you to know I am at this moment trying to think of anything but sickness. (R. H. "everything about sickness.") No anything but . . . but. (S. : I see—that's it.) And now do you remember what I tried to talk over with you besides . . . I am clearer now . . . coming here, and what we used to say about your work. I think you were happier in it, were you not, very much, now out with it, James.

Do you hear her sing [Not read.] (R. H. : No, the words are not clear, Rector.) Cing. (R. H. : "Coming?") Do you not hear her sing ging singing? (R. H. : No.)

Friend, there is something and we will be obliged to ask thee to move. (S. : I'm to move?) (R. H. : I don't know.) [S. goes over to the other side of room.] No, return. [S. returns.] [*Cf.* pp. 429, 467.]

Yes, my head grows lighter and lighter. Do you know the last thing I recall is your speaking to me. [When the eyelids fell in death, I alone remarked, "He's gone."—J. H. H.] (S. : Yes. Right.)

And you were the last to do so. (S. : Very well. Was any one else at the bedside?)

I remember seeing your face, but I was too [to] weak to answer. Hear me now. Where is Eliza? (S. : She is at home.)

I remember her and Robertson [?] well.

(R. H. : Robertson, is that?) (S. : I think I know.) (S. : Robert *who*?) [My question was absurd. I thought it an attempt to name my brother Robert, but it was probably my uncle "Charles" asking if I was there. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.] [*Cf.* pp. 310, 317.] Do you know Rector? I remember him well.

Wasn't he there, James, or did he come in later . . . to thee?

(S. : Yes. He came in after you.)

I thought so, as I remember it.

Yes, Hyslop. I know who I am. And Annie, too.

And long before the SUN shall set for you I will give you a full and complete account of your old father, James.

Keep quiet, do not worry about any thing, as I used to say. It does not pay. Remember this ?

[This sentence is word for word, if I may use the expression, what he used to say to me when he found me worrying. The part "It does not pay" is especially his phrase in this connection. The same can be said of the reference to my not being "the strongest man" (see below), except that his phrase in life was usually, "you are not very strong," or "you are not as strong as the others." I am, however, not so certain of his variety of phrase as I am of his constant allusions to my want of strength and cautioning me against worrying about things.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : We've got him clear now.)

(S. : Yes, father, I remember that well.)

That, James, was my advice always, and it is still the same. You are not strongest man you know and . . . the [written above the word *strongest*] and health is important for you. Cheer up now and be quite yourself.

(S. : Yes, father, I shall. I am glad to hear this advice.)

Remember, it does not pay, and life is too short there for you to spend it in worrying. [Cf. pp. 40, 352.] You will come out all safe and well, and will one day be reunited with us, and we shall meet face to face, and you will know me well.

[Two expressions here are exactly like my father. He used frequently to talk to us children of *reunion* after death, and spoke of "*meeting face to face*." This latter phrase was also often used when speaking of meeting God.—J. H. H.]

What you cannot have, be content without. [Not read.]

[This advice was also constantly his.—J. H. H.]

No ; before we go we want you to hear what . . . what he is saying. R.

What you cannot have, be content without. [Not read.]

[R. H. says he cannot read the word after *be*.]

I must catch it while he is saying it. I will then repeat afterwards if necessary . . . afterwards.

(R. H. : Good.) U D. (R. H. : Yes.)

Be content without, he says. His sentence [sentence] was as follows : What you cannot have, be content without . . . be con . . . [Read correctly.] Yes. Health or anything else, but do not worry, and not for me. This is going to be my life, and you will know all that is possible for any one to know. (S. : Yes, father, I am glad of that. It will be my life here, too.) Yes, I know it, and as we lived th . . . lived there . . . there so we will also live here. Devoted you were to me always, and I have nothing to complain of except your uneasy temperament, and that I will certainly help. Only trust in all that is good, James, and be contented whilst you stay, and I will certainly be near you. I am a little weary, James, but I will return and recall, if possible, my medicine.

He is taking me away.

(R. H. : Yes, you will have one day more now with your son.)

Oh, let me refresh myself and return to him.

(R. H. : Yes, think . . .)

Seek and ye shall find. [A biblical phrase often quoted by him to us.—
J. H. H.]

(R. H. [S.] : Father, good-bye until to-morrow, and I will see you then.)

Come in to-morrow and see how I am getting along. Remember this ?
(S. : Yes, father. I shall remember this.) But do you remember my
saying this to you . . . saying this. (S. : Yes, father.)

[I do not remember specific incident, but something like it occurred
frequently when I helped nurse him on his death-bed. (December 30th,
1899.)—J. H. H.]

What I will do [?] I will. [Crosses in air.]

+ Friends, we must cease now, and we have him in our holy keeping,
when all earthly recollections will return to his memory.

Patience and peace be unto thee. (Amen.)

Now speak, friend, if thou wilt, and we must be gone.

(R. H. : Only I was about to tell his father to think over some incidents
for him to come prepared to tell his son to-morrow.) [Cross in air.]

Well it will be. May the grace of God be with and abide with thee
evermore. + {R}.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

II. [Some words of which all that I could distinguish was]

* * * James.

[While Dr. Hodgson was occupied in getting his things together, I
heard Mrs. Piper remark faintly just before emerging what sounded like
"Hyslop," though quite indistinct, soon after uttering the "James" as
observed by Dr. Hodgson.—J. H. H.]

SITTING IV.

Record of Sitting, December 27th, 1898.

[Imperator writes.]

[Cross in air.]

+ H A I L. (R. H. : Hail, Imperator.)

We have thus far not failed thee, friend, neither will we * * *
[undec.] (R. H. : It is not very clear, the writing.) And we desire that
thy earthly friends * * * * [undec.] during the coming months, after
which we will give thee further instruction as to what * * * [undec.]
best to take. May . . . still may all good be over thee and His
blessings rest on thee. Thy friend's father will answer to * * [undec.]
and * * [undec.] of all that is desired of his or our hemisphere [?] of
life. U D.

(R. H. : I cannot more than a word or two at present. Do you wish our
friend here to go on now or do you wish to speak to me first ?)

It is well. But I entered first for the purpose of restoring the light.

(R. H. : Ah, yes.) and clearing the way for his father who is with us +.

(R. H. : Yes, I understand.)

I go now and peace be with thee and thine + I. S. D. (R. H.: Amen.)
 (R. H. to S.: Emperor had to come in himself for the purpose of restoring the light.)

[Rector writes.]

Rector: Good morrow, friends, we meet thee once more and all is as we would have it. We assist his friends to return with clear thought. (R. H.: Yes.)

Yes. All is well. [Hand moves as though seeking something.] (S.: Want to feel something?) [S. goes to get accordion.] James, James I am here. My thoughts are clearer now and I know better than I did when I left you before what you said to me.

(S.: Yes, father, good morning.)

Good morning, James. I see you are better. I am happier for it. There shall be no veil between us. Wait patiently and all we talked of will be made clear to you. Yes, my head seems clearer and I can see perfectly . . . you. Oh yes. [The *you* apparently intended to follow *see*.]

(S.: Yes.) [Excitement.]

I can see and hear better than ever. Your voice to me does not seem so far away. I will come nearer day by day.

Annie and I both, and all that transpired between us whilst in . . . I was in the body I will refer to, that you may be sure it is I.

I remember very well indeed and what I said. I was most emphatic in . . . in my desire to know the truth and make you know it if possible.

Speak clearly, sir. Come over here [to Sp.] Yes.

Are you with James? [to R. H.] (R. H.: Yes.)

Well, will you help me to return later if I wish to return? If so, I will try and free my mind now.

(R. H.: I shall be very pleased to take messages to your son at any time when Rector or other messenger can bring them.)

Well, I will not feel troubled then, because I can have no further talks with him now. James, do you remember what . . . the things I took out west . . . West . . .

(S.: Yes, father.) [Father moved "West" in the fall of 1889.—J. H. H.]

Well, are they not for you . . . (S.: Some of them I think are. What ones are for me?)

I wish all the books, every one, and photos. (R. H.: Photos?) (S.: Pictures?) painting, Picture . . . yes, every one of those of mine. I took them out West, you remember. [Cf. p. 325.] (S.: Yes, I remember.)

I should have said that [?] I wished I would have had you have . . . d . . . them before now.

He speaks too rapidly, fearing he may forget something . . . h . . . had said all I wished.

Cannot you send for them. I am sure will . . . will give them up. (S.: Do you want one of the books to touch?) Yes, very much, my diary, anything, diary . . . yes, or anything, any one of them. Give me one, James, if possible. I have something on my mind. [Father kept some sort of a journal which I may be able to find. I suspect that his account book is meant here, which was like a "diary."—J. H. H.]

(S. : Well, father, I have no book with me now, but I shall send one to my friend here.) Yes, and it will help me when you are gone. [Caret below gone, are above it.]

I remember Himi [or Hime]. S (R. H. : Is that Hume ?)

(S. : Yes, that is right.)

Yes. Give it me. S*** is [?]

Hume [?]

hme [?]

(S. : Yes, that is right. Now one or two words after that.)

[Without having told me the seriousness of his condition, father all at once sent me word to get him in New York the medicine known as "Hyomei." He had tried a great many patent medicines, and, having failed to get relief, resolved to try "Hyomei," which he had seen favourably advertised. It is a medicine procured from some medical plant, and is to be inhaled. I sent it to him, and it was the only thing that ever gave him any decided relief.—J. H. H.]

S nut [?] Serris doings [?] I cannot catch all now . . . life . . . You know what is in my mind perfectly, James. I used to speak of it often.

(S. : Yes, father, I know what you have in your mind. Do not worry about that part which I did not get.)

I will give him all of them. (R. H. : "All of them ?")

Yes, he says. Yes.

[He took a variety of patent medicines, and meditated getting others that he did not take. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.]

Do you remember the little knife I used to pick [written on top of page already filled. Fresh sheet turned] I used . . . pick out my nails with . . . (S. : I am not sure, father.)

The little brown handle one. I had it in my vest waist coat [waist superposed on vest as if to take its place] w . . . pocket. . . . Wait, wait. He says I had it in my vest, and then in coat pocket. You certainly must remember it. [I remember nothing of this, and in fact am sure I never knew of any such knife.—J. H. H.]

(S. : Was this after you went out West ?)

Yes. [See Note 14, p. 359.] I seem to lose [loose] part of my recollections between my absence and return, just before I had this change, and the cap I used to wear, the cap . . . [I know nothing of this cap.—J. H. H.]

+ [Imperator] [Writing becomes quieter.]

the cap I used to wear. And this I have lost, too. [See Note 15, p. 360, and cf. pp. 387, 406.]

James, let me see some of my trifles . . . trifles. They can do no harm and may help me to recall well.

(S. : This, father, is the only thing I have with me.) [Accordion.]

I am clearer when I see it. What will it be when you come, too, James . . . all music not imitation . . . where is my coat ? I begin to think of what I do not need.

I am coming nearer you see . . . ne . . . need . . . and all the things I ever owned are passing through my head at this moment. Get the

pictures ; do you not want them, James ? (S. : Yes, father, I shall get them.)
I will be glad. I am thinking of Streine [?] Str . . Str i . . S t r y c n .

Speak. Speak. (S. : Well, father, is this Stryc ?)

Yes. (S. : Well what is the next letter ?)

N i a . . E . . E . . Str.

Slower, sir. Slower my friend, do not speak so fast. I will help you.

Now slower. [to Sp.]

S t R . . S t r y c n i n e .

(S. : Good, father, that is right.)

[In saying "that is right" I meant that he had succeeded in making clear what was evident to both of us as we saw the writing going on, but we wished to see it completed. I know nothing about his use of strychnine. I do not think I obtained any of it when I got the Hyomei. There was certainly no reason for asking me to get it in New York, as it was easily obtainable at the drug stores in the small town in which he lived, while the Hyomei was not. If I obtained strychnine for him in New York, of which I have not the slightest recollection, I could obtain it only through a prescription, and would not have known the name for it in pharmacy. If the fact of its use by father be established and that he got it elsewhere also, then the incident will be a good instance excluding ordinary telepathy as the explanation of it. But if I did obtain it for him, as I feel very sure I did not, the case would be amenable to the telepathic hypothesis, at least as a possible explanation.—J. H. H.] [See Note 16, p. 360, Note 23, p. 365.]

He helped . . Helped . He told me I must answer your other question first [i.e., Emperor told him to answer S.'s previous question about the medicine. See previous sitting.]

Do you hear me . . my son? (S. : Yes, father, I hear you perfectly.) I remember you went and got it for me. God bless you, James, he says. And a numerous amount of other medicines [?] which I cannot * * [undec.]
+ thanks to thee, friend. All is well.

Ask Willie about the knife. [Name correct.]

(S. : Yes, father, I will ask Willie about it, but there is one other boy who will know better than he.) I do not . . . George. [Name correct.—J. H. H.] (S. : No, not George.) Rob. [Name correct.—J. H. H.]

Did you ask me to tell the other . . . Roberts [?] Robert.

(S. : That is good, father, but not the one. Yes, Robert is the right name, but the one that will remember the knife is a younger boy.)

He will explain it to him and I will get his answer soon.

+ He is with him constantly. (R. H. to S. : That is, Emperor.)

Do you hear me . . what I told you about George. (S. : Yes, you mean before ?) Yes. I . . . (S. : Yes. I remember.) I had a good deal to think of there, James. (S. : Yes, father, you did.) And the least said the sooner mended. Hear. [See Note 4, p. 348] (S. : Yes, father, I hear.) Do you U D. (S. : Yes, father, I understand.)

I will work now, and unceasingly as I can for him.

(R. H. : I think he means Emperor.) [Not correct, as *him* is spelt with small *h*.—R. H.]

What . . . Cannot hear you ; do not hurry so. Do you mean
F . . . ?

(S. to R. H. : Yes, I see. That's all right.) James.

(S. : Yes, father, I mean F., if you can tell the rest.)

Yes, I can remember very well. F R A D [?]

[There appears here an attempt to spell the name of my youngest brother. This is much more apparent in the original writing at the sitting than could be indicated in print, except by a reproduction of what is here printed as "D." In the original there are two lines which are like capital A without the cross line, and so represent the first two strokes of capital "N," and to these are added the curve which so strikingly resembles the letter "D." The symbol might be taken as a poor attempt to make "N" and "K" almost in one stroke. In fact it was written in one stroke, and the greater resemblance to "D" in the final part of it is the decisive reason for regarding it as too imperfect an attempt at "N" and "K" to say that these were undoubtedly meant.—J. H. H.]

F R E . .

It is my fault, not his, wait a moment. R.

My stomach . . . Stomach . . . strange it does not trouble, isn't it? If one is full of distress how can one feel other than depressed, but not so with you. I wish I could step in and hear you at college [colledge] [The phrase is characteristic and the word "college" very pertinent.—J. H. H.] and see all that disturbs you. I would write right . . . soon right things there for you. I had a will of my own . . . perhaps you will remember.

(S. : Yes, father, I remember, but it was not a bad will.)

I am glad you think so. But if the rest had been like you, perhaps I should have refused them anything . . . [R.H. reads over—hand adds :] not. [This is very pertinent, and involves a suggestion of facts too personal to publish, especially as it is connected with the reference to the college just above.—J. H. H.] [Later events induced me to change this purpose. See Note, pp. 402-405 (April 20th, 1901).—J. H. H.]

(S. : That's it. I know just what . . .)

But what I propose to do now, James, is to right matters to my own liking . . . liking . . . especially with the boys. I assure you when I can get so I can speak and say just what I like I will straighten out things for you.

(R. H. : Rector, our friend here with me wrote out a few sentences to read to his father. I think perhaps now would be a good time, if you will ask him to listen calmly and quietly till his son James finishes reading.)

Yes, but let us say, friend, that he will only {at this period} be able to receive it in fragments until I can go out and explain it to him.

He [Imperator] is with him, and will wait with me. R.

(R. H. : Yes. Do you think wiser to wait till just before we go?)

Well, the better way would be to repeat now and . . .

(R. H. : Then later also.) [Strong assent.]

Yes. Thou art bright [light ?] to hear me so well.

(R. H. : Say when ready.)

Give me something of his that I may hold him quite clearly. [Accordion given.]

[S. reads.]

(Father, this is my last chance to talk with you until my friend asks me to do so again. You will remember to communicate with him from time to time, and I shall write to him to greet you whenever he sends word from you. I have not asked many questions, nor reminded you of any important facts, because doing so would be interpreted here on earth as suggesting the answers themselves.)

Ah, yes; I remember the difficulties. [Cf. p. 341, and Note 24, p. 365.]

(Hence I have wished to let you tell your own story, so that I could go before the world and prove more clearly the great truth which we have at heart. You know it is the work of Christ, and you will remember that I always said that I wished to live the life of Christ, even if I was not a believer.)

Perfectly. Yes. That is surely James.

(To meet you, then, in this way, and to feel that you will farther help me give mankind the great truth of immortal life)

With God's help I will, my boy.

(is an inspiration which you can well understand. Keep your mind clear, and, whenever you can or are permitted, tell to my friend later some facts in your life or mine, and other members of the family, their names and so forth. These will be sent to me and I can verify them and put them on record. You will then do a good work on your side that will help me with Christ's work on this side.)

[This passage was prepared beforehand with a distinct purpose. I resolved to test first the memory of the communicator and second his religious attitude. We had carried on a long correspondence in regard to my apostasy from my early teaching, and he knew in life that I had taken just the attitude here indicated. Moreover I had concealed my own name and personal identity so thoroughly and avoided in all cases (unless we except the mention of my Aunt Nannie to my sister) everything like the suggestion of names or events that would lead to identification, that I was curious to see what the response would be. It is certainly very striking, and not less so for its apparent memory of our past relations, on the one hand, and for the manner in which the recognition takes place. Here the statement, "Perfectly, yes, that is surely James," is not made to me, but to Rector, and owing to the nature of the machine it slips through to me, so to speak.—J. H. H.] [Another interpretation of it may be that Rector appreciated its importance and delivered it intentionally (April 18th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

[Finis.]

Yes, *I will, and unceasingly*. You know my thoughts well, and you also know what my desires were before entering this life . . . enter . . .

(S. to R. H. : Yes, that's an interesting word again.)

[I refer in this remark to what seems a departure from the spiritistic lingo in the communicator's language. Father knew nothing about the doctrine except in the vaguest way. He never came into contact with it, never read any of its literature, and would know nothing of its lingo. But as I had frequently noticed in the sittings expressions bearing the stamp of acquaintance with its peculiar phraseology about death, I resolved to watch

for indications of departure from it and adoption of the more natural phraseology characteristic of my father in life. I do not know the spiritistic lingo myself well enough to say positively that there is a deviation from it here. But a very natural spiritistic phrase here would have been "since passing out," instead of "since entering this life." Hence in this case and in one other in which the term "change" was used to express the same idea, I wondered whether there was not a departure from the ordinary spiritistic lingo.—J. H. H.]

and you also know whom I longed to meet and [not all read] what I longed to do for you . . . whom he longed to meet, he says. [Read correctly.] Yes, he says. [Cf. p. 389.]

(S. : Yes, father, I know well.)

Good. Keep it in mind, James, and I will push from this side whilst you call from yours, and we will sooner or later come to a more complete U D.

(S. : Yes. I understand.)

[January 13th, 1900.—A phrase in the above sentence recalls a passage which I read at Mrs. Piper's trance on February 9th, 1897. It occurred in a letter written at my request by a personal friend of Stainton Moses, with the view of helping the latter in his communications. The passage is: "I write this letter because it seems possible that we may thus meet across the barrier, my pull perhaps helping your push." See also the phrase used at the sitting of June 6th, 1899 (p. 474), "pulling with my push," and note the remark made by Mrs. Piper's "subliminal" on June 3rd, 1899 (p. 457), "Stainton Moses helping Hyslop."—R. H.]

[I may also call attention here to the fact that in the sitting of June 7th, 1899, near the beginning (p. 478), my father specifically alludes to Stainton Moses by name, giving, however, only the name Moses, as having been one of the persons to whom he had communicated something after he had ceased speaking to me at the end of the previous sitting of June 6th (p. 474).—J. H. H.]

Go on. It helps me when I hear you speak, and will be of great advantage [?] to me later when trying to speak with our friend here. Few, they tell me, have had so good an opportunity as I have of returning so often, and it has been [*benf* or *bnef*] of the greatest benefit to me . . . benefit . . . and I will struggle on until my thoughts are all clear. And from my boyhood to now . . . boyhood . . . I will recall *every thing* for you.

Go on I am waiting.

(S. : Yes, father, I have read all that I wished to read, and I shall be glad if you can recall and tell anything about a railroad collision.) [Excitement.]

Yes. I think I will, all about it, but do not ask me just yet, James . . . ask me just yet . . . just yet.

[The reader will notice a singular absurd break here on my part, which shows as much incoherence and irrelevancy as could ever be charged to a discarnate spirit.—J. H. H.]

(S. : All right. I will not. Do you remember much of your religious life?)

Yes, I think I do, nearly everything, and my views, whereas they were not just correct in everything, yet they were more or less correct, and . . .

correct . . . and I have found a great many things as I had pictured them in my own earthly mind . . . Hear.

(S. : Yes, I hear.)

Since Christ came to the earthly world there has been a co . . . almost constant revelation of God and His power over all. (R. H. : Constant, *what is that?*) Revelation he . . . he says. [This language is very characteristic.—J. H. H.]

What do you remember, James, of our talks about Swedenborg . . . S.

(S. : I remember only that we talked about him.)

Do you remember of our talking one evening in the library of his . . . Library . . . about [his] op . . . [the *d* of description superposed on *op*] description of the Bible? (S. : No.) Several years ago. (S. : No, I do not remember it.) his opinion opinion of . . . *Spiritual sense* . . . his description of its *Spiritual sense* . . . *Sense*. (S. : No, I do not remember that, but perhaps some one else in the family does.)

I am sure of our talks on the subject. It may have been with one of the others, to be sure. In any case I shall soon be able to remember all about it. I am so much nearer and so much clearer now than when I vaguely saw you here . . . when [not read above] . . . and when Charles tried to wake me up here and . . . Do you hear me?

[This whole incident about Swedenborg is too vague to me for any claims to interest or significance. I have only the vaguest recollection that I ever talked to him about Swedenborg, and I am not confident enough of this to trust even myself in the matter, unless some one else can refresh my memory. If anyone had asked me whether father had ever known anything about Swedenborg, I should have answered No with a great deal of confidence. It is possible that in the conversation with him, to which I have referred, some discussion of Swedenborg may have occurred, and I have an impression that it did. But I fear that my memory on this point is worthless, and that it is but an impression that the talk was a possible one.—J. H. H.] [See Note 17, p. 361 and pp. 31, 370.]

After a while I will repeat my views. I am glad you have not given me any suggestions for your sake, but it has perplexed me a little, and at times seemed unlike yourself. I faintly recall the . . . faintly recall the . . . trouble on the subject of spirit-return. Hear. [*Cf.* p. 339.] (S. : Yes, I hear.) I and I see and U D now.

(S. : Yes, I understand, and do you know where it was, and who were with us?)

He seems not to U D your quesn [?] [Not all read.]

I do . . . he says. I do not U D your question, James.

(S. : Yes, father, you spoke about our talk about spirit-return, and I asked if you could remember the persons who were with us at the time, and when it was.) I think, if I remember rightly, it was in New York. [Not correct. Father never saw New York after I went there to live.] [I had discussed the subject briefly in some of my letters from New York, especially at the time I sent him the *Proceedings* to read (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

(S. : No, it was not in New York. But two other persons were present at the time.) Yes, well it will all come back to me, and I will, if not to you,

give it to our friend. (S. : Yes, that is right, father. Do you wish to be remembered to any others in the family?) Yes, all of whom I have given mention, and * * [two or three letters undec.] . . . al . . . all and I think I have not left out any one . . . one . . . have I, James? (S. : Yes, father, you've left out one I think you would be very glad to mention.) Did you say one . . . yes . . . do . . .

(S. : Yes. I said *one*. Not the children.) No, I think I have sent all except sister. (S. : Yes, I think perhaps you are right. One thing I had not understood. Now which sister is this?) I mean *Nan*. R[P?] [followed by one or two other letters undec.] Mannie. (S. : Yes, that is right exactly.)

Give my love to her, of course, and if you knew my feeling at this moment you would be pleased. *She was one of the best* . . . (S. : Yes, father, I know how you feel about it.) [Cf. p. 451.]

I am glad and free . . . and free, oh glad I am, a more faithful one [? interpreted at the time as *son*] never lived. (S. : Thank you father for that.) It is just and . . . (S. : It is just like him.) right.

[My remark here was based on the original reading of the word "one" for "son." The note, therefore, which followed at the time explaining its fitness has been expunged. The statement, however, under the latter has as much pertinence as ever, though its reference is not to myself and though it be non-evidential as before. It is applicable to both my aunt Nannie and my stepmother, but much more specifically to the latter. There is some uncertainty as to which is meant in the passage. But there are several facts which suggest a preference for my stepmother. (1) The word "sister" used just previously would apply equally to my sister who had not been mentioned, especially if we suppose that father had failed to express all that he tried to say, especially also if we suppose that "Nan," which is immediately changed to "Mannie," is an attempt to say "Maggie." (2) The name "Mannie" is as much an approximation to "Maggie," that of my stepmother, as to that of my aunt Nannie (Cf. p. 343). The specific discrimination of my aunt Eliza's sorrow in the same passage (see below), as if not recognising the revelancy of the allusion to the other person in mind, is particularly pertinent in three respects, on the interpretation that the "Mannie" refers to my stepmother. First there is the specific selection of "Eliza in her sorrow," as if she were not included with the other in mind. Second, the discrimination is in agreement with facts suggesting a reason for it (Cf. p. 363). Third, the previous reference to this aunt's sorrow (p. 316) was appropriately connected with the recognition of the same grief in my aunt Nannie. Hence the preponderance of psychological evidence is here in favour of the reference to my stepmother (May 20th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

Tell Eliza too. (S. : Yes. I shall most certainly.) *both* . . . *Both*. (S. : Yes. I shall tell both very gladly.)

And tell them to believe and trust in God always, [This is perfectly characteristic.—J. H. H.] and I will often bring comfort to Eliza in her sorrow. [This allusion has very great interest, but I shall not comment on it until later.—J. H. H.]

(S. : What . . .) I will tell you, friend, all about it after James is has [superposed on the *is* as if to take its place] gone. (R. H. : Very good.

I shall be pleased.) I have seen him and will tell you all. (R. H. : I shall take all you tell me with much pleasure.) (S. : Thank you, father.)

Do you remember the glasses ? (S. : What glasses ?) [I had one pair of his glasses, and I think my stepmother had the other, but I wanted to know more here.—J. H. H.]

and where they are ? She has them I think.

(S. : Yes. Who has them ?) Nani. (S. to R. H. : Not quite.) (S. : No, not Nannie.) Ani. (S. : What glasses did you ask about ?) M . . nni [Interpreted at the time as *mine*.] (S. : Yes, father, I remember them.

Whom did you leave them with ? With whom did you leave them ?)

I am thinking. It was *Eliza*. [Correct. He died at her house and left his glasses there.—J. H. H.]

I do not think I said just right.

(R. H. : He's getting dizzy.)

I will *think it over*. [See Note 25, p. 365.]

(R. H. : Rector, perhaps he had better stop now ?) + [Imperator.]

He longs to remain with him, but + is taking him away.

(R. H. to S. : Better say good-bye. Better get that ready to read over again to Rector.)

And I will take thy message to him, friend, if thou wilt give it me.

(S. to R. H. : Tell me when.) (R. H. to S. : Oh, if you want to say good-bye to your father, better say it now.)

James, good-bye, my boy.

(S. : Good-bye, father. I hope I can see you again.)

Be faithful to yourself and your Aunts, James, and *do not worry* about anything.

(S. : No, father, I shall not worry about anything.)

If you will do this . . . if you . . . all will be as I would have it.

(S. : Yes, father, I believe it, and I shall do my best.)

He is going . . . give me thy message.

(R. H. : Rector, will you have the message now, or first let me ask about the next arrangement for sitters ?) + [Imperator.]

Will have thee give it to me just before I go. (R. H. : Yes.)

(R. H. : Mrs. D. is anxious to see you.) But we have arranged to meet her next time. (R. H. : Yes, I thought so, but was not absolutely sure. After that what do you wish ?) We desire to meet thee ou . . . immediately we . . . after we . . . yes unless . . .

(R. H. : To-morrow Mrs. D., next day myself, and then we can arrange further details.) + *Well*. Had it not been for Him we could not have helped this . . . [new communicator] (R. H. : Yes, I understand.)

But, friend, thou knowest not the food which . . . food . . . lieth in store for thee regarding this new communicator. He is all that is *good and true*. (R. H. : I am delighted to hear that you are pleased with him.) [Cross in air.]

(R. H. : Shall he . . .) speak. (R. H. : Shall my friend now read his message ?) Yes He is waiting to take it to his father, who is standing beside him now.

[S. reads again the statement given above, p. 339.]

Amen. James, go forth, my son, in perfect peace with the world and God who governs all things wisely . . . wisely . . . and I will be faithful to you until we meet face to face in this world.

(R. H. : Amen.) [This is very like father.—J. H. H.]

We cannot possibly hold the light, it is going out and we must go with it. Friend, we have met with joy, and we depart with . . . in like manner. Fear not, God is . . . is . . . ever thy guide, and He will never fail thee. (R. H. : Amen.) We cease now, and may His blessings rest on thee. + {R} (R. H. : Amen.)

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

Mrs. P., as she began to come out of the trance, first uttered indistinctly "Hyslop," and then said also indistinctly, "Robert Hyslop." This, of course, was the name of my father.—J. H. H.

Additional Notes on Sitzings of December 23rd, 24th, 26th, 27th, 1898.

(Note 1.)

New York, April 26th, 1899.

Apropos of the statements made at the beginning of the present report regarding the precautions taken for secrecy and the extent to which they were fulfilled, the following incidents are of some importance, at least to the would-be critic, in the case. The precautions were designed to shut out absolutely everybody from a knowledge of my intentions except Dr. Hodgson and myself. As a matter of fact this was effected, though there was one little mishap that might have led to discovery and mistake in the realization of this purpose. I had carried on my correspondence regarding the sittings directly with Dr. Hodgson at his residential address, and not at the office, so as to exclude all knowledge of my purpose from the Assistant-Secretary of the Branch, Miss Edmunds. This I did not at all feel necessary, but only wanted to be able to say that it was a fact in order to satisfy the naturally scrupulous and cautious scientist. But after getting the promise of sittings at some future date I wrote a short letter to Dr. Hodgson, and from mere habit, after actually looking up Dr. Hodgson's house address, made the mistake of writing the office address, and the letter was opened by Miss Edmunds, as she usually opened the official mail. I had been careful to cut off all headlines that might lead to my immediate identification by any one not in the office and who did not know me either by name or personally. My signature was attached to the letter. The letter was sent to Dr. Hodgson apparently without reading it though after opening. The following is an exact copy of the letter without the omission of a word or sign.

November 13th, 1898.

MY DEAR HODGSON,—I have not been at the college since Friday, and do not know what mail will be awaiting me there when I go down to-morrow. But I do not wait to ascertain this until I write asking that you tell me by return mail, if you have not already written me, whether I am to have the

sittings for the dates mentioned some time ago. I wish to make final arrangements for the trip. You will have to tell me when and where to meet you.—Yours as ever,

J. H. HYSLOP.

It had been intended originally to have the sittings earlier than the date actually fixed on at last. But as soon as Dr. Hodgson received the above note he returned it with his reply, calling my attention to my mistake. Nevertheless I withheld more carefully than ever all further intimation of my intentions, and when I went on to Boston during the holidays for the sittings and was taken to the office, before introducing me to Miss Edmunds, with whom I had frequently corresponded in his absence, but whom I had never met, I said to Dr. Hodgson that I was not acquainted with Miss Edmunds, but that she probably knew my intentions from that mistake in my letter. But he decided with my advice nevertheless to introduce me to her under his regular pseudonym, Mr. Smith, and did so with the jovial remark, "Another Mr. Smith," and added: "Perhaps you know him, Miss Edmunds." She replied that she did not, and I reservedly added that I had never met her. She then spoke up: "Oh, is this Professor Hyslop?" As the cat was out of the bag I said: "Yes, but I intended to keep the fact a secret, but as you saw my letter referring to my intentions I may as well confess." "No," she said, "I did not see any letter, but as we were going over the copy in the office this morning it flashed over my mind that the stranger called "the four times friend" was Professor Hyslop, but I did not remark the fact to Miss S—— (assistant) until about an hour ago. But it was only a guess, as I did not know you were going to have sittings. I simply remarked to her that I wondered why Professor Hyslop would not like to have some sittings, as he is interested in them." But as my letter had been opened by Miss Edmunds in pursuance of her custom, I deemed it best to have her statement regarding her knowledge of my sittings to be put on record with my report. I therefore wrote her to explain her relation to the question, and to state what she knew of my intentions. The following is her reply:—

5, Boylston Place, Boston, Mass., *January 12th, 1899.*

DEAR PROFESSOR HYSLOP,—I can give no distinct reason *why* I guessed that you were "The Four Days Friend," as I certainly had not reasoned it out, but thought that I had guessed it from reading allusions in the sittings to "The Four Days Friend."

On first reading your letter of January 8th, I remembered nothing of the letter you refer to, but on talking it over with Dr. Hodgson, I dimly remember opening a letter from you addressed to Dr. Hodgson, some time ago, which I thought might contain something I could attend to, Dr. Hodgson being busy, and not often at the office. Since his return from England I have, in fact, opened most letters, but I usually put aside yours, Dr. Newbold's, and those from any one whom I know to be a personal friend.

This special letter has, however, made so little impression on me that it is quite likely I did not read it, but simply glanced at it hurriedly, and put it aside as something that I could not answer or help in. What my "subliminal" may have caught from that hasty glance, I cannot now, of course,

account for. Soon after the return of Dr. Hodgson I remember your sending one or more letters addressed to him containing references to cases such as Mrs. D., about which he did not know, and this probably accounted for my opening that letter. Also when he first returned, I opened more letters than I do now because he was away from Boston for the first two months, and this special letter I simply left in his desk (or else forwarded it to Bar Harbour, I do not know which) and he has made no remark about it until now, when I showed him your letter of the 8th inst.

Another unconscious factor leading to the guess may have been that when you wrote me during the summer to engage sittings "for a friend," I thought it not unlikely that the "friend" was yourself; but I did not mention this to any one and thought no more of it.

I mentioned to no one outside the office my "guess" of "The Four Days Friend," but on the day of your arrival, and just before you came in with Dr. Hodgson, I remarked to Miss S —, our stenographer, "I guess 'The Four Days Friend' to be Professor Hyslop." Less than an hour after this you entered, and you will remember that, before guessing you to be Professor Hyslop, I asked whether you were "The Four Days Friend," and was told "yes." "Then," I said, "it is Professor Hyslop."

As I knew Miss S. would copy the sittings and would be sure to overhear something, and would know that you were in Boston, I thought it would do no harm to mention my guess to her. She also remembers my once remarking to Miss [Printer's mistake for Dr.] Hodgson, "I should think Professor Hyslop would want sittings," and Dr. Hodgson was absolutely indifferent about it. He has, in fact, given no hint.

Since your *Forum* and *Independent* articles, it seemed in the natural order of things that you should want some sittings.

All this may not be very clear, but it is absolutely all I can think of to the minutest detail, and it is needless to say that I have used *guess* in the purely English sense of the word.—Yours sincerely,

LUCY EDMUNDS.

(Note 2.)

New York, January 15th, 1899.

It is important to mention for the benefit of the reader that the introductory remarks and notes about the incidents at the close of the sittings when Mrs. Piper was coming out of the trance were written immediately after the sittings while they were perfectly clear to memory. Indeed in most cases full notes were taken at the time, and had only to be supplemented by additional incidents from memory. I postponed absolutely nothing but the interpretation of the messages any longer than was possible, so that no intervening duties and thoughts occurred to disturb the accuracy of the account as it stands. Some of the notes in regard to the truth or falsity of the facts were written after my return to New York, but I was exceedingly careful not to wait until so late a time to write anything that involved a memory, for more than five or six hours, of incidents at the sittings. The record shows a complete account of everything said or written at the sitting except my observations of incidents in regard to the

trance, which were written down from copious notes and memory immediately after returning to Boston, including as I have said, what Mrs. Piper said as she came out of the trance. This account will therefore be found accurate and full, and without any defects that might otherwise mar the impression to be made by the record. Nothing is omitted which the critic might desire to know.—J. H. H.

(Note 3.)

New York, January 15th, 1899.

Yesterday I took the manuscript copies of my sittings to one of the aunts who were mentioned in the sittings by my father. Her prejudices are all against this sort of work, and she has always warned me away from spiritualism, so that I did not expect to receive any favourable attention. I was surprised when I had read the accounts over to her to find that they impressed her so strongly that she admitted at once and without indication of my own attitude toward them the force of the claim for their spiritistic character. She remarked, however, in a somewhat reluctant way, too, that she did not wish to commit herself in writing to that view, though she was apparently willing to hold it personally. The thought was that I was desiring to have this conclusion supported by her opinion of the incidents. But I explained that I wished only to have her impressions as to the pertinence of the facts to such a supposition and her corroboration of the personal and characteristic features of the communicator purporting to be my father. These were accorded with frankness, and some light was thrown by her upon some incidents of which I knew nothing and some which, if I ever knew them, were wholly forgotten. But her recognition of the *vraisemblance* to my father was distinct and emphatic, much more so than I had expected, considering the strong prejudices which she had and has always had against spiritualism. I expected a perfectly deaf ear to the whole subject, and such an attitude of contempt as would somewhat throw discredit upon my judgment on this point, and so was prepared for a setback. I was therefore agreeably disappointed in this result. As an indication of the real impression upon her mind, I may narrate the following interesting incident in which her conviction was unconsciously betrayed with some force. After my remark that I did not expect her to commit herself to the spiritistic view, I said that there was a loophole for getting out of it, and mentioned the telepathic hypothesis, which I explained, and of which she had known something from past conversations when I had rejected the spiritistic theory on the ground of telepathy. For a moment she understood that I was advancing that theory here to explain the spiritistic view away, and she showed some mental resistance to this procedure. But when I remarked that I did not accept the ability of the telepathic theory to explain away the spiritistic theory, except on the assumption of such gigantic suppositions that it would strain any credulity to believe, she showed a decided welcome to my position, and expressed voluntarily her preference for the idea of communication with departed spirits. I was amazed at the readiness to accept such a position after the smiles

and half sneers of the past when I had tolerated that theory as a possible alternative to telepathy, and more especially after the repeated warnings given me in regard to spiritualism.

From her I received also some corroboration of important incidents and, in addition to this, facts which indicate that significance attaches to certain statements in the sittings which I had thought were a part of the automatism that awakens suspicion of the whole thing. I shall explain this matter on a separate sheet.—J. H. H.

May 24th, 1899.

P.S.—In the sitting of December 26th there is a curious fact upon which I did not comment when I wrote the above, but I had my attention called to it yesterday when reading my report over. The phrase is "Give my love and tell (?) sister Annie tells her . . . Anna not Anna but Annie. I am your sister." Now I learned from my Aunt Nannie in Philadelphia when I read the account to her that my sister was christened Anna, not Annie, and that my mother always insisted on calling her Anna, and corrected it when pronounced Annie by any one. This fact was spontaneously mentioned to me by my aunt. I have no conscious recollection either of my mother's interest in this matter or whether we were in the habit of calling her Anna rather than Annie.—J. H. H.

(Note 4.)

New York, January 15th, 1899.

There are four different phrases in the record which struck my aunt on reading it as quite characteristic of my father. Many other statements were recognised as characteristic of him in sentiment, but these four phrases were identified as such and without reference to sentiment. The first of these is the phrase, "Well, I was not so far wrong after all," which occurred in the second sitting while referring to my conversation with my father on the subject of psychical research. The next instance is the phrase "own ideas" used in the second sitting in reference to the same fact. This instance has less significance than the former, because it is less individual, though it represents the choice of expression which my father would make when others might take "opinions" in preference. The third illustration is the biblical quotation, "What is their loss is our gain," in the second sitting. Even the plural pronoun is pertinent here. My aunt confirms my impression that the phrase was characteristic of father. This might be true of many others at the same time, but it was so characteristic of him and his intimate family relations in just such connections as are indicated here that the phrase is striking. The same can be said of the phrase "Seek and you shall find" in the third sitting, just after promising to do all he could to satisfy my object in these sittings and just as the sitting was coming to a close. This makes a fifth, and I might add a sixth, "Tell them to believe and trust in God always" near the close of the fourth sitting when asking me to be remembered apparently to his sisters, but probably to the sister named, Eliza, and my stepmother. This instance my aunt recognised as extraordinarily characteristic, both for its pertinence and for its

resemblance to father's habit in circumstances such as are indicated here. Both aunts had recently lost their husbands, and though only one of them is distinctly alluded to, and this not the husband of the one who recognises the characteristic nature of the phrase, the expression and the situation were just what father would appropriate in this manner, and my aunt attests that this was father's mode of speech or writing in such situations. I remember the same myself as frequent enough, but after my scepticism it was not so often that it was used to me.

But the instance of most interest is the one which I intended to regard as the fourth, and of which I knew nothing as characteristic of father until my aunt indicated the fact. It is the phrase, "And the least said the sooner mended," in the fourth sitting when referring to affairs connected with my brother. The history of the expression is as follows. My aunt says that the phrase was a constant one with her father, and that he taught it to his wife, who did not use it at first, and that it became a family expression to mean that certain things had not better be talked about too freely, because they might give trouble, especially in matters that were in danger of becoming gossip. I myself never used the phrase, and it struck me as so odd here that I did not see its meaning at all in this connection, and hence did not catch its pertinence until its characteristic nature was remarked by my aunt. In this light and with her statement regarding the use of the expression in their family I see a remarkable pertinence in its use here when referring to the friction with my brother. It also throws light upon the expression a little later (p. 337) which Dr. Hodgson thought a mistake, namely, "for him," which, if it meant Emperor, ought to have been spelled with capitals as is usual. But evidently it refers to my brother. But, aside from this reference and pertinent allusion, the most important thing under consideration at present is the characteristic nature of the expression and its history beyond my knowledge at the time. I cannot recall ever hearing father use it. It is possible that I have heard its use by him, but I am certain that I have not heard it frequently enough to think it characteristic of him. This judgment is borne out by the unintelligible nature of the expression until explained to me by my aunt.—J. H. H.

(Note 5.)

New York, *January 15th, 1899.*

There are some incidents in the sittings that have taken on a meaning which they could not have at the time owing to my ignorance of the facts necessary to understand them. These facts I found out from my aunt when I showed her the record.

In the first sitting the first name announced was Margaret, which, as I said at the time, I thought was the name of my oldest sister. This I find is correct. I do not recollect her, as she died when I was only two years old. In connection with her name was mentioned "Lillie," which had no meaning for me. This could possibly be taken as an attempt to give the name of my twin sister, whom I do not remember and who died when two years old. [I have since ascertained that this twin sister was only four months

old when she died]. Her name was Sarah Luella. I could not and should not put this possible interpretation upon it were it not for what my sister Annie said in the third sitting when she came in to ask about the lock of hair and pictures. The record (p. 331) shows the question "Do you know who Sarah is . . . Annie." This "Sarah" had no meaning for me whatever, and I thought it a part of the nonsense which is so common with mediumistic phenomena, until the correctness of the name was indicated by my aunt, who said that this was the name of my twin sister. The whole passage becomes perfectly intelligible with the supposition that this sister is meant. I now wonder whether this same person was meant in the first sitting when my brother Charles referred to "one who is nearer to you than all the rest of us," and which had no meaning to me then.

In this same passage previously my brother Charles had said that he had suffered from typhoid fever. This, as I recorded at the time, was false, and I thought that the same verdict should be passed upon the statement of the trouble with the throat, and that it had taken him "over here." But I find from my aunt that he suffered with a very putrid sore throat while he had the scarlet fever, and that he was sick only four days. There is no one living that could say anything more about the expression, "because the membrane formed in my throat." The phrase is pertinent, however, and probably states a fact, as the scarlet fever was of a very malignant form. There is no one also to attest the relevancy of the reference to the trouble with his head. This might be true of any sickness. I have a very faint recollection of the sore throat, and none at all of the length of his sickness.

In the first sitting also there was an apparent reference to the name "Corrie" which I could not read, and when it occurred to me that "Mary" was meant I asked if this was the name. The answer was in the affirmative and added that she was my father's sister. I knew nothing about this and supposed that it had no pertinence. But I have found from my aunt that her oldest sister's name was Mary. I had never heard her called this, and, in fact, she died before I knew her. I had always heard her called Amanda. Her name was Mary Amanda. The reference to "Elizabeth" also had no meaning to me at the sitting, but I learned from my aunt that my mother had a sister by the name of Eliza, who died when my mother was very young. There is only the specification of the relationship here to indicate the possibility in the name. Perhaps, also, the "Corrie" mentioned was an attempt to give the name of my aunt Cornelia, also my mother's sister still living, and whom we always called aunt Cora. See sitting of June 1st (p. 452), where a closer approach to the name is made.
—J. H. H.

(Note 6.)

New York, March 26th, 1899.

I sent the manuscript of my first four sittings to be read by my stepmother and brother with the request that they make any comments they desired, confirmatory or derogatory of the facts presented in the record. My first letter was misunderstood by my stepmother, she thinking that I had asked for an expression of opinion as to the genuineness of the case

and its spiritistic character, though I was careful to say that I wanted nothing but a statement as to what was and what was not fact in the record. In her reply, after answering some questions that pertain to later sittings, she wrote as follows: "As to making any comments, it is too mystical. There are some striking things, but I cannot help thinking that there is fraud in it. I do not want to comment on anything that I know so little about. I will give you all the information I can, but many things in the sittings seem like guess-work. One thing I know is this: Your father's affection for you always remained firm. One of his marks of affection was to reprove when he thought one went astray. As he grew older and more helpless he seemed to rely on you more than on any of the other children. I hope your mind will become clear on the important subject you are investigating."

I wrote in reply to this that I did not wish any expression of opinion on the merits of the work, and that I regarded a severely sceptical attitude of mind the proper one to take regarding the explanation of the case, but that my object was mainly to have the facts confirmed or denied. I further advised her not at any time to form opinions as to explanations, but to critically scrutinise the alleged facts, and say what she could for or against them simply as facts. The following is the response to this.

Bloomington, Ind., *March 23rd, 1899.*

MY DEAR JAMES,—In going over the report again I can corroborate most of your comments. On page 313 of December 24th, the recognition of your presence seems quite natural, and on page 318 "I was not so far wrong after all" is his language. December 26th, on page 325, there is language that sounds like his, "That, if I remember rightly, was the one great question which we talked over."

Another expression on page 333, "Only trust in all that is good, James, and be contented, etc." But most of the language has very little meaning that I can see. Frank has made comments more fully—so I will just corroborate yours.—Affectionately,

MOTHER.

My brother, whose education qualified him to speak with more intelligence of the case, especially as he had read two of the reports on it, wrote me at first, in reply to my request, that he would wait for a better understanding of what was wanted, and this was explained as indicated above. But he commented in advance as follows. It must be remembered that I did not explain to him anything about the sittings or the persons supposed to be represented in them. Hence the pertinence of his interpretation of the incidents will be evident at a glance. "In the sitting of December 24th, pages 315 and 318," he says, "is it supposed to be father or uncle James Carruthers who is talking? I do not see that I can make any comments of any material value. You remember I left Delphi in the August of the year previous to father's death. So I did not see him for almost a year, so that the larger part of the things spoken of I know nothing about. Some of the expressions, as for example in the sitting of December 24th, page 315, 'I would not return for . . . music, flowers, drives, etc.,' do not seem like what father would use. I need not point out others, for you will recognise

them as readily as I. I have read the reports all carefully and do not find any statements that I know to be false other than those you have marked as such."

In reply to my explanation that I wanted only such confirmation or denial of facts as suggested themselves to him, my brother answers as follows :—

Bloomington, Ind., *March 22nd*, 1899.

MY DEAR BROTHER JAMES,—In regard to the first sitting I do not think it worth while to make any particular comments. In the other sittings many of the expressions used are very like those that father used in his conversation and correspondence, while others seem very unnatural for him to use.

In the sitting of December 24th, the narrative on pages 313 and 314 is all very natural to father in tone and expression. When starting to meet some one at the door or yard gate he would often say: "Give me my hat" (page 313). From page 314 to 316 it is more like uncle James Carruthers than father.

I do not remember father to have used the expression "the girls" in speaking of his sisters, as on page 316. "What is their loss?" etc. was a common expression of father's. Page 317 is very natural, especially the expression "stick to this"; and page 318, "My toy, I remember," etc.; page 318, "you had your own ideas"; page 320, "Everything in life," etc.

I have known father more than once to express to me and others his pride in your attainments, and at the same time deprecate your scepticism. Page 321, "I know well," etc., is very natural.

In the sitting for December 26th there is nothing that calls for comment other than what you have made until we reach page 332. Here the expression "Now out with it, James" is very natural to father. But the following, "Do you hear her sing?"¹ seems strange for him. On page 323, "It does not pay" was his common expression; page 333, "will one day be reunited with us and we shall meet face to face" is father's form of expression for this thought. Page 334, "Seek and ye shall find" was a frequent expression of his.

In the sitting of December 27th, page 335, "There shall be no veil, etc.," is natural to father. Page 336—Father had a little brown handled knife, but I did not know him to carry it in his vest or coat pocket. He had a cap which he wore for a nightcap perhaps two or three times.

Page 336, "James, let me see some of my trifles. They can do no harm," etc., does not seem natural.¹ The narrative on pages 337, 338, 339, 340 is very natural in tone and expression. Page 341—Father did not commonly refer to any part of the house as "the library." Page 341 seems foreign in language and thought. Page 342 is very lifelike, especially the advice to "trust in God always." Page 343, "If you will do—all will be as I would have it," is his form of expression.

The expressions to which I have directed attention, with the exceptions noted, are very like what father commonly used in his conversation and correspondence.—Yours as ever,

FRANK E. HYSLOP.

¹The statement about the singing and the request for trifles my brother does not understand, and it is not surprising that they seem unnatural. The second is a request for some article to be given the medium, and the first is one of the automatisms which are quite frequent in these sittings.—J. H. H.

(Note 7.)

New York, April 17th, 1899.

The following notes represent the results of my later inquiries as well as some of the earlier ones which have not yet been worked up. I made my inquiries at once after the sittings and preserved the replies which are now summarised and recorded. The inquiries were made without telling the parties what my experiments had been, though they were surmised from the nature of my questions. But I carefully concealed the nature of the incidents which I wished to have corroborated or denied. This was especially the case with the incident about the brown handled knife which was corroborated in regard to its separate details and without the slightest hint regarding the facts stated in the sittings.

The first incident relates to the communication that evidently purports to come from an uncle of mine that had died after I made arrangements for my sittings. While making the notes to the second sitting and whilst in Boston I wrote to my aunt the following letter apropos of the reference to my uncle by Mrs. Piper. This was before the third sitting was held.

Boston, Mass., December 24th, 1898.

MY DEAR AUNT,—Did you see Uncle James C— recently in your sleep? Or did you dream of seeing him? Write to me at once in New York.—Yours as ever,

J. H. HYSLOP.

The following was the reply I received, omitting those parts which are advice to me to abstain from the investigation which my aunt had surmised I was engaged in.

Xenia, Ohio, December 27th, 1898.

MY DEAR NEPHEW,—Yours received this morning and in answer will say, I have neither seen him in my sleep nor dreamed of seeing him, but really I cannot see the difference. It is said those whom you think the most about you do not dream of them. I have never but once dreamed of your father and I am sure I have thought of him often, and your uncle James is seldom from my mind in my waking hours.

I send you this, not knowing why you need it. I have no faith in spiritualism, but the guidance of the Holy Spirit is what I seek . . . ,—
Lovingly,

E. A. C—

This letter I received on the morning of the 28th, and on the same morning I wrote the following second inquiry:—

519, West 149th Street, New York, December 28th, 1898.

MY DEAR AUNT.—Please to answer the following question at once: Did Uncle C— and you have walks, drives and book-reading together, which you used to enjoy with each other, and did he enjoy music greatly?—Yours as ever,

J. H. HYSLOP.

The following was the answer to this inquiry, but not dated. It is post-marked, however, "Xenia, Ohio, Dec. 30, 3.30 p.m., '98," and received by me on the 31st.

MY DEAR JAMES.—We did have many walks, drives and book-reading together, particularly the Sabbath-school lessons. He enjoyed music, but could not sing. He always sang at worship and when I would be up he would be down. Yet he enjoyed music from others.—Lovingly,

E. A. C—

This letter in the main corroborates the incidents for which inquiry was made, though they may not have the weight desirable in the case. Knowing my uncle and his life as I did I myself must attach some value to them. The incidents mentioned are not so common in family life in the region where he lived, however common they might be for mankind at large, and appear to be specific matters of taste and habit in the actual life of the alleged communicator. I was absolutely ignorant of them. I knew that my uncle had a piano in his house and that his daughter played on it, but I would never have supposed that he was fond of music, as I never heard the instrument played in his home more than a few times. I might have surmised that he liked music, but I would not have guessed that he was in the habit of taking drives, walks, and engaging in book-reading with my aunt as a special pleasure. His life was a comparatively busy one in a small country town.

When I began to write these notes on April 9th I soon observed that the passage that I had interpreted as from my uncle might be partly a message from my father. I was struck first with the statement of my aunt that she had seen father in her dream, and this without any inquiry from me to know whether she had or not. I re-read the whole passage carefully which had always puzzled me on account of its apparent origin from my father in so far as the continuity of the messages was concerned, but also seemed to represent at a sudden stage of the communications the incidents in the life of my uncle which did not characterise my father's habits. That is to say, I could never assure myself whether the narrative applied wholly to my uncle or partly to my father and partly to my uncle. The first person is used in both cases, so that it would seem we should make it all hang together. The interesting fact creating a suspicion of this procedure is that my father also died in the same house, so that some of the language that would otherwise be undoubtedly interpreted as referring only to my uncle could also apply to my father. For example, the reference to leaving my aunt. But there is no special reason for this statement on the part of my father, except an automatism, as it would be so natural for my uncle to say this in reference to his wife. The two things in favour of its being my father are (1) the fact that the alleged communicator was my father up to the mention of my aunt's name (Eliza), and there was no hint of a change of communicator, (2) the traces of automatism just after the mention of my aunt's having seen the communicator in sleep. A change of communicator often takes place at such times, and there was here time to have another take the place of the person thus swooning. The only external fact favoring this interpretation is that my aunt actually saw my father in a dream as here stated of the communicator, which I found was not true of my uncle. But aside from this actual coincidence and the circumstance of swooning, as we describe it, the whole narrative would also apply to my uncle as well. Nor would the

manner of addressing me by name alter this interpretation, as my uncle called me always by the same name as did my father here. But I wrote nevertheless to my aunt after this second examination of the passages and asked her to describe the dream in its details as she could remember it. I obtained the following reply to my inquiries.

Xenia, Ohio, *April 13th, 1899.*

MY DEAR JAMES,—Yours received and at your request I proceed to answer according to the best of my ability and memory.

I saw your father in some strange place at one of the old picnics which you know he so much enjoyed. I think now it must have been in Delphi, as the place was not familiar to me. He was sitting on a log with a group of others with whom I was not particularly acquainted. I only saw him, did not speak. He had on his hat and seemed to be enjoying himself, as he was the centre of a group. I have not yet dreamed of Mr. C—, and I do not want to do so, as the awakening would be dreadful.—Lovingly,

AUNT ELIZA.

I had inquired to know when the dream had occurred and have had to repeat this inquiry. The answer will be found below. But the coincidence cannot in any case be given any amount of evidential value. The utmost that can be assigned it is the circumstance that the ambiguity of the passage is such that we cannot say the incident is incorrect. It would be incorrect if we assume that the communicator, beginning with the mention of my aunt's name, is my uncle. This view obliges us to suppose that there was an unannounced introduction of my uncle while my father was supposed to be communicating, and this, of course, is quite as possible as any other alternative. On the other hand, as my father died in my uncle's home, and some of the statements alluding to his having left my aunt are applicable to him, assuming that they are rather automatisms, we could assume the truth of the dream incident, and introduce my uncle immediately after it, with the remainder of the narrative belonging to him. But I think it is impossible to clear up the passage in every respect. The simplest way to give it unity is to suppose that the statement regarding what my aunt saw in her sleep is either a mediumistic guess or an automatism, and so to treat the general incidents as referring to my uncle, whatever hypothesis we adopt to explain them. The following letter, however, explains itself as indicating when the dream occurred.

Xenia, Ohio, *April 17th, 1899.*

MY DEAR JAMES,—Yours came this morning, and as you are so very prompt and so readily accede to my wishes with reference to the northern land I will also try to be prompt.

The dream about your father was after his death. I cannot state the exact time, but I think not long before your uncle's death, as I told him how life-like your father looked. I have not dreamed of him since, neither of your uncle D— nor of your uncle James.—Yours lovingly,

AUNT ELIZA C —.

Σ A Σ

The interesting feature of this last letter is the remark that my "father looked so life-like." This makes the experience resemble those cases of dreams and apparitions which are noted as clear and life-like at the time and that often turn out suggestive or coincidental. The records show that this feature often appears in the cases that are afterward discovered to be apparently significant, and therefore has its interest. We must not, however, be in haste to attach any such significance to this incident. It is simply to be remarked as a fact that comes to the surface without any questions or suggestions from me. It might well be natural to remark this characteristic in the dream from the fact that it was the only dream that my aunt had of my father after his death, and this circumstance might justify either the suspicion of an illusion in regard to its special clearness or the supposition that it was not clearer than are, perhaps, all dreams. Hence I do not wish to be taken as assuming any importance in the coincidence, but only as remarking the fact, and if any one wishes to give it importance he may do so, though any such interpretation must run the gauntlet which even much better accredited coincidences have hard work in surviving. It raises a question, however, which may be answered in further sittings, and it is possible even to clear up the doubts involved in the equivocal nature of the whole incident.

(Note 8.)

New York, April 19th, 1899.

The following letter was in response to a request to make the date and incidents more specific than the undated and dictated letter already recorded has done (p. 329). It is, moreover, signed by the physician himself, and makes the facts more certain and definite than before. It refers to my conjecture at the time of the sittings that the consciousness of congestion was a fact in the knowledge of my father at the time of his death.

Xenia, Ohio, January 4th, 1899.

J. H. HYSLOP,—DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 2nd to hand, and noted. In answer to your question, "Whether you remember saying to father or in his presence that congestion occurred when he had his spasms and suffered from difficulty in breathing," I would say that I did state to your father that there was congestion (passive) of the lungs when he had his spasms and suffered from difficulty in breathing. I also stated the same fact to friends in his presence.—Yours sincerely,

J. P. DICE, M.D.

It will be apparent from this statement that the fact of congestion was in father's knowledge before his death, so that it has a special interest in not being limited to the telepathic hypothesis for explanation.

(Note 9.)

New York, April 9th, 1899.

Concerning the reference in the *third* sitting to the promise to come to me if possible after death, I find on my investigation into the letter referred to that my impression about its contents was correct. The

letter was dictated to my stepmother and written by her. It contains absolutely no promise to communicate with me, but only thanks for my solicitude for his welfare in this evident close of his life. But I wrote to my stepmother, who knew the contents of my letter to him, and asked her the following question: "Did father ever say anything about trying to reach me or make his continued existence known to me after death?" Her answer is: "No, your father never said anything about trying to reach you, or making his continued existence known to you after death." Whatever, therefore, may be supposed to have been in his mind or intention, no promise was actually made, certainly not to me, and there is no recollection of anything like it by my stepmother. She adds: "I feel positive that he never thought of such a thing."

[I repeated my inquiry personally of my stepmother, taking down her statements at the time, to know if father ever mentioned to her his intention to try to return to me if possible after death, and she replied as before that he did not. I then asked her if she remembered my request of him on his death-bed, and she replied that she did very well, and then volunteered the further statement that she had asked him what I meant by it. He answered in the sentence: "Oh, I don't know." This, my stepmother continued, was "the expression he always used when he did not want to tell what was on his mind." This fact renders possible the intention which is definitely indicated in the promise to return. March 24th, 1900.—J. H. H.]

(Note 10.)

In regard to the physical symptoms accompanying his death, I can only add that every one of them is correct except that of the allusion to his eyes and the trouble they gave him. This is not known to be false, and all that my stepmother remembers about the incident is that he frequently complained of his eyes as his health failed. But this has no pertinence to the question here at issue in this passage. The allusion to the trouble with his head is much more relevant, but no one knows whether it was specially troublesome during this last half-hour. There were several periods during the latter stage of the illness in which he complained of pain in his head, but as the voice had wholly disappeared during the last twenty-four hours of his life, and as I recall no physical indications of suffering in the head, I cannot corroborate any supposition interpreting the reference here to such a pain connected with the throes of death. He showed a patience in all his suffering that often made it difficult to know just what pains he had unless they appeared to be connected with the spasms of the larynx. For instance, it was long after one of the spells in which there was not the slightest reason to expect any revival that he remarked that there was a pain in his heel, and that he had felt it ever since this attack. It must have been twenty-four hours afterward, and on examination blisters had been formed on the heel. There is much reason to suppose from the complication of difficulties that he did suffer from pain in the head. He had had a stroke of apoplexy some twenty years before, and we found that this critical spell was accompanied with some symptoms of neural disturbance that might give rise to trouble in the head.

(Note 11.)

In regard to the incident of my sister's lock of hair, I must say that I had some difficulty in assuring myself of the correctness of the fact beyond my own memory. But after correspondence with my sister, stepmother, and an aunt in the State of Washington, who was the best witness to the fact, I ascertained its truth. But as it can hardly be evidential in any case, owing to the frequency of such incidents in the lives of friends, I need not dwell upon it farther than to say that it is contained in a wreath made of the hair of all the members of the family, living and dead, at the time of my mother's death in 1869. The most striking part of this communication from my sister was that which alludes to the photograph, and the relation of her death to that of my brother Charles. The phrase "very young" is specially interesting, as it implies a distance in time which corresponds to that of her death. If she had lived she would now have been thirty-nine or forty. We have the pictures of her and Charles yet with their obituary notices, but I have not seen them for some years. The allusion to her demise "just after Charles" is quite pertinent. She died just twelve days after him with the same disease. I remember well that on the evening after the burial of my brother, as we sat down to the table, my sister, though without the slightest symptom as yet of illness, and standing between the door and the table, said to my mother: "Mamma, I am going to get sick and die, too." This remark always struck my mother as very strange, and as my sister took sick the next day the statement and fulfillment of her prophecy have always remained in my memory. Hence this allusion to the relation of her death to that of Charles at once appealed to me with much force.

I deliberately referred to my aunt here by name, because I thought my sister would not remember her at all, and the claim that she does may be interpreted as an error, though the cautious "I think" may atone for this. Her trying to "reach us years ago" is not verifiable.

There is also an interesting incident in the spelling of her name. I do not remember whether we called her Anna or Annie. My aunt tells me that her name was Anna Laura. I accepted the name Annie at the sittings as correct, and saw only one of the usual slips in the passage where Anna was given and then corrected to Annie. My aunt wanted her called Annie Laurie, but my mother would never listen to this and insisted on Anna Laura. The confusion of the two at this point is not without its interest in this connection.

(Note 12.)

The attempt to name the medicine here for which I had asked on the previous day has some interest in connection with some later inquiries made for another purpose. I wrote to the druggist in the town out West for a list of the medicines father had bought for himself, and on the 27th of September, 1895, he seems to have bought some quinine. Of course I did not buy it for him, and the consideration of the fact cannot have any significance, except to note that there is a spontaneous dissent from it when Dr. Hodgson asked if that was the medicine meant by the word "quien" in the

automatic writing. This shows that the dissent coincides with the incorrectness of the supposition that I bought it for him. There is, however, in the case an instance of the occasional automatism that come at these sittings and that are correct so far as they represent incidents in the life of the alleged communicator, but incorrect in their apperceptive bearings, though the correction of this case partly removes objection to it.

(Note 13.)

The reference to a "diary" also can have a meaning if we take my step-mother's statement as indicative of its correctness, and this confirms my conjecture at the time of the sitting. I asked her if father ever kept a diary, and her reply is as follows: "Your father never kept a diary since our marriage. His custom has always been to keep a day-book, and note down his receipts and expenditures. You have his two day-books in your possession. I have an old one here that dates back of the one you have. He often cut slips out of paper and kept them, but you got them in his old pocket-book along with his other papers." On examination of the day-book it has many of the features of a diary, certain statements, besides accounts, being made in them for recollection.

(Note 14.)

The allusion to the brown-handled knife is an incident of considerable importance. I knew that I had no knowledge of such a thing, and the use to which it was here said that it was put. I therefore wrote to my step-mother, brother and sister, to ask about it. I was careful not to tell them what I had been told at the sittings, as I wished to avoid any suggestions of the answer. I did not tell them anything whatever regarding the statements made to me at the sittings. It was later that I hinted at the nature of my work and object in asking these questions, though it was surmised that I was engaged at these experiments. But without explaining what I had actually done I wrote, addressing the letter to my brother, and asked the following question: "Did father own 'a little brown-handled knife in Delphi that he kept in his vest pocket and then in his coat pocket?' I want you, Henrietta, and mother [stepmother] at once to answer this question. Please to answer it if you can without questioning each other. Be sure to follow instructions, and write me at once." The replies which I received were as follows. My step-mother writes: "Now in reply to the inquiries in Frank's letter I will say your father had a medium sized brown-handled knife which he always carried in his *pants* pocket. I never knew him to carry it in vest or coat pocket. I have his knife now." My sister writes: "Papa had a brown-handled knife at Delphi, but it was not a small one, and I never remember seeing him carry it any place except in his pants pocket." My brother writing in regard to the same fact says: "Father had a pocket-knife about four inches long with a dark cherry handle, and another a little longer with a rough brown bone handle. But he never carried a knife in his vest or coat pocket."

I then wrote to my stepmother to have the knife sent me and it came. It is the brown-handled one with the cherry handle, and is a smaller knife than is usually owned by persons living as my father did. After he left the farm there was no need for a larger knife. The brown bone-handled knife which my brother mentions is not in existence now, or it cannot be found. But I asked the farther question without suggesting why I wanted it answered, and without telling the facts: "What did father use that little knife with the brown bone handle for?" I asked this question from memory, thinking that it was the bone-handled one that was in mind and not the smaller. My stepmother answers: "As to the use of the pocket-knife, I cannot think of any special purpose he used it for, except cutting his finger nails, and he liked to have me trim his toe nails often, as he could not get down to it. He liked to watch little tinkering jobs about the house that needed to be done." My brother answers: "Mother, I think, wrote you that father used the little brown-handled knife for paring his nails, or for general tinkering about the house."

It will be seen from this that the corroboration of the fact is practically complete, save the statement about the place of carrying the knife. This discrepancy might be easily explained, but, as we are dealing with an evidential problem, the difficulty, if it be one, must not be slurred over. Whatever this may be regarded, the coincidence has some value owing to the precautions taken to prevent the answer from being suggested by my question.

(Note 15.)

Since writing the above note I have inquired more carefully in regard to the cap, because it has been alluded to twice since this sitting, and when I was not present, and what truth there is in it can be ascertained in later notes. [Cf. Note, p. 406.]

(Note 16.)

This incident about the strychnine has an interest which I did not surmise at the sitting. I wrote to my stepmother, brother, and sister, asking "whether father had any medicine given him by the doctor about the time I sent him the Hyomei, and what it was? Was it strychnine?" My stepmother's answer was: "Your father took medicine from Dr. Smith, of Delphi, in the fall and early winter of '95, which I think probably had strychnine in it, almost sure that it had. He only gave the prescription, and I judged from that." My sister writes: "He was taking Peruna at the time you sent him the Hyomei. I was at home then, and I remember of hearing about him taking strychnine at some time or other. I don't know who prescribed it, or just at what time he was taking it." My brother writes: "There was probably strychnine in the medicine that father took when treating with Dr. Smith, of Delphi, as a nerve tonic is usually prescribed in such cases. But he stopped treating with Dr. Smith at least eight or nine months before you sent him the inhaler."

It thus appears that he was taking strychnine without my knowledge, and this is made especially certain from the fact that it occurred after I had seen him in the winter of 1895, for the last time before his fatal illness.

The mention of it seems to have been connected with my question about the medicine two days before, which was partly answered in connection with the mention of the Hyomei, as the letter "S" and the word "Serris," just after the incident of the Hyomei, seem to be the anticipation of the strychnine, which was interrupted by other incidents. This is a conjecture, however. Assuming that it was intended to answer my inquiry the answer must be regarded as false, because I did not get him any strychnine. But in spite of this it turns out that he did use it, and if my question was understood to inquire for the medicines he took as well as that I got for him it is a very pertinent answer. At any rate it represents an incident outside my knowledge, and not acquired by telepathy from me, supposing, of course, that we give it any significance at all. [Cf. Note 23, p. 365.]

(Note 17.)

After the sitting and my note on the Swedenborg incident was written, I sent to my stepmother to make inquiry in regard to its truth, asking the following questions: (1) "Did father ever talk with you about Swedenborg?" and (2) "Do you remember the long conversation we all had about psychical research at the time I was in Indianapolis giving my lecture on the subject, and do you remember whether father said anything about Swedenborg in that talk?" My stepmother's answer is: "He did talk with me about Swedenborg after you had been there, merely answering my questions about Swedenborg's belief. I remember the conversation on the Sabbath day you were at our house in Delphi about psychical research, and your father was the first to speak of Swedenborg. In answer to something you said he replied: 'that was Swedenborg's belief.' I cannot remember much of the conversation." The incident turns out thus to be true and pertinent, though still amenable to the telepathic hypothesis from my subliminal memory which was not clear enough at the sitting to be anything more than a surmise on my part when mentioned. On the other hand, the unity and interest of the fact in the light of what would be true in case it was my father actually communicating is much greater on the spiritistic theory than the telepathic. It is precisely what he would think of on such an occasion, while I have never given Swedenborg anything more than the most casual connection with the subject, though aware of his belief and experiences from tradition.

LATEST NOTES.

This Section contains additional notes representing the results of my latest inquiries.

(Note 18.)

New York, *September 20th, 1899.*

In studying this sitting for a careful review of the facts, I discover internal evidence that I appear to be communicating at this point with my father. I had supposed from the name Charles that I was dealing with my brother, but further and careful examination shows that this is not the best

interpretation of the passage. The key to this newer view is the statement : "I have seen Annie and mother and Charles and Henry." This could hardly be natural for my brother Charles. But this discrepancy could be passed by were it not for the following incidents that completely fit father, and do not fit my brother at all. (1) The third person and relation of time expressed in the statement : "Yes, *he did*. Some time before. And when I came he helped me." (Cf. p. 341.) (2) Also the allusion to his passing out "suddenly at last." (3) The trouble with the head and heart. (Cf. p. 327-8, Sitting for December 26th, 1898.) (4) The expression, "Give me my hat," which was one used by my father, as remarked by my brother, whenever he wanted to go to the door or out on an errand. (5) The mistake of referring the ownership of the accordion to my brother George. (Cf. incident of the guitar, p. 461.) (6) The phrase later indicating the right fact if it was father and only a possible one if it was my brother, namely, the statement : "I used to play on this."

Of course, I had no clue at the time for this interpretation, and only later events suggest it. The name of my brother and the intimation of G. P., that it was "Charles" calling, the mention of the other calling for me not being accompanied with the name or relationship, concealed this possible view from me, so that it was most natural for me at the time to suppose that I should adjust my questions and interpretation to the supposition that it was my brother. But close study of the passage shows that the presence of the lady communicator made the confusion too great to get my correct bearings, while her dismissal brings my brother in her place later when the communications become clear and intelligible. But in this confusion that precedes the discovery of my identity the incidents fit my father, and not my brother, while the name of my brother is correct. In favour of my interpretation is the fact that there is no clear and unmistakable claim that the incidents belong to my brother, natural as it would be to suppose this connection from their relation to his name in the communications.—J. H. H.

(Note 19.)

New York, *September 24th*, 1899.

In studying the passage in the second sitting, that of December 24th, 1898, in which the name "Robertson" occurs, I chanced to think that there might be a meaning in this reference which had entirely escaped me. On examination, therefore, I find that it has a possible significance of some interest. As my notes show, I had supposed that I was dealing only with my brother Charles, and that the name "Robertson" was an attempt to mention my brother Robert. The narrative of the record indicates this very clearly. It also indicates my attempt to trick the communicator into the belief that this brother was not living, but, as the record shows, I failed. It is also evident that I did not at all understand the communications, and possibly the discovery of this led to the disappearance of the real communicator in favor of the continued conversation with my brother. However this may be, it now seems probable to me that this is the first appearance of my "uncle Charles," as he is connected with the mention of the name "Robertson" in

the second sitting (p. 317). What it appears to be is a question to know where "Robert's son" was. My uncle usually called my father "Robert," and if we suppose the same state of mind and desire to speak directly to me, as in this second sitting, we have evidence to suppose also that we are here dealing for the moment with my uncle. The broken syllables "Ell . . . el . . ." get a pertinent significance which I never suspected before. [Cf. p. 314.] They are probably attempts to give the name of his wife Eliza, with which both father and my uncle later succeeded. There is one difficulty in this interpretation, and this is the use of the feminine gender by my brother in introducing him. I had supposed for a moment that the reference was to my mother, but soon saw that this was false, though without reckoning father into the account the statement that she was the last to "come here" was true for the family necrology. But this same remark would apply absolutely to my uncle, who was the last of the family connections to die. Hence, supposing that my brother is here somewhat confused in details, as I notice is the case with intermediaries (Cf. pp. 332, 100-108, 146-147), we may put the other incidents down in favor of the hypothesis that I am communicating with my uncle, and what appeared confusion before becomes perfectly clear and intelligible.—J. H. H.

(Note 20.)

New York, July 10th, 1899.

In a conversation with my aunt Nannie, living in Philadelphia, just before going West on the mission connected with these investigations, I learned a fact of some interest in connection with the first sittings. I learned it without asking a question regarding the matter, but during conversation about her sister's affairs, whose husband, my "uncle Charles," had died so suddenly last fall, and who had appeared to communicate in those sittings. My aunt remarked that her sister (Aunt Eliza) had suffered so much from discouragement and loneliness. The business was left in a terrible condition by my uncle's unexpected death, and my aunt was always completely dependent upon him for the management of everything. She was moreover of a very social nature and less self-sufficient than her sister Nannie, and when my niece, who was boarding with her while going to the High School, went home at the end of each week, my aunt suffered greatly from loneliness, and complained of it to her sister. From worry with business and from this loneliness they were much afraid at one time that she would not live. There is then a coincidence between this state of mind and the remarks made by the communicator, or communicators, in the sitting of December 24th, 1898. It might be what a mediumistic brain should concoct out of any similar situation, and I do not refer to it as anything evidential, but only as an interesting coincidence, consistent with the spiritistic theory, though not sufficiently evidential of it to merit emphasis, especially as in the event of its recognition we must suppose it to have been post-mortem information. It does not bear upon personal identity in any case. But it is coincidental with the actual condition of aunt's mind in a special way.—J. H. H.

(Note 21.)

August 5th, 1899.

This reference to a fire persisted in later sittings until I took special pains to inquire further about this incident after I had actually given it up as false, or a mere automatism. But its persistence on the part of the communicator, on any theory, required that the investigation be pushed further. I then inquired of my aunt again whether she remembered any fire near the old home which gave father a fright, and put my question also without intimating that the message located it in his early life. Her spontaneous answer was: "I do not remember any fire that could give him a fright. When he was a very young man a barn in the neighbourhood was struck with lightning and burned, but I do not think it gave him a fright." The incident is then so near right that father reports rightly a fire that occurred in his early life, though there seems no reason to suppose that it gave him a fright. But the chief interest on any theory, even that of chance, is that the two references to a fire fit exactly with his experience with his own barn. Are we to suppose here the same confusion as we found in the case of the walking-sticks, and with the social incidents of two brothers? We know what a fright the fire mentioned in the sitting for May 30th caused, and that it was connected with the expectation that it was his barn, about which I know he was always anxious. I do not remember ever hearing him speak of this earlier experience, but as I know his solicitude about the barn built in my time, it is probable that I have heard him tell the story of the barn struck by lightning, so that I cannot say that such an event would not be amenable to telepathy. But the real or apparent confusion of two incidents that are known to have been a part of his experience is a most interesting fact, all the more so that it seems to have occurred more than once.—J. H. H.

(Note 22.)

New York, October 31st, 1899.

This allusion to holding his hands over his breast has a possible meaning if we assume that it is connected with an attempt to give the name of the medicine that I had asked for just above. The reference to his heart and eyes just before this is of course a continuance of the death-bed incidents. The mention of the swelling at once called my attention to the possibility that he was answering my earlier question with the catarrh in mind, and hence, when the mention of holding his hands over his breast came, I thought there was again a return to the incidents that I did not recognise at the time as intended for the death scene. But as the name of the medicine for which I had asked was closely associated in his mind with the disease I was thinking of, and as the allusion to the swelling had such pertinence in reference to his expressed wonder that it should be an accompaniment of catarrh, it is pertinent to suppose that he was describing a method by which he took that medicine, as it would be inevitably held in some such way in the intervals of inhaling the vapour. I wrote to my stepmother to know if she could remember his holding it with the two hands over his breast, and she recalls no instance of this in particular, but it is more than a probable

fact, as he did take the Hyomei to bed with him, and it would be most natural to hold it so in intervals when sitting in his rocking-chair. But there is no way to either prove the fact or to be certain that my interpretation is the true one, though I regard it as probable.—J. H. H.

(Note 23.)

Short Beach, Conn., July 25th, 1899.

I have been reading my father's letters to me during the last few years of his life, and find an incident in one of them which has some interest in this connection, and which partly confirms my statements about this strychnine, and partly serves to contradict the opinion that I have held about my knowledge of his taking strychnine, though this knowledge was purely subliminal. The note in the appendix to these sittings shows that I did not purchase this strychnine, and now I find that a letter of April 27th, 1896, mentions the fact that he was taking strychnine and arsenic at the same time that he was taking the Hyomei. I had thought all along that I knew nothing of the fact, and that the circumstance was not even in my subliminal, so completely had the fact been suppressed in my memory, as would quite naturally be the case from its being a mere incident in a letter that I had no special reason to remember. But here it turns up to be amenable to the telepathic hypothesis for any one who pleases to apply it to the case. The reference to arsenic will have an interest in another connection. But it will be equally interesting to note that no other facts in this correspondence are obtained, as perhaps should be the case if telepathy is to be the explanation. But I am less anxious to remove telepathy from the explanation than I am to show documentary evidence from the pen of my father himself of the fact that he was taking strychnine at the time he was taking the Hyomei.—J. H. H.

(Note 24.)

This response to my statement is a most pertinent one. I had intimated my reason for not asking questions, and here, after mentioning our talk on Swedenborg, there is the perfectly correct recollection that I had discussed the difficulties of any such communications. That it was unlike me not to talk freely with my father was true, and both the appreciation of my position and the recognition of the problem as I saw it in our talk, put together here in the natural synthetic action of independent intelligence is very interesting. It is not like the process of telepathy as we ordinarily conceive it.—J. H. H.

(Note 25.)

April 10th, 1901.

While working on the *résumé* of these four sittings I observed that there might be a connection between the names "Mannie," "Nani," "Mnni," and "Ani" in this general passage, and the later references which turned out to be regarding my stepmother, whose name was Maggie (Cf. Note p. 342). The internal evidence of this is the name "Mannie" and the special pertinence of certain statements with reference to my stepmother.

A further and perhaps strong piece of evidence for this interpretation of this reference is the doubt entertained about his own answer, which was, of course, called out by my denial that "Nani" had them. This I denied, of course, because I thought at the time that he had his sister Nannie in mind. As he died at the home of my aunt Eliza, and did leave his glasses there, and as there was ample reason for his supposing that I was confused in regard to his meaning, the complex situation involving an attempt to indicate both *where* he left them and *with whom* he left them was calculated both to create confusion and to cause error. From my point of view there was no error except in the mention of his sister, but assuming that it was my stepmother that he had in mind, as the previous use of the name Mannie (p. 342), and later references under the name "Nannie," without the appendage of sister or aunt, justify me in supposing, to say nothing of the present evidences, the whole message becomes perfectly intelligible, slight confusion and all.

If I could suppose that my question asking who were present at the conversation on spirit return was understood there would be clearer evidence that "Mannie" was meant for "Maggie." But it is quite apparent from the content of the reply, especially in the reference to "sister," to say nothing of Rector's direct statement, that it was not understood. The whole passage therefore seems to be a connected one. It would appear from the allusion to the spectacles that my father's mind was turned in the direction of events and persons present at the time of his death. Possibly the manner of his reference to the two aunts is corroborative of this supposition. All the facts are consistent with it if they do not prove it.

Now my stepmother was present at the conversation on spirit return that I had in mind when I put my question, and she was also present at father's death. It was therefore relevant that she should be mentioned in either case. My two aunts were present only at father's death. Assuming, then, that my question was misunderstood and that it suggested to my father his "promise" to return after it was all over, and that this, with my statement that he had not mentioned all the names desired, had suggested the persons present during his last illness, we should have a perfectly intelligible passage throughout. The "Nan" might be supposed to stand for my aunt Nannie, and the "Mannie" and "Mnni" for "Maggie," while the name of Eliza is clear. In the light of the latter identification of the names of my aunt and my stepmother the confusion of them here is intelligible (*Cf.* pp. 69, 406). This interpretation of the passage gives a clearly possible meaning to the statement that I was in New York when the conversation about spirit return took place. This was false in relation to my question, but I was in New York when I wrote the letter asking father to come to me after it was all over. The note in the body of the detailed record shows the special evidence that my stepmother is included in the intended reference of my father (p. 342). The natural association of these three names is also illustrated in the mention of them together at the close of the sitting of June 8th (p. 496).—J. H. H.

APPENDIX II.

This Appendix contains the records of five sittings—February 7th, 8th, 16th, 20th, 22nd, 1899—held by Dr. Hodgson on my behalf, together with contemporary notes. In sending me the record of the first of these sittings, Dr. Hodgson wrote on February 7th, 1899 : “ You had better make such notes as you wish, so that they can be embodied in the type-written copies as before. But do not return them at present or tell me anything about them. Wait till I have finished the series on your behalf.” I did as he requested.

Between my sitting on December 27th and the first of the series dealt with in this appendix, there were various references to myself and my father at sittings held by Dr. Hodgson for other purposes. Dr. Hodgson gives these as follows :—

[Rector writing. Sitter R. H.]

December 29th, 1898.

* * * We are desirous as soon as it can be made convenient for thee to give us some articles belonging to Mr. Hyslop to bring him to thee clearly. (Yes. His son will send me his father's diary if he can obtain it.) [Cross in air.] It can be and we will see that he receives it for us to assist him in clearing his thoughts. (If some other book which he has used were obtained it perhaps would serve the purpose.) Yes, either this or the one he has in mind, but vaguely as yet. We await this. (I understand.) * * * Now, then, we have arranged all for the coming few days, and we would be with thee a great deal in thine own room. We desire also to make ourselves and our presence known to thy friend H., and besides this, we would keep in touch with * * *

January 18th, 1899.

* * * (Yes, very good. Then our friend Hyslop is anxious to see you many more times if you think that is desirable. He would like to come when you arrange, perhaps after the ten times friend is finished with one way or another, and have himself as many sittings as you can arrange for.)

This is one thing to which we would especially give attention, and to which we have vaguely heretofore given reference. (Excuse me a moment.) [I shut hot-air register.]

Viz., things of importance to thee as well as to us. We will after we have arranged . . .

[to Sp.] Pardon . . . yes . . . + . . . + . . . [Cross in air.] for one or two days after we have finished with thy ten times friend, give thee full notice of our arrangements for him. U D. (Yes, very good. * * *) * * *

(Shall I give one or two brief messages?) *Yes.*

(Hyslop sent his love to his father and wished to say that his father was right about Swedenborg,—what he said.) *Well.* * * * (After the ten times friend, you will arrange with me about Hyslop.) + Yes, friend. * * * (* * * perhaps after the ten times friend I could have several days not only for myself, but perhaps also one or two on behalf of Hyslop before he comes again himself. Then I should have to come with him, as he cannot read the writing well,—and after * * *) + We will arrange for thee as soon after thy ten, etc., friend . . . [as possible] for (I understand) . . . the two days also for two or three for Hyslop and then go on with our *ladies*, after which we will arrange for Hyslop personally, then go on with * * *

January 25th, 1899.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim. II. as she goes into trance, says "preparing for Hyslop."]

* * * We have a great and good work to do with this dear spirit Hyslop, who is awakening [not read at once] to the realisation . . . ("anchoring"?) He says awakening . . . that he can keep his promises to his son on thy side of life. A *very* high and intelligent spirit is he, and no barrier between them—viz., himself and son. He is being helped by us, and will from time to time reach through the veil, and speak familiarly with "James." (Yes, very good.) + (I am very pleased.) We are still desirous of meeting him often after the conditions are arranged to our satisfaction. * * * (Then perhaps I had better come myself the first day after [the Sabbath]. We say it friend. Yes. We have much to do. And we must do part *ere* we meet Hyslop. * * *

January 30th, 1899.

We will, if convenient for thy friend Hyslop, arrange for him, or for thee two days, and thereafter him [pause] four days. [Not understood at first. I supposed they were correcting two days to four days, and asked if they meant four days for me.] No for him, four days for him.

[Re-reading it after the sitting, I think Imperator meant to suggest two days for myself personally, and four days for me on account of Hyslop. I supposed at the time that only the latter was referred to.]

(Do you mean for him personally?) Yes, or for thee to meet him. [I was about to speak.] But listen, friend. We say if convenient for him we will meet him four days, if not we will meet thee for him.

I find it a little difficult for me to get all words to thee whilst He is speaking. (Yes. That's all right, Rector. Now . . .)

Canst thou not let us know at this point whether he can meet us or thee . . . either him or thee, as we desire to prepare his father and friends for this, we care not which, of thee ("or him"). [Assent.] (Yes. It will be most convenient that I should have the days on his behalf in his absence.)

Yes. Well, friend, then we would have thee arrange *at once* for as many articles. . . . [not read] articles he says . . . we now give mention to the number . . . *three*. We would like some articles if possible worn by his father when in the body, also some one object handled a good deal by him. (Yes. I have received several books which he used much or at least one of which I think he handled much.)

Viz. the Diary. (I don't think it is the Diary.)

Well, it *must* be something handled quite *as much*. (I will . . .)

We are desirous of keeping him as clear as possible, friend. (Yes. I will write for the best obtainable articles in addition to the books I have.)

Yes. A *pen* or pencil for instance, or knife, any object handled much. U D. (Yes. I understand exactly.)

Well, then, friend, if thou dost U D about the days all is well. (Yes. Which days after the Sabbath will you devote to Hyslop?)

Four. (All . . .)

All but two. We will have no break between.

(Yes. I will come first, second, third, and fourth after Sabbath. Is that right?)

It is. (Good.)

And all will be well.

Dr. Hodgson further informs me that the omissions indicated by asterisks in the records which follow have no relevance to my concerns, and in part are private, and in part deal with other communicators or sitters.—J. H. HYSLOP.

Record of Sitting, February 7th, 1899.

R. H.

[Mrs. P. talking about ordinary matters, when without a break almost.]

Do you know sometimes lately, it seems as if my head was full of bells. . . .

I want to go into . . . I want to go into the other place . . . I don't like to stay here.

[Rector writes.]

[Cross in air.] Rector (Good morning) H A I L (Hail, Imperator.) Friend, we desire to speak with thee especially. Whilst we are speaking thy friend's father will be in good hands and in preparation for this meeting. (Yes.)

We wish that we might meet Mrs. [Z.] for the benefit of her little girl, as it will doubtless be our last meeting for some weeks, and perhaps many. (Yes.)

The child is now in our hands, and under our guidance, and we desire to develop the highest nature . . . nature . . . as we have already begun with this . . . this. After our next meeting we will be better able to determine the day, as we see her condition meanwhile. U D. She hath weakness in the so-called lungs which we are . . . restoring to . . . we . . . a more natural condition . . . ("we are restoring a more natural condition?")

I did not get His exact words, but very nearly, friend. R. (All right.)

We do desire to give at least four meetings for Hyslop's father soon . . . at least.

We can meet thee after this day on the morrow. (Yes.)

And we will direct thee then as to our arrangements. +

(Yes. There is another matter, or rather, there are two inquiries which I have received from friends to put. Shall I put these now for you to reply to-morrow, or shall I leave them entirely till to-morrow? One concerns Mrs. M. and the other is to Mr. W.)

Yes. Kindly give them now for His ans. to-morrow. R.

(Yes. Mrs. M. says: "Ask if they have any advice or counsel for me in my affairs at the present time.") [Cross in air.]

Received. ans. on the morrow. +

(Now Mrs. W. ?) Yes, friend.

(This is to her husband.) [R. H. reads over Mrs. W.'s letter.]

* * * * *

We may ans. to this that he, Mr. W., has long been seeking an [substituted for *the* first written] opportunity to send some message to her, as he fully realises all she is and has been passing through . . . she. Not once only, but many times he has begged to us I. S. D. and R. to allow him at the first opportunity to speak and free his mind, which we have promised to do. But we cannot do so for a few days. It will, however, be as we would have it be. + {R}.

We will not be able to ans. further on this subject on the morrow, but later.

(Very good. I understand.)

We are doing every thing that is possible to benefit all worthy . . . worthy persons on thy side, and thereby give relief to those here on our side. We saw in Mr. D. . . . thereby [not read in previous sentence] . . . for instance, great need for our return alone with him or to him. Everything we may do will surely be well. [Cross in air.]

Now, friend, if thou hast no further questions we will bring Mr. Hyslop to thee now. (Very good.)

[To Sp.] No he is not . . . but it is his friend . . . very well. No, not James, but Hodgson. Yes . . . come.

[R. H. gets package A out of bag and begins to undo it.]

Give it me friend. R. (One moment, Rector.)

[R. H. undoes package. Meanwhile hand apparently attends to Sp.]

Be patient kindly [to Sp.].

[Meanwhile R. H. undoes the various wrappings, and finally drops gently a metal box on the table from the last wrapping. Hand touches it and moves it forward a little.]

Yes, friend, I am pleased to meet you. I wish to speak to James, but I U D he is not here, but sends you in his place. (Yes.) Am I right? (Yes, Mr. Hyslop, quite right. I am here in behalf of your son James, whom I know well.)

I am very pleased to know you, and I am desirous, as doubtless you know, to reach him in every possible way. (Yes, I understand well.)

I am thinking at the moment of what I referred to concerning Emanuel Swedenborg [Swedenborg not read at first]. Borge [?] E sounds like Emanuel Swedenborg [badly written and not read.]

(Rector, please when you get it as clear as possible, put it in capitals.) Yes, thanks, I will. E m a n u e l S W.

[As soon as the S was written I thought of Swedenborg, and on looking at the previous writing saw that this was obviously intended.]

(Oh, I think I know, Swedenborg.) [Assent with emphasis]

[This reference to Swedenborg again is interesting as showing the condition of mind in which my failure to remember the incident distinctly on December 27th of the year just passed left the communicator. There is evidently here some fear that the fact was not clear to my mind; as it was not my note making that fact evident. But correspondence with my mother (stepmother) shows that I did have such a conversation, and after learning the fact I sent word to Dr. Hodgson to tell my father what is here said to him. It is quite as interesting to remark the promptness with which it is dropped when he is told of the discovery and admission of my mistake.—J. H. H.] [Cf. p. 341.]

I am glad to know that he U D my meaning. (Yes.)

[At sitting of January 18th, 1899, R. H. present, occurred: “(Hyslop sent his love to his father and wished to say that his father was right about Swedenborg—what he said.) *Well.*” See sitting where Professor Hyslop was present, December 27th, 1898, p. 341.]

Yes, now I wish to tell him about another subject.

[Hand feels box] First, what message does he send me?

(He told me some time ago to give you his love, and he has written two questions which I have here, but perhaps . . .) [dissent, as though to suggest better not give them then, as I did not intend to unless desired. Hand was apparently about to write, but did not, and took up listening position again.] (it might be well for you to tell me first what you have on your mind?)

Yes, I shall be glad to do so. I am thinking of the time some years ago when I went into the mountains for a change with him, and the trip we had to the lake after we left the camp. Ask him if he remembers this.

[Hand lifts box up as if to show it clearly to Sp.]

And I have often thought of this.

[Father never went into the mountains with me, nor to the lake. Also the allusion to his doing this after leaving “the camp” has no meaning whatever. I do not know that he ever saw any mountains except the Alleghenies which he probably saw in 1876 when he went to the Centennial at Philadelphia. It would require a great deal of twisting and forced interpretation to discover any truth in the statements for any one in the acquaintance of my father, even if it could be done in any way at all. It might suggest something to others, but it suggests only what is false to me.—J. H. H.] [See Note 26, p. 408.]

On one trip out West we or I was caught in an accident and I was badly shaken up in consequence.

[Hand feels box, holds it up, trembling.]

I received a nervous shock from which I never fully recovered. This and a fire which took place are uppermost in my thoughts. Many little things are often in my mind, but I think more frequently of the serious ones, which are to be noted among my earthly experiences. [The first word of foregoing sentence read by me as *very*.] Many little ones he said. (Oh yes, “Many little things.”)

I have now completely recovered from this and I can walk about as well as ever I could. He may be glad to know this. (Yes, I will send it all to him.)

I am a little distance from you, my friend, but I hope to come nearer soon. [Hand frequently holds box up.]

I often think of the long talks we used to have during my last years in earth life of the possibilities of communication with each other. [*Cf.* pp. 29-34.] I hear James often speaking to me. I hear him calling as it were for me to be near him. I am now thinking again of the accident. We were delayed several days if I remember rightly and I think I do. I think we lost our . . . lost . . . forward cars . . . cars . . . forward . . . and engine so-called [*engine* not read]. He says ENGINE. Did they not go through the bridge, James . . . Yes.

Friend, thou wilt have to wait a moment for him now. (Yes.) I have never seen a spirit more desirous of being clear and correct than he. We will keep him near, friend.

Ask him to recall all about this, friend, when he returns {R} (About which, Rector?) his experiences . . . his + wishes thee to do so. (In connection with this accident you mean?) In any thing, yes this in particular.

(Yes, I will.) And the fire of which he is thinking. He is returning.

Yes, friend, I here ("I have"). I am here.

(Mr. . . .) but I cannot remain long at a time just now.

(I understand. I am sure that James will be very pleased for you to remember all you can about your experiences in connection with this accident or the fire.)

Yes, well then I may as well tell you all I can remember. I remember it seemed to be in the night and we were going at quite a rapid rate when a sudden jerk and crash aroused me, only to find we were in a . . . dilapidated state . . . [*Jerk and crash* not read at first.] he says jerk [sentence read through.] Yes, quite right.

Yes. Yes that is, the rails, bridge, cars and all . . . Bridge. I have to catch it as best I can, friend (Yes, I understand.) otherwise I could not get it all for thee.

[This incident about the railroad accident is much like that about the trip to the mountains, except that it may have some possibilities in it. As it stands it has no definite meaning to me. I recall definitely no such accident as is here described. The allusion to its having occurred when we or he made a trip out West takes it outside my memory. Father owned some land in Illinois and used to take trips out there to look after it. But I never heard of any accidents into which he got on any of those trips. In 1861, when I was only seven years old, I went with him, my mother, my sister Anna, and an aunt on one of these trips, but I remember no serious accidents on it. If I remember correctly, we were delayed at Kokomo, Indiana, for some reason, though I do not recall whether there was a delay on account of an accident, or whether my memory of the place is due wholly to its singular name. As I write, however, I recall that we stopped for dinner, and I have always remembered the peculiar name as a matter of childish interest, along with many incidents of that trip, which the nature of this discussion does not at present require me to mention. I know of two accidents that occurred in Chicago on this trip. But they were not connected with any railways, nor with anything

that would suggest them. I have only the vaguest impression that on this trip there was something that might be construed as an accident, but I am confident that it could not be described in such strong terms as are used here. The allusion to the fire is as indefinite as the accident, and is evidently an attempt to reopen the incident that was not made clear to me in the December sittings. The only thing that has any apparent connection with the real life of my father in this narration is the allusion to his recovery of his ability to walk, and the expression of his belief that I should be glad to know it. There is no reason from its connection to construe it as coming from him, but it was a fact that for fifteen years he had been unable to walk without a cane or a crutch. But if there is any truth in the whole incident it has no connection with my experience.—J. H. H.]

Give me his book kindly . . . or if thou canst give me his . . .
(Rector, this is all I have with me) Give him his . . . Yes glasses.

(Does he remember this?) [box]

Yes, friend, very well. He had it for years.

(Perhaps he would like to tell me about it.)

Yes, but there is very little to tell about this, he says, only it is his glasses case and was in the family for years. (Did he call it his glasses case?) [*spectic* apparently superposed on *years*] He says spectacle [*spectical*]. (Did he call it his spectacle case?) Yes. (I want to get it just right if possible.)

I am quite sure of what I am saying to you, my friend. I think Nannie will remember this also very well. You might speak to her about it, or ask James to do so. (Yes, I will.)

I shall be better able to recall everything in time if you will be kind enough to let me speak occasionally. I am more anxious than I can tell you to explain every thing.

[This language about the spectacle case has some pertinence. For some years after he began to wear glasses, he called them spectacles. Later he began to call them glasses, but he always, in my recollection, called the case his "spectacle case," as corrected here. Of course I had seen very little of him after 1882, except in vacations, and then after 1885 only once until 1892, again in 1894, and last when he died in 1896. But I remember what he called both his glasses and the case. No special evidential value can be put upon the fact here, because there is hardly any choice for a speaker on this matter, as the usage here adopted would probably be universal. But it deserves remark as a fact that the usage here conforms to the fact of my father's usage when living, and that there was a change of usage for the term glasses. This is the reason that I asked in the sitting for the 27th of December last what glasses he meant when he alluded to them. I wished then to see if he would resort to his regular usage in regard to them. "Nannie" is probably Rector's mistake for Maggie, the name of my step-mother.—J. H. H.] [Cf. pp. 342, 366.]

(Yes, have you . . .) and . . . [Hand had started to write, then listens.] (I was going to ask if you had finished about the fire.)

Yes, for now. I will think it over and tell you more about it, as I am to meet you to-morrow, as we used to say. (Yes.)

I shall be glad to do so.

I begin to see what James is wishing me to do.

(I will explain further. You understand, Mr. Hyslop, that we do not see you and we do not hear you.) Is it so? (There is a lady in our material world who has this *light*, and she goes into a trance. You must remember talking of trance.)

I do, I do. Yes, quite. This is quite clear . . . then (Well) Go on.

(Well, this lady goes into trance, and her head is resting on cushions just as if she was asleep in the ordinary way.)

(Then, her hand and arm rest on a table, convenient for writing upon.)
Yes.

(Now our kind friend and helper Rector [hand bows] can use this arm and hand of the lady in trance and make it write just as you used to write yourself.)

Indeed. Then, well then what I say is written out for you, is it?

(Yes, exactly. You talk in your way to Rector. Rector talks to me through this machine, that is, the arm and hand are like a machine.)

Oh yes, I begin to see, but I can see Rector and hear him speak to me. I hear his question perfectly, and I see him clearly.

Friend, he has his head near . . . head . . . head.

(Well, now, you see that all that *we* can see, because we are still in the material world, all we can tell is, that the hand of this lady in trance writes on the paper and says that it is so and so using it from the spirit world.)

Oh yes, I see.

(Well now, if James had said to you when you were in the body, "Come with me and see a lady in trance. Her hand is controlled by a spirit," you probably would not have believed it.)

No, probably not.

(And if James had passed out of the body and you were left behind, and if I came to you and said "Your son James wishes to see you and talk to you," and if I prevailed upon you to come here, we will suppose, and you were in the body with me and James was where you are, talking to Rector—what do you think James would try to remind you of?)

Why everything that we used to do together of course, friend,

(Yes, now . . .)

or in other words *all*. I say *all*, about his earthly experiences, because he would like me to make sure it was he.

(Exactly. Now that is just what he wants. He wants . . .)

Well, it is just what he will get, then, because I know perfectly well who and what I am and I know what would please my son James, and I will do all in my power to prove that I am his father. U D.

(Yes, now, I shall be delighted to meet you to-morrow. The time is nearly gone now for us. But if you think over what I have told you about the way it appears to us—that is, a lady in trance writing with her hand, while the rest of her body is, as it were, asleep, that is, trance—you will see how important it is for you to tell as many private personal incidents and curious things about your personal friends and so on that nobody else could.)

Friend, we will explain all this in detail to him {a part we may say is well U D by him now, [{}]} and we feel satisfied that although he may not

say as much in some ways as other spirits might, yet what he does say . . . what he does say . . . will be correct. +

(Very good. That's the important thing after all.)

Yes, we know full well, friend, and we will take care that all will be well.

Good day, friend. I will think it over.

(Good day; and I shall look forward to hearing from you again to-morrow. It will not be possible for me to get a fresh message for you from James, because you remember this is Boston, and James lives across the country.)

Yes. New York. (Yes, New York.) I remember well.

[The allusion to my being in New York, though correct, could hardly be of much evidential value, even if, in my question about the medicine (p. 330), I had not used the name of New York.—J. H. H.]

(But I will tell him all in due time.) And I you, friend. (Well, thank you very much.)

[Box held up trembling.]

Friend, the light is going out with us, (Yes.) and ere we depart we bid thee farewell. (Is there anything I can do further to help?) No, all is well. May God in His tenderest Mercy lead thee into light and joy, and may His blessings rest on thee + {R.}

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

That's the . . . that's your world and this is ours.

I saw you take it a . . . I saw . . . I want you to . . . turn the dark * * * turn the dark board away, I don't like to look at it.

You see Rector turns round a dark board and says that's your world,—and he turns round the other side and that's light and he says that's his world. The whole world is black, but the light bodies can come into it. * * *

Record of Sitting, February 8th, 1899.

R. H.

In going off, Mrs. P.'s left hand points out forward, then makes a cross in air; then her lips move quietly as though she was repeating words, but no sound was audible.

[Imperator writes.]

[I see from the more gentle movements of the hand, and the quieter making of cross in air, that Imperator has taken the hand, and give stylographic pen.]

HAIL (Hail, Imperator.) [I spoke in a low voice, and perhaps my greeting was not heard, as the *Hail* was repeated.] HAIL. (Hail.) +

In this light we greet thee and bestow God's blessings upon thee.

Friend, thou art with us and we are with thee.

God's tenderest care will protect thee, no [not read] . . .

Evil enter not where thou art

He hath said I am the father . . . Father, the . . . life . . . the and let my light shine forth in thee.

Holy Father, we are with thee in all thy ways [?], and to thee we come in all things. We ask thee to give us thy tender love and care.

Bestow thy blessings upon this thy fellow creature, and * * * instruct him that [?] . . . this thy fellow cre . . . help him to be all that thou dost ask . . . him . . . Teach him to walk in the path of righteousness and truth. He needs thy loving care. Teach him in all things to do thy holy will. Teach him to do thy holy will, teach him . . . and we leave all else in thy hands. Without thy care we are indeed bereft. Watch [?] over and guide his footsteps and lead him [?] lead him into . . . and lead him into light . . . lead . . . lead him into truth and light. Father, we beseech thee to so open the blinded [?] eyes of mortals that they may know more of thee and thy tender love . . . love . . . and care.

We have now restored the light . . . we have . . . and we thank thee, oh Father, for thy help.

Friend, if thou art perplexed or troubled, come to us, and [we] will right all. (Amen.)

In His name we act for thee . . . act.

May all good and deserving mortals find . . . worthy . . . worthy . . . deserving . . . seek and find God.

[Repetitions occasionally necessary owing to several instances when the ink did not flow and frequently to my inability to decipher. Here was originally written "May all good and deserving mortals find." I couldn't read after "good and," when "worthy worthy deserving" were written, followed by "seek and find God."]

We depart, leaving thee now in His . . . His hands and under the guidance . . . under the guidance . . . of [read at sitting as "under His guidance"] . . . with . . . His messengers. I. S. D. and he who * * [?] all things well, Rector [?] [Couldn't read.]

* * [?] well . . . well what . . . what . . . what God desires him to do. Rector.

[After my reading this last sentence.]

Yes, friend. We [? he] will be near thee throughout. I go now and leave thee with Rector. Peace be with thee. (Amen.) + I. S. D.

[Rector writes.]

Rector: Good morrow friend. (Good morning.)

Enter Doctor for a moment only. [Not read at sitting. This writing dashed off very rapidly.]

Conditions infinitely better.

[Disturbance in hand.]

[Doctor writes.]

Doctor. Good morning. I am Doctor.

(Oh, good morning, Doctor. Very glad to meet you again.)

I am still with you. (I am very pleased.)

No friend cares more for all [?] your interests [than I do. I will help you throughout. (Thank you very much.)

Although silent in speech I am with you in thought . . . silent . . . Silent.

We now bring your friend and well wisher. Adieu.

Call for me whenever you wish me.

(Yes. I shall always be very pleased for your help. I have often thought that you have been here helping or with me sometimes when I have not been here.)

True indeed, quite true, I am often with you, and I am present although I do not speak directly to you.

I am your friend and helper in all things, and when you are absent from the light I am often guiding and helping you. Will continue to do so.
Farewell.

(Farewell, Doctor, for the present. Thank you.)

[Rector writes.]

Returned. Rector. (Yes.) With the direct answers to any [my?] questions and to help Mr. Hyslop to come closer. (Good.)

I . . . (Shall I present articles?) [Assent. Cross in air.]

Yes kindly. I am very near thee, friend.

(I am very glad.) (There is this.) [presenting box used yesterday.] [I also opened package C. and left it opened on floor behind me, seeing that it contained a book, knife, and spectacle case.]

+ wishes me to say that it will be impossible for h . . . Him to answer for Mr. W. this day, as it will necessitate our using too much light for him, and we must give it for this kind gentleman, viz., Mr. Hyslop. (Yes, I understand.) He will ans. for W. later. (I understand.)

Good morning, James. I am glad to be here again. I am your father still who is trying to help you find me. I recall quite vividly some few recollections which I think will interest you somewhat. I remember some years ago of sending . . . sending George some of the photos taken of the Library [not read] . . . wait a . . . Library, and he said he would return copies after he had finished them . . . ("finished"?) finished them . . . finished, he repeats.

[This allusion to his "library" had no meaning to me, as I never knew him to call any room a library. He had no such room in his house. But I wrote to my stepmother in regard to this and several other matters in this sitting, and the reply is that father "never called" the sitting room, which also contained what books he owned, his library. Besides, he never had any photos of it taken and sent no such articles to my brother George. This incident is therefore totally false. It has an interest, nevertheless, under the telepathic hypothesis, if that must be invoked to explain the true incidents in the various sittings. The term library describes what I have in my house, though I never had any photo of it taken, and we might suppose that the telepathic acquisition of what pertained to my father might be mixed up with ideas taken from my mind about my library. I do not attach any weight to this supposition in the case of this incident alone, but only in view of the resort to telepathy at all for other facts, when the falsity of this incident considered in relation to my father can be partly accounted for by supposing some telepathic "fishing" amid the ideas of my own mind. The applicability of "library" to my own mind is, of course, the only reason for such a suggestion, though in detail it is as false regarding myself as it is regarding any experience of father's. The only escape of the spiritistic theory on this and some similar and later incidents is that the discarnate

spirit is out of his right mind, or that there is an intermediary present who interprets a reference to the room where he kept his books, and that he would call a "sitting room," as "library."—J. H. H.] [I have since ascertained that my father sent a photo of himself and my mother to my brother George, but the language here does not fit the fact as known. (May 21st, 1900.) J. H. H.]

I also rem . . . recall the disturbance and trouble I had with one of my eyes, the left one. Do you not remember this, and the little so-called . . . What . . . P . . . A . . . yes, I hear. Pad. Pad. I had a peculiar mark, which you will recall, at the back of the ears [ear ?]

Tell me, friend, that I may show it to him.

[The allusion both to the difficulty with the left eye and to the mark behind the ear is, as far as I and my stepmother know, entirely false. We never knew of any trouble with either of them.—J. H. H.] [See Note 27, p. 409.]

(Some more articles, Rector ?)

[Hand lifts box and still holding box, touches with fingers a spot behind my left ear just below mastoid process.] (Here ?) Yes.

Yes. Give me one. [In reply to question above about more articles.]

(I think there are some more inside this [box]. Can you ask Mr. Hyslop if he can tell what they are inside before I open.) [Pause.]

He is saying something. Wait until I hear it clearly.

[Pause.] This I think is the one I used to put my Pen ho [?] . . . no not pen, Paper cutter . . . P . . . sounds like . . . in . . .

[As a matter of fact I had kept father's pen in this spectacle case ever since his death, and it was there in the case when thus shown to Mrs. P. But, as indicated by Dr. Hodgson, it had not yet been opened. The allusion to a paper cutter I thought nonsense, as I had never known father to have a paper cutter. He never needed one for the purpose of cutting the leaves of new books, as I suppose he had not bought any books that would need cutting of the leaves for forty years, and the newspapers he took needed no such instrument. Hence I treated the reference here as nonsense. But I took no risks in the matter, and asked my stepmother whether father ever owned such an article, and if so, whether he ever put it in his spectacle case, expecting to find my suspicion confirmed. Her reply is that he did have a paper cutter, a wooden one made by my brother, for opening letters, but that he carried it in his vest pocket. I believe also that he never kept his pen in this case. The later statements seem much clearer on this matter.—J. H. H.] [Cf. Note 34, p. 414]

Perhaps you will recall my asking for my knife . . . recall. [Cf. p. 336.] (Yes.)

I think, friend, he is quite ready. [Cross in air.] Yes.

[The allusion to his knife here shows a memory of what had been asked for at an earlier sitting as already discussed, and indicates the same personality as then on any theory of the case, as also do many other incidents.—J. H. H.]

(Does he wish to say anything about the present contents of this box) [Pause.] (before I open it ?) Only concerning his spectacles, that is all. I have to say . . . let me go a minute and return. I am very blind and I begin to feel strange.

[The box did contain his spectacles as well as his pen.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, go away and come back.)

We like him very well. He seems a most intelligent fellow, but finds it difficult for him to remain long at a time. In time he will, however, come very near, be quite clear, and do a great [work] for thee, friend.

Here I am. Yes, I see, you are not really James, but his friend. Glad I am to know you. (I am very glad.)

Yes, I remember I used to have this little case on my desk a great deal.

Yes. And I am sure I used to place my spectacles in it. Yes, and sometime my paper-cutter.

Yes, I am sure he is right.

[The statement about the spectacles is correct, but that about the paper-cutter is false as far as can be ascertained.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, well . . .) He seems to know. (Anything else about what he used to do with it.) No, no he says nothing.

(Well, Mr. Hyslop. Can you see what is now in it?)

Looks like my glasses. Yes.

(Don't bother about trying to see what is actually now in the box, but if you are able to tell what exactly is in it, of course I shall be glad.)

Well, will you not let me look and think more about it and make quite sure of it?

(Why this . . . there is no hurry, and I would much rather you should take all the time you want and be quite calm and peaceful, and just think quietly how you can best give good tests to James.)

Yes, very well, then. Until I become accustomed to this way of speaking, understand the light that looks so bright to me and through which I am now looking at you, I will not try to say too many things, but you can perhaps imagine how anxious I am to reach my children, especially James, as he was really more to me than the rest, in a way.

I think of everything I ever did. All in one minute it comes to me, then seems to leave me when I try to express something of it to you. (Yes.)

Yet with patience and time, friend, he will become clear and remember all. + . (Amen.)

Hurry him not, worry him not, and all will be well. Let him look at thy object and return to thee and tell thee of it, friend + .

(Yes. Is he there, now, Rector?) Yes. (Shall I ask him to look at the box and go away and return?) + has done so.

+ Now after he hath returned, kindly let him tell thee . . .

(Yes, before anything else.) [Assent.]

and then ask him another question to think over, etc.

[Here I opened Professor Hyslop's letter containing two questions to be in readiness.]

Friend, we will answer one question meanwhile for Mrs. M.

(Very good. Yes. I'm listening.)

All is well and we are doing all we can for thee. Make no haste in anything for the present, and think little concerning what thou are planning to do. Wait a little while and it will be wiser for thee. + . (Yes.)

Any question.

(A question from Hyslop?) [Dissent.]

(Mrs. M. ?) [Assent.]

From her take to us now for a later reply.

(She said : ask "If they have any advice or counsel for me in my affairs at the present time.")

"I want to know whether they know what has happened to me lately, as much as I want their help." She adds that.)

Yes, we do indeed well, and we have given our answer.

(That is all then, is it ?) Yes, until later (Very good.) on, when we meet thee again. Yes, all.

Yes, it contains my cutter. [Cf. pp. 378, 379.]

How soon are we to meet thee again ? (That is for you to arrange.) We have now arranged for Mr. D. . . .

Yes, my friend, yes. [Rector to Mr. Hyslop ?]

And Mrs. C., and then we can meet thee two times for Mr. Hyslop, and we prefer that thou, [{ } as he does also], shouldst not open this until he gives thee [the] permission. When he does thou wilt be satisfied. (Yes, very good.)

Do not do so until we meet thee again for him. (I will not.)

Meanwhile place it in thy room for a few hours whilst thou art there near what Miss Q. calls her chair (I will.) and he will return there with us, and then answer here for thee. (Very good. Yes, I understand.)

[January 13th, 1900. For "Q.," see *Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 9, 60-67. Since the time of that Report I have had many written communications from "Q.," who has made various references to the armchair in which I usually sit when reading in my room.—R. H.]

Meanwhile, friend, give me the other object, as it will also help him.

[Package C. contents placed on table, book, knife and spectacle case.]

[Hand touches them with much trembling excitement.]

Place it here [indicating that book should be placed where the hand had placed the box,—on that edge of the writing-table next the cushioned table.]

This I desired most of all.

(Which, Rector ? knife ?) [Hand is taking up knife]

Yes. [Hand feels over book again.]

and book, but knife especially. Oh I rem . . . [sheet turned]

Oh, I remember so well all I longed to do before . . . before . . . leaving the body. I often used to sit in my room and pore over the pages of my books and write out little extracts from them in my diary.

[This statement that he used to pore over his books and make extracts from them is quite true. I thought it so from some things that I had seen among his papers after his death, and from what I knew of his general habits when I was younger, but thinking that I might be mistaken I inquired of my stepmother regarding it, and find that it was his habit to write out extracts, though he did not write them in his diary. As indicated in earlier notes, father did not keep what could be called ordinarily a diary, but only an account book which served in many respects as a diary, as it contained facts and records that most people would call or embody in a diary. He also kept his daily accounts in it. But the extracts from his reading were written down on other pieces of paper for special use.—J. H. H.]

What is that, Ferdinand? [not read and badly written, but apparently intended for Ferdinand.] sounds like Ferdinand. U D. (No.) Ferdinand. Fer (No. Can't read.) E F E R D I N A N D .

(I will look.) [I look and read the title on back of book, *Anderson's Lectures on Theology*. The back of book was doubled over and was not visible to me before.]

(No, not Ferdinand.) Sounds very like it. He says it again. (It is *Anderson's Lectures on Theology*.) Yes. Yes. But did A N D I hear it so well . A N D . . . (Yes.) E Yes, all right; he has it. Yes, but this is all I shall need now for some time, he says. (Yes.)

He is now in the same state that thy friend George was when he first returned to thee. [I understood this to mean that the communicator was in the same state as regards appreciation of the situation, ability to communicate, etc., as G. P. was when the latter first communicated. See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 296 (*January 13th, 1900*).—R. H.]

(Shall I now give him a fresh question to take and return?) Yes.

(His son James asks: "Do you remember any other medicine besides the Hyomei and strychnine you mentioned before, and that you took at the time you took them, or near that time?")

[Repeated. Hand apparently communicates to Mr. Hyslop?]

No, again kindly.

(I will add something first. You said, Mr. Hyslop, you referred, when James was here with me, to medicines about which he asked. You said, you referred to Hyomei, and also to strychnine. Remember?)

Yes, I do now quite. You refer to what I said after I came here.

(Yes, exactly. When James was here with me, and asking you test questions, and you were a little confused but trying to recall things for him.)

Yes, I know now, go on.

(Well, James writes: "Do you remember any other medicine besides the Hyomei and strychnine you mentioned before") [Hand here turns sharply away from me to Sp.—to repeat? after a short interval the hand again turns to listen to me.] ("and that you took at the time you took them, or near that time?")

Yes, I think I do, and I will try and recall it presently.

(If you will get his question quite clear, and then kindly go away and think of the answer and then return and give it to me, it will be best, I think.)

Yes. I + will remove Rector with him also for a moment as he [Rector] has the question very clearly and can better communicate it to him. (Yes.)

Adieu R.

[Prudens writes.]

Prudens: Are you well, friend?

(Yes, thank you. I am very pleased to meet you here.)

What are you talking about kindly?

(We are getting an answer from Mr. Hyslop whom . . .)

Yes, I know. But what did you say to me? [":]Glad to see me."

(Yes. I said, glad to meet you here.)

Ah, yes, I see, well it is mutual.

I came to help [keep ?] keep the light in repair. Are you getting on well in your life ?

(Yes. I feel that I am much better off in every way since I came into relations with your group of workers under Imperator.)

Well, He is constantly caring for you and no messenger could be more helpful than He is, I know. For the present I am Prudens to all who may enquire on your side. (Yes.)

I go now. Good-bye. P——.

(Good-bye, Prudense [Prudens] for the present.)

[Rector writes.]

Friend, it is impossible for him to answer these . . . these questions until he returns to thee again. (Very good.) He must and will be helped to think them out. (Yes.)

And when he does thou wilt be pleased . . . pleased. His son, if thou wilt remember, gave him this opportunity, *i.e.*, to leave the light and return the next day with answers, and this is what we would have him do. (Yes, I understand exactly.) It is better so, and will not confuse him. (Very good.)

Friend, we do not think we can hold the light longer.

(No, the time is nearly up, too.)

He hath drawn on it so completely.

Had it not been for + we could not possibly have remained as . . . so [superposed on *as*] long . . . so . . . as we have already.

(Very good. I come the third and fourth after next Sabbath.)

Yes, unless + hath got him quite clear and sees need for him to speak earlier, (Yes.) in which case thou shalt know. Speak if thou dost [wish]

(Otherwise, to-morrow Mrs. Z. Monday . . . first day after Sabbath, Mr. D.)

Yes, unless we change this for the benefit of Mr. Hyslop, as we may feel it necessary.

(In that case you will tell Mrs. Z. to-morrow ?) Yes, we will. (Very good. I think all is clear now.)

Friend, we bid thee farewell until we choose to meet thee as thou wilt know. God be thy guide meanwhile. + {R} [Cross in air.]

[Hand holds up knife, puts it down. Cross in air.]

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

Cut your fingers with it sure. Take it away from him. Take it away from him. Oh, is that you, Imperator. I want to go too. I want to go. [in crying voice.]

[Further inarticulate murmurs.]

[In regard to both this and the first of the two sittings in my behalf by Dr. Hodgson, I wrote to my stepmother to ascertain whether certain incidents were true that I could not know, and the following is her reply. Among them I asked whether there had been any delay or accident on the railway when they moved to the West, thinking that I had heard in some of my father's letters of some delay, and supposing that there might have been some basis in a fact of this sort for the extraordinary statements on his part

about the railway accident, though aware that chronologically such an incident would be out of its place in reference to me. Her letter in reply shows that there was no delay of any kind according to her recollection, though my brother Frank says that there was some delay in regard to the goods, but no accident. But even supposing either some delay or an accident or both, I think we could attach no significance to such a coincidence, except in favour of chance or guessing; for the statement in regard to the alleged facts evidently relates to a trip when I had accompanied him, or when he had gone alone. The only possibility of relevance therefore lies in the supposition that the time must coincide with the journeys which my father took to Illinois. Of course my age of seven years makes my memory too poor to trust for any purposes, confirmatory or otherwise. I have already mentioned the fact that I remember distinctly one delay for dinner at Kokomo, Indiana, and since then I recall the probability that we stopped there twice, once going and once on returning, but I recall nothing definite enough to say that there was a delay at that place. But I have a strong impression from memory that there was a delay at some point on that journey that was due to an accident, but not to our train. Where, I cannot recall. At any rate, it was not serious enough to be talked about either to relatives or at home among his children, and no one is now living that could possibly throw light upon the matter but myself and my mother's sister, who was with us at the time, as I was the only child with him and mother at the time, except sister Annie, and she died a few years afterward. My aunt remembers no railway accident in which father was at any time.

But the answers to my questions put to my stepmother regarding the various incidents in the two sittings explain themselves. I did not tell her the contents of the statements made in Boston, but inquired to know whether certain facts were true or not.—J. H. H.

Bloomington, Ind., February 11th, 1899.

MY DEAR JAMES,—Your note of February 9th at hand, and I reply at once.

1st. Your father *never* called our sitting room at Delphi the "library."

2nd. No, he never had a photo taken of *any description* to send to George.

3rd. He had a little wooden paper-cutter that Frank made him to open letters with once while he was at home with us in Delphi, but he *positively* never carried it in his spectacle case, but in his *vest pocket*.

4th. No, there was no delay or accident on our way from Xenia to Delphi.

5th. No delay or accident happened to the cars that brought our goods. They got to Delphi before we did.

6th. No, he had no mark behind his ear. [Cf. p. 410.]

7th. When he wanted to write an article for publication he would read up and note down extracts that he wanted to use. Most generally he put the ideas in his own language, but in his general reading he did not,—
Affectionately,

MOTHER.

I remember in my correspondence at the time that my father complained of some delay and difficulty in getting his goods through as he had desired, and this is confirmed by my brother's statement.—J. H. H.]

Record of Sitting, February 16th, 1899.

R. H.

[Rector speaks.]

* * * * *

[Rector writes.]

* * * * *

Now we are ready for other work and will do all we can under the circumstance[s].

We have meanwhile had some conference with Mr. Hyslop, and whereas we . . . whilst we find him far from what we desire we know he will be all we could ask or desire him to be for thy work. In due time thou wilt have much comfort through him and his messages. After he becomes clear he will be of much help to thee. Here he comes. We were speaking with him concerning the medicine . . . medicine, and he thinks James means the morphin . . . the morphine which he took some time before.

(Shall I read the question again ?) [Cross in air.]

Ah, but we know he says Morphine. Yes.

("Do you remember any other medicine besides the Hyomei and strychnine you mentioned before, and that you took at the time you took them, or near that time?")

Yes, all right. It must be this, as I took *some*. (Yes.)

[I know nothing of father's having taken morphine and doubted it when I read this passage. The nature of the difficulty, however, under which he suffered, which would prompt some physicians, at least according to older practice, to resort to it, led me to inquire both of the physician who attended his last illness and of my stepmother whether father had ever used any morphine, and both answer in the negative. The physician did not prescribe any for him after his return to his old home to die, and I knew there was no reason in the disease itself for hope of relief in this remedy, though morphine might have been serviceable to aid his sleep. He had also suffered from much sleeplessness for a year or more before his death and this was the reason that I suspected the possibility of his having taken morphine under the old-fashioned treatment he received in the State in which he was then living. My stepmother says in answer to my inquiry : "No, he never took any morphine at any time that I ever knew of. He always said that he never could take it."—J. H. H.] [See Note 28, p. 410.]

(Now, shall I go on with Mr. Hyslop now ?) [Assent.]

Yes, do kindly, as + is with him, doing His best to keep him *near*. The object first. We desire his glasses first as he has them on his mind and we desire to clear his mind in regard to them. After he has fully recognised them we will have no further question from him concerning them . . . concerning them, and he will then go on with the other. . . .

[In the meantime I had placed the metal box of previous sittings on table. At this stage I directed the hand to the box.]

Yes, one pr. of them is [written above line after *here* with caret below.] *here* and the other pr. there [not read at first].

one pair is *here* and the ("other pair is") *near* . . . *near*. [hand points in direction of my bag on floor.]

[I get spectacle case of leather out of parcel in bag, original package C used at previous sitting for Hyslop, and put it close to other box on table.]

They are both here. Yes. One spectacles in fact both in fact both spectacles.

Yes. All right. I am very glad to see you. How is James, and have you really seen him or do you only hear

(I only hear at present. You would . . .)
through what we used to call letters ?

[Singular statement : it is like the ordinary medium's.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, he . . . I got a letter from him this morning, but he wrote it some days ago and mailed it in New York without a stamp, and so it was returned. You would joke him on this.)

I would indeed.

(It was about questions for you, which I will give you when you have cleared your mind about the spectacles and the articles inside this case.)

They are my spectacles, friend. Yes. I have other things on my mind of course naturally, but I am near enough to enable me to see that the outline [{ } as it appears to me now } [bracket apparently inserted after *of* was written.] of the outline of my spectacles are present.

Here and here. [Holding up each case in turn.]

I am very pleased to know you as I often heard of you when I was in the body. (Oh, did James speak of me ?) Yes. Tell him this, he will remember it very well.

[I did speak of Dr. Hodgson to my father in the conversation mentioned in my own sittings, but as often as I may have mentioned him in this conversation I cannot be said to have done it in the way that it is most natural to interpret this statement here. I gave father one of the first two reports on Mrs. Piper to read, but I cannot recall whether it was Part XVII., *Proceedings* S.P.R., or Dr. Hodgson's first Report, Part XXI. My impression is that it was the former. But there is nothing in the allusion to suspect that this is in mind, except a desire that an interested person might have to construe the frequency indicated in an unnatural manner.—J. H. H.]

Do not gather the idea that I was subject to . . . gather . . . morphia because I was not, only as a medicine . . . a subject U D.

[True, pertinent and natural, but without significance. A medium's trick.—J. H. H.] [Further reflection shows that this last remark is not justified. November 3rd, 1899.—J. H. H.]

(I understand. Yes.)

Can you not give me some idea of the time since I left your side of life ? Is it what used to seem years to us, or is it only months ? I remember the spring very well. (I think, Mr. Hyslop, it is some two years or so, but I am not sure.) Oh, no, I think not. Two years. Well, well, if it has taken me two years to find this door open I am ashamed of it. I think I lived in the body in the spring I remember it so well [*spring* not read] . . . what we used to call spring [read] . . . so wel . . . yes, spring.

[No meaning in this, except that it is false if the intention be to allude to the time of his death. He died the last of August, 1896.—J. H. H.]

[Further inquiry shows that in the spring of 1895 father suddenly recovered his voice, and was very happy and hopeful about it, and, as a

consequence, renewed an active interest in certain religious matters involving the use of his voice. He lost it again in a few months, and then in the spring of 1896, a few months before his death, he became very much depressed by the evidence that his disease was getting the better of him. This might possibly explain the allusion to spring. (May 22nd, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

Now, can you recall anything about my beliefs in God? You know well that I always intended [tended?] to [apparently interpreted by R. H. at the time as “You know well what I always tended to”] do, that was to shut my eyes to what I could not really see.

(He's getting confused, Rector, isn't he?)

No. He means he would not really believe he could return, but hoped he would be able to do so. U D. (Yes.) [See p. 474.]

Yes, he seems quite clear just now. Perhaps it would do to ask him another question. Yes. He says it would.

(Well James says :) Speak softly and slowly, kindly friend.

(James says : “Do you remember Samuel Cooper and can you say anything about him?”) [Repeated, and Cooper also spelt.]

+ will take this to him. [Pause.]

Yes, I do very well, and this reminds me of the accident. [No relevancy in this remark.—J. H. H.] [See Note 30, p. 412.]

He refers to the old friend of mine in *the West*. [Not true unless “West” could mean *west* of Boston. But this would make it a mediumistic trick.—J. H. H.] [Later discoveries of what I did not know show that father's statement is true of Dr. Joseph Cooper, and that any remark about a trick is not justified. (January 1st, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

I remember the visits we used to make to each other well, and the long talks we had concerning Philisiavel [?] Phisoehvacl [?] P h i l o s o p h . . . [philosophical] topics.

Let me think this over, James, and I wi [sheet turned] . . . will answer it completely, and tell you all about him [not read] . . . tell . . . and tell you all I know about him.

Yes. This is [all] [In reply to my inability to read the word *completely* at the time.]

And I will answer for you. (“This is I”?)

(“and I will answer for you”?)

Yes, that is all.

[This reference to the visits and talks on philosophical topics has no truth in it whatsoever. The man for whom I had asked was an old neighbour of father's in the State in which father lived before moving to Indiana, and I knew if he in any way recognised this man with the slightest allusion to some simple truth about their lives on adjacent farms it would be conclusive evidence of identity. This Samuel Cooper was so far from being philosophic that he would not understand even the word. The phrase “philosophical topics” then sounds like an echo of some telepathic acquisitions obtained from my mind when in Boston. It has absolutely no relevance to the person named in my question.—J. H. H.] [For effect of further inquiry upon my estimate of this general incident, see Note 29, p. 410. (May 23rd, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

Do you recall a little black skull cap or w [the *I* used superposed on *or w*] I used to wear and what has become of it? I have looked and looked for it, but do not see it anywhere about. [See Note, p. 406, and pp. 43, 44.] Answer this for me, James, when you come again.

Friend, thou mayst not know of him much, but he does well, and is quite clear about it. He also inquires of a special pen or quill, as he calls it, with which he used to write. (Yes. I will tell James.)

[This allusion to the skull cap again is interesting, especially in connection with that to the "pen or quill": for it induced me to inquire of an aunt who knew father's early habits when he became bald, as he did very early, and before I was born. He was bald as far back as I can remember, and I thought it possible that he might have worn some cap for his head, though such a thing as wearing a skull cap was foreign to his own habits and an unknown among his acquaintances. I find that he never wore such a thing in his early life. But he did use quill pens until he bought the gold pen which I had sent on to Dr. Hodgson for use at the sittings. The cap is mentioned in a later sitting, and I shall add there what I did in regard to a similar allusion in my last sitting in Boston on December 27th.—J. H. H.] [See Note, p. 406.]

and . . . wait . . . what is he talking about . . . [Excitement] book kindly . . . Book . . . Book directly.

[I presented the *book* from parcel C on the floor.]

Yes we desire to hold him. Yes, he seems to be quite himself just now.

I also recall a thin black coat or dressing gown affair I used to wear mornings. (Yes, that's first rate.)

I can see myself sitting in my old armchair before the fire . . . open [open fire] in the library [not read at sitting] ("evening"?) [Dissent] [See Note 43, p. 502.]

Wait a moment friend, do not haste.

morning.

reading over the paper. Look at me there, James, and see me in the gown I refer to and answer me.

(Yes, I will tell James, and he will later send you lots of messages, and come also to see you, I hope, many times himself. He will be very pleased to receive your pictures of the things you used to do.)

[I never knew him to wear a thin coat or gown mornings while sitting before the fire. I remember him only as wearing often a different coat when so sitting before the fire from that which he did his work in when the weather was cold. The whole passage savours too much of a description of one who lives in a library or among books to be used as evidence, especially the word "gown," which father would never use. I find from my step-mother, however, that father did use to wear a thin coat in the mornings when sitting before the fire.—J. H. H.] [Later references to this incident and further study convince me that there is more pertinence in it than the above note admits. (May 23rd, 1900.)—J. H. H. Cf. pp. 54-55.]

Yes, I am glad. It will be pleasant to talk . . . talk with him as I used. James was always a good son, and cared much for me. As I grew older . . . as I grew older he . . . we grew together—*i.e.*, companionable . . . companionable [Correct.—J. H. H.] as we were much

together. [Not correct.—J. H. H.] And Nannie, I often think of her and her faithfulness to me . . . yes faith . . . faithfulness. (Yes.)

Did you realise that my bronchial trouble disturbed me much? . . . my . . . Perhaps you know about this, but I feel it no more. (Cf. pp. 327-328.)

(All the physical troubles are over now.)

Yes, and I feel very well satisfied with myself, quite unlike my former self, James. (Yes.)

I do not think I can speak with you much longer now, but I will come when I can and tell you all I have on my mind.

[This whole passage beginning with the flattering allusion to myself has a singular interest. First it represents just what father would say about me to anyone else. We did grow more companionable toward the end of his life, the estrangement caused by my apostacy having been overcome. But we cannot be said to have been much together. The very opposite was the fact, as some of my other notes abundantly show, except that we often talked a great deal with each other when we were together. This allusion to the faithfulness of Nannie, which is the name of his sister, while it is true, has no pertinence whatever here, especially when we look at the following statement in reference to his bronchial trouble, which was perfectly true. If he had used the name Maggie, which is that of my stepmother, there would have been extraordinary pertinence in the passage, all the more so when we know the care and patience with which my stepmother nursed him during his long illness. (Cf. pp. 342, 366.) This does not seem to me like the ordinary mediumistic trick, because the word "faithfulness" and the specific allusion to bronchial trouble are too true and pertinent, the word "faithfulness" being just what he was accustomed to use to me when defending my stepmother against criticisms which stepmothers have often to bear from step-children. It is not less interesting to note also the evident intention to speak of the bronchial trouble to a stranger who is supposed not to have known the fact. This word had not been used in any of my sittings, but from what I have said in regard to his disease, it is pertinent enough to be called correct, though not technically right. It was the larynx that was attacked, but the disease had penetrated into the bronchial tubes and they were badly affected with it. But in a fit of unconsciousness, as it were, in the attempt to communicate, it is noticeable that there is a change from the address to the third person to addressing me in the second person. There is no significance in this except that it may help to show the possible source of the confusion in the whole passage which can be cleared up in the way I have spoken of it.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. Can . . .)

I wish George could come to me. (Do you mean to your world?) Yes, I do. (Why?) James will U D. this. (All right.)

[I do not understand this, though in the light of a later sitting it may be made intelligible.—J. H. H.]

However, I see it is better so.

Do you remember your sister Annie? (Did James have a sister Annie?) [repeated] Yes. [This is correct, and Dr. Hodgson seems to have forgotten what came in this name at my sittings.—J. H. H.]

(All right. I will tell him.) She is here with me, and she is calling to you.

(Mr. Hyslop.) Yes, I hear you. What do you wish?

(It is curious. I know your son James very well, and we are interested together in this work. I have a sister Annie also, and she is still in the body, and I think your views in the body were probably not unlike my own father's, and you might be interested to meet my father over there, and you can talk to him about James, and perhaps he will tell you something about me. I think you and my father would get along very well.)

Well, I am glad to know this, and I will surely look him up, but you will remember one thing, and that is that my Annie is not yours. (Yes, I understand. She's with you.) Yes, and I will surely find your father and know him. These kind friends will help me to find him. (Yes, they will; they will introduce you to him. I shall be very pleased if they will.)

Was he very orthodox, do you think? (Fairly so.) [This question is not like father, though it is not impossible.—J. H. H.]

Well, there is no need for it here. However, we won't discuss that until later, when we know each other better. (He was a Wesleyan Methodist.)

Well, this of course was more or less orthodox. [This sounds like an echo of Dr. Hodgson's "fairly so."—J. H. H.] (Yes, oh yes, indeed.)

Exactly, well we will get on finely soon. I know this perfectly well. But I must get accustomed to this method of speech, and see how I can best express my [*best* written above *express* with caret below] my thoughts to you. (Yes.)

I am now thinking of my own things and concerns.

I can preach myself very *well*. Ask my son if this is not so. I recall many things which I would gladly have changed if it had been as clear to me as it is now. I wish I could take my knife a moment, as it will . . .

[Knife, from parcel C, given to hand.]

It will help me when I return to you. I do not think I can say more to you now.

(Well, I am very pleased to have had this talk with you, and I am sure that James will be glad to read what you told me about the medicine and gown and reading the paper and so on.)

Well I have so many things to say of much greater importance in a way later when I can fully and clearly express myself.

I am anxious to do much for him. (Yes.) Will you excuse me, I must go. (Yes, certainly. Good-bye for the present. Thank you very much.)

[Excitement.] There is one tune going through my mind. Listen. *Nearer my God to Thee*. Hyslop.

[This whole passage in reference to Dr. Hodgson's father and the statements purporting to come from my father are full of difficulties. With exception to the allusion to my sister Annie it might be taken to be a deliberate fabrication of the medium on the suggestion from Dr. Hodgson's mention of his father being a Wesleyan Methodist. The statement of my father that he could "preach" and that I could confirm it is not true, except in the sense that it would be true of any one who took as much interest in religious matters as he did, who spoke at prayer meetings as often as he did, and who commented on a chapter in the Bible in substitution for a sermon, as he

did when we had no preaching. But he would never call this "preaching," and he never undertook any function in such services that could be mistaken for "preaching," at least within my experience and recollection. It seems to be an idea that might be readily awakened by association with the conception of a Wesleyan Methodist in any brain acquainted with their laymen's habits. This is also confirmed by the quotation from the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee." For the very interesting fact here is that father belonged to a denomination that would not tolerate either hymn singing or instrumental worship in its religious services, and father never knew a hymn in his life, while this hymn is a perfectly familiar one to Wesleyans and others. It would be the last thing in the world that he would quote at all, and especially to prove his identity to me. His attendance at church also was so strict that he never went to any church where he would even hear a hymn. He did not even, after 1858, go to any church whose doctrines and practices most resembled his own, but only to his own congregation. Hence this quotation looks like the very worst attempt to establish identity, and runs the risk of doing the very opposite. It is probable that father had heard this hymn at some funeral service where it was sung, but he certainly could not quote it freely, and would not be tempted consciously or purposely to mention it in order to identify himself to me. He was not opposed to singing hymns for secular purposes, and during the Moody and Sankey excitement allowed us children to sing them at home on evenings with accompaniment of organ music. But he would not tolerate them in any other connection.

If we have a right to interpret the passage as an automatism and representation of conceptions which any person, incarnate or discarnate, would naturally have, and as a most probable memory of my father, we could *explain* the incidents on the spirit hypothesis, but it would be far from affording any evidence for it. On the contrary, it awakens suspicions in this regard and requires overwhelming evidence of a better import to justify any attempt to explain away difficulties.—J. H. H.] [See Note 31, p. 413. (May 23rd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

[Further consideration has led me to think that I attributed too little importance to the substitute for preaching which my father gave us in the form of comments on a chapter in the Bible. I found also a striking significance in the mention of the hymn. See Note 31, p. 413.]

Friend, he is awakening, and seems very clear this day.

I hope he will feel free soon as we do now.

* * * * *

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

Who's the little dark man ?

He's very persistent any way, isn't he, Rector ?

You'll manage him if you keep on.

I don't want anybody . . .

Good-bye.

I didn't want to ache [?] any,—I didn't want to go. I don't want to go into the dark world any more.

Record of Sitting. February 20th, 1899.

R. H.

[Rector writes.]

* * * * *

I come to meet you once more. I am nearer than before.

I think the way begins to seem brighter to me. Have you not any word for me from my son ?

(Yes. He says that he doesn't know about that morphine, but he was thinking of some *patent* medicine.)

Oh yes I will think and ans him . . . ans. . . yes. Do not hurry me, friend, and I will give it to you.

(Yes, no hurry . . .) I wish (perhaps you would like . . .) you would ask him if he does not recall the fact of my taking several grains of morphia before I took the Hyomi.

[It is interesting to observe that the word Hyomei is spelled almost correctly here, though it was not pronounced or spelled by me in Mrs. P.'s presence. Dr. Hodgson, however, had pronounced it several times in the previous sittings. As already remarked, it is the medicine that I had asked my father about in my earlier sitting, and in the absence of myself from this sitting might be given much evidential value, but for the necessity of reckoning with Mrs. P.'s subliminal and its memory.— J. H. H.]

I think he will recall it yet. It was, if I remember rightly . . . rightly, I think, some months before when I had a bad or ill turn, he says.

I will try and recall the name of that preparation. Anything more before I go ? (I think best one thing at a time.)

Yes, I think so, friend, but we find he does better by returning . . . ret . . . after we also have gone and returned.

Friend, repeat his question to me. + [Imperator.]

("Do you remember any other medicine besides the Hyomei and strychnine you mentioned before, and that you took at the time you took them, or near that time?")

We hail thee, friend. All will be well. [From Imperator.]

I, personally, have much to do, friend. R. [From Rector.]

(Yes. I understand, Rector.)

* * * * *

Yes. I took . . . [Hand raps once emphatically.]

Yes. I took M M M U . . . M U N . . . M . . .

Give me something.

[Metal box, spectacle case, and knife and book given.]

Yes. I took Munion . . . M U N Y O N . . . sounds like

. . . and he repeats again and again.

G e r n i s i d e (Gerniside?) [Assent]

Yes. G . . . G e r m i s i d e.

Did you realise my voice was weak, friend ?

[This allusion to his having had a weak voice is pertinent and true, but I cannot give it as much force as it might have. But it is interesting.— J. H. H.]

(I didn't know.) I say it was. H. (I think I remember that James told me so, or wrote about it.) It was quite, but I am anxious to speak plainly to and for you.

(Yes, do not worry. Feel quite calm, and think quietly of any other medicines that you took that you think James knows about.)

I took at one time some preparation of Oil, but the name has gone from my memory. I know everything so well when I am not speaking to you. Do you hear me. (Yes. I . . .) Now . . .

[These attempts to give the names of the medicines which he had taken in addition to those mentioned in my sittings have some interest. The one that I had in mind when I sent on the question is not mentioned, and I have had to send West to find out whether there was any truth in the statements made here. I recognised at once the internal probability that at least some of them were correct, as the disease would require some form of Germicide, and some preparations of oil would serve it well. I went also and inquired of the druggists in this city, without telling them what I wanted the information for, whether the first-named medicine, "Munyon's . . ." was for catarrh, and I found one by that name for this disease, which was what father thought he had. I found also that, though there was no special medicine by the name of Germicide, there were many medicines called by that name or said to have that property, which were or could be used for catarrh, and I knew merely that father had taken many patent medicines for his trouble. But I had to wait word from the West from my stepmother for any positive evidence as to the statements here made. My mother answers as follows :—

DEAR JAMES,—As Frank has written at length, I will answer your questions briefly.

1st. Your father never took any medicine in his sickness that sounded like "Munion."

2nd. The inhaler that you sent him was the only thing that could be called a Germicide.

3rd. He did not take any preparation of oil internally.—Affectionately,
MOTHER.

It must be remembered that I did not tell my stepmother what had been told at the sitting, but simply asked the simple questions whether father had ever taken the medicines named. My brother answers the same questions as follows :—

120, East 3rd Street, Bloomington, Indiana,

February 23rd, 1899.

MY DEAR JAMES,—When father was using an inhaler for his sore throat he used a medicine called Hyomei. It was a medicine put up in New York by R. T. Booth, and you got it for him, father, along with the inhaler and sent it to him. This Hyomei was claimed by Mr. Booth to be a germicide and hence to be a specific for all lung and throat troubles.

Father had Rev. Morton Malcom to send him from Pennsylvania, I think, a bottle of medicine called Japanese oil. It was a strong liniment for external application chiefly. I think he used some of it in that way, but did not take it internally.

FRANK E. HYSLOP.

New York, *March 11th, 1899.*

I called to-day at one of the wholesale drug stores to inquire if among Munyon's medicines there was one called Germicide, and was answered in the affirmative. It is a medicine for catarrh and is taken by an inhaling process. I was shown the apparatus by which the medicine is taken, and it consists of a bottle with an arrangement for dissolving the medicine and inhaling the vapor through a tube. The emphatic answer of my brother and mother that father never took any of this prevents any use of the statements at the sitting except as a failure. It is interesting, however, to note that this medicine called Germicide, or rather Catarrh medicine denominated as a Germicide, is just what father would have considered with his idea of what his disease was. It is more than probable that he had seen and consulted various advertisements, but I have not been able at this date to discover the slightest evidence that he ever took it. Assuming that he had often thought of it we can explain the statement at the sitting as consistent with the supposition that we were dealing with a discarnate spirit, but without farther evidence that he had thought of it the incident must be set down with that of the morphine as an error, and in no case as evidence.—J. H. H.]

[See Notes 32, p. 413, and 33, p. 414.]

(I wonder if you could not tell Rector various things that would be important for James and let him tell me.)

He can tell me distinctly only when I am not speaking to thee, friend, but . . .

(Yes. I understand, Rector. But, for example, as I tried successfully long ago with the old communicator Phinuit, I asked him when I was not here . . .)

Ah yes. I will be glad to do this for thee and bring his answers to thee on the . . . on the third day. U D.

(Rector. Why, if this is the best way of getting clear answers, why is it needful to bring him here at all?)

So that he will see me operate and U D how and why we reach thee, that he may not be perplexed at our inquiries, also to be better able to recollect his earthly experiences, through coming into contact with his objects, etc. U D.

(It is absolutely necessary, then?)

Yes, otherwise He would not have it so. But thou wilt remember that it requires time and patience to clear up his mind absolutely in regard to his *earthly life*. Thou wilt U D that much of it is gladly forgotten by all of us.

(Yes, indeed. I think perhaps it might be better not to ask any more of his son's questions, but let Mr. Hyslop himself continue to recall what he thinks best.)

[This statement by Rector is hardly consistent with that made by my father. That is, Rector says that the earthly recollections are so likely to be forgotten and father says that he can recall them so clearly when he is not speaking through this machine. I had asked Dr. Hodgson why he did not have Rector ask father the question away from the sitting and bring the answer himself. This recommended itself to me because it seems that Rector can think and write with perfect clearness, and that it could not be

said of him that the conditions caused any special confusion. This then is the answer that we get when the trial is made, and it seems to quite contradict the implications of father's statements written by Rector himself as the communications themselves indicate. The explanations are not impossible, and apart from the statements made about the effect of the machine and the clear memory away from it might be treated as reasonable. Of course, if Rector means that the forgetfulness occurs when in contact with the machine we can understand it, but the statements suggest difficulties.—J. H. H.]

Yes, wisely so, friend, and we agree perfectly that this is the better way, as thou didst do by George and others, because it only leads [leades] to confusion [confussion] of thought and at times brings back memories which are glad to be forgotten. The pleasantest [pleasant] side of his earthly experiences will be recollected, and expressed by so doing . . . expressed by . . . after which he will be able to tell all.

Friend, whilst speaking he is like in comparison to a very sick . . . very sick man . . . whilst . . . yet when we take his objects it clears him greatly for the moment.

Now I am told to take what I can from them and recall myself the question, take it to him, also one any other that is of a pleasing nature, and return in due time to thee with a definite answer. R.

Meanwhile give me question and I will take it. (The medicine question?) No, I can take two easily, since I U D the first *well*.

(Well, I do not know surely what is of a pleasant nature.)

I will take Cooper, I think. (Yes. Samuel Cooper.) Yes, is it Samuel?

("Do you remember Samuel Cooper, and can you say anything about him?")

S A M U E L. Yes. Very well. Very well, friend, I have it.

(And you know the medicine one?) Yes. Listen. What other kind of medicine did you take besides the Hyomi and [or written over the *and*] about that time . . . and or . . .

(Yes, and besides also the Strychnine.) Strycni

Yes. I do. [to Sp.]

I will act faithfully and do the very best with this, friend. (Yes. Thank you, Rector.) I will return as per appointment and give it thee straight off. (Yes, thank you.)

* * * * *

[Here the hand, in touching the objects, pushed the metal box over the edge of the table, and it fell and opened, revealing the contents, spectacles, pen, and folded paper packet.]

What have I done?

(The box that was here, you accidentally with the hand knocked off the table to the floor. There is no harm done. You may now show him the contents.)

[I had fulfilled the request made on February 8th (p. 390), and on several occasions for several hours together when alone in my rooms, had placed this box on my table near my arm-chair, keeping it of course still closed.]

[Much excitement over these contents.]

Oh I remember so well this pr. of spectacles, and the place in on [superposed on *in*] which it used to lie on my desk. I can see it all, and I near the . . . I also had near it a paper cutter, a writing pad, a number [of] rests . . . rests for this, and two glass bottles, yes, one square in shape and the other rather *round*. This was your sister's. (Which ?) [Paper packet held up.] (In the paper ?) Yes. (What is it ?)



Let him look at it a moment.

I am thinking . . . it is the two little pieces of what we used to call money if I mistake not, which I do not think I do.

[I here took up the paper packet by the middle and felt what I inferred to be the edges of two coins¹]

I cannot really say more to you now. I am getting weak. Let me look at this again. I am sure, however. Good-bye.

[This whole passage about everything except the recognition of the spectacles is false. I, of course, knew nothing about the incidents, but inquired of my stepmother and brother in regard to them without telling them what the statements were. I find that father never kept these spectacles on his desk, nor the case, but both of them in the pocket of trousers which he wore on occasions of going to church or visiting, so that he would not forget them. Moreover, he had no writing pad, no rest for such, and never kept any but an ink bottle on his desk. The allusion to the coins was also false. I had wholly forgotten what the little piece of paper contained when I sent it with the case and its contents, but I knew that the object or objects were not coins. I have a record of what they are, but refused to consult it before sending. They are most probably what Dr. Hodgson suspected them to be, and I am quite sure that I can guess whose they are. But I know that they were not my sister's.]

The mediumistic memory is quite apparent here, as both the writing pad and the paper cutter are recalled at once in connection with the articles which the accident brought to the attention.—J. H. H.] [Later inquiry alters both my knowledge of the facts and my judgment of the case. See Note 34, p. 414.]

(Good-bye, good-bye, Mr. Hyslop.) I am going. I cannot work for more now.

Friend. Listen. I cannot hold him . . . (No . . .) he is going and I am going presently behind him U D. (Yes. I do.)

What can I do for thee but bestow my blessings on thee, friend, and all that thou dost do. (Amen. I shall be grateful.)

I could not, as it would be impossible, re . . .

[Hand bows as in prayer for a short time.]

remain here longer for him. Friend, hear me kindly . . . hear me.

We will meet Mr. D. on the fifth and . . . and thou wilt U D.

(Yes, fifth this week.) after past Sabbath. (I understand.)

Do friend in thy heart be true to God.

Friend, it is wise that we depart, and ere we go we give thee our blessings. May God the Supreme watch over thee for all time. Farewell. + {R} (Amen.) [Cross in air.]

¹ See note at end of sitting.

[*Note*.—Here, while putting the paper packet back in metal box, I felt what appeared to be very distinctly not coins, but elliptical objects. I inferred at the moment perhaps the lenses from spectacles.—R. H.]

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

Is that a blessing? Say it. * *

Father be and abide with thee for evermore.

Servus Dei I don't know.

I have all these to look out for. I leave thee well.

Go and do the duties before thee.

Blessings on thy head.

The light shall cease.

Why do you say that?

Are you going? Good-bye.

I want to go along the same path with you.

Hear the whistle. [This was an ordinary "earthly" whistle which I also heard.]

Not to worry.

What did you reach out your hand for? You made me all so warm. I'm all of a perspiration.

[Mrs. P. looked flushed, almost as if she had been walking on a warm day. She then "heard her head snap."]

Record of Sitting, February 22nd, 1899.

R. H.

[Rector writes.]

Rector. (Good morning.) We hail thee, friend, and bring light to thee.

Waste no idle moments in trying to enlighten those whose minds are lying [line] dormant. It is a useless task [time written first, then ask superposed on the letters *me*]. Time alone can do this. We only ask thee to work on faithfully and earnestly in one field until we bid thee reach out beyond that field to others. R. . . Bid . . Bid. (Yes.)

[January 13th, 1900. This might have applied to a long conversation which I had on the previous morning with a caller in my office concerning certain aspects of psychical work.—R. H.]

I will not remain alone here long, friend, as they are coming and will be here presently. (Yes.)

Friend, art thou well? (Yes, I think I am perfectly well, Rector, thank you.) Good news awaits thee and greater help. Peace be to thy mind *evermore*. (Amen.)

(Shall I ask about sitters now?)

Presently. I am here holding the light whilst + returns. I will be able to enlighten thee presently.

Friend, we boldly assert that what we teach will deter from sin to a greater degree than anything which [has] heretofore been given to mortal man. R. Coming. U D. . . that what [Difficulty in reading the word *what* above, necessitating repetition.] (Yes I understand, yes.)

HAIL. (Hail, Emperor.) We welcome thee and on thee bestow our blessing. We are producing a change in the light.

We bring first Mr. Hyslop, who hails thee as we do.

(Yes. I . . . articles?) [Metal box and contents given.]

Yes. I remember quite well of taking this vapor preparation to which I have previously given mention and also the other U D, and the name Cooper is very clear to me also as I had a friend by the name who was . . . P . . . of philosophical [pshliosophical?] turn of mind and for whom I had great respect, and who . . . with whom I had some friendly discussion and correspondence. I had also several tokens [?] which I recollect well. One was a photo to which I referred when James was present and in my collection, among my collection.

Do you recall, James, the one to which I refer? I know this clearly and I have met him *here*. He is if you recall on this side of life with me and came some years before I did. I liked much his philanthropic views and as you will remember a close companionship with him. I am too weak to remain, will return in a moment.

Among my collection of letters you will also find several of his which I preserved.

I remember a discussion on the subject of regelego [?] regnal [?] regelgnion with him some years ago. Doubtless you are thinking of this also. Religion . . . yes sure [?]

There are many things I can recall concerning him later. [See Notes 29, p. 410, and 39, p. 499].

Look for my letters, also the photo to which I refer, James.

Now what else can I do for you? Do you remember the stick I used to carry with the turn in the end, on which I carved my initials? If so, what have you done with it? They are in the *end* . . . with the turn . . . t U R N, he says. (Yes, I understand.)

I used to use it for emphasising expression occasionally.

[Hand strikes pencil on book several times.]

(Thumping down?) [Hand keeps repeating a turning motion.]

Yes, he turns it about and then caresel . . . carelessly drops it . . . the end of it. U D. (Yes. I think so.)

If not, speak now before he becomes in any way confused.

[This long and complex message has much interest, though I cannot say that it is evidential. The first statement about the medicine is correct. The Hyomei was a vapour which had to be taken by means of a special instrument which I got at the time I got the medicine itself. It is impossible to say, however, whether the communicator intends here to thus characterise the medicines which he had named previously to Dr. Hodgson, or the Hyomei, which he mentioned to me at my fourth sitting. The phrase, "and also the other," makes it probable, and perhaps conclusive, that the vapour refers to the Hyomei. If so it is an interesting coincidence, and not less so with the fact that much of the passage is not true.]

It is evident that the predominant idea about this Samuel Cooper is that he was of "a philosophical turn of mind," which is, as I have said before, absolutely false. It is true that the two men differed radically in their

religious views, at least in the opinion of each of them, for one was a Wesleyan, and the other, my father, a Presbyterian. They have had "friendly discussions" on the subject of religion, which the usually supposed difference between philosophy and religion in the common mind might suggest to any brain, but they never carried on any correspondence. The statement that he had met him "here" is pertinent, and also that "he came some years before I did," is exactly correct. From what I have just said above about the correspondence it will be apparent that there are no letters from this man in father's collection.

The reference to a photo in his "collection" is not definite enough to make anything out of it. Nor was it definite enough at my sitting to recognise what was meant. But I now recall a large photo of father which might be meant, especially when I recall that at my sitting he wished me to have it, he always knowing that I would value it most and be more likely to keep it carefully. But it would have to be more particularly indicated here in order to suppose that either this or any other particular picture was intended. It is the same memory, however, that is here at work that claimed to be my father at my sittings.

This reference to the "stick with a turn in the end, on which I carved my initials" has some possibilities in it. I know he had a cane with a turn in it at the end, the usual curved end for holding it. I gave it to him myself, but I do not know whether he ever carved his initials on it or not. I rather think he did not do so. But as he had more than one "stick" he may have had one such as is here described. I shall have to inquire in the West about it.—J. H. H.

Since writing the above a letter from my brother says: "Father never had a cane or 'stick' with his initials carved on it. He never used a cane or stick to emphasise his talk."

My brother who wrote this was probably too young to remember that an older brother and sister with myself once gave father a cane, an ebony cane, with his initials carved on it, and that it was lost on the train while travelling. But this cane was not curved at the top or anywhere. It was a perfectly straight stick. I refused to mention this fact until I learned whether he had ever had any other stick answering to the description given at the sitting. The cane I gave him was curved at the top, but had no initials on it when I gave it to him, and I did not know whether any initials had been put on it by him or not. It was not his habit to do anything of this sort. He valued a cane only for its use and not as a memento, so that I should not naturally expect what he here mentions as anything done by himself, though that is not what is necessarily implied by the statement. I shall inquire further about the emphasis.

In my first correspondence regarding the "stick" or cane I did not tell anything about the statements made to Dr. Hodgson in Boston, and the answers came as already recorded. The attempt to make clear at the sitting that the communicator had a curved cane in mind suggested to me that possibly there was an attempt to indicate a distinction that would be natural between the cane owned years before on which father's initials were engraved, and the cane with the curved end that I had given him. If this were what the communicator had in mind it would have been a very forceful choice of evidential

incidents. Hence with the suspicion that the inquiry regarding the facts needed to be pushed farther I wrote to my brother telling him what had been said at the sitting, and asking that he, my stepmother and my sister think the matter over and see if they did not recall the fact that father did have a cane with his initials on it. I referred to what I had remembered about the one given father by my brother and sister years ago. I asked also further about the emphasis mentioned at the sitting. The replies are unanimous in regard to the question of the curved cane and initials on it, which were quite consistent with my expectations in the matter. I had known of no such cane [*Cf.* p. 415], and the carving of his initials on it was so inconsistent with my father's habits, as he never indulged in whittling or carving of any kind, that I could not imagine its truth, though granting its possibility. But the answers, one and all, state that he had no cane whatsoever on which his initials were carved by himself, and that the curved cane that I had sent him had not been touched in this way. In so far as regards his use of the stick for emphasis there is not the same unanimity of opinion. My stepmother says: "I never knew him to use his cane to emphasise his words in conversation—was always deliberate." My brother wrote in his first reply, which was mislaid, and found when the second letter was answered, that he "never knew him to use his cane to emphasise his expression." In the second letter he writes: "Neither mother [stepmother] nor I remember him to have used his cane to emphasise his talk. But Henrietta says she remembers distinctly that he did it at times, especially in animated conversation. She is very positive about this. I remember [and my stepmother says the same] that he often sat with his cane across his knees or resting his hands and chin on it. But as to his using it to emphasise his talk I cannot be positive, though like yourself I have a faint impression that he did."

I may add that even if there were unanimity of opinion as to his occasional emphasis of his conversation in the manner alluded to at the sitting it could have little evidential value, because, as my stepmother correctly remarks, father was usually so calm and deliberate in his conversation and discussions that there was little temptation to resort to any forms of emphasis of this kind, though my impression had been exactly that of my sister, that in the occasional animated talks in which he sometimes engaged he did emphasise himself in this way. But it was not a habit or characteristic of him as it perhaps is of myself, and so could not be used as evidence of identity. It has been necessary, on account of this characteristic in myself, to push the inquiry on this point to the end, because the question of telepathy between my mind and the medium, at any distance, is concerned in the matter, though in that case there is no excuse for allusion to either a curved cane with initials on it, nor to any other with such initials, for I own no curved cane, never carried any whatsoever until a few years ago, when I cut two in the mountains and had them made up. But there is nothing in the communications that would apply to me except the tendency to emphasise with a cane when talking in an animated way while carrying it.—J. H. H.] [See p. 57, and Notes 35, p. 415, and 92, p. 533.]

James. [The hand was apparently listening to Sp., and I turned to arrange some sheets of paper on the floor.]

Look friend . . .

do you wish to go to the College this A. M. If so I will remain here
. . . U D.

[The hand between each word of the first sentence above stopped writing and made a turn, somewhat like the motion that the hand would make in wiping once round the bottom of a basin ending palm up.]

(Rector, now, in this way?) Wait [?] [Hand turns to Sp., then to me.]

(Rector, that way?) [I read the sentence over, imitating the movements of the hand.] Yes, (With a twirl of the stick?) nervously.

This is almost identical with his gestures . . . gestures [Jestures]. He is amused at our description, friend, and seems to vaguely U D our imitation.

Draws it across his so-called knee, lets it fall by his side, still holding on to the turned end . . . drawers . . . draws . . . d R A W S . . . end. Hears sounds of music, to which he listens attentively, with the exception of keeping time with the smaller end of his stick . . . attentively . . . att . . . at . . .

Do you hear me?

[I thought here that the hand continued listening to Sp., but it had apparently turned to me for some remark.] [See Notes 36, p. 416, and 92, p. 533.]

Speak to him, friend, and ask him anything thou dost wish, he seems at a loss to U D what is required of him at this instant.

(Mr. Hyslop, I have a letter to you from James.) Yes. Will he speak to me? (He has sent it to me to read to you.) Oh, friend, do so as it will assist us very much in trying to keep his mind clear. (Yes, he says . . .) *Slowly* (He writes as follows :) [I here begin to read the following letter:]

“New York, *February 21st, 1899.*

“MY DEAR FATHER,—I have been very glad to receive the messages which you are sending me with the help of Rector and through my friend Hodgson. I hope you will make your mind perfectly clear and free. Tell me first about any of your earthly experiences that are most frequently on your mind. I have many of them in my mind, and shall be glad for you to talk to me about them or any other things that are passing through your thoughts about your old friends and neighbours, your experiences with them, your home and its life, and all with whom you were most intimate. I shall be glad to hear about them. I remember when you took me to the station to start to college. Do you remember how you felt then? Do you remember the college to which you sent me at that time? I remember it so well, and the way I had to go to reach it. I remember, too, how aunt Nannie used to care for us when we were young. It was soon after that I started to the High School to prepare for college. Do you remember this and all that occurred at and about that time? Tell me all about your dear friends then and afterward. I remember, too, how we used to go to church. Do you recall this, and how we managed it? Tell my friend Hodgson, and I shall be very glad to learn it from him and to do all that I can to help you. If there is anything that troubles you tell Hodgson about it, and he will send it to me. I hope thus to hear from you often, and shall take pleasure in listening

to all that you can tell me about yourself and old associates both at home and in the church.—Your affectionate son,

J. H. HYSLOP.

[After "Do you remember how you felt then?"]

Yes I do, well. At the parting. It was one of the most hopeful of my life. And do you remember what I said to you then? Write, as I cannot see you often if . . . be . . . and . . .

[Pause] repeat slowly, his thoughts are clearing a little.

(James says . . .)

I have it. Write often as I shall be with you constantly in thought, James. This is the starting point in your life. Take advantage of it, improve your time, let me know how you are getting on daily and keep up a stout heart. Want for nothing. Keep to the right, be just in all things. U D . . . improve . . . I . . . (Yes.) [read over.]

Yes, and I shall be lonely enough, but I look forw . . . lonely . . . look forward to the future.

I think, friend, he has nearly the words, as he seems very *clear about it*. R.

[This passage alleging to be what father felt and said to me when parting from me at the station as I started to college is a very good reproduction of what he felt and said, except the statement "want nothing," which his pocket-book would not have justified him in saying, as the phrase is usually understood, though it is literally what he did say. But correct as the drift is, it cannot be quoted as evidence, as it is just what any brain could concoct. If any specific incident of the occasion had been mentioned I might give some weight to the accuracy of the sentiment.—J. H. H.]

(Very good. Shall I go on?) [Cross.]

Yes, wait just a moment.

[I continue reading the letter. After "I remember, too, how we used to go to church:" the hand bends down on table for a few moments. Prayer?]

[After end of letter.]

God bless you, my son. Do you remember this expression. Yes I do remember.

[The phrase was a common one with him whenever we parted.—J. H. H.]

I wish you to know that to me James was all I could ask for a son, and when I left him or he left me I was heart-broken in one sense, but I felt that I had much to look forward to. [Perfectly accurate. The only occasion on which I ever saw him shed tears, December 10th, 1899.—J. H. H.]

I remember the coach very well, and the roughness of the roads and country. I also remember Aunt Nannie and her motherly advice to you all, and I look back to her with a great gratitude for her kindness to us all. Do you remember Ohio, James [not read] sounds like Ohio [not read] O . . .

Well (O). O H I O . . . and anything about Bartlett. I have not seen him yet, but hope to in time. I am trying to think of the principal of your school and what he said to me about George. I am still troubled about him, and if you can help me in any way to se . . . by sending me anything encouraging about him, I shall feel better I know.

(Yes, I will write this of course to James.)

This, James, is the one thing I wish to right if possible, and perhaps you will be able to help me.

(Yes, I am sure that James will do all that is best about George. Don't worry about him.)

Well, if you can help me free my mind in regard to him and his life I can be freer and reach you clearer. I am much troubled about this, and I have been praying for all to come out right. You will join me in this I know.

(I will, indeed. I will help all I can, by prayer and telling James. You can speak quite freely and unburden yourself completely.)

Oh, if I can only do this in this one thing I will not be disturbed more.

(Yes. Do free your mind.)

You see, I left with this on my mind, and I cannot dispose of it until I have learned from James that he will not feel troubled in this regard. We had our own thoughts and anxieties together regarding this . . . this . . . this as J [?] and Aunt Nannie also.

(Do you mean she was anxious with you?) [Assent] he says yes.

[This whole passage, started by the reference to going to church which I had made in my letter, is in many respects a very remarkable one, though it will not appear so evidential as is desired. But the expression, "God bless you, my son," is just what might be started in his mind by my referring to the memory of going to church, especially if we assume what is here claimed to be the fact: namely, that the mind is not clear. But passing this aside as useless beyond the fact that it was his natural expression, though perhaps equally natural to most mediums, the more striking incidents begin with the remembrance of the coach and "the roughness of the roads and country." The use of the word "coach" is not natural for father, as he did not use it, but always spoke of such a vehicle in the country as a carriage. "Coach" was a specific term for the vehicle of that name used in the cities. But when I wrote my letter to Dr. Hodgson I had in mind just the conditions here described—the rough country roads—though I thought specially of the alternative riding and walking which father, my brother and myself had to do when it was too rough to take the carriage. I wanted to see if I could call out some such facts and the place to which we went. The main object was the latter, which would have been absolutely conclusive to any one who would read the facts. It is not less remarkable to find my aunt Nannie appreciatively mentioned in this connection, as she was associated with this period of our lives, and father had every reason to be grateful to her for her kindness. My mother died in 1869, and Aunt Nannie came to keep house for father, as she was his sister, and there were six of us to be cared for. I was the oldest and only fifteen years old. She attended the United Presbyterian Church, to which father did not belong, and sometimes the necessity of getting her to her own church at one place and the rest of us to ours at another was an additional reason for our going with father on horseback. We took but one horse and alternately rode and walked. But usually the reason for this was the roughness of the roads and the necessity of walking at times to keep warm. When the weather permitted we took horses enough for all of us. The roads were terribly rough. This was long before the turnpikes were made, and the roads have been good in that region for twenty-five years, so that the mention of the rough roads

is pertinent in the extreme for the time indicated. They were not rough in Indiana, whither he moved in 1889. It should be remarked that the statements were made when I was not present, and that this is the first reference to specific facts in the State mentioned.

The perturbed state of mind indicated in regard to my brother George is very interesting, and pertinent. The reference contains the thoughts of several years, and might be construed to apply also to many anxieties that he felt about him in connection with my brother's care of father's property in the northern part of the State of Ohio. But the immediate time to which this mention of him in connection with the principal of the school has reference is an earlier period than the care of my father's property, though closely connected with it in other relations than time, and what it means will be seen when I have called special attention to the wonderful accuracy of the reference to Ohio. This was his native State which he did not leave until 1889, and this is the first definite reference to it. It is perfectly coincident with the mention of the roads and their roughness and the thought of my aunt Nannie, whom I had suggested, and who had not been with him for over twenty years. The transition to my brother is so abrupt that I can understand it only as suggested by our going to church together, and this brings up all the memories connected with our lives. The name "Bartlett" when I first read it seemed to me to be a part of the nonsense of these experiments. But when I re-read the record it occurred to me that it was the name of the township in which my brother lives. But on examination of a legal paper connected with the property in that township, of which I am an executor, the name is slightly different, though nearly like this, and if we allow for the disturbance that might be caused by the difference of time between thinking the sentences and writing them with the fact that the use of the word "yet" in the next sentence might have determined the writing of the last letters of the name "Bartlett," we conjecture a possible importance in this word of very considerable evidential value. If the word had been "Bartlow" it would have been almost overwhelming in its suggestiveness, and this in spite of the irrelevancy about not having seen him yet. But thinking that father might have known such a man and corresponded with him about the northern land, as my brother George was here mentioned, I took the occasion to ask my aunt Nannie, the only one likely to know anything about it, as she was closely associated with father in the ownership of this land, whether she knew of any such person and the possibility of father's connection with him especially *re* this land. Her reply is: "As for your question I never knew your father to have any dealings with a man by the name of Bartlett, either in connection with the northern land or any place else. I would have known if he had any connection with the land." This strengthens the supposition that the name is an attempt to mention the name of the township, Bartlow, but it makes it more difficult to explain the irrelevance about his not seeing him, though true if it was a man he had in mind. I also suspected that Dr. Hodgson had not read the original rightly, and without telling him what it ought to be, as above indicated, I wrote him to send me the other possible readings of the original automatic writing. He sent me the original in answer to my inquiry, and there is only one reading possible for it, and this is the one given, namely: "Bartlett." But putting

together what I know of my father's anxiety about my brother both at the time indicated in the next sentence and afterward, there is good reason for suspecting an attempt, though it be a mere automatism, to give the name of the township in which my brother lives. And this all the more if we suppose it an attempt to indicate in this way what is forgotten or could not be named in regard to the town itself. To see its possible pertinence let me show how any one might utter this when the name of the town is forgotten but the name of the township remembered. Let it stand as follows. "Do you remember Ohio, James, Bartlow township?" This is, of course, all conjecture, but it is possible, especially as it connects the mention of my brother, the two causes of mental anxiety here suggested, and the time involved in the incidents that I know.

(If we suppose that there is a change in my father's thought after the word Bartlett we can make the whole passage intelligible on the ground that the words, "I have not seen him yet," are explained by their reference to the principal of the school mentioned in the sentence that follows them. This suggestion would meet the difficulties which I raised in the following as well as in the previous paragraph. May 29th, 1900.—J. H. H.)

Since writing the above comments on the name Bartlett, it has occurred to me that another possible interpretation than the one I have given might be made, especially on the hypothesis that what we get must be either automatisms or mediumistic guessing. Father was very fond of Bartlett pears, and indeed of pear culture, and had a large orchard of pear trees in Ohio. As I said, he was very fond of the Bartlett pear, and tried to succeed in its culture, but his whole effort at pear culture failed. But it is only the assumption that we are dealing with automatisms that justifies this far-fetched interpretation, and as the supposition that it refers to such a fact would involve a time in his life somewhat separated from the time connected with the other events considered here it is not to be considered as either suggestive or important, but only one of those coincidences which should be mentioned for the benefit of critics and sceptics of this work. No interpretation that I can put on it, considering the sentence after it, can make it perfectly clear that any of the possible meanings mentioned is true. It is the large number of coincidental glimpses into events that are so pertinent to the case that gives the passage its force. There may, then, be no excuse for even a possible reference to "Bartlett" pears except the hypothesis of automatisms from a real spirit, which looks too much like an attempt to see spiritism at all hazards in the case. But as mediumistic guessing could as well explain such a conception as automatism we cannot purloin a spiritistic interpretation for the sake of even making out a possible case. The context favours either a nonsensical automatism or the interpretation given in the main part of my notes.

It was my father's intention to send my brother also to college, and he had him at the high school after I started to college. At first my brother applied himself to his studies as vigorously as I had ever done. But the last year or more he gave up much of his time and interest to social life. His abilities were sufficient to enable him to do this without endangering his graduation. But my father was afraid that this tendency would grow if my brother went away from home to college, where he was free from parental

inspection and influence, and my father went to the principal (this is the only word he would use) of the high school and talked the whole matter of my brother and his work over with his teacher, and came to the conclusion that he would not send him to college. Afterward he talked the matter over with me, and I urged him to try it, but he was inexorable, though it was a bitter trial for him to refuse it. It will be seen then that the reference here is particularly pertinent and is naturally associated in the state of mind it represents with the lifelong interest and frequent anxieties he had about him. The mention of this incident here also explains what he always had in mind in life when defending my brother against any derelictions of duty regarding the care of the property. My brother went out to a perfect wilderness, and where there was no chance for civilised and cultivated persons like himself to get any proper social satisfaction, and though father lost some money in the venture, the hard work of my brother and the sacrifices that his life involved in that region, after his high school education, always induced father not only to pardon what he would have reprehended in a stranger more severely, but also to apologise for him when any one else complained about him. But with all his generosity and charity he was constantly worried with the affairs connected with the northern land, and often referred to my brother's education and sacrifices when we wrote or spoke of the affairs out there.

The expressed desire that I should not be troubled about him is also pertinent, as he knew how many times I had been obliged to use his mediation in order to get my own affairs attended to at all. He always did his utmost to keep me from misunderstanding the situation, and I have no doubt that he worried more than I knew about, though I do know how my stepmother and aunts talked about the matter. The mention of aunt Nannie again in this connection at the close is also very pertinent. It was she with whom he most frequently corresponded about this property, especially as she had by far the larger interest in it. She has often mentioned to me their correspondence on the management of things there, and I do not know a more suggestive fact anywhere, taken with the others, than this singular reference to her, as having a common knowledge and anxiety regarding my brother George.

On the whole I must consider this passage a strong evidential set of incidents, though some of the gaps have to be filled in from my own memory, or even pieced out by tolerant interpretation. It is not as definite or objective as is desirable, and so cannot impress the reader as forcibly as it does myself, since no one else can see the personal pertinence of the references and incidents as I can see them, though I think I have made tolerably clear the possibilities of their pertinence.—J. H. H.]

Now, friend, I would advise thee to get some answer from this gentleman's son, saying he will let nothing disturb him concerning this, and give it to his father here, which will once and for all clear his thoughts of it.

He has gone for a moment.

Thou wilt see there was some special anxiety . . . special . . . in regard to this when he left thy world U D. (Yes. I understand.) Since his son would help him, he can do . . . would help him in . . . this by saying

it shall not trouble him. R. (Yes. I understand.) I seldom see a more devoted father than he is . . . devoted . . . and James is his favourite son.

Yes, I will tell you more of . . . of . . . Messenger when I feel stronger. [The word Messenger has no significance for me. We might conjecture that some confusion may have arisen in connection with "some messenger" on the "other side." (Cf. p 466) (May 29th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I wish to remind you of all. Did you remind James of my cap? (Yes. He does not remember it.) Not remember it? Ask Nannie. [As later developments show, I regard this as Rector's mistake for Maggie, the name of my stepmother. (Cf. pp. 336, 387) (January 8th, 1900).—J. H. H.] (Yes, he will doubtless make every inquiry.)

You see I was in the West far from him for some time, and my habits of dress and my doings may not be known to him, but the rest may remember if he does not. (Yes, was Nannie with you?) Yes. (Perhaps Nannie can tell him.) Yes. I know. (Well, he will find all out eventually.)

I shall be glad of this, because I am doing my best to recall everything. I cannot remain longer now, but I will come again ere long, and recall more concerning the boyhood days of my children. Good-bye, thank you. (Good-bye, thank you. I will next time bring you what James says.) Well, does he not recall my desk and odds and ends? I am going. I cannot remain.

+ Friend, it would be useless to hold him longer. (Yes.)

[This continued reference to his cap is interesting, and this time it comes within the reach of possibilities. I said in a note the first time it was mentioned in my last sitting on the 27th of December, that I knew of no such cap, and did not think it possible that he ever wore one. My note on the second mention of it explained a further attempt to get at some meaning to it. I had before this, and after returning home from my sittings, written to my stepmother asking her if father had ever worn a cap. The following letter which I received in reply I interpreted, as did my stepmother, to mean that he was not in the habit of wearing a cap, and hence I treated the matter as of no consequence. Several other questions were answered in the same letter and I quote from it. "Your note of January 2nd and 3rd received to-day and in answer to your inquiries I will say, first, your father never wore a cap since we were married except once, and that was during very cold weather in '95. He was in the habit of sleeping with his head covered in the bedclothes, said his head was cold on top. I thought it was bad for him to breathe that way, and made a knit cap for him to wear in bed, but it would not stay on, and he never wore it more than one night. *Never* wore a cap of any kind in daytime."

I took this as sufficient to condemn the reference, but it has occurred to me since this frequent reference to the cap that the wish in life to have some covering for his head, which was very bald and which suffered from the cold, might here crop up as an automatism. This possible interpretation is borne out here by the very pertinent allusion to his separation from me for some time in the West. This is correct, and I think my correspondence with my stepmother shows me sufficiently ignorant of many of his things and habits. This reference to Nannie is interesting, especially as he does not say "aunt" in it. It is not pertinent to her at all, but if the name were correct it would make the incident very evidential, as can be seen from the contents of the

letter just quoted. The use of "aunt" in several references containing the name Nannie and the omission of it in the two or three cases where my stepmother is concerned suggests that Rector did not catch the name rightly. The right name may come out later, and if so it will explain this inadvertence. (*Cf.* pp. 47, 69-74). In the meantime the correctness of the allusion to the separation between us in connection with the recognition that I do not remember the cap is an interesting fact when I am told to ask one about it whose name might be mistaken in this complex process for that of my stepmother.—J. H. H.]

[Further inquiry shows that the cap was a *black* one, as said in the communication (p. 387). (January 10th, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

We UD from him that there was a lapse [laps] of a few years between [betweene] the meeting of himself and his son. We will learn all from him in time. R.

(Yes. I think it will not be wise at present to ask any special questions).
[Strong dissent.]

Not, friend, we desire not. When we are sure of his state of mind we will allow thee to ask anything.

(Yes, and about the medicines, I will not ask any more about that. If you, Rector, know, and can tell me, well and good, but otherwise, of course, leave it until he gets clearer. He does not even yet seem to me to be nearly as clear as I thought he was going to be, and I see that it will probably be some time yet.)

Ah, yes, we do not realise fully thy time, but we know one thing, and that is that he will be as [sheet turned] as clear as Mr. W. in a little while. (Well, Mr. W. has done well.) He will repeat all as well as he, but he was a very ill man, and rather advanced in thy life. (Elderly ?) [Correct.]

Yes, and has many things going through his mind here, which we are unable at present to clear for him, yet time alone with our help will do this . . . can do this.

Friend, it takes more light than anything else, and we are at times praying ourselves for help.

Friend, we are in a short time going to meet thee for at least four successive days for Hyslop, and until then we will only meet thee occasionally, and do what we can for him . . . for him. (Very good.)

* * * * *

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

II.

There's Mr. Hyslop and Mr. Hodgson. They've just met. Tell him I've just found him. * * * [Inarticulate, borderline between II and I.]

I.

Be better now.

I see you are.

That's Mrs. Hodgson and the children.

I want to . . . I want to fly.

There's Imperator. Friend.

They took—they closed the opening right up.

All the veil is taken off and all the light is gone.

I feel stiff enough.

You hear my head snap, don't you ?

LATEST NOTES TO APPENDIX II. ; SITTINGS FROM FEBRUARY 7TH
TO 22ND, 1899.

Short Beach, *August 9th, 1899.*

Note 26.—Some time ago a suggestion occurred to me in the use of the word "camp" in the above statements that permits a conjecture here that illustrates what is possible in this case, and it is not so violent a hypothesis as the absurd one which I rejected in my first note because I was not willing either to entertain or to state it. I do not hold that the one I am going to state now is at all probable, but that, in consideration of the nature of these communications, as already remarked in some interesting cases of confusion, the supposition is either possible, or serves to show how near the actual truth the statements are. The conjecture did not occur to me until I became more or less aware of the fact that in these communications there was often an associative connection between one message and the following. Having remarked this, and noting how nearly the word "camp" was to being a part of the name of a place, Champaign, which my father, mother, sister Anna, an aunt, and myself visited on the trip out West alluded to just below, I determined to ask the only person living who could know, whether we had taken our trip to Chicago and the lake, which I remembered we took as a fact at that time, *after* leaving this town. Her reply, that of the aunt who accompanied us on that trip, received this morning, is that we went to Chicago and the lake *after* leaving this town. My stepmother writes me that father often talked to her of this very trip, mentioning the name of the town whenever he alluded to the trip. The facts then in favor of interpreting the reference as I conjecture it are as follows. (1) That it was in 1861. The phrase "some years ago" may be taken as distinguishing between recent and remoter events. (2) That the trip can properly be described as "a change" or pleasure trip, though incidentally business connected with some land was associated with the trip. This, however, concerned only some fencing and minor matters. (3) That we visited Lake Michigan and Chicago at the time, making a special journey down to the lake shore while in the city. (4) That the trip was made *after* we left Champaign, supposing that there was some confusion here in getting the word Champaign, so that it becomes "camp." (5) That father very often talked to my stepmother about this trip. (6) That the message about the trip is closely connected with the direct mention of a "trip out West." (7) That the use of the word "one" in this very next message about a trip out West apparently to distinguish between more trips than one, several having been made previously on business, is evidence of an associative nexus between the two messages. (8) That the doubt expressed in the phrase "we or I" in the second message and connected with the accident involves the same distinction as I have just mentioned between the two communications. (9) That the very frequent confusions in these messages which have an undoubted half significance at least render the reconstruction possible, whatever we may think of its probability.

But the facts against the interpretation are: (1) That we did not go to the mountains in this or any other trip, but to the prairies in Illinois. (2) That it was not after leaving any camp. It was after leaving Champaign.

In order that the reader may see how nearly the passage is to being absolutely correct I may be allowed to reconstruct it somewhat with the imaginary confusion that ends in "mountains" and "camp." If we assume anything like the trouble that was manifest in the guitar incident (*Cf.* p. 461) the following is conceivable. "I am thinking of the time some years ago when I went into [Father says 'Illinois.' Rector does not understand this, and asks if he means 'hilly.' Father says, 'no! prairies.' Rector does not understand. Father says, 'no mountains.' Rector understands this as 'No! Mountains.' and continues.] the mountains for a change with him, and the trip we had to the lake after we left [Father says, 'Champaign.' Rector understands 'camp,' and continues.] the camp." The name of the town is usually pronounced *Shampagne*, and according to my stepmother my father so pronounced it when living, though my own recollection is that he often pronounced it *Campane*. But of course, we do not know the various tendencies to error which occur in the transmission of such messages. Compare with this the mistakes of "New" for "Ewen" (p. 631), "regicide" for "reconciler" (p. 631), "idle" for "Italian" (p. 631), "motion" for "emotions" (p. 629), "murder" for "weather" (p. 631), "turnips" for "quantlets" (p. 627). I do not present the above reconstruction, however, as probable, but only as an indication of what is possible, and wish to be very cautious even in suggesting such speculative possibility.

But the right to reconstruct such messages is at least illustrated, if not justified, by such incidents as occurred in connection with Question 7, p. 619, in my experiments on the Identification of Personality. (*Cf.* also pp. 608-614.)—J. H. H.

New York, July 10th, 1899.

Note 27.—On June 27th I read these sittings over to my stepmother, my sister, and my brother Frank, and found that several things which were either not remembered before or were denied are true after all. This fact came out in each case in an interesting way and without suggestion from me. I assumed that the case was closed against the incidents, but the spontaneous remarks of one or the other of the persons to whom I was reading the account furnished information that I had neither expected nor asked for. In one or two cases I asked a question, having forgotten what had been told me, and got an answer which showed that the record was true. Of course my questions by correspondence did not show the context and connection, and it was natural that the incident whose confirmation or denial I sought should be misunderstood. But when the whole narrative was seen the case became quite different. Hence some of the statements now contradict those formerly made. On cross-questioning my relatives and reminding them of their former statements to the contrary, they still adhered to the last statements and remarked that they had misunderstood the questions put to them before. Moreover the incidents recalled were so minutely described that I could not refuse the preference to the later narrative and confirmation. I had, of course, to be very cautious about this as such a change of conviction is liable to suspicion, but as the confirmation was against the natural prejudices and disposition of my mother and sister I had only the danger of suggestion on

my own part to overcome, and in most cases at least this danger was avoided by an indirect question and in some cases by receiving spontaneous statements that were not answers to my inquiries, but unexpected verifications of the record, or confirmation of facts not clearly put in the record.

The first of these incidents was the one that was mentioned in the sitting of February 8th to Dr. Hodgson, and this was immediately followed by another of very considerable interest. I had asked my stepmother whether father had any trouble with one of his eyes and received a negative reply, but when I read the passage referring to the trouble in the left eye and remarked that she had denied it before she said: "Well, I do not remember this, but it was true that he had some trouble with it. He used often to take off his spectacles and complain that there was something the matter with the left eye. He would rub it and complain that he could not see with it. But he never doctored for it." The fact is *a priori* probable, as I had noticed the last few years of his life that the disease with which he suffered was gradually making inroads upon various parts of his system.

When I read the passage about the "peculiar mark which you will recall, etc." my stepmother made the same reply that she gave to my letter some months before, but went on to say spontaneously and without suggestion or further question from me, that father did have a mole on the left temple near the ear and in front of it. I do not myself recall this, or that I ever knew it. My father wore a beard, and this mark, which was a very slight one, was not likely to be easily noticed, especially as I had seen him very little since 1879. The corroboration would be complete in this instance if it had not been for the mistake of referring the mark to a place behind the ear. But it is remarkably interesting to see two incidents, one strictly correct and the other nearly so, in the same breath, as it were, and with the associative unity that would be natural to one trying to prove his identity.—J. H. H.

Short Beach, Conn., July 25th, 1899.

Note 28.—I have ascertained an interesting fact that shows the allusion to morphine more nearly correct than my first note implies. On reading father's letters over I find in that for April 27th, 1896, that father states to me that he was taking strychnine and arsenic at the same time that he was taking Hyomei. Now this arsenic is not morphine, but it is a poison that was very closely associated in father's mind when living with the common class of poisons, and it might be a natural mistake to make here in mentioning it instead of arsenic. Of course, the evidential feature of the case is lost in any event, but as a mistake it is more easily accounted for by the fact that I have mentioned than it would be on the supposition that it was more false than it is. That is to say, it is more like a mistake of memory than a mistake of fabrication.—J. H. H.

Note 29.—The second incident which unexpectedly turned out to have considerable interest and importance related to the name Cooper. I had referred to the name because I thought that, if Dr. Hodgson would get the answer that I wanted (see sitting of June 1st) the incident would try telepathy very severely. But, as my notes show, I was not only ignorant of

any relevance in the statements made by the communicator, but I did not even remark that the communicator actually distinguished between the Cooper that I had in mind and another whose name I either never knew or had wholly forgotten. I merely read the passage to my stepmother and remarked the absurdity of its pertinence to this Samuel Cooper; with which she agreed, but, all unconscious of the light she was throwing on the record, she said that father was a warm friend of Dr. Joseph Cooper, of Alleghany, that he often spoke of him and that he probably had some correspondence with him at one time. She distinctly recalls the last occasion on which my father referred to him. It was one of the meetings of the United Presbyterian Assemblies, which father would attend when it met in his home city. He pointed him out to her, but as they had grown widely apart in their religious views, which were always different, he did not speak to him at this time. Unfortunately all my father's correspondence was destroyed about two years ago, except such as pertained to his business affairs, and it is impossible to corroborate the statement that he had corresponded with this Cooper on religious matters. My two aunts do not remember either father's friendship or his correspondence with the man. This is not surprising, because whatever relations my father may have had with this Dr. Cooper occurred about the time of the Union of 1858 when the United Presbyterian Church was formed, and it was at that time my two aunts separated from father on religious matters. This Dr. Cooper, I am told by one who knew him well and who is a theologian of some rank in that church, was very conservative, though more liberal than father. This would attract him to father on questions connected with the union of the two churches, and I can conjecture that the fact would give rise to father's desire to know how so conservative a mind could go into the Union at that time. Father had intelligence enough to worry any theologian very much if he was not strictly logical or sincere, as many a one could testify. I have no doubt that if I could recover this alleged correspondence, I would find that it related to questions connected with that Union which father could not accept and whose acceptance he could not understand in men professing the beliefs of Dr. Cooper. This Dr. Cooper remained conservative in everything but the question of instrumental music, and astonished and offended his old friends a short time before he died by accepting the new tendency toward its introduction into church worship. In the absence of testimony and correspondence, therefore, these facts may indicate the possibility of correctness in the statements of the communicator, especially when we discover, in a later sitting (p. 420) the pertinent reference to a school which had been built as a memorial to this Dr. Cooper.

The allusion to "tokens" on February 22nd (p. 397) in connection with the name Cooper has considerable interest. My father belonged to a small denomination, the Associate Presbyterian, which practised what is called "close communion" and hence used these tokens, little oblong metal pieces of a coin-like character, to indicate the person's right to participate in the dispensation of the bread and wine in the communion service. The improbability that they should be mentioned by chance is clear from the following facts :—

The denomination consists of about ten or twelve ministers and perhaps not more than a thousand communicants. There are perhaps fifteen or

more separate congregations. There is not one of these east of the Alleghany mountains. They are all in the Mississippi valley. One of the best informed ministers in it wrote me that this denomination, the Associate Presbyterian Church, was the only one in this country that used these tokens in communion services, others that were conservative using only certificates or cards. "Open communion" is the general practice and hence certificates even are limited to one or two denominations.

The tokens are placed in the hands of an elder or member of the "Session" for safe-keeping in the interval between communion services, and there are not more than fifteen or twenty persons in the United States of whom it can be said that they have had these tokens. My father was an elder in this church and was always entrusted with the keeping of them. When the little congregation to which he belonged in Xenia, Ohio, of perhaps not more than twenty or twenty-five members, was disintegrated by the death or emigration of its members, father kept these tokens in a little chamois skin bag, and I obtained them as mementos after his death.

The most interesting part of the reference to them, however, consists in their connection with the name Cooper. The use of tokens was never considered as essential to religious belief or practice. But those who still clung to their use did so on the specific ground that the abandonment of them would relax allegiance to the more important features of religious ceremony. A good many questions of this sort were warmly discussed in the settlement of the terms of union between the Associate Presbyterian and the Associate Reformed Churches to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1858, which my father declined to enter, owing to his conservative beliefs. If father ever had any correspondence with this Dr. Joseph Cooper, it was at this time and most probably concerned such questions as are implied in the use of tokens. Father and Dr. Cooper differed on these matters, as is indicated by the different directions which they took in their action at the time. It is therefore very pertinent here to see the mention of these tokens in connection with a name that was very prominently associated with the controversies that were terminated by the formation of the United Presbyterian Church.—J. H. H.

Note 30.—Since ascertaining the relevance of the statements with reference to this Cooper, from the standpoint of the communicator, I may alter the judgment previously expressed of some of the statements (p. 386). The reference to the "accident" as soon as the name was given him is pertinent enough, though it is not remembered by the only person who can testify on the matter, my stepmother, whether any accident interrupted their journey on the occasion when they visited the West together. But it must be recalled that an accident had been mentioned in connection with some trip out West, so that any name that would suggest the West to the mind of the communicator might very well recall the incident of the accident, whether it ever took place or not.

It will be apparent also that the allusion to "the old friend of mine in the West" takes on a new possibility in the light of the general relevance of the message. It cannot be said that this Dr. Cooper lived in the West from the standpoint of my father in his lifetime, because it was east of him that

Dr. Cooper lived. It could be true as stated only from the standpoint of the place of the communications, and this is hardly allowable except by straining the interpretation. But if the communication is incomplete, the statement might be connected with an attempt to speak of the Cooper School, an attempt, however, which did not succeed until a later sitting (p. 420). This was "in the West," but whether an imperfect message or not, the association of the name West with Cooper, in the light of the facts explained, is natural enough, even if confused and dreamy, so that I can recall the remark that it might be a mediumistic trick.—J. H. H.

Note 31.—The next incident pertains to the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee," on which I commented as opposed to the supposition that I was dealing with my father. I was explaining the absurdity of the incident and pointing out that it, with some others, was flatly against the spiritistic theory, as I read the record to my stepmother, when she emphatically agreed, and spontaneously remarked to confirm my judgment, all unconscious that she was overthrowing it, that this hymn was especially disliked by father and that he very often expressed this dislike, remarking that he could not understand how orthodox people could use a Unitarian hymn. I was absolutely ignorant of this fact, and though I knew we had sung Moody and Sankey hymns for secular diversion to which father was not opposed, thinking, in spite of his objections to hymns, that they were better for secular enjoyment than the usually vulgar songs of the neighbourhood, yet I do not recall singing this specific hymn and certainly have not the slightest recollection of his prejudice against it. My stepmother's statement is absolutely news to me. But it gives decided pertinence to the incident and overthrows my objection to it, and gives unity to the ideas connected with the mention of Wesleyan Methodists a few moments before. Of course mediumistic associations could account for this association, but it would hardly account for the extraordinary pertinence of the allusion to this particular hymn.—J. H. H.

Note 32.—Having observed some traces in the record of statements which were probably mere thoughts or intentions in the life of the communicator, and having ascertained from my stepmother that father had never used any of Munyon's Catarrh Remedies, it occurred to me to ask her on this visit whether father had ever talked about Munyon's catarrh medicine, and the answer was that he had often mentioned his intention to get it, having seen it advertised in one of the Philadelphia papers. But he never bought it nor used it. It will be apparent, then, that there is at least a half pertinence in the incident, at least sufficient to prevent it from having a direct negative value.

To verify this statement that possibly father had seen an advertisement of Munyon's Catarrh Remedy in the Philadelphia paper which I knew he took I examined the columns of this paper for the years 1895 and 1896, the period covering the serious nature of his illness, but I did not find a single advertisement of this medicine. I found, however, three advertisements of well-known catarrh remedies, Aerated Medication, Johnston's Liniment, and

Hyomei. These were advertised in a very conspicuous manner, and it is more than probable that they were seen and talked over between my father and stepmother. In fact it is possible that the impulse to try the Hyomei may have been awakened by the advertisements in this paper, and it is also possible that my mother's memory errs only in regard to the particular advertisement about which they talked, since my brother is very positive that father did see an advertisement of Munyon's Catarrh Remedy in a circular, and not in this paper. Munyon's Catarrh Remedy has been widely advertised in various ways. If my brother's memory can be trusted, and my stepmother thinks him correct about it, the conjecture regarding the possibility that we have an automatism here somewhat like the expression, "Give me my hat and let me go," has its conceivability.—J. H. H.

New York, *November 8th, 1899.*

Note 33.—In order to ascertain all the probabilities in this matter and test the accuracy of my brother's memory as against the proved mistake of my stepmother, I wrote to the Munyon Company asking whether they had ever distributed circular advertisements of their Catarrh Remedy over the West, and in particular the State of Indiana. I was careful to explain that I had no wish to pry into private business matters, but only to test the memory of a person who said that they had done so. The reply is as follows :—

Philadelphia, *November 4th, 1899.*

PROF. J. H. HYSLOP, Columbia University, N.Y. City.

DEAR SIR,—We are in receipt of your favour, and beg to reply that we do not care to answer your questions, as we never furnish information in regard to our business methods outside our office. We regret that we are unable to afford you this courtesy, and remain, very sincerely yours,

Dict. by H. H. C.

MUNYON'S H. H. R. Co.

W.

The only facts of weight in the case are that my stepmother remembers distinctly enough that father had talked of getting this medicine, and that my brother confirms this fact, while the memories of the two are at variance about the source of the suggestion to father, with a preference for my brother's memory in my judgment, especially as the advertisements in the paper mentioned by my stepmother pertained to his disease and could easily be confused in her memory with the one she here alludes to. The case is therefore at least sufficiently indeterminate to prevent the use of it for the theory of fabrication.—J. H. H.

Note 34.—I found also in the sitting of February 20th that the allusion to a round and a square bottle was less false than my original note indicates. My stepmother still insisted that he kept no such bottle as a square one on his desk. My sister did not remember anything of the kind, but my brother Frank, who was at home at that time, says emphatically and without positive contradiction by either of the other two that father kept beside his round ink bottle also a square mucilage bottle on his writing desk. But none of

them remember whether he put his spectacle case on this desk beside the bottles. They do emphatically say that he did not keep the tin spectacle case there, and that it was not his custom to use the other leather case very frequently. He may have put it on this desk at times.—J. H. H.

[Further inquiries while reading the proofs also show that my father had, and quite constantly used, a writing pad, my first inquiry having been misunderstood from the way I put it. Also, there were a number of little "rests," not exactly pigeon holes but shelves, so to speak, in the desk, and on one of these the writing pad was kept when not in use. There also were placed the various odds and ends, among them the usual implements and material of a desk (*cf.* p. 379). No one seems to remember whether father ever placed the paper cutter or knife on these "rests," but only that he carried it in his vest pocket. But as it was given him solely for opening letters, and as he indisputably left everything else, hardly excepting the leather spectacle case, on these "rests," it is possible that he often left the paper knife there with his letters and pen. (June 11th, 1900.) J. H. H.]

Note 35.—The incident about the cane or "stick" mentioned in the sitting of February 22nd, especially when compared with that in the sitting of June 8th, appears to have considerable interest. Without asking any questions at all about it, I happened to see standing in the corner of the room an old walking stick which had been broken and then mended with a tin "ring" about it. I asked if this had been father's cane, and received an affirmative reply. I asked how it had been broken, and was told by my brother Frank that the break was caused by prying with it. The tin sheath about the stick was about four inches long. The cane was a curved handled one that had been given father by his brother-in-law, who had lost the straight ebony cane with the initials on it that had been given him by us children. But unless we allow for confusion in the effort to indicate what walking stick was meant in this case and for omissions in the communication, there is some discrepancy between this incident and the statement made on June 8th. If we can suppose father to have made the attempt to distinguish between the ebony cane and the curved one I gave him, on the one hand, and between the two curved canes on the other, the incidents obtain a most extraordinary interest and importance. This broken cane I had, no doubt, known at one time before it was broken, and also I must have known that it was broken, because my aunt gave me the money to buy the one I gave him, telling me that the one he was using was broken. But I had not seen it in this broken condition, and had absolutely forgotten what I had been told about it.

A little reconstruction will show how nearly right the sentence is in which the statement is made about carving his initials on the curved cane. This cane was given him by his brother-in-law for the straight one with his initials on it given to him by us children and lost by this brother-in-law. If then the sentence had read: "Do you remember the stick I used to carry with the turn in the end, which was given me for the one on which my initials were carved in the end?" it would have expressed the exact truth very clearly, as my story shows, and there would have been no confusion about it.—J. H. H.

Note 36.—I was for a long time very much puzzled by the description of various movements attributed to my father in connection with the cane. From one expression I supposed that there might be a reference to the act of breaking it. But as this would not apply to all the incidents I had to abandon the supposition. I therefore instituted more careful inquiries into father's habits in the use of the cane and ascertain that the various statements may have immediate applicability to incidents well calculated to establish identity. The "thumping down," indicated by Rector's manner, may apply to father's actual use of this cane to call my stepmother by pounding it on the floor. He could not speak above a whisper, and if she were in the kitchen he could not make her hear in any other way, and as he could scarcely walk, owing to locomotor ataxy, it was the easiest way to attract her attention. There is, perhaps, some possibility that the allusion to a movement, described by Dr. Hodgson as like the motion of the hand in wiping out a basin, may refer to a playful trick of my father when he was in the mood for it. He would hook the handle of the cane about my stepmother's arm or neck and watch her try to extricate herself. The cane would naturally drop on the floor when she succeeded. His cane was constantly in his hands and he used to roll or draw it across his knees. He was also in the habit of keeping time with it to music, and when in meditation on some subject. There is thus much in his habits to suggest some pertinence in these apparent allusions to them. They were habits entirely unknown to me.—J. H. H.

APPENDIX III.

This Appendix contains the records of my eight sittings on May 29th, 30th, 31st, June 1st, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th, 1899, together with contemporary notes. The sittings were arranged for as indicated in the following:—

[Rector writing. Sitter, R. H.]

May 18th, 1899.

* * * (Then Hyslop is coming to this vicinity in the body, and he is very anxious to have as many times as possible. He can be present conveniently the four after the second Sabbath, and there are earthly reasons which would make those times desirable for him if possible, and . . .) [Hand turns to talk with Sp.] (Shall . . .) [Cross in air.] (And he would like to resume with you again on the week after that, so that he might have perhaps as many as ten times altogether. Then . . .) [Hand again talks with Sp.]

(Further, there is one lady whom you mentioned . . .) [Hand points to previous sheets to indicate their reference to this.] (and laid aside . . .) [Hand assents.] (and she, Mrs. —, informs me that she expects to be here next week. I suppose that she could be present on the fifth or sixth after Sabbath if necessary as she goes away again after.) [Hand assents strongly.]

He will arrange to meet Hyslop on the first four after second Sabbath. No other must interfere between our meetings with him. (Good.)

He will arrange for him on the first four after third *also* +. (Good.)

He hath especially given mention to . . . of [attempt to write of above to.] his desire to meet him through me to Mrs. D. Hast thou not yet received this desire? (Yes, Mrs. D., or rather perhaps G., mentioned that at his mother's sitting you stated your expectation of meeting him shortly.) + Well. We now arrange this for him as previously stated. * * *

EXPLANATION OF NOTES.

The Notes marked *Introduction* and placed just before the detailed record of each sitting and representing also a record of facts previous to the trance and the beginning of the writing, were written, as indicated by the dates, immediately on my return from the sittings, and usually from notes taken at the time.—J. H. H.

June 7th, 1899.

INTRODUCTION.

I noticed the usual physical indications of the on-coming trance which it is not necessary to detail here, further than to say that the change in the expression of the face compared with the normal condition seemed very marked. There was what might be called a very slightly bloated appearance to the face, the face looking less muscular, as if having less tonicity, though not in any way swollen. The lips and mouth were slightly drawn as the trance approached. The cough which at first seemed to trouble Mrs. P. lost its tendency to manifest itself, as if the trance condition relieved her throat of irritation, and it wholly disappeared when the trance was completed. There were several occasions in the on-coming trance when the eyes assumed a fixed and upward gaze until the lids began to droop. There was a slight twitching in the muscles of the cheek and hand, in the latter, as usual, before the writing began.—J. H. H.

These and the incorporated notes were made during the evening after the sitting, so that they are contemporaneous.—J. H. H.

May 29th, 1899.

Record of Sitting, May 29th, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

[Rector writes.]

H A I L. (R. H. : Hail, Imperator.) Peace to thee, and all will be as we would have it. Blessings on thee. +. We meet thee this day with peace and joy. All hail. Welcome, friend. Good news to thee we bring and . . . quiet with one and all. [Hand bows as in prayer.]

I am here and glad I am to see your face once more. If I fail in my memory think not for me, but let me think my thoughts, and they will come to me in time, past memories one and all.

Friend, we will have a word with thee after he hath gone.

[While R. H. is writing, the hand listens to S., who touches R. H. to draw his attention to it.] (R. H. to S. : Say something.)

(Good morning, father, is this you ?) [Excitement in hand.]

Yes. I. Yes, James, it is I your father. Was it malt [malt not deciphered immediately] you wished me to think about . . . how are you once more and is all well with . . .

[R. H. asks about word after "was it."]

Was it malt you . . . M a l t I N E you . . .

[This allusion to Maltine here is very singular, whether any explanation or significance be given it or not. The allusion to it seems to imply that it was one of the medicines which I had asked for at an earlier sitting. But while it is a medicine with which I am familiar, and which I have often used myself, it was not what I asked for, nor was it among the medicines which my father used for his disease. But the singular fact is that I had sent the spectacle case and contents to Dr. Hodgson in an old Maltine box, and this

box was on the floor out of which the spectacle case was taken a moment afterward.—J. H. H.] [See Note 37, p. 497.]

I am still with you and I have much to say. Go on. I am more free now . . . free now. Give me something.

[R. H. opens parcel and puts spectacle case on table and opens it so as to expose contents.]

I long to reach you clearer, nearer. Did you hear me speaking to you? (Yes, I hear you speaking.) Do not go more to that place. I am not there. I am not there and you cannot find me if you go.

(To R. H. : Shall I ask what place that is?) (R. H. to S. : Yes.)

(What place is that, father?) With the younger men trying to find me. They are not light and I cannot reach you there.

What was it Nani [?] said about the paper . . . [See Note 38, p. 499.]

I am sorry if I mistake any thing but they tell me if I am patient I will remember all.

(R. H. : Mr. Hyslop, your son James was trying experiments with some other persons, but he did not expect to find you, so you need not bother about that.)

Thank you, I U D, and I am glad indeed. James, if you will wait you shall know all. Believe me I will in time recover fully.

[I saw in this allusion to my going to a certain place evident indications, or at least a coincidence capable of interpretation of such indications, that I was with some "younger men" in connection with this subject. I recalled at once an occasion in New York some weeks ago when I addressed the young men of the Graduate Club on psychical research and recounted in full the facts of my former sittings. I felt the occasion very strongly and the men showed much interest in the account. But it did not occur to me that the allusion might be to a system of experiments which I instituted immediately after my sittings and on my return to New York to imitate the Piper phenomenon. I had frequently to explain them, their purpose, meaning, etc., to the young men with whom I conducted them. I also frequently mentioned my experiments with Mrs. Piper to these men, and so quite constantly had my father on my mind. It is strictly true that the "younger men" are not "light," that is, mediumistic, though it is interesting to see the real or apparent supposition that I was in some way endeavouring to get into communication with my father, and the correct statement that I could not expect to do it in this way, if the Piper experiments are a test of its possibility.—J. H. H.]

Why do you not hear me? (R. H. to S. : Say something.) (I hear you all right.)

Well, what I want you to know most at the moment is that I am speaking to some other man who is speaking for me and I will soon be here myself. U D.

Mother, Annie and all the rest. [Name Annie correct.—J. H. H.]

Speak to me now. (Well, father, I shall be glad to hear from all of you. Give your names if you can.) And yourself, how are you? I feel that you are much better and less worried. (Yes, father, I am much better and less worried.)

I will speak again presently, have patience with me.

There is time for all things, and God is merciful to all.

[Characteristic.—J. H. H.]

He will return in a moment . . . merciful to all.

We would like to have our earthly friend U D us if possible, and when so we can be of great service to him in more ways than one. R. (R. H. : Yes.)

Yes, I am here, and I am thinking over the things I said when I was confused. Do you remember of my telling you I thought it possible that we might live elsewhere ?

(Yes, father. I remember it well.)

But to speak was doubtful, very . . . Ah yes [?]

we do speak, although vaguely at times. (R. H. : After *very* ?)

Ah, but we . . . ah . . . (“vaguely at times”) . . . at best . . . we do . . .

[The allusion in this passage seems to be the same as in former sittings, both to our conversation on this subject and my doubts.—J. H. H.]

What is on my mind at present is the conditions which help me to return, U D. I have found a just and all-wise Protector who will not overlook me. I am coming nearer and nearer.

Yes . . . yes . . . [in reply to questions by R. H. if word above was *protector*.]

Do you remember when . . . Do you remember when you asked me what I said to you on your departure for school ? (Yes, I remember that well. Do you know what school I went to ?) I remember asking you to improve the opportunity. I am thinking about it now and I will speak it very soon. Do you remember my last words to you ? [Same thought as in last sitting Dr. Hodgson had for me (*Cf.* pp. 401-405).—J. H. H.] (Yes.)

I shall look forward to seeing you again soon when I hope to be better able to speak.

[Hand talks with Sp.]

Friend, wilt thou move for a while and return presently ? . . . for

(R. H. : Do you mean me, Rector ?)

Yes, thou, as we have some work to do for Mr. Hyslop here, and thy father also is coming. Kindly go. Go not for long.

[R. H. goes out.]

nor far away.

Art thou here, friend ?

I want to see you clearly, James, if possible.

(Yes, free your mind, tell what you are thinking about.)

I am here again. I am trying to think of the Cooper School and his interest there. [See Note 39, p. 499.]

Do you remember how my throat troubled me ? . . . throat. [Another allusion to his fatal illness.—J. H. H.] (Yes.) I am not troubled about it, only thinking. (I am glad to hear that.)

I remember my old friend Cooper very well and his interest . . . interests (Yes) and he is with me now.

(Yes, I am glad to hear it. Tell about him.)

He is with me now. He maintained the same ideas thorough. (What is the last word ?) throughout [throuought] (Yes, I understand.)

And perhaps you will recall a journey . . . journey U D we took together. Do you hear me. [We did take a journey together, but this allusion is too indefinite for any special pertinence. If the "we" refers to Cooper and himself it is not true.—J. H. H.] (Yes, I hear.) And do you remember John? (John. Yes, I remember him.) He has just come to greet you for a moment. [See Note 39, p. 499 and p. 480.]

And do you remember anything about Lucy . . . Lucy . . . Lucy . . . I say Lucy. [*Lucy* not deciphered.] She was Nannie's [?] cousin. [*Cousin* not deciphered.] You may not hear me.

[I can make nothing of this passage referring to Lucy and calling her Nannie's cousin. I know no one of that name that could be called my aunt Nannie's cousin, nor a cousin of my stepmother who evidently passed in some of the sittings under the name Nannie, though this is not correct. Neither can I make anything out of the allusion just afterward to my brother and the visit to him. Apparently there was some wandering and confusion in both cases, as communications from father were superseded by those from my sister who avows it her mission to help father to remember and to become clear.—J. H. H.] [See Note 40, p. 501.]

(Yes, I hear.) And yet I am thinking of F * * [rest of word undec.] and my visit to him. I mean your brother . . . Brother . . . Hear it? (Yes, I hear it.)

Where is he now . . . is your . . . I . . . my son. I do . . . [This is too vague for any use. Father never visited my brother Frank. But then this may not be meant. Nov. 3rd, 1899.—J. H. H.] [See Note 40, p. 501.]

Annie . . . I want to help father to remember everything because I came here first and long ago. [This relation of time is correct in both instances.—J. H. H.] Do you hear me, James? Do you remember the large sled . . . the large *Sled*? (I am not sure) S l e d Sled (Yes, I understand.)

Do you know the one I mean? I remember you and the Allen [?] interpreted by S. as *older*] boys had it when I was in the body. Do you remember it? [*Cf.* p. 422.] (No, I do not remember.)

[I have no recollection of this sled incident, but it is extremely probable. My sister died in the winter. "Allen" is probably Rector's mistake for McClellan.—J. H. H.]

Here is father and he is alone

[R. H. returns.]

again now and I will go for a moment. [See Note 41, p. 502.]

Now, James, here I am, I am thinking about the church and the little . . . [*Cf.* p. 435.]

[I should have been glad to have seen this developed.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Shall I stay?)

Yes. All right now. Remain, friend, and all will be well.

Speak to me occasionally, James, that I may hear you.

(Yes, father, tell about the little church, tell about the church.)

It . . . reach you . . . Be just always. [These words probably part of conversation between Rector and communicator.]

And perhaps you will recall an old friend of mine who was a doctor and who was a little peculiar in regard to the subject of religion, and with whom I had many long talks. (Who . . .) A man small of stature and . . .

and more or less of mind. It has gone from me, *i.e.*, his name, but it will come back to me.

[It appeared hardly safe to identify this reference to a doctor friend too definitely. When I saw the word "doctor" written I thought of father's old family physician who died long ago. But the reference to his peculiar views about religion turned me off upon another physician who had the reputation of being an arch sceptic. But then again as soon as the mention was made of the long talks, the passage taking time enough for the writing to enable my thoughts to change, I saw clearly that this was not the man meant, as I knew my father never talked to this physician on religion, while his old family physician was of the same religious conviction as my father. The long talks and peculiar views of religion, however, at once suggested the name of another physician (Dr. Harvey McClellan, whose name was apparently attempted towards the end of the sitting) with whom I know my father did talk on this subject, and I remember that my father and aunt used to condemn his more liberal views very heartily.—J. H. H.]

[Further study of this incident leads me to think that possibly my father had his dentist in mind here, and this in spite of my thought at the time and the immediate attempt to give the name McClellan which was plainly indicated to refer to my cousin. The reference to the church and the talks on religion, especially when characterising them as peculiar, confirm or suggest this interpretation more strongly than the first one. This dentist was a Unitarian. My father admitted his intelligence, but could not agree with him on religion, and had many talks with him. (*Cf.* Note 74, p. 523) (April 24th, 1901.)—J. H. H.]

Do you remember McCollum [?] (S. : McAllum ?) (R. H. : McCollum ?) (S. to R. H. : No. I know what it is.)

(Spell it again.) McAllum. (How was he related to you ?) He was McAllan [?] (Yes, that's it.) Don't you U D who I mean? He came over some time ago. [Correct, if it refers to my cousin.—J. H. H.] (Yes. I remember. Tell.)

What about your uncle ? (Which uncle do you mean ?) I mean . . . let me hear once more . . . I mean Charles.

(S. to R. H. : That's not quite right. Shall I make him spell it out ?) (R. H. to S. : Yes.)

You must remember him. (Yes. I remember him, but please spell out the name in full.) In full. (The name Charles is not right.) In full did you say ? (Yes.)

C l a R l . . . [hand signifies dissent.] speak it more loudly.

C l o r O R . . . C. [pause.] (That's Clark) C l a R A k E C l a r k (that's right) e. (Not quite.) son [?] . . . there are some more which I will . . . I say. He is here himself speaking it for me.

C l a r k e. C l a r a n c e.

Speak it louder, friend. Well he is Uncle Clauc [?] C l a r a k e.

I will wait for it.

It sounds very like it. Clarke. Charles [?]

[This allusion to my "uncle Charles" and the long effort to get it right is one of the most interesting incidents of the sitting. It will be remembered that in one of my earlier sittings, that of December 24th last, he was called

"uncle Charles," and on my demand for more explicit information, he was said "not to be a real uncle." I here asked for the name to be given correctly and in full. "Clarke" is not correct, nor will any but psychic researchers familiar with the phenomena we are here dealing with recognise any similarity between this and the real name which I hope still to get in the future. There is some suggestion of it in "Clarke." But the most interesting part of the incident is the consciousness of Rector that he is not getting it right, and his very earnest effort to get it.—J. H. H.]¹

Well, never mind. Don't try. Wait a moment and do not hurry . . . yes and McAllan. Well, you must know him. I had a cousin by that name. Don't you remember it : [*Cousin* first interpreted as *brain*.]

C O U S I N. Cousin. [He was my cousin, not father's.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I remember my cousin. What was his first name? Tell him to give his first name.)

He will, but do not worry about it.

Yes. I haven't seen so many here around the light in a long time. R.

Where is George? I often think of him but I do not worry any more about him. [Name correct and suggestion pertinent.—J. H. H.] (George is at home and all right. Do you remember where that is?) Oh yes, I often go out there to see him. (Do you . . . do you ever see him?) Oh yes, I think, if I U D your question, I do.

Yes, and do you remember Thom . . . Tom . . . and what has he done with him? I feel quite . . . yes . . . yes, all right . . . I mean the horse. (S. : That's it. My conscience !)

[This reference to "Tom, the horse," is profoundly interesting. As soon as I saw Tom written I thought of an old negro whom father often employed in the harvest field and with whom he used to have much fun. But I was completely surprised when the statement came, "I mean the horse," possibly as information to Rector, who perhaps was puzzled at first to know what the passage meant. The question should have ended with "what he did with him." "Tom" was the off horse of a favourite pair of father's, who had served him so well that he would never part with them but resolved to keep them until they died. "Tom" was excitable, though not dangerous, worked too hard and was wind broken. Just how and when he died I do not know, as his death occurred after I had left home and neighbourhood for teaching, but I merely recall that a letter from some one of the family told me of the time and manner of his death. My impression is that my brother

¹ The failure to get the name Carruthers correctly, at least eventually, was probably as much my fault as any one's, perhaps mine alone. When Rector gave the name "Clark" instead of "Clarake" I said, "That's right," meaning that "Clark" was the correct form for the apparent attempt in Clarake, and not that I recognised the name as the correct one for my uncle. But my statement was calculated, unintentionally, to make Rector believe that he had caught the name, and that it was right. It is interesting, therefore to note that in most instances during the later sittings the name of this uncle appears as "Clarke," and only occasionally as "Charles," which had been used for the name of this uncle until I called for the correct form here. Had I not used the expression "That's right" I might have gotten the name correctly, but the mischief was done, and I did not wish to precipitate such a time as occurred later when I asked for the correct name of my step-mother. January 16th, 1900.—J. H. H.

George was connected with the disposal of the horse after his death. [See Note 42, p. 502.]-J. H. H.]

I am thinking about it now, and everything I ever knew I believe, because my mind travels so fast and I try to get away from the rest as much as possible. [Interesting suggestion as to place of Attention and Inhibition in this phenomenon.-J. H. H.]

Arthur after I go out I shall feel better.

[Arthur was probably Rector's misinterpretation of *After*.-R. H.]

I feel better than I did a while ago. I wonder what Annie meant about the Sled . . . Sled. She has it on her mind.

James, are you waiting for me? I used to read the paper in my chair, but strange they none of them remember it. [Not all deciphered immediately.] [See Note 43, p. 502.]

Did you write to Nannie about it, James? . . . papers . . . [R. H. had misinterpreted *paper* and *strange* and *none* in sentence above, and re-reads it with some other interpretation of *strange* and *none*.]

No, no, do not speak so, friend . . . strange they do ("none of them remember it") write [right?]

You must know what I am thinking about.

[I remember that father had a tall rocking chair in my younger days in which he always sat, and in which he was accustomed, daytime or evening, to read the papers. I imagine that he had the same habit in the latter part of his life.-J. H. H.]

And the little tool I used for my feet ("and the little *tool*"). He says no. S t o o l. (S. : Is that word *Stool*?) Yes. I had for my feet. Cannot you remember? (When was this?) Just before I came here.

(I do not remember it, but I think some one else will.)

[As I read this over, I think that this reference to a stool is pertinent, and that father used one during his last illness. Nannie is not the correct name here, though, if we interpret it as a mistake of Rector for the right name (Maggie, my stepmother), the intended reference would be pertinent. (Cf. p. 69, and Note 25, p. 365.) If she confirms this statement about the stool, it will support my interpretation of the name in this and in some earlier sittings.-J. H. H.] [See Note 44, p. 502.]

Strange I think, but when I go out I will think it all over and see what I have told you.

Do you feel about the bible as you did? There are many errors in it. I have found that out and

[This is a great change of mind for father, and would be against personal identity, and could be made consistent with it only on the supposition of the spirit hypothesis involving a view of things quite different from the ordinary orthodoxy.-J. H. H.] [Cf. hymn incident, p. 389.]

give me . . . [articles placed under hand.]

James, where is that paper knife . . . do you know?

(I have not found it, but I think mother knows about it.) [See earlier sittings, pp. 378, 379 and Note 14, p. 359.-J. H. H.]

Well, that will be all right, but what I am anxious about is for you to know I am not forgetting anything, only I am a little confused when I try to tell you what I so long to do.

I think of twenty things all at once. I am now thinking of those pictures ; where are they ?

Do you remember a small cap I used to wear occasionally, and I left it I think with Francis (R. H. : Francis) [Hand dissents] Fred—F r e I mean Fredrick [?] (“Fredrick”?) [S. shakes his head negatively.] no, not that, but with F . . . but F. (*cf.* p. 387.)

[This allusion to the cap again is interesting, especially in connection with the name Francis, and the attempt to correct or change it into another form. My brother's name, the youngest, is Francis, but we invariably called him Frank.—J. H. H.]

Do you know the one I mean ? I cannot think any more. Wait for me to return. I will be better bye and bye. Yes, his name was Henry McAllam [?] and he is . . .

[Here we have very nearly the name of the physician with peculiar religious views mentioned earlier in this sitting. His name was Harvey McClellan. This confirmed my earlier conjecture very clearly.—J. H. H.] [See p. 422, and Note 74, p. 523.]

gone. [Pause.]

Our prayers have been with thee often, friend, and for thy health, and we are thy friends, and when thou art cast down call upon us for help, and help thou shalt receive.

We went to the boy immediately. We wen . . .

We received thy message, and we went to the boy at once. + . . . went.

(R. H. : I understand. Thank you.)

[At the sitting of May 26th, Miss E. gave a request sent by R. H. from Mrs. C., asking Imperator to help a little boy who was ill.]

Ah, James, do not, my son, think I am degenerating because I am disturbed in thinking over my earthly life, but if you will wait for me I will remember all, everything I used to know. I assure you I will, and you shall know what we so long ago wished to know.

I often say to mother [?] Ann Ann e. (Yes, is this Annie ?) Yes, I came with father just for a moment because he is weak. Do you remember how I looked . . . looked . . . and the little pansie flowers I pressed in one of my books . . . [pansie flowers not deciphered at once.] pansies I pressed in one . . . [read correctly] Yes. (I think so.)

[I said yes, here, less because of any clear recollection of the fact than because the faint feeling that it was true justified an encouraging answer. I do not know whether I can confirm this or not.—J. H. H.] [August 1st, 1899. Not capable of any confirmation.—J. H. H.]

On reading this reference to my mother, and the names “Ann” and “Anne” while revising the proofs it flashed across my mind that my mother kept some pansies pressed in an old Bible. This recollection is very clear. I do not know who pressed them, and inquiry of my aunts and my living sister does not confirm my memory of them. But this sister was only seven years old when my sister Annie died, and only twelve years old when my mother died, and is the only other member of the family that is in any way likely to remember anything about the facts, as she alone has shown any disposition to keep and protect my mother's relics and mementos of others. But it was entirely characteristic of my mother to keep articles like pressed

pansies, especially if they were the product of her deceased children or relatives. It was she that was instrumental in having the hair wreath made from the locks of the family and dead relatives. Besides, she had preserved with religious sacredness some little trinkets of a cousin who had been a missionary in India. Hence, it is intrinsically probable that the incident of the pansies is true, but the late occurrence of the recollection and the circumstances under which the recall was made, might suggest an illusion of memory on my part, and I cannot press the significance of the incident. (May 25th, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

I am more fond of them *here*. But I am going away now.

Oh, will I see you again, or what will I tell father for you . . . What will I tell father . . . I cannot see. I am going.

(Tell father I shall be glad to hear about Mr. McClellan and Mr. Cooper the next time.)

I will, but they are here, dear, don't you U D.

(R. H. : I think she'd better stop, Rector, please.)

I will go. Good-bye.

I hear thy father say I will return.

Here . . . here comes our leader, and we will obey Him. R.

Peace to thee, friends. Go thou forth and worry not.

We cease now and may the grace of God be and abide with thee evermore. Farewell + I. S. D. {R} (R. H. : Amen.)

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

There's . . . there's . . . two . . .

Ah [Shakes her head affirmatively several times.]

INTRODUCTION.

The same physical phenomena as the day before accompanied the approach of the trance. It was curious to note the gradual arrest of the tendency to cough as anæsthesia supervened. I observed, soon after Mrs. P. sat down in the chair to go into the trance, that she sighed quite perceptibly several times. This was repeated later as the trance deepened until it ran into short, quick, but heavy breathing, then all at once stopped as the head fell down upon the pillow.—J. H. H.

May 30th, 1899.

Record of Sitting. May 30th, 1899.

Professor J. H. H. and R. H.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim. I. "Sh—h—h."—apparently repeating an injunction for quiet.]

[Rector writes.]

H A I L. (R. H. : Hail.) [Hand appears to wait for S. to speak.] (R. H. : Say something.) (What shall I say ?) (R. H. : Answer the greeting.) (Welcome this morning.)

God's blessings on thee daily +.

Behold the light of Heaven will shine forth and give thee greater knowledge of this life. Imperator.

We meet thee this day with joy, and peace be to all.

[R. H. interpreted *give* above as *guide*, and told Rector he could not read it.]

He saith and He will give thee (R. H. : "greater knowledge of this life") Amen. R.

(R. H. : We meet thee this day"—what comes next?) With joy.

Come and listen to our teachings and all will be well.

Yes, here I am.

James. James. James. (Good morning. Good morning, father. I am glad to see you, and hope you will be able to express yourself clearly to-day as you did yesterday.)

I hear, and I am really glad to hear you, James. How I have longed to find you . . .

[S. starts to turn over page, although there was room for more writing.]

(R. H. : Don't . . . get as much on a page as we can.)

and now I am very much nearer this . . . to-day.

I have talked it over with my old friend Cooper, and we both agree that we will very clearly speak our minds here.

We are the same friends to-day that we always were, and James also.

[This does not appear to be addressing me as the following indicates.—J. H. H.]

Let me speak. R.

There is a gentleman on our side named James also. (R. H. : Yes.) Kindly do not get the one here confused with the one in the body.

[This is an interesting caution at this point, though I wonder why they felt the necessity of giving it. I could name two Jameses to which it could apply.—J. H. H.]

I am still here. I have been wondering if you remembered anything about me. I am your cousin H., H. McAllen.

[The first initial to this name is not correct, but as the second "H" repeats the first we may have only the second initial of the name intended. I do not remember distinctly whether the second initial of this cousin, the relationship being rightly named, is correct or not.—J. H. H.] [His name, I find, was, as I supposed, R. H. McClellan, or Robert Harvey McClellan. —August 1st, 1899.—J. H. H.]

Don't . . . do you not hear me? (Yes, I hear you. I shall be glad for you to go on.) I am with you still you see. Do you remember Wallace . . . and Williams, the Williams boys I mean. [I do not recognise at present any pertinence in these names.—J. H. H.] [See Note 45, p. 503.]

I am at the moment trying to think what became of Robert.

Speak to me, for God's sake, and help me to reach . . .

(Yes. I remember Robert, but which Robert is it?) [Repeated.]

I think you say, which Rob is it? Well, Hyslop. (That's right.) I mean Rob Hyslop, of course; which other . . . other . . . could I mean?

[This is the name of my brother, whom we always called Rob. instead of Robert. The explanation of it and the curious imputation that I should not think of any other is very interesting. The evidence a little later seems

to be that the communicator was not my father, but the cousin mentioned in the previous note.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I remember him. He is in Cincinnati.)

Give him my greetings. I am a little dazed for the moment, but have patience and I will be clear presently. This is * * [undec.] it . . . Are you still here? Which one was it . . . was it not Robert who got his foot injured?

(I do not remember that Robert got his foot injured, but there was one Robert, my father, who got his leg hurt.)

We know this but we want you to know it too, and it was on the railroad . . . [R. H. stops the writing by turning over the page.]

Do not interrupt me when I am listening.

(Oh I know.)

[There is evidently much confusion in this passage. Robert is the name of my brother, but it does not fit the incident which I have been curious to see from the time I began the sittings last December. The injury of the foot on the railway which cost the life of my uncle last fall was a sudden one, and his death was clearly alluded to in my second sitting, December 24th, 1898. This, too, is the uncle whose name cost so much effort in yesterday's sitting and failed. The linking of the name Robert with the incident is a mistake, but I am not sure that it is a message from my cousin. It might be a question of Rector's to the party trying to communicate. The answer to my statement referring to father's leg, he having suffered for many years from locomotor ataxy, shows that my language was not understood, but the allusion to the hurt foot and railroad is specific and pertinent, if only it had been accompanied by the right name.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I know that, but it was not Robert, it was another name that has already been mentioned.)

(R. H. : Oh Lord!) [R. H. made this ejaculation as S. spoke rapidly, and R. H. feared that he might not note every word.]

Yes. Well your father is with me here and he is helping me, and George Pelham, to tell you these things.

I. so was Will Will William . . . listen friend.

[I do not know the pertinence of this reference to William if it has any.—J. H. H.] [William is the name of one of my brothers. (See Note 45, p. 503.) August 1st, 1899.—J. H. H.]

He got injured while on his way west . . . [I do not know whether the "way west" is true or not.—J. H. H.]

Look out, H., I am here. G. P. (R. H. : Good, George.) + sent me some moments ago.

I mean I am thinking of one of the boys who got his foot injured on . . . the railroad, and he is there with you. Hear. [The use of "one of the boys" is wrong, supposing that my uncle is in mind, and so also the statement that he is on this side so far as I know.—J. H. H.] [See Note 46, p. 503.]

(That means on this side?) (R. H. : Hm.)

James, was it George? [Wrong so far as I know.—J. H. H.] I have been trying to think . . . think where is . . . and do you remember Peter who was . . . or belonged to Nanie? [I can attach no meaning to the

names of "Peter" and "Nanie" in this connection.—J. H. H.] [See Note 63, p. 515.—J. H. H.]

(I do not recall Peter now, but I remember some one by that first name.) here.

(I do not know whether he is there or not. Is he on your side?) Yes, we say yes.

I am W. H. McAllen (?) (R. H. : Is that W. H. McAllen?)

The name does not sound right to us, friend. It is, he says, Mc . . . sounds like Mc L E L L E N . . . G. P. . . .

Yes, I am he.

[This is interesting for the spontaneous recognition on the part of the writer that the name was not correctly given, and for the equally spontaneous trial to give it right. At this point apparently it is G. P. who interrupts and gives the name. [Cf. "Hettie G. P.," p. 434.] The last syllable should be "AN."—J. H. H.] [Only just now my attention was called to the fact that the "C" is also omitted before the "l." (June 1st, 1900).—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I am very glad to hear from you. What relation are you to me?) [I asked the question to be assured of the communicator.—J. H. H.] Your cousin. (That's right.) [This answer is correct.—J. H. H.]

Have you forgotten that, James? [An interesting question.—J. H. H.] I am a good soldier, don't you see I do not forget a comrade. [No special meaning that I know in this language.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I remembered you well, but I wanted to be sure that I got the name just right.)

Oh I see. Well, that accounts for your not speaking to me when I came before with Uncle Hyslop. [See p. 422.]

(Yes, that is right. Do you remember what I was doing when you saw me last?)

Yes, you were writing, teaching, I believe. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(Don't you remember a meeting in which I spoke?)

[Much excitement.] Oh yes. Oh yes. Oh yes. Oh yes. (R. H. : Calm.) but I could not exactly remember just what it was.

[This lapse of memory, if such it could be called, is natural enough, to say nothing of the general nature of the question I put. It would be most natural for my cousin to think of me as teaching, and as he had been ill some months before his death and after I saw him at the meeting which he arranged for me, my question might not suggest what was in my mind. On the hypothesis of telepathy it ought to have been gotten. The recognition and excitement after my second question are very interesting, though it cannot be treated as evidential since we can suppose my question as implying its own answer.—J. H. H.]

(S. to R. H. : Want another pencil?)

And have you any knowledge of Merritt—

[I did not understand at the time the meaning of this name nor have I since been able to ascertain any relevance in it (June 1st, 1900).—J. H. H.]

The machine is not right, H. [From G. P.]

[R. H. substitutes a fresh pencil.]

of Merritt—

Wait a moment, His father is coming.

Yes, James, I am here now. You must know what I mean when I say I do not think it did me any good. The fact is it was time for me to come and nothing could do me any good. Do you U D. [A very pertinent remark if interpreted in reference to his disease.—J. H. H.] (Yes. I understand.) I am glad it is as it is. (I am very glad you feel so about it.) And I want you to feel as I do. You are tired, James.

[This is a correct statement and is interesting for the dogmatic character of it. I was very tired from hard work at the college in the work referred to below.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, father, I have had some hard work with these communications and investigations.)

but do not make it hard, make it as you can easy.

You know how I used to talk to you about overdoing anything, and you will remember your tireless energy. It is I, your father, who is speaking now; and how absorbed you used to get in your work, no matter what the nature of it was. Take my advice and don't do it, but be patient and work faithfully; the activities will go on after you are done there, do you hear me? I . . . faithfully . . . activities.

[The advice and comments here made by my father are very characteristic. The most suggestive coincidental feature of it is the reference to the way he used to talk to me about my hard working. The word "overdoing" was especially the term he used to employ. The same could be said of the word "absorbed," and "patient." He always advised me about being patient and more slow and deliberate in my work. He was so himself. Some of the other remarks in this passage are suggestive either of what is going on with him on the other side or of my work going on here. They have no evidential value, but they are curiously consistent with this whole phenomenon.—J. H. H.] [See Note 47, p. 503, and p. 313.]

(Yes. I hear. I expect to rest this summer.)

Going home? (Yes, I am going home.) [I had resolved about a week or more ago to make this trip West on business matters.—J. H. H.]

God bless and keep you while there. Give my love to them and all. (R. H. : It means *one and all*.)

And do not forget that I shall not be far off. Do you remember when I got hurt, James? (Yes, father, I remember when you got hurt.)

[Father was injured by some overwork in the harvest field, and the effect of it in a few years was to disable him entirely and to render him unfit for any labour whatsoever on the farm. It resulted in locomotor ataxy and the life of an invalid for over thirty years. The injury took place when I was very young and I do not remember being a personal witness of it. I was told of it by father himself, and hence my language here is not meant to imply that I was a witness of the injury (*Cf.* p. 428).—J. H. H.]

And do you recall the fire I spoke to you about. [*Cf.* pp. 324, 503.]

(I remember a fire but I am not certain which fire you refer to.) (I remember a fire but I am not certain which fire you mean.)

We lived near, and, although it did not interfere, it gave me a fright. My thoughts are quite clear on this point. I think there can be no mistaking it.

[There is a curious persistence about this fire. I know of no such instance within my memory except the railroad collision and fire in connection with

it. But this neither fits in with the statement about its being near and about the fright nor accords with anything I can recall. My aunt was on the same train, and had a narrow escape, but father did not know this until afterward. There was a fire in the near neighbourhood of father's old home connected with a mill, but this was before my time.—J. H. H.] [See Note 48, p. 503.]

There are some things which I have said whilst speaking to here . . . you . . . [Hand indicates that *you* is to be inserted in its place.] (R. H. : "to you here") [Assent] which may seem muddled. Forgive it, my son, and if you wish to straighten it ask me and I will.

Charles. (Is this brother Charles?) Yes and John.

I just called them . . . I just called them.

(What John is this?) Brother John. [Father had no brother.—J. H. H.]

(Is this brother Charles speaking?) Yes, and father. We are both speaking.

Chester [?] Clarke [?] and Charles [?] Yes.

Oh, speak, James. Help me to keep my thoughts clear.

(Yes. I think you are uncle, are you not?)

No, it is I, your father, who is speaking, and I am telling you about Charles and John.

(What John is that? I remember Charles, but not John, unless it is John some one else.)

Mc John. There are two of the McLellen over here. (Yes.) [This I knew to be correct.—J. H. H.]

And this one is John. (Yes.) (Do you remember where he lived on earth?) I do. What (Do you remember where he lived on earth?)

(R. H. to S. : You're getting away beyond the record.) [S. was talking faster than R. H. could record.]

(I remember John McClellan.)

I don't believe I U D just what you said, James.

(Do you remember where he lived on earth?)

Ohio O H [S. asks R. H. to read.] (R. H. : Ohio.)

Was it that you meant? (That is right.) I told it I thought before.
O H I O.

[This long passage beginning with Charles is a very interesting one though only two things in it are clear. The confusion begins with the answer to my question about "brother Charles." But when the "Chester," "Clarke" and "Charles" appear in this connection, the reference is undoubtedly to the one whose name appeared as uncle Charles. This uncle "Charles" was his brother-in-law.] [See Note 49, p. 504.]

[In my original note I explained that I thought the John McClellan here indicated was the one I knew at college, and it was not until the sitting of June 6th (*Cf.* p. 471) that I understood my mistake, though a letter received before the sittings were over told me that the John McClellan I had in mind was still living. (June 1st, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

(That is good. Father, that is very good.)

I am good, am I? Well, why shouldn't I be good? What else could I be, James, and set an example for my sons? (Yes.) But you were the best I ever had. (Well . . .) I feel this deeply, James.

(Well, father, I am glad of that, but when I referred to your being good, I meant the message that came through was correct and fine.)

Oh, I see, I misunderstood it.

(S. to R. H. : He corrects that.)

[This language is characteristic of father, as I remarked in my earlier sittings (see sitting for December, 24th, 1898). It was especially characteristic of him to see that his example to us should be all that it should ever be in a father. But the misunderstanding of my question was a curious one. It illustrates the imperfection of the communications, as well as the liability to misunderstanding, perhaps on both sides, on any theory.—J. H. H.]

Oh yes, to be sure. Well, speak a little slower, James, and I am I feel . . . hear . . .

slower. [In the writing above the *l* was omitted and the word was interpreted as *sooner*.] I shall be able to hear it better.

There was another one here whom you must have forgotten.

Do you remember Mary Ann Anne. (Well, the rest of it?) Do you remember Mary Anne Hyslop. (Yes, I do. What relation was she to me?) Have you forgotten your mother? (No, no, father. I have not forgotten, but I wanted to see it written out here.)

[This is almost the correct name of my mother. The following shows how much of it is correct Mar—Ann Hyslop. Her name was not Mary.—J. H. H.]

Well, speak to her, my boy.

(Mother, I am glad to hear from you. What have you to say?)

I can only say that God has been good to us all, and after all our struggles in body we are again together reunited and happy . . . and happy, and I am glad to see you my dear and I want to tell you that I have watched over you many a day when you little knew I was near.

I am tired speaking, but I will speak again soon. Father will help you now. Good-bye (Good-bye, mother.) and God bless you always. [All very characteristic.—J. H. H.] I want to speak of the rest, but I am too weak.—M. A. H.

[These are correct initials of her name.—J. H. H.]

(S. to R. H. : Look at the hand.) [Hand becomes somewhat limp and sways slightly on table.]

Yes, James, my son, I am still here. I have come to keep my promise to you. I want to go back to the old home and recall my life there, but if I can see you from time to time I will tell you all.

James, do you remember my preaching

(I remember you used to talk and read to us about the sermons.)

and . . . Sunday . . . mornings . . . at home.

(Yes. I remember that well.)

Do you remember the dining-room and prayers.

[This passage beginning with the question about father's preaching is exceedingly interesting. Only he was not a preacher, and would never say "Sunday." "Sabbath" is the word he always used, but the word Sunday may have been due to G. P., who was apparently assisting (see below p. 434). I may also explain here more fully than I did in a previous note (p. 413) what significance may be attached to the term "preaching." Corroborative

also of my interpretation of the use of the word "Sunday" is the fact that there was some delay both before and after the word. The church to which my father belonged was a small one and could not afford to pay for regular preaching. The consequence was that we were often without it, perhaps nearly half the time, until it had, in his later days, to be wholly abandoned. But very often—if I remember rightly, always—when there was no sermon, father would gather his family about him on Sabbath mornings and say that as we could not go to church, he would read and comment upon a chapter of the Bible. He always expressly indicated that it was to take the place of a sermon. Morning prayers were often held in what we then called the kitchen, where we always ate our meals except when we had company. They were often held in what we called the sitting-room, but what is usually called the dining-room by most people, and in which we often dined ourselves. Evening prayers were held nearly always in the sitting-room. But it is interesting to remark that "prayers" is not the word that would be most natural to him. He always spoke of the service as "worship," or "having worship."—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I remember them well.)

Think there is one of the boys I have not yet mentioned, isn't there?
(Yes. I think so. Yes. I think you have not mentioned him very clearly.)

Well, I was not sure, but I would like to reach to brother Robert myself
. . . Robert cousin. [R. H. asks what the word is after "reach to"]

Do not speak so fast, friend. If they spoke so fast here I could never tell thee anything.

I would like to refer to brother Robert myself . . .

B R O (R. H. : "brother")

Reach . . . Reach he said first, then refer . . . refer.

Do you know who I mean, James?

(Yes, father, I know very well.)

[This passage with reference to my brother Robert is a very remarkable one. It turns upon the incoherence indicated by the words "reach brother Robert myself . . . Robert cousin." The name of my brother Robert was given on December 27th, 1898, at my third sitting, but the name Hyslop was not mentioned. In the earlier part of this present sitting both names were given in full by my cousin R. H. McClellan, and it is interesting to remark this because father at no time gave the last name of my brothers and sisters. But here there is the recognition of the person who had mentioned him before, his relation to me, his first name, the distinction between him as a person and my brother Robert, and the desire to "reach him myself" in distinction from the previous message. Evidently there was the usual difficulty in getting the name (McClellan) which had been given previously, and "cousin" was thrown in to identify him and distinguish him from my brother. The mention of my brother in connection with the prayers is especially interesting, as father would often pray for this brother as if his heart would break.—J. H. H.]

I am glad you hear me so clearly. There is more than a million things I would like to speak about, but I do not seem to be able to think of them all, especially when I am here. It was not so long ago that I came here. [Correct : a little over two years ago.—J. H. H.]

Do you remember my library . . . LIBRA . . . my books, and what has become of them? I think you had some. [Cf. pp. 335, 377, 490.]

(Yes. I have some and mother has the others.)

I am sure it . . . they are all right. I . . . they . . . yes [R. H. not sure that the previous *they* was correctly read.] wherever they are, but there are some things on my mind which I must get off. I think if I could help you to recall my sitting in that chair reading my paper I would be glad. Could you not ask about this for me? [Cf. pp. 387, 419.]

[I do not know why these persistent references to his books and reading in "that chair" should be made, unless we treat them as automatisms. The chair was a special one always reserved for him, and I think had some historical interest in connection with the family. If so, I can understand the attempt to say something about it. He has frequently referred to his "library" in earlier sittings, and on one occasion in those sittings it seemed to imply a room. I said in my note, and it can be repeated here, that he never called any room his library. But he evidently means the books themselves in this instance when using the word.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, father, I have sent word to mother and asked about it.)

I am glad because I cannot feel satisfied to say anything that is not in the body connected with some of us. If I do you will not [know] me, will you? (R. H. : "not know?") me. .

Now I have not spoken of Abbie yet . . . (Abbie is not quite right.) Addie, no, did you say no? (That is not quite right.) [repeated]

A . . . Nabbie. (R. H. : Is that *Nabbie*?)

A b sounds like Abbie, is it Addie?

(What relation is that to me?) She is his sister.

(Do you mean *Annie*?) *No*.

(Oh, well I know. I know who you mean now. Yes. I know who you mean now. But it is not spelled quite right.)

He seems to say . . .

let me hear it for you Rector. [Apparently by G. P.]

H Abbie. (The letter H is right.)

Yes, but let me hear it and I will get it.—G. P.

Hattie. (That is very nearly right.) Harriet.

(Pretty nearly. Try it one letter at a time.)

H E T T I E. G. P. (That is right. Yes. That is right and fine.)

Ett [?] Hettie.—G. P. [Cf. "McLellen G. P." p. 429.]

Yes, do you hear it, James? (Yes. I hear it.)

[This attempt to get the name of my sister is very interesting. When "Abbie" was given I thought the intention was to give the name of my stepmother Maggie, but as soon as "Hattie" came I saw that it was my sister who had not yet been mentioned. The nickname Hettie is correct for her, though we never called her that, at least I never did so, and I know some of the others and her friends called her Etta. This seems to have been written partly, "Ett . ." at the end. But it was near enough for me to recognise it clearly for Henrietta and I did not press for this last, which was probably not the natural form of using her name.—J. H. H.]

[I learn that father always called her Henrietta. Some of the friends of the family called her Etta. (July, 1899).—J. H. H.]

Well, do you wish me to tell you about her ?

[*About her* written on top of page already written upon, before R. H. could turn over. R. H. said rather sharply the usual words "One moment, please," used by him to Rector to stop the writing while the page is turned.]

What is it, H., did you speak ? [Apparently from G. P.]

(R. H. : Only, Rector, I wished to turn over the page, as you were writing on the same sheet.)

Oh yes, all right, friend. But thy friend George is helping me to . . . in speaking with this elderly gentleman. He had a marvellously good memory when in his body until the very last, and he is extremely anxious to remember everything, but will assist his children or child. [R. H. interprets *child* as *died*.]

now . . .

I mean child, child, friend, not die.

James, do you remember a little bridge we used to cross in going up the church ? (R. H. : "Church.") [*Cf.* p. 421.]

(S. to R. H. : No. May be.)

to the church.

(Yes. I remember the bridge and the creek.)

Yes, I do very well. I do also. Mother just called my mind to it.

[This reference to "a little bridge" is pertinent and interesting if it refers to the one which the communication suggested. But it is too indefinite for me to attach any evidential weight to it. The interesting part of it, however, is the statement that he was reminded of it by (my) mother. This would characterise her rather than father, because he had not gone to church in that direction for twenty years before his death, and mother died (1869) about the time when we ceased going to church that way.—J. H. H.] [There may be a doubt about the reference being to *my* mother (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

Hettie. Tell me about her. Tell me about her.

(Hettie is at school now getting ready to teach.)

I know she must be a good girl. Do you know how fond I was of her ? (Yes, I know that very well.)

Does she ever speak of me ? I don't suppose you can tell because you are not with her often . . . often.

(S. to R. H. : That's Hen, isn't it ?) (R. H. : No.)

[I thought the word "often" was an attempt to give the name Henrietta, and thought it might go on. But I saw in a moment that Dr. Hodgson was correct in his interpretation. The statement is true. My sister was born the first or second year I was at college, and I was at home very little after that.—J. H. H.]

James, I am * * [undec.] I am glad he [?] is . . . he is . . .

here comes John again, we will be obliged to let him go for the present.

(R. H. : Yes.)

And if you will speak to me, James, I will tell you that cousin Annie is very anxious to send her love to H . . . h . . . H. Hettie.

(I will. I will give her love to her. I will give cousin Annie's love to Hettie.)

And do you remember anything of Ruth? I often hear her speak of her, and . . . she is only a friend I think. [See Note 50, p. 505.]

I am . . . in fact the light is going out.

I wish thee to speak, friend, ere we depart.

[Hand listens to R. H.]

(Mrs. B. wrote me late the night of the fifth day after last Sabbath, saying she had a painful toothache and could not attend here. I sent word to the light that there would be no meeting, and she went away on some work of her own. Then Mrs. B. found next morning that she could come, and she came, but the light was away from home. It was of course entirely Mrs. B's misunderstanding of her own illness that caused her to miss.)

We thank thee for this explanation, and we will answer by saying all who fail to meet us it is their loss not ours U D.

James, my boy, I will meet you again . . . sincerely [?]

Your affectionate father. [This is the exact form of closing his letters to me. It is of course common and not evidential.—J. H. H.] [Cf. p. 456.]

(Yes, father. I am glad. So good-bye to-day. I shall see you to-morrow.)

We cease now, and may the blessings of Heaven be with thee. Farewell + Imperator. {R}

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

Hyslop. Hyslop.

All right. Good-bye.

There's Imperator.

Saying a prayer.

Farewell. [In a loud voice.]

I didn't want to go. [In crying voice.]

INTRODUCTION.

There were the same general physical indications of the oncoming trance, but also interesting variations. I have noticed that hardly any two of the trances are exactly alike. There is no appearance of the artificial in them, such as is so easily remarked in the simulated trance of a fraud.

The first sign of the trance in this case was a few stares into space, and a slight elevation of the open eyes. Then several cases of gaping which showed some weariness, of which Mrs. P. had complained when she sat down. She placed her hand on her head a little above the forehead, and appeared to press it heavily. Presently the stare became quite fixed, and the mouth noticeably drawn. Then her face twitched slightly, and the mouth opened a little, and the tongue pushed forward a little. Then she suddenly said: "See a light," and in a moment her eyes closed, and a slight choking noise in the throat occurred, and her head fell suddenly on the pillow. After the lapse of a few minutes

heavy breathing commenced, and, with the mouth quite open, and the tongue protruding somewhat, the choking noise in the throat occurred again. In a moment the breathing became easier, but was still prolonged and heavier than the normal.—J. H. H.

May 31st, 1899.

Record of Sitting, May 31st, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

Mrs. P.'s sublim. I. "See a light." (R. H. : See a light ?)

[Rector writes.]

[Cross in air.] H A I L (R. H. : Hail.) We hail thee this day with peace, friends of earth. (R. H. : Amen.)

Goest thou not far off but remain to hear us out +.

(R. H. : Do you desire me to leave the room and be ready to return when called upon ?)

No, friend, but return to us daily until we cease. U D.

(R. H. : Yes, I understand.)

Sleep thou well. Eat thy food not in haste

(S. : Whew !) [Hand points to R. H.]

but listen to our warning, do it not so *more* +.

(R. H. : Yes, I will remember.)

[This was a very singular incident to me on the part of the trance personality. Dr. Hodgson thought that this probably referred to the fact that we hurried through our lunch after the sitting in order to get to work as soon as possible on the records.—J. H. H.]

Keep thyself quite calm, rest and come to us daily.

Fail not, and all else we leave with God +. (R. H. : Amen.) Farewell.

Friend, we hail thee once more, and all is well.

(R. H. to S. : That's to you.)

Hearst thou me ? (Yes. I hear, and hail thee welcome.)

[Hand seems to listen to R. H.] (R. H. : Do you wish me to speak or ask any question, Rector ?)

He felt it necessary for thee to take a message for a friend, (R. H. : Yes, very good. I am ready.) which will avoid confusion U D. (R. H. : Yes.)

Say to Mrs. M. that he received the roses and is grateful. (R. H. : Yes.) More later. F. R. H. M. [Mrs. M. (See *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. XIII., pp. 341-349, and also this Report, p. 458) had placed some flowers for her husband, the communicator here, about three days previously, but, as I ascertained later, they were not roses.—R. H.]

James, James, rest your body and soul and fear no man.

[The admonition to rest is pertinent when we recall the previous reference to my weariness. The expression "fear no man" has a *possible* meaning which it is impossible to explain without speaking of myself.—J. H. H.]

I am with you to-day. God bless and keep you, my son. [Perfectly characteristic.—J. H. H.] I hear you faintly, so speak slowly [read at time as *yourself*].

(R. H. to S. : You murmur these words over.) [This meant for S. instead of R. H. to read the words as they were written.]

and . . . slowly and I will hear it all.

(Yes, father, good morning, I am glad to hear you again.)

I heard every word and I am coming nearer and nearer to you. There is no dream here. (Yes.) And shut out the thought theory and do not let it trouble you. I went on theorising all my earthly life and what did I . . . did I gain by it? My thoughts only became more subtle [suttle] and S U T T L E . . . and unsatisfactory. There is a God, an allwise and omnipotent God who is our guide, and if we follow the best within ourselves we will know more of Him.

Now speaking of Swedenborg. What does it matter whether his teachings were right or wrong so long as we are individually . . . and . . . our . . . ourselves here . . .

lost two or three words

. . . are our selves here . . .

lost one or (R. H. : "lost one or two words," yes.)

Never mind, I am clearing, James, and all will be well.

[This is a very singular passage beginning with the reference to "the thought theory" and ending with "all will be well." My father had no confidence in philosophical speculation, or "theorising" as he used to call it at times, but he always drew an unconscious distinction between philosophy and his own attempts to give intelligent meaning to his conception of religion and its doctrines. He was always explaining and "theorising" about these to himself and us, though within the limits of Biblical conception and doctrine. The reference to God in the passage is very characteristic, because when he found himself at a loss to explain any difficult matter he always fell back upon his faith in an all wise and omnipotent God who would some day make things clear. But the most striking features of the passage are the references to the "thought theory" and to Swedenborg. It will be remembered that he twice before referred to Swedenborg, the first time in connection with his reminder of our conversation (in 1894) [Correct date, 1895.] about the scientific evidence for immortality. I had explained to him how thought-transference stood in the way of proving it, though it might be necessary for communication. The reference here to this theory of telepathy, its connection with Swedenborg, about whom we talked at the time, and to personal survival are facts of extraordinary unity and interest.—J. H. H.]

Here comes John and Hathaway, and he is with him here.

(R. H. : It looks like HcMany.) H A T H. (R. H. : Hathaway?)
H . . . H A T H A W A Y

[I know nothing whatsoever about anyone by the name of Hathaway. I have only seen the name in print.—J. H. H.]

Yes, is James here? Ask him what can I do for you, my boy. I am back, and I feel much freer than I have before. I just waited to clear the way, and there is a young man here who is very kind to me. [Doubtless G. P. is meant.]

Do you remember yet about Williams?

(S. to R. H. : Shall I answer?) (R. H. : Yes.)

(What Williams is it?) He is F R A N K. John is anxious to know.

Speak, James. [Name Frank Williams suggests nothing.—J. H. H.]

(I do not remember Frank Williams, but tell more about him, and I may recall him.)

He had either two or three boys, sons; they were Arthur, Fred and Irvin . . . I R V I N . . . [These names suggest nothing.—J. H. H.]

You must remember, it seems. I am not quite sure that you hear all I say, but take out as much as you hear . . . hear. (R. H. to S.: Why don't you say something?) (Yes. I hear it all clearly.)

You may have to find out about them if you do not remember them. (Yes. I shall try if you tell me where they lived on earth.) They lived not far from me in Ohio, and I remember Frank very well. [Name of State correct for alleged communicator.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. to S.: Ask if Nannie knew them.) (Did Nannie know them?) She must have heard about them. (What kind of work did they do?) Frank was at the library . . . Library, and sent the books over to me just before I left. [See Note 51, p. 506.] Do you know where F R a n k Hyslop is.

(Yes, I know where he is. Where did you know him? Where did you know Frank Hyslop?)

What did I know of Frank Hyslop. Well, of course I know him very well, and all . . . all of my cousins. Why shouldn't I, James?

(Yes. What John is this talking to me?) Mc. (Right.) L E L L A N.

(Yes, I thought so, but do you remember where you saw Frank Hyslop?) I do not exactly, as I do not remember just how long I have been here. I think he was at Uncle Robert's. I am not sure about this, James.

(Well, don't worry, but did you ever have anything to do with a college?)

[Excitement in hand.] Yes, of course, I am not forgetting that, but sure enough it was there I saw Frank, and I have a faint recollection of his going to be a doctor. D o c t o R. [I know nothing of this whatever. On the contrary, my brother expected to teach.—J. H. H.] (Cf. Note 57, p. 511.)

[R. H. asks about the undec. words above.] Wait a moment and he will return and clear it up.

Which I have a faint recollection

(R. H.: Rector, I can read that part, but I cannot read the two words after "I am not forgetting that but")

It . . . yes . . . and I have a faint . . .

(R. H.: No. I understand that, but I cannot read the two words after "I am not forgetting that but")

Wait.

(R. H.: If he does not remember his exact words, never mind.)

Ah, but U D, friend, it is I, Rector, who has to hear him and take it to thee.

But I remember something about one of the boys who wanted to be a doctor. Do you, James? (What boy wanted to be a doctor?) One of the Hyslop boys.

(Well, I do not remember it myself, but do you remember your son where I went to college?)

Well, of course, but you see I am not quite clear yet, but it will surely come back to me, be patient with me, James, and I will help you.

(Yes, don't . . . yes, don't worry about it. Is your wife on your side or on this side? Is your wife on your side or is she on this side?)

She is here not . . . wait . . . she is there and not on this side . . . our life. He must know this. I am sure.

(No, I did not know it because I do not often write to your son.) But Frank (Yes, Frank will know.) will know, and if you ask him he will tell you. [Sudden jerk in hand.] [Note 52, p. 506.]

James, I am your brother Charles, and I am well and happy. Give my love to the new sister Hettie, and tell her I will know her some time. Father is . . . often speaks of her.

(S. "Father often speaks of her") Yes. Do you hear? (Yes, I hear.)

[This reference to "the new sister Hettie" is a most curious incident. This sister was born some ten or eleven years after the death of my brother Charles, and hence it is pertinent for him to call her a "new sister," as if indicating that he never knew her, which of course was true.—J. H. H.]

Well, it was Frank who had the [who hthe] pictures and father would like you to have them if you are still in the body, James. Speak to me.

[R. H. asks about the words after Frank above] Cannot hear.

[R. H. repeats] who had the pictures.

(Yes. I shall have the pictures, Charles.)

He asked me to say this for him. His voice troubles him a little when trying to speak.

[This statement about my father's voice troubling him is a curious one. If troubles incurred when embodied can prolong their influence on the soul after death, or are revived in the act of communicating, the allusion here would have considerable evidential weight, as previous notes show that father suffered, and died, from both paralysis and cancer of the larynx.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I understand. Yes, I understand.)

But if you could only see his delight when he hears you, I am sure, my dear brother, you would never doubt that he still clings to you. It is his one desire to comfort and help you, but he wants you to go home and rest there.

James, one thing more . . . more. Do you know that I was a life-long friend to you all? (Yes, I know it.)

[Evident change to father in the next sentence.—J. H. H.]

And do you remember the visit I paid to you . . . you? [Cf. p. 474.]

(When was it?)

I cannot tell the date, but it was just before I came here.

[If this had been "the visit you paid me," it would have been nearer right and pertinent.—J. H. H.] [See Note 53, p. 507.]

(Who is speaking now?)

It is father who is speaking now. (Yes.)

But he seems a little dazed.

I am coming, H., to help out. (R. H. : Thanks, George, we shall be glad.) How are you? (R. H. : First rate. We shall be glad to have your help.) All well. John Hart sends love and best wishes. Now . . .

(R. H. : Give him my dearest remembrances.) I had . . . I will [See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., pp. 363-7.]

I had a friend who . . . used to call . . . do you remember Dr. Meredith . . . Mek . . . Meredith . . . Do you remember D erdith . . .

(R. H. : I remember that Meredith, Harry Meredith.) Yes.

(R. H. : Was a friend of yours.) Yes, what has become of him ?

(R. H. : I don't think I knew him personally myself. I saw his name a month or two ago in some paper, but I forget the circumstances.) Give him my love if you ever chance to meet him . . . chance. [See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 298.]

[This interruption by G. P. during a few moments' respite for my father is an interesting feature of the case. I comment upon it elsewhere (pp. 211-214).—J. H. H.]

Mr. Hyslop and his wife is here, are here [S. points at the *is* and *are*] and . . . if I fail grammatically, H., it is owing to the machine. Hear. Cannot always make it work just right.

(R. H. : Yes, I understand, George.)

[This consciousness of a grammatical mistake and the correction of it are no less astounding when you are able to watch the conditions under which they occur, than the readiness with which the change of personality takes place. Besides, they fit in so nicely with what we know of G. P.'s intellectual tastes and habits.—J. H. H.] [See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII., p. 363.]

I . . . I wish you would hear me out, James, my son. I am going to try and keep my thoughts straight. Yes. I will do my best for you. How is Franks . . . (Frank is much better.)

I thought he might come to us for a while, but we have not seen him yet.

[This query about my brother Frank and the expressed fear that he would not live are very pertinent facts indeed. Father knew before his death of his condition, and often wrote me that he did not think my brother would get well. In fact my brother was so ill that it was impossible for him to be at father's funeral. It is interesting also to remark in the statement about his expected death that it means to assert that the expectation had been harboured since his own death, and there is a pathetic implication, unconscious of course, of a strange universe in the statement, "I have not seen him yet."—J. H. H.]

Have I overlooked any one, James, I will not . . .

(Yes, you have overlooked one, and then the name of another, my present mother, was not given rightly. Yes, you overlooked one of your children.)

Have I, have I, well I will think about it, and see whether I have forgotten them. I know I never forget anything, but when I can tell it all to you is a different matter. Did you say anything about mother, James ? (Yes, you did not give rightly the name of my mother on earth now.) but the one with me. (Yes.)

I was speaking about . . . I thought. I intended to bring her and keep her clear.

(Yes, that was right. I remember my mother on! *your* side, but there is one on *this* side you know.)

[There is an interesting misunderstanding here, which was perhaps caused by my failure to say "stepmother" instead of "mother." Father had mentioned to Dr. Hodgson in one of the five sittings held for me some facts that pointed clearly to my stepmother but gave the wrong name, as I have already remarked (p. 406). Hence having offered me a chance to ask for corrections I here asked to have her name given correctly. The difficulty came in using the word "mother" at all in this connection, but having a view to scientific purposes I would not give any definite hints regarding the name.—J. H. H.]

[Perturbation in hand.] [Pause.]

E. E. El . . . [This has two possibilities, but has no reference to my stepmother.—J. H. H.]

I wanted to speak about all of my dear Rec [?] R e b [?] [This has a very interesting possibility connected with my cousin R. H. McClellan.—J. H. H.]

[When I wrote the previous note I had in mind the possibility that my cousin was trying to give the name of his aunt Rebecca, as the word began with a capital and suggested in the other incidents of the writing that it was intended for a proper name. It might, however, have been intended for the word *relatives*. (June 2nd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I cannot hear it, speak slower.

Well, go out then and come in again with it.

All right.

Yes, but I did not get what he said last. He said something about Lucy [?] L U C Y, but it was not for thee, friend. [meaning not for R. H.]

(S. to R. H. : I know. I know.)

And he said it over and over the last time here.

(Yes, is this my cousin speaking?)

It is in father's place, and he will not return for a few moments.

The Lucy is not Jessie's sister, friend. [indicating R. H.] (R. H. : Yes, I understand.) [My assistant Miss Lucy Edmunds, has had communications from her deceased sister Jessie.—R. H.]

but for the other friend, here.

(Yes, I know. But what relation was Lucy to you?)

Mother said it only a moment ago, and she is on father's side, and he comes and speaks of her often. We . . .

[See Note 54, p. 508.]

(R. H. : Yes, Rector, kindly get George to state explicitly if possible who this Lucy is. Last time I think you wrote it several times, but when I was out of the room, perhaps the time before, and our friend here I think did not read it at the time.)

did not hear it. All right. We will see about it as both Annie and her father have brought her here several times, and Aunt Nannie will know well. (I shall ask Aunt Nannie about it.) She is a cousin of thine, friend. Dost thou not hear? (Yes. I hear clearly.) But do not remember. (I remember one cousin Nannie and one Aunt Nannie.)

Yes, she is. Aunt Nannie is in the body and cousin Nannie is in the spirit. (Yes, your . . . what relation is this cousin Nannie to you?) She is my sister. (R. H. : *Whose* sister?) L U C Y S .

[See Note 55, p. 508, and Note 95, p. 536.]

(Well. Well I shall inquire about that.)

It is as they say it, and it must be so.

James, don't you remember any . . . don't (R. H. : "dost thou"?)
you remember *her*?

[The original notes on this complex passage, beginning with my cousin's reference to his relatives, have been expunged, owing to the fact that in this case the retention of my perplexities about it has no value for the critic. I may therefore substitute the explanation that later study gives it. I discuss certain aspects of it in Chapter III. (pp. 231-235). The reference to Lucy explains itself as the name of my cousin's wife, still living. But Rector's intimation to me that this Lucy was not Miss Lucy Edmunds is an interesting piece of intermission. The next message is not so clear. But I suppose it means that my cousin's mother had tried to give the name Lucy, and that the allusion to "father's side" means to explain to me that it was father's sister, whom I never knew, rather than my cousin's stepmother, whom I had known and who was my mother's sister. My father had been the first to attempt to give the name Lucy (p. 421). The reference to "aunt Nannie" coupled with the statement that she was my cousin was perplexing to me, as the reader can well imagine, until I learned from my cousin's sister Nannie that during his last illness, in which she had nursed him, he always called her *aunt* in deference to the habits of his children. She is still living, as the statement following indicates. The reference thus becomes clear. Also if we suppose that the allusion to "cousin Nannie" in saying that she was "in the spirit" is a mistake for "cousin Annie," my sister, but the communicator's cousin, the rest of the passage becomes clear. But the later answer to my question as to who this "cousin Nannie" was will have to be interpreted from my point of view, in which the "aunt Nannie" above, the communicator's sister, is *my* cousin. Lucy is her sister-in-law, not her sister. (June 2nd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I am your father who is speaking now.

I do not seem to be able to express all I want, but I hope to do so . . . Yes I do. I was thinking about S a . . . Sarah . . . not right Maria . . . No . . . There is another named . . . named Mary [S. taps word Mary on sheet with his forefinger.] of whom he speaks also.

I think * * [undec.] is John's wife.

(S. to R. H. : "James' wife") (R. H. to S. : No. "John's wife.")

(S. to R. H. : "James' wife.") (R. H. to S. : No. "John's.")

[R. H. can't read word after *think*.]

Do not hasten, friend.

The name is not distinct to me, yet the lady is still in the body, and that is . . .

[The possible significance of this group of names is best indicated in the following facts. Maria is the name of the wife of the John McClellan that I know. She was a Mitchell, and a Sarah Preston, who was brought up in the Mitchell family and treated as a member of it, died in 1895 in the town in which this John McClellan lived, and it might be supposed that she was present and interested in the reference to this John McClellan. Mary Ann

was the name of the sister of this John McClellan and was referred to below (p. 446). His wife, apparently referred to here, is still living, as the passage seems to indicate. The confusion in the reference appears in the undeciphered word which may be a mixture of Sarah and Maria. (June 2nd, 1900).—J. H. H.] [See Note 56, p. 510.]

Give . . . give me something, friend . . . better leave it here.

[S. puts spectacle box with contents on table.]

(R. H. to S. : Give those other things. [Putting *knife* on table.] That's a favourite thing of his.)

I often hear Hettie playing . . .

[My sister used to play on the organ, but whether she has kept it up since father's death I do not know. It is probable that the thought is an automatism of his memory. But he gave the organ expressly to her.—J. H. H.]

yes, better now.

Speak to him friend, and just let him know that thou art listening. (Yes, I am listening carefully.)

I would like to tell you of . . . I want to . . . all I wish to. I do not believe it possible for me to hear him more distinctly. I was anxious to speak of the foot which got injured . . . injured in the accident, and it has been on my mind for a long time. I think it is much better now.

(S. to R. H. : Now here's a chance to clear that question up.) (R. H. to S. : Yes, do so.)

(Whose foot was it? Whose foot was hurt on the railroad? Whose foot was hurt?) F James it was Will's, I think Will's.

[I cannot understand this incident of the injured foot. I never knew of any such injury to my brother Will. What I have been curious to have made clear is the relation of the incident to the person to whom I supposed it referred. As I have already said, my uncle "Charles" (not correct name) died recently from just such an accident on the railway, and noticing what I took to be the confusion about it in the previous reference to it, I asked that it be cleared up here. But I am more in the dark than ever, because I have no memory of such an accident to my brother.—J. H. H.]

(Well, I shall ask about it.) He got it injured, and so did I. (Yes, I shall ask Will about it. I did not know it.) Did you know he was on it? (No, I did not know it.) [See Note 57, p. 511.]

The boys were so unlike you. I do not think you often asked anything of them, you never used to do so. (That's right.)

[This reference to my not asking about my brother is perfectly true. I corresponded with them directly, and I very seldom, I might almost say never, asked about them in my letters to father. It is especially interesting to see this explanation given of my ignorance about the alleged accident to brother Will.—J. H. H.]

You remember (Yes.) what she used to say. [This is true if the "she" refers to my stepmother.—J. H. H.]

if the were like James . . . like . . . they were like James I would not have anything to think about but [See Note 58, p. 512] . . . how is Helen. ["Helen" is possibly Rector's partial hearing of Henrietta. Otherwise it is meaningless. Note remark that follows.—J. H. H.]

I am really too weak to think more for you, James, and they seem not to hear me so well. Are you tired, James? (No, say all you wish to say.) But do you think they hear me? I always told you to be just, and I want you to be so with me.

[The fact was that I was tired enough, and I feared confession would stop the sitting, and hence not being too tired to wait for more results, I said no to the question, and the answer to my statement is a suspicion of my truthfulness. The answer is characteristic of him, as he knew I would endure much without complaint when he was living.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, father, I shall, but please free your mind. I shall be patient. Yes, father, free your mind, and I shall be patient.)

I want to tell you all . . . Samuel Cooper. You remember you asked me what I knew of him. Did you think I was no longer friend of his? I had several letters (S. : "little") (R. H. : "letters") (That's right.) which he wrote to me concerning our difference of opinion, and I think they were with you. Have you got them?

(I shall look them up. Do you remember any other differences with him?) [I have commented on this in report of earlier sittings. See p. 397 and Notes 29, p. 410, and 39, p. 499.—J. H. H.]

I think I do on the subject of this very question, this . . . religious views . . . his religious views.

(S. to R. H. : That's all out of the way.)

and the . . . strange . . . children . . . and the children, I will think it over and tell you more about them.

I am confused, James, and I cannot tell you what I wish, and I will try again. I am going now. What is the use to try and tell you what . . . cannot speak . . .

Friend, we will be obliged [obliged] to let him . . . him go for a while and think over the memories.

(R. H. : Yes, there is little time left also.) (Yes, that is right.)

And when he returns he will remember better than he does now.

Clarke is here again. [This seems to be the old attempt at my uncle again.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I shall be glad to hear from you. Yes. I shall be glad to hear from you.) Do you know me. (Yes. I know you and would be glad to have you say what you can.)

Do you remember James? [This is correct for my uncle's first name.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I remember James and would be glad to have the rest.) And it is Clarke. (S. to R. H. : That's not right, you see. Not right.) [tapping word with forefinger.]

both are here . . . are speaking to you . . . (And is it James that speaks to me?) [R. H. did not hear all this, and said "Say that again." Repeated.]

Yes, and . . . Yes there were two James and do you remember an uncle? (Yes I remember, and Uncle James,—what . . .) Well it is he. (Which uncle James?)

H. . . . James Mc. [Correct.—J. H. H.] (Yes, that is right.) and a cousin John. (R. H. : Rector, how's the light?) Don't you remember us both? (I am not sure of cousin John.) [p. 471.]

Well, I will tell you more about myself later, and we will perhaps U D each other . . . my sister Anne is here with . . . yes [?] Anne . . . going.

[There are some things in this passage that are quite correct and pertinent. The statement that there were two Jameses is perfectly correct. One is the James that is referred to here as Clarke, and the other the uncle named James McClellan. But the *cousin* John I cannot make out. This "sister Ann" also puzzles me very much: that is, it has no meaning whatsoever. But my uncle James McClellan died in 1876 while I was at college.—J. H. H.] [See Note 59, p. 513.]

All are going, as it is failing us.

[Sudden jerk of hand. Then quiet.]

It is failing us.

There are many, and much to do.

Friend, go forth and make no haste. (R. H. : No.) Keep in the highest and God bless thee evermore. We rest the light and return to thee. Amen.

+ {R} Farewell.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

[Almost inarticulate whispers at first.]

Tell Hyslop I had to take him away. [Apparently much repetition of above sentence before it was distinct.]

That's my prayer. Had to take him away. I want to stay. I want to take the bonnet off. I want to go out. (R. H. : And stay out?)

[Looking amazedly at R. H.] Well, I thought you turned into an ape. (R. H. : You did?)

O Mr. Hodgson, my fingers got all numb.

Did you hear my head when it snapped?

INTRODUCTION.

The first indications of the approaching trance which I noticed to-day were a whispering movement of the lips and then a marked stare. Presently I noticed the tendency to arrest in her cough, which seemed to-day to come on at first only as an incident of the coming trance, as Mrs. P. showed no traces of a cough in the normal state. In a few moments I remarked the open mouth, which soon began to appear drawn, and then to mutter something quite inaudibly. This was soon followed by short quick breathing which lasted for only a minute or so when the head fell on the pillow as usual. There were then various changes in the breathing which represented interruptions between short quick and more prolonged breathing until it lapsed into the breathing of deep sleep which resembled a snore just enough to suggest it but not to produce it. This became a little calmer as the writing began, though I noted afterwards that with change of control there was some resumption of the heavier breathing for a moment.—J. H. H.

June 1st, 1899.

COMMENTS.

There was an interesting feature in this sitting which apparently shows a knowledge of the confusion that I have been unable to disentangle in my notes of the previous sitting. The McClellan family seems to have been shut out from personal communications, and I was left with my father who was superseded by my brother Charles and sister Annie when he left the machine. The sitting as a whole on this occasion is much clearer and less confused than the others. But the most interesting feature of it is the manifest attempt to avoid the confusion of the day before, the trance personalities actually stating their own knowledge of it and determination to prevent it. The whole *modus operandi* of the sitting showed the effect of this resolution.—J. H. H.

Record of Sitting. June 1st, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

[Rector writes.]

H A I L (R. H. : Hail. I . . .)

Welcome friend, all hail thee.

(R. H. : I have some . . . I have some inquiries to make about future sittings that it might be well to settle now.)

The light is clearer this day, and whilst it doth burn brightest . . . brightest speak thy thoughts to Him.

(R. H. : Next time Mr. D. is coming. Next week the first four days after the Sabbath are for our friend Hyslop here.) [Assent.]

(R. H. : I have just received an earnest request from Mrs. Z. to have a sitting for her. She sends her influences and ——'s, and wishes me to bring other matters of her and her family to you. If you think it wise, I thought perhaps the day before the Sabbath might be given to this.)

We will meet thee on that day for her, and we will not fail her. + .

(R. H. : Amen.)

(Then Mrs. A. wishes the light to go to her for the sixth after coming, [hand moves as if to hear better] for the sixth after coming Sabbath, and spend the night with her and return here on the Sabbath to be ready for the next day not yet settled. Mrs. A. has changed her home, and it is further away.)

Is it where we took the light when thou wert absent, friend ?

(R. H. : Probably it was, but I am not sure.)

W . . .

(R. H. : It is, I believe, near other friends of the light named Y——.)

We will take the light on the sixth, but not on the Sabbath, and to no one will we return on that day, as we have heretofore stated. Stated. U D.

(R. H. : Yes. I understand.)

We have our work as thou hast thine. (R. H. : Yes, I understand. The light can sit on the sixth, but not on the Sabbath, and can return home on the Sabbath.) [Cross in air.] Yes, and this only. To *no one* will we return on the *Sabbath*. (R. H. : Good.)

(R. H. : Then . . .) [Hand talks much with Sp.]

(R. H. : Then Mrs. C. is apparently much anxious to know when she can see you next. There would be the fifth after next Sabbath not yet filled.)

We feel that we have given so much help to Mrs. D. that it will not be necessary for us to meet either Mrs. or Mr. D. after the next time. Consequently if any inquiries are made from there kindly say it will not be necessary for a time. U D.

(R. H. : Yes. I understand.)

And we will meet her on the fifth after coming Sabbath.

But, dear friend, we do not wish any mortal to interfere with [Hand pointed to Sp.] the spirit named Hyslop . . . named . . . (R. H. : No, indeed.)

[This is a curious allusion perfectly consistent with the original plan of the sittings arranged by the trance personalities.—J. H. H.]

and until he is quite clear and conscious it would be better to exclude all inquiries +.

(R. H. : Yes. Amen. Any further arrangements can be left till the day before the coming Sabbath.)

Yes, and better so.

[Hand moves towards S. as if to ask whether he had anything to say.]

(R. H. to S. : Say something.) (I am glad to be here this day.)

H A I L. And to thee we return this day and no further arrangements will be necessary at present, but rest thy body well until we return to thee after coming Sabbath.

And we wish to say that we were somewhat confused as [at ?] the closing of the last meeting owing to the light failing us. [This is a very interesting and true statement to be volunteered.—J. H. H.]

We have also various friends of thine who are present, and at times more or less confuse us. Thy dear father is a very active and arduous [endless ?] [S. touches R. H., and indicates by pointing that he could not decipher *arduous*.] worker . . . indefatigable worker [This describes father perfectly. He always worked hard at anything he attempted.—J. H. H.] and since . . . ever since he has become conscious of thy desires he hath returned almost daily with more or less friends here. U D.

(Yes, I U D. Yes, I U D.)

Well, James, it is time for me to return. Do you hear Him . . . (R. H. to S. : That's Imperator.) whispering to me and telling me how to reach you clearly? I long to remember more of my earthly experiences, and if I can I will leave nothing unspoken. More or less sad was my coming here, a condition from which [written "condition whi," then *from* inserted above between *condition* and *whi*, then *ch* added to *whi*.] (S. to R. H. : Mark the completion of that *which*.) I am slowly recovering.

[This stopping in the middle of the word "which" to insert the "from" above the line, and then coming back to the right place and completing the "which" without trying to rewrite it, considering that Mrs. P. was not only unconscious, but had her head turned away, was a wonderfully interesting performance.—J. H. H.]

I meant . . . intended [the *t* of *meant* not completed, then *intended* superposed on *meant*] I intended to refer to uncle John . . . U . . .

but I was somewhat dazed, James. Do you U D me. (Yes. Yes, I U D.) I heard that very well. I wanted to refer to this for the purpose of clearing matters up.

(Yes, I am glad to have uncle John mentioned.)

and there is another thing to which I would refer, and that is the university.

(Yes, I U D, but go on.)

It was there, James, that I had you go, and the others I will refer to soon.

[I had supposed at the time of the sitting, as the note then made and now deleted indicated, that this "uncle John" was a confused reference to the John McClellan whom I had known, and who was the treasurer of the university to which father had sent me for my education. But it is not certain that this John McClellan was intended by the reference, especially as it is apparent that the communicator is governed by association in referring to the incident of sending me to the university as "another thing." (June 2nd, 1900.)—J. H. H.] [Cf. Footnote, p. 472.]

I am all right while + is near me, and my memory comes back to me clearer. I have given mention as you doubtless understand, to several persons, places, etc., which are not quite clear, and before I go on, if you will refer to those which perplex you most I will do my best to correct them and perhaps I can recall some of them myself. I intended to refer to the McLellen family one by one and keep all of their names quite [page turned with the words of R. H. "One moment please." Hand listens to R. H.] (R. H. : All right.) (S. : All right.) clear, but at times my head bothers me, and I have to return to regain myself. Do you remember our old home in the little town of C. ? [?]

(R. H. : C., is that ?)

Yes, and where I with Aunt Nannie lived after your mother [your inserted above, between *after* and *mother*, after *mother* was written.] left us and we brought you up.

[This is an interesting passage beginning with the reference to "our old home." This very expression is consistent with the fact of his removal to another State, alluded to as "out West" in earlier sittings. The letter C is not correct for the name of the town possibly meant. The name of the town was Xenia, pronounced "Ze-nia," and we may suppose that Rector interpreted the sound Z as the pronunciation of C (*see*), assuming, as there is evidence to believe, that phonetic analogies are admissible in this problem. Father did not actually live "in" this town. My aunt Nannie did. Our house was a few miles from it, but Xenia was our regular post-office and was always referred to as our birth-place, etc. The statement that my aunt Nannie lived with us, at this "old home" after my mother's death, is every word of it true, and the time relations are perfectly accurate. (June 2nd, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

I am in no way confused, but my mind is clear and I am very close [not read at once] to you and an . . . close . . . I do not think I have ever been so clear before.

He [Imperator] is assisting me in every way, keeping . . . assisting . . . all quiet, and the names of your mother's family are all . . .

mother's [the previous *mother's* had been read as *brother's*] . . . known to me.

I intended to clear up about James and John McLellen before I left.

Speak, James, if you . . . (R. H. to S. : Now's your chance.) (Yes, father, I hear clearly and remember the old home and Aunt Nannie bringing us up.)

And the special . . . special . . . *care* I had with one of the boys. It is all right in my mind now. I only refer to it that you may know it is I your father, and no one else who is speaking, and . . . (Yes.)

[This is a very pertinent allusion, especially the italicising of the word "care." It is of course indefinite, but every member of the family would recognise the reference very quickly. The facts are too personal to be narrated here, because of their unpleasantness.—J. H. H.]

I also wanted Clarke for a mere recollection, not because I had any special interest otherwise. [Name not right. Cf. pp. 422, 431.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. Yes, I know, and . . . did he have anything to do with your sister ?)

Oh yes, only by marriage. [Correct relation.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, that, that is right, and is he on this side or not ?)

Yes, he is and has been for some time. (R. H. to S. : That's not clear.)

I often see him. [The implication is correct.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. Do you mean that he is on *your* side ?) He is here. [Correct—J. H. H.]

(Yes. What brought him there ? What brought him to your side ?)

Why do you not remember of his coming here suddenly, James ? (Yes.) [Correct about his sudden death.—J. H. H.]

It was pneumonia. [Not correct. But it would be true of the uncle James McClellan just previously mentioned.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I remember his sudden coming, but I wanted to see if something said about him before was what you meant.)

What it was, due to it, and if I mistake not you remember it very well.

(Yes. I remember it, but do not worry about it now. It will come again. You can go on.)

I only was disturbed because of the accident that I could not make clear, and Charles interrupted me somewhat because he had a *fever*, and yet we are not suffering with anything, don't think that, James, will you ?

(No, I shall not, it is all right.)

[The incidents in this reference confirm my interpretation of the real meaning of the name Clarke so frequently mentioned before. The mistake of pneumonia is very singular, and it is interesting to see that there seems to be some consciousness of the confusion involved in it. Also there seems to be a half reproach administered to me for wanting him to tell me what I could be supposed to know already, as if it were only the purpose of my experiments to deal with his own memories ; if not reproach there is evident wonder. If the word accident could be taken for all that it suggests in connection with both my uncle's sudden death and the statements made about it in previous sittings, it would have special significance.

The statement that brother Charles had a fever is correct, as the notes to my first and third sittings, December 23rd and 25th, 1898, quite clearly

show. The reference to his interruption is curious. It appears as if they thought I was asking for the illness with which my *brother* Charles died, as mentioned in previous notes.—J. H. H.] [See Note 60, p. 513.]

and Nanie will feel better to know this. She was one of the best of sisters. [Cf. p. 343.]

[I see no pertinence or meaning to this allusion to "sister Nannie." In this connection the reference should have been to another sister, namely, Eliza, mentioned at earlier sittings (pp. 343, 449). The description of "Nanie" as the best of sisters is exactly father's opinion of both of them.—J. H. H.]

(Yes. Yes. I shall tell her. You re . . . have you seen any one that Aunt Nannie is interested in?)

Yes, I intend telling you about him before I get through, James. (Yes, all right. Go on and free your mind and I shall not interrupt you.)

but I like to hear you speak. I see the . . .

Excuse me a moment . . . I will return in a moment.

+ takes him away for a moment. Will return again soon. I see you James, I am your sister Annie

[The appearance of my sister Annie was accompanied by a marked change in the handwriting and much more rapid execution. There was no hesitation and it seemed as if she had no difficulty in thinking coherently. When my father returned, the writing changed back to the more deliberate style and less distinct character in respect of the letters.—J. H. H.]

(I . . .) and I am very glad to meet you here. Pa is better now.

["Pa" was always the way that we children addressed or spoke of father, until a late date when I began to call him "father." I have not called him "Pa" for twenty-two years. I stopped it about the time I left college, but the others still continued it for a long time. But my sister Annie in life never used any other expression but "Pa."—J. H. H.]

(Yes. I am very glad to see you.)

Do you remember when I came to this life, James? (Yes, I remember very well.) And did you know I did not see you? (Yes. I think so.)

[This last statement about not seeing me, and my answer, are not strictly true, but the former is near enough to the truth for me to give this answer in order not to introduce any confusion into the writing, as I thought a negative answer might do. Some idea of how near the truth it is will be observed when I say that I have but one distinct recollection of her. I remember on the evening of my brother Charles' funeral, he having died twelve days before her, that as we sat down at the table to supper, Anna was standing between the table and the door, and mother said something to her, I think, about coming to supper. She was perfectly well apparently at the time, none of us having yet shown any symptoms of the scarlet fever. But she replied to mother in a clear innocent tone, "I am going to get sick and die." The impression that the statement made on mother, with the awe and indefinable feelings which the death of my brother had excited in me, stamped the incident indelibly on my memory. I was eleven years old at the time. My sister was only four, I think, or thereabouts. I have refused to look up the fact in order not to expose any more than is possible to the telepathic theory. But if I cannot now recall anything more than the

above incident about her, though I was eleven years old when she died, it ought not to be wondered that she, being only four when she died, should say that she did not see me.—J. H. H.] [If we could take the liberty to conjecture that my sister did not see me when she was dying, since her death as a fact was very gradual, we might obtain a meaning that would satisfy another possibility. But I am very doubtful about the rights of such an interpretation (June 2nd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

But I thought of you a great deal and I am thinking now of Corrn [?] C a lora [?] what father calls [calles] her . . . not quite right . . . C l a . . . C o r o [?]. [This is apparently an attempt to give the name of my aunt Cornelia (June 2nd, 1900.—J. H. H.)

[See Note 61, p. 514.]

You cannot help me, can you, I mean mother.

[Apparently the words, "You cannot help me, can you," were addressed to her mother.]

J e n n i e and L U C y . [See Note 62, p. 514.]

(I remember Lucy, but not Jennie. I think there is a Jennie, but what Lucy is this ?)

She is on my mind at this moment, and I want to send a message to *her*. (Very well, send.)

Do you remember grandmother ? (Yes, I remember her well.)

L U C y is there and I am just thinking of her, father knows about her better than I do.

Yes, I have waited all these years to find you, and I helped father when he came here. I feel it because I do not remember more for you, James, but you have changed also. [Interesting statement like one made before (p. 331).—J. H. H.] I had a sister-in-law, so I am trying to think of her. What is it you call her, James, tell ; no you better not, I will tell you pretty soon . . . very soon. I am sorry I cannot say more, but I hope to some day. [See Note 62, p. 514.]

What is meant by Peter ? [No meaning.—J. H. H.]

Was it the dog George had ? (I do not remember. I do not remember this.) Can't you ask him ? (Yes, I shall ask him about it.) [See Note 63, p. 515.]

[Hand indicates fresh arrival.]

Yes, I am back again now, I heard you say it was strange I could not tell you more about Cooper. What did you mean by that ?

(I wanted to know if you remembered anything about the dogs killing sheep.)

[Excitement in hand.]

[This excitement so evident in the hand was very interesting, especially when taken in connection with the sudden recollection of what I referred to, the wonder at my question and the statement that the communicator had forgotten it.—J. H. H.]

Oh, I should think I did, yes I do very well, but I have forgotten all about it, this was what we had the discussion about [Correct.—J. H. H.] and I made it unpleas . . . for him . . . [Perfectly correct, except that the blame was not on father's part.—J. H. H.] yes, very well, James, but just what you asked me this for I could not quite make out, as he was no relation of mine.—[Correct.—J. H. H.]

I remember it all very well, and if I could have recalled what you were getting at I would have tried to tell you, but I see him seldom, and I referred to him only because you asked me of him . . . about him.

(Yes. All right, father, I wanted it for my scientific purpose.)

Oh, yes. Why did you not just remind me of it? Well I will work for you, and to remind you of other things quite as good. But don't hurry me, and in time I can talk to you just as I used to.

[This whole passage regarding the incident I had recalled and the mental status indicated by the reply, though not containing evidential matter that must impress the reader without elaborate explanation, is perhaps as important as anything in my sittings. Let me first narrate the facts and then come to my purpose in suggesting it, with the comments that are necessary.

I remember that one winter night some dog or dogs killed a number of our sheep, and the next morning we tried to track the dogs through the snow to their homes. I took one track in one direction, and father followed another in a different direction. But it happened that I was thrown off the fresh trail by an older one in the snow, I being too young and ignorant to distinguish carefully, and failed to remark that the dog I had been set to trace had turned off to his home at a certain point, the dog being Samuel Cooper's. I followed the old trail to another neighbour's. But when father made the search after me, he found my mistake, and as Mr. Cooper had seen me following the trail to another neighbour the fact prevented father from throwing the blame unmistakably on the dog evidently at fault. Hence nothing could be done, I receiving some reproach for my carelessness. But later in the spring the dogs attacked the sheep a second time. What followed this event I shall not describe at present, but add to the account if anything further is said about the matter. It will suffice to say at present that the events that immediately followed were caused by the dissension between the two, they being immediate neighbours. (These incidents which I omit for personal reasons, and which were of a nature to impress my memory indelibly were far more interesting than those that I have mentioned, to say nothing of the clearness with which they stand out in my memory.) Knowing how innocent my father was in the case, and how much he felt any disagreement with his neighbours, it occurred to me that I might test his personal identity by simply asking a question about Samuel Cooper, which I sent to Dr. Hodgson for one of his sittings. The confused and confusing result has already been remarked. This was made "worse confounded" by the mention of John in connection with his name at the first of the present series of sittings, May 29th, when I came later to suspect that this was not the John Cooper for whom I thought it intended at the time. Later, however, I came to suspect that this John possibly referred to another person, and all the allusions made to Mr. Cooper took on an entirely new possibility and import. I suspected this at the sitting previous to the present one, and the statement that he, Samuel Cooper, "was no relation of mine" supports this suspicion. It seems to imply that father expected me to ask about my relatives only. But it is an interesting fact to see that he correctly states that Samuel Cooper is not a relative of his, and the statement occurs in an interesting connection, though it is equally true of the Cooper that he evidently had in mind all along. The whole passage is a fine

resemblance of reality in conversation and thinking. The recognition, the correction, the wonder indicated regarding my question, and the final appreciation of my object are incidents in a unity of consciousness that is beyond all simple explanation short of charity for the spiritistic theory, to say nothing of the two correct incidents in it, that about the discussion and the denial of relationship with the person named. The reader may reflect on this incident when applying telepathy.—J. H. H.]

Do you remember where George used to go, and it did not please me very well?

(Yes, I remember. I remember it, and shall be glad to have you say all you wish about it.)

You see the hours I spent over him and with him, the advice I gave him, and very little good at times.

[This passage is too indefinite for evidential purposes, but it expresses exactly my father's thought and actions in regard to a certain event, which, though not reflecting on my brother unfavourably, was connected with his welfare in a way that my brother may not have appreciated at the time.—J. H. H.]

I remember F R ank, and I also recall the time he caught the fish. Do you remember that Sunday? [I know nothing of this.—J. H. H.] (No, I do not remember it. But I think Frank will remember it.) Yes I refer to him as he knew about it and the trouble it gave me. (Yes, I shall write to Frank about it.) Can't you see him? Oh I see . . . you will be going soon. [See Note 64, p. 516.]

(Yes, that is right, that is right.)

Yes. Well, wait and ask him if . . . as it will be better to ask . . . as, as, it will be better to ask him . . . and the . . .

(R. H. : Rather than write?) [Assent.]

Mr. Hyslop says so.

(Yes, I will talk to him about it.)

And there was a place where he used to go and spend evenings, and both his aunt and myself did our best to keep him out of *temptation*.

(Yes. I am glad to hear that. You mean Frank I think?)

[I know nothing of this incident. I left home before Frank was old enough to make social calls.—J. H. H.]

Yes, I do mean Frank, but do you remember anything about War (Yes. I do. Go on.) and the mental anxiety I passed through at that time (Yes. I remember it very well indeed.) and . . . and my leg? I am getting tired James, will rest a moment and return.

[This reference to the "war," to the mental anxiety at that time, and to his leg is profoundly interesting. Father was very strongly opposed to slavery and passed through a period of intense mental anxiety and fears for his country at the time. He would probably have volunteered for the service had not the injury to his leg which I have described in a previous note rendered him unfit for a soldier. But near the close of the war, when he could perform a slight service as a soldier without risk to his health, he went to aid in the prevention of Morgan's raid in Ohio. This service did not require any long marching, but only some militia duties.—J. H. H.]

This is a very heavy atmosphere to be in.

What about Aunt L U C Y? (Aunt Lucy who?)

Charles is speaking this, and he came here quite young . . . young. She was related to the other mother, wasn't she?

(Do you mean the mother on this side?) Yes, I do. (Well, can you tell what her other name is?) John can as he knows her very well. Ask him when he gets here, if that is you, James. (Very well. That is all right.)

And what happened to the chimney after I left.

Do you not remember? (Yes. I remember it.) And wasn't it taken down? (Yes, I think so.)

I heard father talking about it to mother some time ago . . . I mean the chimney, James. (Yes. Yes. I remember it very well.)

Well, all right, I am not worrying about it, only I remember how cold it was before I left.

Going out now.

[We had no aunt Lucy, though at the time of the sitting I thought we had a second cousin by this name. I can only suppose that my brother Charles mistook the relationship when trying to give the name of Lucy McClellan, in reality his cousin by marriage. The reference to her being related to "the other mother," if it applies to my stepmother, is false, but it may be a conjecture of Rector's, as he apparently makes the previous statement. The statement that John knows her very well is unverifiable, and indeed extremely dubious, though I admit it possible. (June 2nd, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

[The reference to the chimney is interesting, though I could hardly treat it as evidential if it came from my brother Charles alone, because he died many years before the incident occurred. But it is peculiarly pertinent to have it come thus indirectly from father and to have my mother connected with it in this way, as it appears to be a story told her for information. Now the facts are these. When we built our house in 1860 or 1861, the chimney on the kitchen was not high enough to prevent the interference of the winds, coming against the main part of the house or over it, with the draught in it necessary to support the fire in the cooking stove. The consequence was that, after trial, it had to be built up to reach above the second storey of the house, and was a solitary chimney, perhaps twenty or twenty-five feet above the roof of the kitchen. It did not give a very artistic appearance to the house, but had to be endured. About 1884 a cyclone overthrew it, and it was rebuilt. The reader can determine the pertinence of the reference, and more especially the form which it takes as having been told mother by father. She died long before the accident to the chimney. Are we to suppose a consultation between them for something peculiar and specially evidential to tell me?

The allusion to the cold weather before he left is pertinent, as a note in my first sitting shows. (Cf. p. 310.) My brother died in the winter when the snow was on the ground.—J. H. H.] [See Note 65, p. 517.]

Yes my son, all the medicine in the material world could not have kept me in it, as it was time for me to come. Go home, James, and see them all, and do not miss me, but try and feel if you can that I am somewhere near you.

(Yes, father, I shall feel that you are near.)

And God keep you, as He always has, one of the best of sons. I can now speak what I could not often say when I was with you there, but you never gave me much anxiety.

[Father did feel much concern for me during the "Sturm und Drang" period of my religious doubts, but it is probably true in every other respect that he had little anxiety about me.—J. H. H.]

I seem to go back to the old days more than anything else. Don't say you wonder at this, that, and the other, but wait, be patient—all all will be clear to you some day. If I fail in my memory, do not say well if that is father he must have forgotten a great deal. I really forget nothing, but I find it not easy to tell it all to you. I feel as though I should choke at times and I fail to express my thoughts, but if fragmentary try and think the best of them, will you ?

(Yes. I shall try and think the best of them.)

From day to day I will grow stronger while speaking, and then you will know me as I am. (Yes, father, I think so. You have done very well indeed to-day.)

I must leave you soon they say, so accept my little helps and remember me as your * * [undec.] father R. H. Hyslop [?] [The last few words much cramped and letters somewhat written over one another.—R. H.]

Gone. Adieu [?]

[Father had no middle initial. His name was simply R. Hyslop, or Robert Hyslop, when written in full. His name had already been given in full at the sitting of December 27th. I suppose the intention here was to give only the initials R. H., and that finally the H. was expanded into Hyslop.—J. H. H.] [He used to sign his letters to me, "your affectionate Pa," not "father." I do not know whether the undeciphered words are an attempt to write the first two words of this phrase or not. (May 4th, 1901.)—J. H. H.]

Speak, friend, and I will take any message to him.

(Yes, tell father he has done so well to-day, and I shall be glad to hear from him again. I was very glad to see his name written here.) Amen.

Friend, come to us and fear not. (R. H. : Amen.)

Now, may the grace of God rest on thee. (R. H. : Amen.)

Farewell. + Imperator {R}

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

[Almost inarticulate, as yesterday. Mrs. P.'s tongue seemed almost immobile.]

Hodgson [?] Hyslop to remain [?] Yes, I . . .
I'm not dead Tell James [?] I'm not dead.

I don't know that * * [?]

There's Imperator and Rector, and a man that's got a scar on his face. I don't want to go. Oh oo—oo? Awful dark after I left. Who's that little short man? Who's that little old gentleman that whispers?

[The last sentence describes the condition of father's voice during the last three years of his life. Paralysis of the larynx made it impossible for him to speak above a whisper. (December 10th, 1899).—J. H. H.]

[Extract from sitting of June 3rd, 1899.]

[Rector writing. Sitter, R. H.]

June 3rd, 1899.

* * * We will meet Hyslop on the first four days after coming Sabbath, and Mrs. C. on the fifth, take the light to Mrs. — on the sixth. *Sabbath we return not.* First after Sabbath we have to give to some worthy mortal. Speak.

(You wish to cease with Hyslop after the next four ?)

We would like to continue until his friends on our side are quite clear, but we would prefer to discontinue until after we have restored the light somewhat, as we prefer the best conditions for his friends, who are worthy and intelligent spirits, but who cannot do their best under the present conditions. Yet we are helping them greatly, and will see that they do the best that is possible at this time. The reason of his father's being so clear at first was due in chief to the clearness of the light. U D. (Yes.)

Consequently we will cease after four meetings, and return for greater work later. * * *

[Mrs. Piper had averaged about twenty sittings a month for the previous seven months.—R. H.]

[Among the utterances of Mrs. Piper's "subliminal" as she was coming out of trance were: "Say to Hyslop all is well." * * * "Stainton Moses helping Hyslop."] [Cf. p. 340.]

INTRODUCTION.

The interesting feature of the approaching trance to-day which came with the usual symptoms that I have previously described, was the fact that it came on while Mrs. Piper was talking to Dr. Hodgson about a request from a certain person to have a sitting. She talked about it for some time and gradually ceased this as Dr. Hodgson was talking, and began to show the movements of the hand and eyes which indicate the trance. As she was becoming entranced, and while staring into space she nodded her head several times as if assenting to something, and soon her head fell on the pillow.¹—J. H. H.

June 5th, 1899.

Record of Sitting, June 5th, 1899.

Prof. J. H. Hyslop and R. H.

[Rector writes.]

H A I L (R. H. : Hail.)

Friends of earth, we are pleased to meet thee on this day as it is God's will, and may peace be with thee throughout and His blessings on thee + R.

All is as we would have it and *we will watch over all.*

(We welcome thee this day.) Amen.

¹ As there were no special reasons for taking notes on the symptoms of the trance at the time, the present introductory note and those of the three following sittings were written out from memory after returning to the office on the same day, as the dates show.—J. H. H.

One word to thee and we will go on. (R. H. : Yes.)

(R. H. to S. : I think they mean a word to me.)

The time to which we have given mention for Mrs. M. must be kept by her and . . . as it is . . . as it is most imperative.

[Special days had been previously appointed for sittings for Mrs. M. (See *Proceedings S. P. R.*, Vol. XIII., pp. 341-349, and also this Report, p. 299), and I was not aware that she desired any change, but a special delivery letter reached me immediately after the sitting, requesting an alteration of the time. Her request was apparently answered here by anticipation. Professor Hyslop was present when the letter came, and I showed it to him, and we intended to preserve it carefully, but it was presumably mislaid, and has not yet been found. (May 8th, 1901.) R.H.]

[I saw and read the above mentioned letter at the time. (May 9th, 1901.) —J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Very good. I understand.)

Say this and fail not. + R. (R. H. : Yes. I will notify her at once.)

The mother is in our charge and will be most judiciously cared for. Good day.

(R. H. : Good day.) F I H M. [Fragmentary incomplete attempt at initials of Mr. M.]

Well, James [agitation in hand.] J [and scrawl] (R. H. to S. : Say something.) (Yes, mother, good morning. Be calm and go on.) [Hand rests on S.'s hand for two or three moments.]

I am very pleased to meet you here, my dear little son, after all the years that have passed since I left you a little boy. [Correct allusion.—J. H. H.] I remember it so well and I have watched over you many a day since then.

My thoughts are clearing daily and as I look back it helps me greatly . . . do you remember when Annie came to me . . . to me, an . . . and told me you were here. If you can recall this you will know the first of my returning here to find you . . . [not all read.] . . . know the . . . you will know it was the first . . . first.

and as she recalled you to my mind I have unceasingly sought to find you.

(R. H. to S. : How did you interpret that ?)

It was your sister Annie and not your father who first saw you.

[The only interest that can attach to this statement is that it seems to coincide with the fact that my sister Annie's name was the first relevant one given at my first sitting (December 23rd, 1898). I cannot use it as evidence, nor can I insist that the interpretation is even a probable one, but only that there is a coincidence at least.—J. H. H.]

I am going to tell you something you have forgotten after I become . . . I become clear . . . when . . . M. A. H. . . . when (R. H. : "When I become clear.") (Yes, mother, I shall be glad to hear it.)

Are you feeling well, James? (Yes. I feel very well indeed.) No headache? (No. I have no headache.)

[My mother died when I was fifteen. When I was between ten and fourteen years old, I very often had severe headaches, and my mother always gave me soda for them. The incident is precisely such as my mother would recall.—J. H. H.]

Glad I am to hear this because the good saints here have been praying for you of late. R.

It is I your father who is speaking. Cannot you hear me, James ?

(Yes, father, I hear. I am glad to see you this morning.)

I am very glad also. Now let me tell you one thing more and that is about the little errors which I may make when speaking with you. I think many things all at once and when I try to give mention to them I fail somewhat. Do you remember the school teacher I referred to a few days ago ?

(Yes, I remember and shall be glad to have you go on.)

He has been more anxious to tell you what I had on my mind concerning him.

[This possibly refers to the incident told to Dr. Hodgson (sitting of February 22nd). It is strange to see the statement that it was only a few days ago. But the distinction in time coincides with what appears to be the habit of alleged communicators in the Piper case. The statement here implying that this teacher is not living is equivocal. I cannot tell whether it comes from Rector or father. The sudden disappearance of father and appearance of my uncle makes it probable, perhaps, that it is Rector's statement regarding father's intention to free his mind regarding this teacher. I do not remember the teacher's name, and do not know whether he is living or not.—J. H. H.]

Here is Clarke. (Good morning, uncle, I shall be glad to hear from you.) Give my love to N.

[Hand tightens in excitement, and pencil is nearly forced out from fingers. R. H. lays his hand gently over it.]

Give . . . [Sp.—probably Imperator—enjoins apparently, and hand becomes quiet and bows.]

Give my love to Nan.

[The hesitation after "Nan" was written was an interesting fact. It would appear to have been more natural for my uncle to mention his widow Eliza. There appeared to be in this hesitation a consciousness of a mistake, if the pause can be so interpreted. But as he had mentioned his wife Eliza before more than once it may seem a reasonable deviation here to refer to his sister-in-law, whose name is Nannie, the aunt Nannie of this record.—J. H. H.] [Note 95, p. 536.]

And let me think a moment. I am a little anxious first to tell you about yourself.

I left so suddenly I had no time for anything. [Correct.—J. H. H.] [Read incorrectly by S. R. H. reads correctly.] (S. to R. H. : I see.)

I am all right now, only my head troubles me when speaking. Wh . . . Wait for me . . . for me.

And do you remember Rice (R. H. : *Rice?*) [Assent.] [Then hand *dissents* violently.] (R. H. : No.)

Yes . . . Piece [?] Pierce. I say Pierce . . . D.

(S. to R. H. : I don't remember him.) (R. H. to S. : Say so.)

(No, I do not remember him, but you may say something about him and I shall enquire.)

DR. Pierce. Lidia Lida . . . LI . . . Lida.

(Yes, I remember Lidia. What relation is she to me?)

Annie and she are cousins, Lida Aunt. (Yes, which Annie is cousin of her?) There is a sister Annie and a cousin Annie and aunt Lida. She was an aunt to James Hyslop if I remember rightly and there is a sister in the body by that name. (Yes. Yes.)

[I do not know this Dr. Pierce. I know a physician by a different name who may have been my uncle's doctor. The name Rice came nearer what it is than Pierce. The physician in mind was also my father's doctor both on his deathbed and when he lived in Ohio. (See Note 66, p. 517.)

The truth and confusion in this passage are most interesting incidents. I shall first state the facts, and we can then examine the difficulties. I have a sister whom we call Lida. My aunt, after whom my sister was named, and who was the wife of the communicator and still living, was called Eliza. My uncle in speaking of her and to her always abbreviated the name to Liza. My sister, proper name Eliza, was called Lida for the very purpose of distinguishing her from this very aunt. From my uncle's habit, therefore, of abbreviating his wife's name to Liza, and from the proximity of the two names in the message, we can understand the form that my aunt's name takes in the writing. If a similar mistake occurred in the reference to "cousin Annie" I can interpret it as intended for "cousin Nannie," the same Nannie that appears in the communications of my cousin R. H. McClellan, she being the latter's sister and also a frequent visitor and intimate friend of my uncle and aunt. Otherwise I must consider it as without significance, as I have no cousin Annie. The relation between this "aunt Lida" and myself as here stated is correct, and so is the statement that the other Lida is my sister. (June 2nd, 1900.)—J. H. H.] [Note 95, p. 536.]

Which is the one I failed to mention. . . [Correct.—J. H. H.]

And I had to come to straighten out uncle Clark's mind, James.

I am your father. I had to come and help Uncle Clarke straighten out his thoughts.

[This sudden appearance of my father, with the wonderfully abbreviated reference to my sister Lida as the one he had failed to mention, is very striking. Not less so is the reference to Uncle Clarke (name not correct, though evident to me) with the statement that he had come to "straighten out his thoughts."—J. H. H.]

I am still here, and I will remain as long as I possibly can.

(Yes, I am glad to hear that. Please go on.) I wanted to speak of her myself, James. (Yes, that is right.) And I wanted to hear her sing. Do you hear me clearly? (Yes.)

I know he . . . I know you will remember the organ.

(Yes. I remember it.) And I was just thinking of our Sunday evenings at home. (Yes.)

Yes, although time has changed those days they are still lingering in my memory. (Yes. I remember them. Please go on.)

And I remember our little family circle very well. You see I go back some time ago for the purpose of recalling incidents which took place when you were one of them. I am not dreaming, my son, but I am quite clear and near. I had no idea at first what you really wished of me, then it all came to me when you said [hand indicates R. H.] well how would you have James know it was you. [Hand moves towards R. H.]

(R. H. : Yes, I said that.) Yes, you said that.

[This recollection and reference to Dr. Hodgson is a most interesting one, though perhaps not so remarkable on the spirit theory. On February 7th at a sitting at which I was not present Dr. Hodgson explained the meaning of this work to my father, and asked him what he would expect of me in like circumstances (See p. 374).—J. H. H.]

I remember the organ and our singing, the . . . oh what was that hymn, James, we used to sing so often ?

(Keep calm. It will come all right.)

N [?] . . . well I will think of it presently, and . . . is it all clear to you, or are you confused ?

(No, I am not confused, but we would like to see it written out here when you can think of it.)

[The mark put down as a capital letter N might be an attempt to make another character altogether. The evidence is that it differs in some features from the usual capital N. But I cannot entertain any safe conjectures as to what was intended. (June 3rd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

Oh, yes, I think I U D. [Interesting as probably indicating an appreciation of my scientific object.—J. H. H.]

My dear . . . [S. makes some ejaculatory sound which I did not catch.—R. H.]

[Pause. Hand talks with Sp.] Yes I do . . . Very well . . . I will not try until I am released, and then I will know it and come and say it for him. (Yes.)

[The reference to the organ and our singing is correct, if we could separate it from the reference to the hymn. The reference to "that hymn," when taken in connection with the mention of the organ, would present interesting possibilities to most persons. But father would neither use the word "hymn" in this connection, nor imply that he either sang hymns or used the organ for any purpose of instrumental worship. He was always opposed to instrumental music in worship of any kind. But it is perfectly pertinent to mention a certain "hymn" which "we used to sing so often." I could name what would fit the case, but I shall wait to see what is done in the future. (What I had in my mind here was the 23rd Psalm. June 3rd, 1900).—J. H. H.] [Cf. pp. 476-477.]

Yes. Oh . . . what has Will done with the flute (R. H. : "Flute." "What has Will done with the flute?") [S. shakes his head negatively.] flu . . . flute . . . not flute, I . . . oh, dear, I know so well what I mean . . . fid . . . fiddle . . . fiddle.

(I do not know, but I think you are thinking of another brother and another musical instrument.)

Yes, I think I am thinking of George. (That is right.) and his C. . . . Vial . . .

it is my fault . . . [R. H. puts brown knife on table.]

I am thinking of George and his . . . the instrument he used to play . . . but the name has gone. [Hand sways in air and moves fingers suggesting playing concertina.] [The previous note was made at the moment during the sitting by me, but when S. reminded me, just after the sitting, of the incident, and said it was the *guitar*, I recognised

that the movement of the hand fitted the *guitar* and not the *concertina*.
—R. H.]

(S. to R. H. : Look at that hand.) (Do not bother about the name now. I know exactly what you meant.)

Yes, all right. After I go out I will return and recall it. I feel I must go for a moment.

[This passage beginning with the reference to a "flute" was remarkable for its dramatic feature and for the apparent testimony which it affords in regard to the difficulties of communicating. When the word "fiddle" came out, I at once suspected what was meant, but was not sure that it might not apply to brother Will, though I had no memory of such a thing, as it was highly improbable. But it at once flashed on my mind what was intended and I made the reference to another brother without suggesting the name. The immediate mention of George shows both the correct name and the correct conception of the relation involved in the thought of the musical instrument. As soon as the letter C was written, I saw that the sound indicated an approximation to the first letter of the name of the instrument in mind, and when "Vial" was written I was satisfied and was going to suggest that this was enough, when Rector spontaneously recognised that violin was wrong and assumed the fault himself. Then there began the most remarkable attempt on the part of Mrs. P.'s hand to imitate the movements of a player when playing on a guitar that one could imagine possible under the circumstances. It swayed slightly and moved the fingers as if picking the strings, and so clearly imitated the playing of that instrument that any one thinking of it at the time could not escape detecting it.

I did not know what a concertina was when I wrote the above portion of this note, but supposed that it was an instrument played somewhat after the manner of a guitar. But having ascertained from Miss Edmunds that it is a wind instrument like the accordion I am at a great loss to understand how Dr. Hodgson could so mistake the movement of Mrs. P.'s hand and fingers. This mistake has to be mentioned because, having in mind what was intended, I am liable to the accusation that the resemblance recognised by me was an illusion of apperception, and Dr. Hodgson's reference to the concertina powerfully sustains that suspicion. But I am confident beyond all doubt that there is less reason for this suspicion than the sceptic imagines, though he is entitled to the caution which such phenomena impose upon the observer.—J. H. H.]

What is it . . . My stepsister . . .

I am Charles. + sent me to take father's place. Hettie I did not remember. (That is right.)

[My brother Charles died in 1865 [Correct date, 1864] and my sister Henrietta was born in 1874.—J. H. H.]

as she was my stepsister half sister [Correct.—J. H. H.] I mean but I could not think of it at first. Do you realise, James, how much our leader is helping me . . .

(I shall be glad to hear you go on.)

he said, I mean father said . . . said . . . I mean father said . . . you go Charles and do the best you can until I can breathe more freely

. . . until I can breathe more freely . . . [The above repetitions due to non-reading by S.]

Do you remember Uncle James McLellan . . . and Frank . . . speak . . . Hyslop. (Yes. I remember Frank Hyslop well.)

He is not here yet, he is over there somewhere, father spoke to me of him a few moments ago. (That is right.)

[The name of my uncle James McClellan is practically correct and also that of my brother Frank Hyslop. Charles could remember little or nothing about him. I am not certain at this writing whether Frank was born at the time of Charles' death. But it is interesting to observe the allusion to his having heard father speak of him. The statement that he is still living is correct.—J. H. H.]

[I find on examining the birth register that my brother Frank was born three years after brother Charles' death. (August 1st, 1899).—J. H. H.]

You see father forgets nothing but he cannot say all that he thinks . . . all he thinks yet.

Who is Dr. Pierce. He was a friend of Uncle Clarke's, and he is still over there . . . there. (Right.) [?] [Assuming that Dr. J. P. Dice (*Cf.* p. 459) is meant by this it is correct, he being a friend of my uncle and my father's physician (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.] [I said "right" at this point in recognition of Dr. Hodgson's correct reading of the word "Clarke's" instead of "Charles" as it first appeared to me.—J. H. H.] and perhaps you will take the trouble to find him at the . . . * * [undec.] . . . oh I am getting mixed too. [R. H. puts knife into hand.] (My brother Charles.)

I was ill wasn't I, very ill, and when they thought I was getting better I was really coming out. You do not know this but Aunt Nannie will, I know. [I do not know anything about this.—J. H. H.] [Cannot be verified, but aunt Nannie is the only person living besides her sister, aunt Eliza, who could possibly know, and aunt Nannie is the one father would mention to my brother for the purpose because of her excellent memory in most cases like this (December 30th, 1899).—J. H. H.] [I have learned since also that my aunt Nannie was teaching near by, and that she came to see my brother Charles during the illness, but she was not present at his death (June 3rd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I am thinking about father's war stories. Do you remember them? (Yes, I do.) [My brother Charles died just before the close of the Civil War when he was only four and a half years old, and hence can hardly be supposed to remember father's war stories. But I conjecture that this incident like most of the others in his communications here, is the result of information on the "other side." It has an interesting connection with father's earlier reference to the war (p. 454), and in the coincidence of Charles's death with the date of that war of which he could remember little or nothing (June 3rd, 1900).—J. H. H.] [*Cf.* reference to chimney, p. 455.]

And any thing about his leg. (Yes, yes, yes I do.) [This is like the previous incident (p. 454).—J. H. H.]

and the little . . . James what became of the little ship . . . [I know nothing of this.—J. H. H.]

(I do not remember. I do not remember.)

think . . . think . . . think about the boat . . . boat.

The other boys must know what I mean. (Yes. I shall ask them about it.) [Cannot be verified (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

And . . . we [?] we . . . and ask about the time after I left that they got *turned over*. I can not ask them because I know. [I know nothing about this.—J. H. H.] (I shall ask them myself this summer.) [Unverifiable, (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

And what has become of Robert? (Robert who?) Robert Hyslop. (Your brother Robert.) Yes. [Correct.—J. H. H.] (He is in Ohio.) Well . . . well . . . is he well. (Yes, he is well.) Are those his children? (I do not understand.) No . . . No, it was only interruption . . . I am thinking of my brother. [Possibly there is a special pertinence in asking about my brother Robert, in addition to father's interest in him. Charles' full name was Charles Robert, and as father had no namesake after Charles' death he called his next son simply Robert (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.] [See Note 68, p. 518.]

(That is right.)

And he has some . . . some trouble with his eye . . . one . . . eyes. Yes, eyes. (Yes, I think that is right.) Yes, it surely is right, and I am going to see what I can do to help him. [See Note 67, p. 517.]

I will do better for you bye and bye, James, do not get impatient with me. I was all right, and I tried to do right always. Don't you think so? (Yes, I do think so.) I want very much to help you to find us all. I could not stay away.

We had one other sister . . . [other interpreted at the time as sister; it looks like a mixture of the letters of *other* and *sister*.] more . . . one more sister, didn't we, or you did. (Yes. Yes.) I mean you did. (Yes, that is right. Can you tell her name?) Yes, Lida . . . [Correct.—J. H. H.] (Yes.) was her name. (Yes, that is right.)

and father knows more about her than I do, but often tells me about . . . about them, and of another one named like her. Li . . . Lizz . . . Lizzie . . . Li . . . no not exactly, but Eliza . . . beth . . . Eliza . . .

I am not quite sure of this, James.

[It is true that father would know more about sister Lida than Charles, as this sister was only eight [six] years old when Charles died at six [four and a half]. It appears also that he is attempting to name my aunt Eliza after whom my sister Lida (real name Eliza) is named. "Named like her" seems to indicate this with reasonable clearness.—J. H. H.]

[Examination of the family records shows that my sister was only six years old when my brother Charles died at *four and a-half*, (December 31st, 1899).—J. H. H.]

(Well, don't worry about it.)

but he often speaks of L U Cy. (Yes, can you finish that name Lucy? Can you come . . .)

L U C I N . . . L U C y . . . who * * [undec.] Mother. Mother . . . L It is L U C y I am speaking about. Lan * * [undec.] L U C y. No, I cannot, James. (I know what it is.) [Said to Dr. Hodgson.—J. H. H.]

I will try again to make him hear.

L L U C y . A . . . A n n i e . . . will help me for a moment.

I do not think it is wise, will return again when I can speak louder. I am not confused, am I? (I think not, but what relation was she to me? What relation was she to me? What relation was this person you are speaking about to me?)

Well, I got it all but the Hyslop.

[Rector apparently thought here that my brother was trying to give Lucy as the name of a sister or relative. There never was such a person, and it is curious to remark that in the attempt to trust his inferences Rector goes astray. But it is not less interesting to observe that, at the end of the sitting, as Mrs. Piper comes out of the trance, there is apparently a special effort made to get the name Lucy McClellan, and this time they succeeded (June 3rd, 1900).—J. H. H.]

(Was she very close to me?) [Hand shakes slightly to indicate not understanding.] Say that again.

(Was she very close to me when she was living?)

Yes, very, and would have remained so, but not a sister nor a cousin nor an aunt, James, but it is on my mind, and I would like to tell you all I can about her, but I am a little weaker just now.

[Brother Charles had tried to give this Lucy in a previous sitting (p. 455), and the communications seemed very much confused. But as my uncle James McClellan was named a few minutes before in the present sitting, I here inferred that the attempt was to give the name of his daughter-in-law, who, I thought, was meant the first time the name was given, but I gave up this idea because the relationship mentioned seemed false. But as soon as I saw the hesitation the first time I saw the name Lucy written, I thought it possible that the reference might be to my twin sister Sarah Luella who had died before Charles was born, as the first two letters of her name Luella are the same as that of Lucy. Hence I remarked to Dr. Hodgson that I knew what it meant. I ought to have seen that: "It is Lucy I am speaking about. Lan . . ." was not intended for my sister, but I did not. However, I resolved to test the case by asking for the relationship to me of the person indicated. I put the question in the form mentioned, almost the identical language referring to her possibly in an earlier sitting (p. 309), in order to satisfy a special purpose. The answer is somewhat puzzling. It seems to answer me both affirmatively and negatively. But by separating the statements they can both of them be interpreted as true. This Lucy, still living, is neither sister, nor aunt, nor cousin, except we consider the last by marriage, she being the wife of the Robert McClellan who communicated before. But the statement that "she" was very close to me and "would have remained so," seems to imply that the lady was not living, while in fact she is. But this implication and the closeness of the relation asserted, if applied to the sister that I had in mind, would be perfectly relevant.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : I think he'd better stop, Rector.)

Yes, he is going, don't . . .

He is going far off canst thou not see him yet.

(R. H. : Rector, the writing is getting worse and worse. Perhaps the light is falling.)

Yes, it is, but speak slowly, friend.

He [Imperator] was trying to assist him to recall his memories as he was clear on arrival (S. : "service") arrival . . . clearer on arrival here. U D (R. H. : "Clearer on arrival here.") U D. (R. H. : Yes.)

Oh God, thou allwise Father, give us more light on the returning of the light and ere we return to earth * * [undec.] we may be able to hear distinctly and clearly the voices of Thy Messengers and all returning friends. We beseech thee, Oh Father, to render (S. : "render") (R. H. : "remember." To S. : Don't you say anything.) [S.'s interpretation was correct. I saw that the writing was becoming fainter, and thought that it would avoid confusion if S. did not try to interpret, but left it entirely to me at this stage.—R. H.] us Thy aid and [not read at once] . . . render us thy help in all our undertakings. We . . . faileth [failtheth ?] Thy help we are indeed bereft. Merciful Father, Oh thou Allwise God Merciful God give us help and light [not all read at once] . . . Allwise and Merciful . . .

We cannot bring thy father back this day. Yet we will not fail thee. (R. H. : "Yet we will fail thee.")

Yet we will not fail thee after we depart and return again. (R. H. : Amen.)

The light is failing and we must soon cease. (R. H. : Yes the time is up also.) We will return with light. (R. H. : Amen.)

May God watch over thee through this day. [*through* not read at once.] throughout this day. (R. H. : Amen.)

Farewell + R. }

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

(R. H. : Kindly send the light back quickly.) [Repeated.]

Lucy . . . (R. H. : Your tongue prevents the articulation.) [Repeated.]

Tell Hyslop. Lucy . . . Lucy . . . McLellan.

[S. caught this sound before me and said "McLellan," which I then recognised it to be before it was repeated.—R. H.]

McLellan—McLellan.

Good-bye [from Mrs. P. apparently to Sp.]

I wanted to say . . . I want to say it well [?]

[This mention of the name Lucy McClellan as Mrs. P. came out of the trance represents the right name to clear up both the difficulties of brother Charles' statement and much of the confusion in the previous sittings. I shall now be able to run down a good many intimations. The matter now stands thus. This Lucy McClellan is the wife, still living, of the Robert McClellan who communicated on several occasions. He is the son of the James McClellan, my uncle, who died in 1876. All were very warm friends of my father and myself.—J. H. H.]

INTRODUCTION.

The symptoms of the trance to-day were in many respects the same as in previous cases, but in a few particulars quite different. I noticed as before that the yawning and sighing which accompanied the approach of the trance were incidents of this state and not of the normal Mrs. P. The first peculiarity, not noticed before, was the interruption of a short period of apparent unconsciousness, the eyes being closed, by a few

moments of apparent lucidity. But when the trance became quite profound there was the catching of the breath as of a person in the throes of death, but this soon stopped, and the breathing became as it usually is in the trance.—J. H. H.

June 6th, 1899.

Record of Sitting. June 6th, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I'd like to go to sleep and sleep for ever, when it's . . . when it's hot.
[Just beginning to lose ordinary consciousness.]

[Rector writes.]

H A I L . (R. H. : Hail.)

[Hand then seems distressed, cramped, and writes with much difficulty.]

we like not (R. H. : the position of the light ?)

thy arrangement. (R. H. : Wait one moment kindly.)

[As Mrs. P. lost consciousness, the upper part of the body tended to sway on one side somewhat, out of equilibrium, and we had a little difficulty in arranging her head properly upon the cushions. While doing so, Professor Hyslop moved Mrs. P.'s chair somewhat forward and to the side, with the object of placing her body in a better position as regards the cushioned table, and we also changed the position of the table itself. On reading the above writing and examining the position of Mrs. P.'s body I found that it had sagged over slightly to the right, and it would not apparently remain in a convenient position. On stooping down and looking at Mrs. P.'s feet, slightly moving her dress for the purpose, I found that the feet were crossed and one foot was partly turned over on the side. I uncrossed the feet and planted them straight in front of her, and we then re-arranged the upper part of the body.—R. H.]

[This was a very remarkable incident. As Mrs. P.'s head fell on the pillow I saw that her body was in a crooked position, and feared that during the writing she might topple over. Consequently I moved the chair upon which Mrs. P. was sitting so as to straighten her up a little and prevent her falling over. The table was then pulled up closer to her, and we proceeded to wait for the writing. My surprise can be imagined when the allusion to something being wrong with the machine was made, and turned out to be what Dr. Hodgson has described. It is interesting to remark also that there was a connection between this position and the indistinctness of the writing. As soon as Mrs. P. was put into the proper position the writing appeared natural as usual. I had supposed that the change was due to the transition from Emperor to Rector, as the writing before the allusion to Mrs. P.'s condition was made resembled, to me at least, that of Emperor. But the resumption of the writing immediately by Rector without the symptoms that usually accompany a change of personality rather indicates a connection between the cramped position of Mrs. P. and the writing.—J. H. H.]

We meet thee with joy. H A I L thee once more. (R. H. : Amen.)
[R. H. motions to S. to speak.]

(I hail thee this morning with joy.)

All peace to thee, dear friend, and may thy future life while in its mortal covering be as peaceful as the Messengers of the Most High would have it, and it will be so. + R.

Hearst thou me . . . may the blessings of God rest on thee evermore. We have much to say to thee ere we depart for some time. U D. (Yes.)

We have some advice for thee concerning thy . . . -self . . . self and thy work. (I U D.) +

Time there will be for all things, and we ask thee to *hurry not*.

(R. H. : Yes. Rector, we received the name Lucy McClellan from the light on her return the last time, and were very grateful. We should be glad if you would kindly let us know when it would be desirable for our friend here to ask his father one or two questions which he would like him to answer during this visit either this time or on the next two times, any time that you think desirable.)

I am interrupted. Kindly repeat last three words. [Towards end of my remarks hand had turned away from me as if to talk to Sp.—R. H.]

(R. H. : If the spirit Hyslop will be ready to answer one or two questions before our friend's next times are finished.)

Ask thy questions, friend, when thy father announces himself as being present, and ask them quite slowly and distinctly that he may U D fully the question, as it may take some time for him to grasp the meaning fully, and if he faileth to answer this day it will give him time to think over and reply at the first coming of the light. U D. (R. H. : Yes.)

All questions should be put slowly and distinctly to him.

H., how are you . . . I have just been called upon to lend a helping hand. You see I am not wholly isolated [isoliated ?] . . . i . . . [inter-
preted at the time as *dissociated*] from you.

(R. H. : Good, George, were you here last time ?)

For a few moments. I helped a man named Charles, but I did not get a chance to say, How de do, H. (R. H. : All right, George.)

I am going after the elderly gentleman, look out for me.

(R. H. : We will.) Got those theories all straightened out yet, H ?
. . . theories. (R. H. : Pretty fairly.)

I am going. Auf wiedersehen. G. P.

I am coming, James. I am coming, James, my son.

(S. to R. H. : Shall I ask my question ?)

(R. H. to S. : Wait a minute, wait a minute, don't be in too great a hurry.)

I will be with you in a moment. Hear me. (Yes, I hear. Good morning, father.) Good morning, James. I hope it is a good morning with you. (Yes, it is. Yes, it is a good morning.)

(S. to R. H. : Perhaps you'd better tell them * * ask question) [?]
[One or two words not heard by R. H. (January 1st, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I am glad to hear it, it is always fine here, but you cannot U D it.

(R. H. : Mr. Hyslop.)

Yes, what is it, friend ?

(R. H. : Your son wishes to know one or two things specially. Shall he ask one thing now ? If you do not think of the answer do not trouble, but when you go away think it over and come back afterwards with the reply.)

Well, that is clear enough, I am sure.

(Can you tell me some things that took place before I was born, and which Aunt Nannie and Aunt Eliza will know. All things of this kind will shut out the thought theory, you understand.)

Well, I do in part, James, just let our friend repeat it for me, as I have a friend helping me who U D his accent [acent] better than . . . acen . . . I can either of yours at present. I know yours perfectly, but as he [is] chief helper he can hear better in so doing.

(R. H. : Yes. I . . .)

What about my sisters? I could not quite get that . . . get . . .

(R. H. : Yes . . .) . . . (R. H. : I will explain. Hyslop here wishes . . .)

James. (R. H. : Yes, James wishes his father) [Hand points to Sp.]

(R. H. : Yes . . . to tell him some incidents that Hyslop in the body, his son James, does not know, and . . . and that Aunt Nannie and Aunt Eliza *will* know.) U D. (R. H. : Then . . . people can't say that they came out of the mind of James.)

[Hand rises, then bows, as if telling and then listening to Sp.]

Yes, very well, this is not so difficult a thing to do, I am sure.

(R. H. : One moment. There is another point. If possible, he should recall things before James was born. In other words, get him to think of incidents with his . . .) (R. H. to S. : *Sisters?*) (S. to R. H. : No, *aunts*. Yes, *sisters*.) (R. H. : His sisters Nannie and Eliza before James was born . . . that they will remember.)

Yes, very well, I U D perfectly, and I will go back to my boyhood and tell you what you cannot deny. U D. I feel better this day and I can see you clearer than I ever have before. I am going out for a moment and [shall] think it over, and I will return in a few moments. U D. (Yes. I U D.)

I heard that perfectly and I should know that voice anywhere.

Don't hurry so, friend. Come away. [Between Sp. apparently.]

Is James Hyslop here, if so give him my love and say it is as I would have it, and I shall always feel as I did before he went away. I want very much to say something to him, but how can I?

[Pause.]

I want to return as soon as possible and free my mind, I have much to talk over with him. My name I gave to Mr. Clarke . . . gave . . . and told him to say I was here L U C Y [?]

(S. to R. H. : What's that?) L U C Y.

Where is the book of poems? Ask him if he knows what I am thinking about. [I cannot now imagine who this is nor what the book of poems means. The Lucy given would suggest my cousin, Robert McClellan, but the rest is unintelligible.—J. H. H.] [See Note 69, p. 518.]

[Stir in hand.]

Yes, I am here once more. Will you kindly ask aunt Eliza if she remembers a young man named B a k e r, and if she recall going to a prayer meeting one evening with him, and if . . . ask her [written above] (R. H. : "ask her if") she remembers who teased her about him. (I U D. Go on.)

and ask them both if they remember Jerry.

(R. H. : Jerry ?) Yes. (S. to R. H. : That's right.)

(R. H. : Jerry ?) Yes.

Perhaps you may know of this. If you do, say so, James, and I will think of something else which you do not know.

(Yes, I have heard you talk about Jerry, but please give the rest of his name for Aunt Nannie.)

Ah, but it is no use if you know it . . . (All . . .) [I remember distinctly hearing father and mother mention this Jerry, and what became of him, but I never saw him unless when so young that I could not remember the fact.—J. H. H.]

but ask her (All right.) [I thought the "ask her" referred to this Jerry and said "All right," but it goes with the following incident.—J. H. H.]

if she remembers who put the shoes in her bed. (R. H. : shoes? shoes?) Yes, I say S H O E S.

(R. H. : Good.) (All right. I shall ask her.)

and a sock (S. : "sack?") (R. H. : "sock?") S O C K (R. H. : "sock"?) Yes, on the post. No one on earth can know this, as mother is here, and she and the Rogers girl only will testify to it.

[Excitement in hand.]

I have something better.

Ask her if she recalls the evening when we broke the wheel to our wagon . . . the . . .

(I see. Go on.)

and who tried to cover it up, so it would not leak out so to speak. I remember it as if it happened yesterday [Characteristic phrase of father's.—J. H. H.] and she will remember it too.

I cannot tell you any more just now, but I will think over what is on my mind about our school days an . . . and of my trying to preach to the boy in the barn . . . boys . . . and more about it.

Be sure and ask about Baker, Jerry, and the broken wheel.

(Yes. I certainly shall do so.)

If any one's mind can know this who is present, I don't believe it. The girls alone know what I mean, and you will find it just as I tell you, James.

(Yes, very well, father, I shall ask about it.)

Is this what you wanted? Well I am a little weak just now and I will step out.

(R. H. to S. : Thank him very much and tell him he can go away and come again.) (Thank you very much, father. You can go away and come again.) All right, James. Be patient with me . . . (Yes, I shall. Yes, I shall be patient.)

Gone. [See Note 70, p. 519.]

Rest thy body, friend. [A very singular injunction to me by Rector, the fact being that I was quite tired.—J. H. H.]

[Hyslop sits down.]

[Hand bows as in prayer, after cross in air.]

I am here once more. I am James McLellan if you wish to know and you are my namesake . . . name. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I remember you and that you, . . . that I am your namesake.)

Yes, all right. We cannot quarrel about that, can we, James, but I despised the name of Jim. [Pertinent. We always called him by another name. But I never knew why we did so, nor that he despised the name Jim.—J. H. H.] (Very well, I understand.)

What is it you want to know about Frank, or was it John who wanted to know? (There was some confusion when Frank was mentioned, and also when John was mentioned. Who is this cousin John that was mentioned before?) [p. 445.] It was not cousin, that was a mistake. (Yes. Is he in the body or is he in the spirit?) He is here, and [Hand dissents violently] I intend to straighten this out, but the light went out, and I could not remain there. He is a brother . . . [Correct.—J. H. H.]

Yes all right . . . [to Sp.]

and he will be here soon.¹

But it is still not straight . . . straight. [Perhaps from G. P. to Sp.]

Wait and I will explain.

You remember brother John very well, you must if you are James. [Correct and interesting.—J. H. H.] (Yes. I remember him well.)

He was the one who went to war.

[I may have known this, but the only reason for supposing it is the fact that I was acquainted with him while at college, he being its treasurer. I have not the slightest recollection of ever knowing his connection with the war, but if it be true I cannot say that I never knew the fact.—J. H. H.]

(Very well. Go on.)

Let me see. [This is evidently intended to correct the above.—J. H. H.]

Well, perhaps you remember father, don't . . . do [superposed on *don't*] you not? (Do you mean *your* father?) Yes. [I never knew him, and do not recall ever hearing of him.—J. H. H.]

¹ June 10th, 1900. In May I wrote to this John McClellan a letter inquiring about some of the facts connected with his father's life, and received from his son a letter in reply, dated May 16th, and received by me the next day, saying that his father had died on the 30th of March last. I wrote to Dr. Hodgson asking him to inquire at his sitting of June 4th of my father, if he could reach him, whether he had knowledge of anything recent to tell me. I kept Dr. Hodgson ignorant of the facts, though he knew from my explanation to him that I wanted information of the recent death of some one connected with the report. The following is what occurred at the sitting.

"(I have first in importance an inquiry for Mr. Hyslop to answer if possible. Has anything happened recently that you wish to tell James?) [Cross in air.]

His father has been cheering up a friend who hath passed over to him of late, and he will return here and speak to thee of him ere we depart. (Good.) [A little later was written:] Mr. McLellan also sent a word to say all is *well* and better than he *hoped*. There was another message, but it was disconnected . . . disconnected . . . and vague. Will get it before we depart. This will be better U D presently."

[A little later my father appeared, and the following occurred:—]

"Did you call for me to answer some questions for James, R. H. [Robert Hyslop.] (I . . .) Well, I am glad to see you.

(I am pleased, Mr. Hyslop. James wants you to give him some particular information, as detailed as you can, about something that has happened recently which he thinks you ought to know about that will help as evidence.) evidence. (Yes.)

Well, Hettie has got through with her work splendidly, and Mr. McClellan has come over to me and . . . splendidly . . . he is delighted with the change,

(Is this my uncle James McClellan ?) Yes. (Yes—no I do not remember your father.) Well, he was John. (Very well.)

John James McClellan [James written first. John written in front of James, then McLellan written after.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : “James John McLellan” ?) No. John James McLellan.

(Very well. I U D, and shall inquire about it.)

Well, go ahead and inquire. I think I know.

(Well, all right. Please tell me anything you wish to tell.)

I wanted to tell you about his going to the war, and about one of his fingers being gone before he came here.

(Very well. Go on please. I U D.)

And he had a brother David, who had a S U N stroke.

(I U D. I U D. That is perfectly new to me. I never heard it before, and it pleases me very much to learn this fact.)

Well, he never was well after he received it until he came here.

Then one more I wanted to speak of was N a n c y but I cannot tell you any more now.

(R. H. to S. : Very good.) [Indicating to S. to make some such remark.]

(Very good. Thank you very much. Rest now.)

Be brave, upright, honourable, do the best you can and don't forget your uncle James Mc. [Correct name.—J. H. H.]

Good-bye. (R. H. to S. : Say . . .) (Good-bye. Good-bye, uncle, for the present.)

* * * [undec. *James or yours?*] James McLellan.

per . . . (Yes. *Which McClellan?*) John . . . did . . . perhaps you heard me speak of him before. (Yes, I think so. What relation is he to James ?) he is his *uncle* or great uncle to him. (What is he to James McClellan ?) He is a brother.

(Well, I am not clear about what you say when you say that . . .) [Hand motions slightly up and down quickly as if to stop my speaking.]

Listen, will you kindly repeat your first question. He is James Mc father McClellans u ? (*Who is?*)

Now, wait I am a little confused myself. He is James McClellan's uncle and great uncle to my son James. th [?]

(Rector, I think that Mr. Hyslop had better go away and think over just who this person is that has passed over, as he says, and come back and tell me clearly.) Yes, all right.” [On his return he said :—]

“I am here, and if you remember my reference to James to James McClellan . . . this is the same one to whom I referred before, and he is . . . the elderly gentleman to whom I referred, and he is James McLellan's uncle. (James McClellan's *uncle*?) Yes. (I believe that he is confused, Rector).

Well, friend, in any case it would be wise to repeat this to him later, and ask him to explain after the light has been removed.

(Rector, I must say that, so far as I can see, the light is worse this time almost than I have known it at all since you began to come. The energy seems more feeble, the writing seems not so clear, and it suggests that there has been a retrogression in the working of the mechanism.)

Friend, thou canst see the necessity of our closing the light soon. Friend, the light is not, neither hath it been for some time as clear as we desire.”

[On June 12th, when Dr. Hodgson was again present, G. P., Rector writing, sent the following message :]

[Hand writes H over the name, about between James and McLellan.]
[James H. McLellan?]

(S. to R. H. : There's an H. over it.)

[Between Sp.] Yes, all right. Don't feel badly about it. Come again . . .

[See Notes 71, p. 520, and 72, p. 521.]

Yes, I am back again, James, and I have or did have a box of minerals . . . minerals I had when I was a boy, and whatever became of them I am unable to say. Will you try and look them up for me. [I know nothing of this.—J. H. H.] (Yes, I shall try to do so.) [See Note 73, p. 522.]

What was the name of that Dr. ? I cannot think of his name. [See Note 74, p. 523.]

(Well, don't worry. It will come. Be patient.)

They tell me in time I can return again after the light goes out for a long time. I shall be glad of this, but will you kindly tell me what you have done with all those books I gave you ? (I have them in my library.)

Oh yes library, I remember of course. Science and theology. I sent you the year before I came here two, did I not ? (This . . . is this father speaking ?) Yes, I. (I forget about that, but will think it over.)

I think you will find that I sent you a box containing two or more books before I became so ill. I have it on my mind now, and I think I am right about it. Did you ask about the paper reading yet and about my glasses troubling me ?

Yes. [in reply to correct reading.]

"I saw Hyslop [hislop], and learned that it was McCle . . . McClellan's son to whom he referred, but the light was so poor he could not talk intelligently. He will see you later and explain all."

The first matter of interest to note here is the realization of the prediction made on June 6th, 1899, and the correctness of the general statement of John McClellan's recent death. But it is apparent that there is some confusion in regard to the relationship. Two correct statements were made regarding it. The first was that he was a brother of James McClellan, and the second that he was a son of John McClellan referred to before (p. 472). All the references to "uncle" and "great "uncle," relating him to me in this way were false. The mistake, however, is perhaps a natural one in the light of the following facts.

There are John McClellan, Sr., John McClellan, Jr., and James McClellan, the last two sons of the first. There is also the other John McClellan who has no determinate relation to any of these, so far as I know (p. 111). Now James McClellan was my uncle by marriage with my father's sister. If my uncle's father is a relationship in any way analogous to that of my father's uncle, we may well understand the source of the confusion in the attempt to assign the relationship. The person whose death was predicted, and who died on March 30th 1900, is John McClellan, Jr. The confusion lay in the question of *uncles*, and it is therefore interesting to note that in the statement on June 12th, G. P. avoided this entirely, and specified that the person concerned was John McClellan's son, thereby making it clear that it was John McClellan, Jr.

The reference to my sister as having finished her work is in the main correct. She had but one piece of work to do after this date in completion of her course. It must be remembered, however, that I had intimated to my father at the sitting of February 6th, 1900, that she would graduate in the spring.—J. H. H.

(Yes. I asked about that, and found it all right if I remember rightly.)
[See Note 74, p. 523.]

Well now I feel satisfied to feel that that you are at least pulling with my push. [See Note, p. 340, on the phrase "pulling with my push."—J. H. H.] (R. H. : "pushing") . . . pulling . . . and that is all I can ask of you. I remember perfectly well what my own theories were concerning this life, and my too often expressing doubts about it. . . it . . . I do indeed [not read at once] but I think I was moved with the thought that I should live somewhere . . . I do indeed . . . yes . . . and not die as a Vegetable. (I U D.) [Cf. p. 386.]

[I never knew that father had the slightest doubt about this. He never expressed any doubt about it to me, not even in the conversation I had with him on the subject, and I could not understand this confession of doubt if it were not for the surprisingly receptive attitude which he took in that conversation for the scientific evidence which I produced in favor of it on that occasion. I had expected some reproach for my interest in it and a reminder that this could come to us only by faith in a revelation. He was always careful to keep his intellectual and moral perplexities from all of us, if he had any ; so much so that it is inexplicable now to be told that he had them on this subject. Of course it remains to prove that this is true, and I should not tolerate it as even possible were it not thoroughly consonant with his behaviour in our conversation and with his interest in Swedenborg.—J. H. H.]

[November 3rd, 1899. It is possible that the doubt refers to the possibility of spirit communication.—J. H. H.]

Do you remember our conversations on this subject? (Yes I do. Can you tell when it was? Yes I do remember the . . .) Yes, do you remember of my last visit . . . your last visit (Yes.) with me. [Cf. p. 440.]

(Yes. I remember it well.)

It was more particularly on this occasion than before.

(Yes, that is right. Do you know what I was doing just before I made the visit?)

Yes, I believe you had been experimenting on the subject and I remember of your telling me something about Hypnotism. [Correct.—J. H. H.] (Yes, I remember that well.)

And what did you tell me about some kind of manifestation which you were in doubt about? (It was about apparitions near the point of death.)

[Excitement in hand.]

Oh, yes, indeed, I recall it very well, and you told me a young woman (S. : "young man") no (S. : not man) . . . a young woman who had had some experiments and dreams. (Yes ; that is right. Yes, that is right.)

which interested me very much, but yet you were doubtful about life after so-called death. Remember the long talks we had together on this, James. (Yes. Yes, I remember them very well, and I am no more doubtful.)

[This is a perfectly correct account of the visit I paid to him, my last as here said, in 1895. It is interesting to remark the mistake, as if referring to some visit of his own, and then the correction of it to my last visit. But all the allusions here are correct, unless an objection can be based upon the use of the word "experiments." I talked

with father on this occasion about Mrs. D., an account of whose *experiences* I gave him at the time. But my "experiments" with her on crystal vision were not made until a few weeks after my visit and the report of them not published until after his death. I might have mentioned the experiments in a letter to him. The other experiences, narrated in the same report with the crystal visions, I knew as early as 1893, and some in 1894, before I visited father, which was during the mid-year examinations in 1895.

There is an interpretation of this, however, which consists with the use of the word "experiments." I spoke of the above possible difficulty because any reader of my paper on Mrs. D. would at once interpret the word "experiments" as referring to those in crystal vision, which were made after this conversation. But the fact is that one of the phenomena which I had mentioned to my father in the conversation was the case of a dream coincidence and the experiment to see if Mrs. D. could identify by a photograph the person appearing, whom she had never seen. (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. XII., pp. 272-274.) Hence the case can have a clear reference to this instance which had appeared so remarkable to my father.

The allusion to "some kind of manifestation," recognised as meaning apparitions near the point of death, possibly refers to what I said about the Census of Hallucinations (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. X.) published in August of 1894, and to one which my stepmother mentioned where one of her parents—I have forgotten which—appeared to the other when dying. I was especially sceptical in my treatment of these hallucinations on this occasion. I explained hypnotism quite fully, and tried several times during my visit to hypnotise my brother Frank, who was then an invalid. I remember father watched me with great interest and with some disappointment when I failed to effect hypnosis, as he had never seen it.—J. H. H.]

God knows best, and if your (R. H. : "You.") (S. to R. H. : Isn't that your ?) father ever lived I am his spirit. I am he. *I am he.* (I UD.)

I feel, think and (S. : "I feel this and") [Hand moves slightly towards R. H.] (R. H. : "I feel this and") I feel, think and know as well as I ever did, and yet I am not able to express in this way all I think. I may give out my thoughts in fragments, but if I do I hope they may at least comfort you a little.

(Yes, yes, father, and it will help me in the great cause for the world.)

Yes, and humanity at large, I trust.

Good-morning, James. I will go with you, my boy.

Good-bye. Robert Hyslop, your old father. [Correct name and relation as already remarked several times.—J. H. H.]

(S. to R. H. : That's it. "Your old father.") [S. sits down.]

Now, may the grace of God be and abide with thee evermore.

(R. H. : Amen.) [R. H. nods to S. to say something to hand, which stretches back somewhat towards S.] (Amen.)

Farewell. + Imperator. {R.}

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I.

[Various inarticulate attempts at utterance, in which names of *George* and *Charles* and *sister* could alone be distinguished.]

I want to take it to them. [More inarticulate utterances.]

I want—I want . . . I can't . . . Rô . . . Rô . . . yes I hear you . . . Robert.

I want to tell George Pelham.

You can't sing. (R. H. : You can't ?)

Elderly gentleman, hasn't any teeth. That's funny. [My father had no teeth when he died.—J. H. H.] [See note to utterances as Mrs. P. entered the trance at the next sitting, that of June 7th (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

[Mrs. P. begins to weep] (R. H. : What's the matter ?)

I don't want to go in the dark. O that's, that's, that must be the window. But I wonder, I wonder where they all went. That's funny. I forgot that I was alive. I forgot you, Mr. Hodgson. I was going to tell you something, but I've forgotten what it was. You see when my head snaps I can't tell you anything. It must be night. Oh dear ! I feel a little weak I think. Is that my handkerchief ?

[S. opens door. Mrs. P. turns and looks at him.]

(Do you know me ?)

Well I do, but I never got a look at you before.

Well, you're the gentleman that came with Mr. Hodgson, aren't you ? Well, I never looked at you before.

[This is a fact which I have remarked at every sitting I have had. I wanted to see whether any objections to the results of my experiments could be made from the accusation that I was "sized up" by Mrs. P., and things told me that might be conjectured as we read character. But Mrs. Piper has never paid any attention to me ; has not even spoken to me since I was introduced to her, and disregards me so thoroughly that there is no use for me to look at her at all except to record the fact that she pays no attention to me. I spoke to her deliberately in her dazed condition, and she stared at me for a few moments like a wild person, and then broke out into the utterances mentioned.—J. H. H.]

Are you going out ? (R. H. : Lots of time.)

Oh, I couldn't tell you how that gentleman looked, Mr. Hodgson, I never looked at him.

I don't like the heat at all. [Mrs. P. still dreamy up to this point.]

INTRODUCTION.

I was careful to observe whether I was noticed this morning by Mrs. P. as she came into the room. Dr. Hodgson and I went upstairs before seeing Mrs. P. at all. I sat down upon a sofa and picked up a morning paper to read until Mrs. P. came up. When she came into the room, or rather just as she entered the door, she spoke to Dr. Hodgson, and as she walked to a writing-desk she turned her head and took a mere glance at me reading the paper, but finding that I had turned my eyes in that direction, she at once turned away and thereafter paid no more attention to me than if I had not been in the room.

The symptoms of the trance repeated themselves as usual except that, as the trance approached, the mention of the number 25, and then,

as I thought, 23, suggested to me that they had a connection with the language Mrs. P. used as she came out of the trance the day before, when she said, "You can't sing, elderly gentleman hasn't any teeth. That's funny," this language being capable of reference to the "hymn" he was trying to mention. If the number 23, as I thought I heard it, be correct, it is the right number of the "hymn" [*psalm*] that I had in mind and supposed father had also. But there is no assurance that there is any such connection with previous sittings in incidents of this kind. I can only mention a possibility of this because of a coincidence in the case. I referred in a previous note to the fact that father had no teeth at the time of his death, but I supposed that the "you can't sing" was only an incoherence. But it afterward occurred to me that for some years before his death he had to give up singing at family worship because of the gradual loss of his voice, and if there is anything in the supposition of continued weaknesses of this kind after death, which must seem absolutely incredible to us, the incident might represent an attempt on the other side, as in the case of the guitar, to sing the "hymn" he had in mind with the hope that some of it might come through. If so, the 23 is a relic of this attempt, the 25 being a mistake.—J. H. H.

June 7th, 1899.

[See Note 75, p.524.]

[I had in mind at the time the 23rd Psalm, which was sung at family worship and recited on certain occasions more frequently than any other (June 9th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

Record of Sitting, June 7th, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

* * [twenty-five?] (R. H. : Twenty-five? twenty-five did you say?)

* * [twenty-five?] (R. H. : twenty-five?)

(S. to R. H. : It sounded like twenty-three the time previous to this. I know what that means.) (R. H. to S. : You do?) (S. to R. H. : Yes.)

[Rector writes.]

H A I L. (R. H. : Hail, Imperator and Rector.)

Hail thee this day with peace and peace to thee we bring + (R. H. : Amen.) (Hail this morning with pleasure.)

We meet thee and hail thee with joy. All is peaceful with us and may it ever be with thee. (R. H. : Amen.)

[Hand bows as in prayer.]

Oh, Holy Father, thou Divine Being, maker of Heaven and earth, we beseech Thee this day to send light unto thy fellow beings. Keep them, Oh Father, in the paths of righteousness and virtue. Lead them to know

more of Thee and Thy wondrous workings for the redemption of their own souls. We ask for no more but leave all else to Thee + Imperator {R} (R. H. : Amen.)

We meet thee and bring thy friends to thee this day.

Here is one thing which thy father wished me to say to thee.

Friend of earth, hearest thou me ? R. (I U D.)

I remembered [{} after leaving my son through the light]

[Hand makes slight motion, suggesting reliance on R. H. to U D that certain words were to be enclosed in brackets.] of having been as a boy in possession of a small boat (S. : "coat ?") (R. H. : "boat ?") B . . which was when I was about ten or twelve years old. I fet [?] forget who made it, but I remember of my going out to a little stream and getting my clothes wet through, and if I mistake not it was Eliza who helped me to get out of the difficulty. I know I have *the facts clear*, but the details I cannot recall. You might ask her about the boat and about helping me get dry, which is the most I can remember. (Yes, I shall certainly ask her.) I know you will find I am right about it. [I know absolutely nothing of this.—J. H. H.] [See Note 76, p. 524.]

I am here, James. I heard them telling you what I said to Rector and Moses [Stainton Moses. See Vol. XIII., p. 408.—J. H. H.] after I ceased speaking with you before. [Cf. p. 340.]

Speak to me and speak as you did when I was on earth, James, and fear nothing.

(Yes. Is this father who said the last sentence ?) Yes.

(Who made that cap you referred to so often ? Who made that cap you referred to so often ?) Mother.

(Well, which mother ? The one on your side or on this side ? Which mother, the one on your side or the one on my side ?) on my side.

[The term mother was so equivocal to me that I was forced to ask for the distinction which my question suggests. But I made a botch of it in the way I put the question. I was governed by the use which I had made before of the same mode of expression, thinking that it would be understood, as before, but it was not, and I have myself to blame for not saying stepmother, as I should have done, and as I was reproached later by G. P. for not doing.]

The expression "on my side" would be wrong if interpreted as coming from father, but the statement that follows shows that the expression "on my side" was repeated to father and not sent from him. This makes both the apparent confusion and the connection perfectly clear and correct.—J. H. H.]

(Do you mean in the earthly life or in the spirit life ?)

Oh, I see what you mean. Your mother, James, is with me, but Hettie's mother is in the body. [This is exactly correct.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, that is right. Do you remember any trip with her out West ?)

[As my mother's name was not given, and as I was satisfied with the relationship to my sister expressed by it, I knew that the right person was in mind and put at once a question both to serve as still more certain identification, and to call out some incidents about which I know little or nothing. Father and my stepmother took a trip out to the far West before he decided to go to Indiana in order to look for such a home as he finally

adopted in the last named State. If he had mentioned any particulars of this trip they would have served a twofold purpose, first identification to the second wife still living, and second the mention of incidents that I do not know.—J. H. H.]

certainly, I told you about it before some time ago, did you not U D it ?

[This is quite a remarkable answer, as showing the confusion which my badly put question occasioned, and the memory of what had been told me before, and which I was not sure I had rightly understood. The error in my question consisted in failing to use the word "stepmother" or "second wife," instead of the pronoun "her." For the mention of a trip out West in connection with the word "mother" would inevitably suggest the trip which father, my mother and myself took out West in 1861. The mention of his having told me of it before shows that this very suggestion was produced. The reference makes clear, however, what I was doubtful about at the time.—J. H. H.]

(No, I was not quite sure what you meant. When you can I would be glad to have you tell some things about that trip, but don't hurry.)

[I intended by this question both to express the uncertainty which I had felt about the reference to that Western trip when it was made and to divert his mind away from it to the other trip, though intimating that I would be glad to have something about this trip in 1861 when he could give it again. I seem to have succeeded in the diversion, though apparently a second thought brought about confusion worse confounded, and this would be natural enough on a second thought, because "that trip" is an exceedingly equivocal expression. I am not surprised at the confusion that followed, and saw very soon why and how I had caused the muddle.—J. H. H.]

Yes, but it was she who made my cap, and you had better ask her about it. [Allusion to maker of cap correct.—J. H. H.] S a r a h. S A R A H.

(R. H. to S. : Let me . . .) [I was about to say "Let me speak."]

Let me see what is it I wish to say. . . Ellen (Allen). (R. H. : What is that, *Ellen*? What is that, *Ellen*?) [Assent.]

help me. Oh help me to [R. H. puts leather spectacle case and brown knife on table, next to hand. Hand moves back the knife and retains the spectacle case.] recall what I so longed to say. My own mother Nannie. I . . . wait. I will go for a moment, wait for me, James.

[The confusion here I interpreted as due partly to the nature of my equivocal question and partly to the attempt to give my stepmother's name. The words my "own mother, Nannie," suggested that he was trying to get some way of making himself understood in regard to my stepmother's name, as Margaret was the name of both, and later this name was given by G. P. [See Note 77, p. 524.]

(Yes I shall wait. Yes I shall wait.)

Yes, very well. Yes, I do. [Between Sp.]

H., did you send for me. What is it ?

(S. to R. H. : That's George, isn't it ?)

Yes. I am coming right back.

I think, James, you mean when we met with the accident, do you not ?

[This shows what I am responsible for in my equivocal reference to the trip, and my failure to make clear with whom it was connected. I thought

the next statement would clear it, but the answer shows that he thought he had already referred to the trip I had in mind.—J. H. H.]

(No, not the accident. You took a trip with Hettie's mother just before you went out West. It was that to which I referred.)

Well, I am sure I have told you of this before. Think it over and you will recall it. I am not sure I mentioned her, but I had it on my mind when I referred to the trip I took just before going out West, do you not recall it? [S. is about to speak.] (R. H. to S. : Sh—sh) [Hand turns away to Sp.] [Cf. p. 421.]

(R. H. : George . . .) [S. about to speak again.] (R. H. to S. : Sh—sh.)

[I do not recall that any previous references to this trip were recognised by me at all, though I did explain that the statements made regarding a trip West were equivocal enough to apply to two of them that I knew about. I shall have to re-read the first four sittings at least, and possibly some of the five by Dr. Hodgson to determine this matter. This confusion and perhaps lapse of memory on my part ought to create charity for alleged spirits who have difficulty in remaining near the "machine."—J. H. H.] [See Note 78, p. 525.]

(R. H. : George, there is apparently some confusion still remaining in the spirit Hyslop's mind about Hettie's mother in the body. He has not yet given her real name. Perhaps you can see just what the cause of this confusion about her is.)

[This statement by Dr. Hodgson is interesting partly for its misunderstanding of my mind and intention at the time and for the confusion which it was calculated to produce, as it did, and for the later explanation and reproach of G. P. Dr. Hodgson did not know, and the necessity of not burdening the record at the time with my reason for my conduct in not pressing for the name prevented me from telling him, that I was satisfied with the right relation expressed in regard to my sister and the cap made by her mother, and that I was trying to run father's mind to a trip whose incidents would serve a fine evidential purpose. Dr. Hodgson of course did not see this, not knowing anything about the trip nor about my purpose, but thought I was still trying to get the name when I was not. In the end, however, thanks to G. P., the matter was somewhat cleared up, but the confusion at this time still continues to show itself, though father makes an interesting attempt to clear it.—J. H. H.]

It was not he speaking then. [Letters like *in* made here above between *he* and *speaking*.] He had gone, H., but it was another spirit present just as he left, but he is coming nearer and will be quite clear presently . . . be . . . Be.

Yes. [with Sp.]

But there is apparently some reference to a trip which has not been clearly U D. (Yes. I U D.)

Has he ever heretofore referred to any trip?

(I am not quite certain except once. I think he referred once to a trip I took with him out West, but I mentioned the other one in order to identify my stepmother with whom he took a trip just before he moved out West.)

I see, well, I will assist him, do not hurry.

[This is an interesting piece of comprehension by G. P. The spontaneous recognition of the situation and cause of the confusion is a wonderful bit of evidence for independent intelligence. He saw exactly what I was aiming at and how my reference to one trip was confused with another. The whole interference of G. P. at this point and immediately following, indicating an independent consciousness of the confusion, is a most remarkable phenomenon on any hypothesis except the spiritistic.

In talking to Dr. Hodgson about this sitting after I had written my notes, and in explaining what was in my mind when I was pushing my inquiries about the western trip with my stepmother, I found that Dr. Hodgson had misunderstood the import of my language when talking to G. P. and thought I was still seeking for my stepmother's name. Hence his inquiry for this at a later stage of the sitting. But my sole purpose was to get my father to talking on a trip of whose details I knew nothing, and in using the word "identify" I merely wished to suggest to G. P. my purpose in asking for incidents. I did not mean to demand a name. But it was natural for Dr. Hodgson to make this mistake, as we had talked over the propriety of asking for this name as we went to the sitting. The circumstances explain our own confusion and afford a legitimate excuse for the confusion evident on the other side. And it tells against telepathy with great force, because, if that process can catch so easily what confuses us, it ought always to have caught the things in my mind and which I wished to have stated. But in no single case has my present thought been caught in a situation like this and palmed off as father's.—J. H. H.]

Yes, this is . . . the one he referred to was the one with yourself . . . yes, which interrupted his thought somewhat . . . somewhat. [Perfectly correct and interesting in the way it explains the interruption.—J. H. H.]

I feel the necessity of speaking as clearly as possible James, and I will do my best to do so . . . B.

Do not try just now ; wait a bit. [Not read at once.]

Wait a bit. (S. : "Wait a bit.") Wait a bit. G. P.

[R. H. had interpreted the *first* "wait" as *said*.]

Not said. Wait a bit.

(R. H. : All right. I understand.)

I think I will let you speak now and finish what you started to say.

It was Aunt Nannie. (R. H. : "About Nannie.")

About Aunt Nannie. I thought it all over about the cap when I spoke of her. I say I . . .

(The cap was not made by Aunt Nannie. You told me rightly a moment ago.) [See Note 79, p. 526]

You are not U D me, James, let me explain . . . I thought of H . . . H A R . . . H . . .

No, go on.

I thought of my mother and aunt my sister both at the same time, and I wanted to say that both of their names came into my mind as you spoke of Mary here, and I got a little confused about it. [Cf. p. 432.] I am all right now. I wanted to say something about our visit to her also.

[See Note 80, p. 526.]

(R. H. : George . . .) [R. H. was about to say to G. P. that there seemed still to be some confusion.] (S. to R. H. : That's going right. I understand every bit of it.) [I said this with reference to the explanation about names rather than the other incidents.—J. H. H.]

[Hand listens to R. H.] what [hand returns to R. H. to listen.]

(R. H. : All right. Never mind.)

And between the visit to the boys and Aunt Nannie I got confused a little. (Yes. I U D perfectly. I U D perfectly.)

Well, we saw George. We saw George and Will.

Now what did I . . . oh yes, I then arranged to go out there to live. I . . . [Pause.]

[This will require investigation.—J. H. H.] [See Note 81, p. 526.]

How are you, James? + sent me to speak a moment while father goes out and returns. I am very glad to be here again. It is I, sister Annie. (Good morning. I am glad to hear you again.)

I perhaps can help you a little, James. I shall be glad if I can. Do you remember . . . do you remember anything about Birds, (Very little.) about anything I did? (Yes, I remember only one thing that you did. I was very young at that time.)

Yes, but I remember the birds very well. (I am glad to hear it.)

Will you ask auntie if she remembers the one I caught (R. H. : "brought?") [Hand dissents] (R. H. : "bought?") [Dissent.] c a u g h t. (I shall ask her.) [I know nothing of this.—J. H. H.] [Cannot be verified, as inquiry shows. (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.]

and the flowers I pressed. Will you ask her for me? (Yes, I shall ask her.)

I think it was yellow in colour . . . Yes. [to reading.]

[I remember nothing of this incident, but it is interesting as against the telepathic theory to know that when this question was asked me by this sister at a previous sitting I made inquiry of my aunt and she replied that she knows nothing about it. The telepathic power would not return to this if it could divine what condition of mind I was in on this matter.—J. H. H.]

[See later note (p. 425) in which I mention the probability that the incident of the pressed flowers is true. They were purple pansies with yellow centres (May 7th, 1901).—J. H. H.]

and I had a little pin holder I made when I was in the body. I think she has it now. [No one can remember anything of the kind. (November 3rd, 1899).—J. H. H.] (I shall ask her. I shall ask her.)

I hope so. Here comes father and I am going now.

I am here once more and I am thinking about the trip I took with H A t . . . [Hand dissents.] H A R . . . No. [S. shakes his head negatively.]

[This is still not clear to me, and evidently the shaking of my head was interpreted as indicating that I was not getting what I wanted, and so I was not, though it did not occur to me that the visit mentioned previously in connection with the same letters was the one in mind.—J. H. H.] [See Note 82, p. 527.]

I want to speak of other things. Will you try and tell me exactly what you want? (R. H. to S. : I will.)

(R. H. : Rector or George. There seems to be . . .) [Hand turns suddenly to Sp., then makes gesture of assent to Sp. and listens again to R. H.] (a locus of confusion with reference to James's stepmother still. . .)

Not so, it hath nothing to do with mothers of any sort, but it is . . . Mother [the previous *mothers* misinterpreted as *bothers* and *troubles*] . . . but it hath to do with trips, which is confusing him somewhat, and I would not worry him about trips, but let him answer when he returns again. (R. H. : Yes.)

Then he will have it quite clear. But refer to something else.

(R. H. : One moment, Rector, please. Perhaps before next time you can kindly look specially at this point, because the name of . . . because the name of the mother in the body has never yet been rightly given.)

Has it been asked for ?

(S. to R. H. : Better say *stepmother*.)

(R. H. : The stepmother has been referred to in various ways, for example as Hettie's mother. She has also been called Nannie, but her name is not Nannie.)

Well, there would certainly be a mistake in that because they all know better here that that . . . than that, because Nannie in the body only acted as a mother to them after the mother of these children here came here, and that must be why if they referred to her as mother Nannie. [A perfectly correct way of stating the facts.—J. H. H.] [See Note 83, p. 527.]

(R. H. : No, Rector.)

I cannot U D it.

(R. H. : There have been several references to incidents which were true about the stepmother, but in referring to these things, the name Nannie . . .)

(S. to R. H. : Aunt Nannie) [R. H. looks up challengingly at S.] (S. to R. H. : Nannie — right.)

[Notice this lapse of memory on my part and mistake in regard to what was said at previous sittings. Dr. Hodgson was right, and I had been the very person to call his attention to the distinction between "aunt Nannie" and "Nannie" as implied by the incidents and their connection. My interruption and error thus resemble very closely many of the cases in which we attribute mistakes to discarnate spirits and dispute their existence on that ground. We must admit the possibility of the same psychological problems on the alleged other side which we can discover on this. My own experiments in the identification of personality illustrate this very clearly.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. has always been mentioned when any name at all was mentioned.) [S. had in previous conversation emphasised to me that *Aunt Nannie* had been correctly used, but that *Nannie* without the *Aunt*, had been used, wrongly, for the *tepmother*.—R. H.]

Well, why do you not come out and say give me my stepmother's name and not confuse him about anything except what you really want ?

(R. H. : I think that it has been asked for directly, but cannot be sure.) (S. : Yes.)

Has it ? Very well, if she has a name you shall have it. G. P. U D.

[The exquisite humour of this is past all praise, coming as it does after the reproach for my mistake, or Dr. Hodgson's, according as G. P. interpreted it. The reproach was followed by explanation on our part and a statement that we had done as here requested, and the recognition of it, with the half penitent and humorous promise to satisfy us, is a remarkable exhibition of intelligence which it would be hard to attribute to Mrs. P.'s brain.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Yes . . . One . . . I have drawn special attention because I thought it might help you to know that there seems to be some *peculiar* difficulty about getting her name.)

I do not think so, H. ; but I do think he would refer to it in his own way if let alone. I know how you confused me, by Jove [not read at once] and I don't want any more of it.

Jove . . . by Jove . . . [still not deciphered.]

I know how you confused me, by Jove (R. H. : "By Jove." Yes, I have it) and I don't want any more of it.

I am going to help him and he is going to tell all he knows from A to Z. No doubt about it, H., no one could be more desirous of doing so than he is. Is that clear to you ?

(R. H. : Perfectly clear.)

Well, when he gets ready, out it will come, and there is no use wondering about it. I see him now, and he is anxious to say something.

I hope you U D about the different names to which he has referred, if not, better ask him to explain about them first of all, (R. H. : "explain"?) yes . . . and there is no need of any mistakes except that this is a little difficult for him, *i.e.*, to speak fluently and freely.

[The same general observations as in the last note could be applied to this whole passage from the end of that note to the beginning of this. Such pertinent and clear indications of an independent intelligence could hardly be imagined, though not founded upon evidential facts such as I have been seeking. The memory of incidents connected with Dr. Hodgson and the comparison of the present confusion with that which Dr. Hodgson had produced in the same way is a remarkably interesting bit of intellectual appreciation, indicating true facts at the same time, and with it the "By Jove," coming as a little stroke of personal character, indicates, or goes to indicate, that there is only one *simple* theory of the phenomena.—J. H. H.]

Did you hear what I said about Robertson, James ?

[This reference to "Robertson" is possibly an interpolation by my uncle Carruthers (*Cf.* pp. 310, 317, 332). (January 9th, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I heard something about him once before, but it was very little.) Well, you know what I mean, don't you ? (Yes, I know clearly if you mean my brother.) I explained it I thought afterwards. (Not quite fully, but don't worry about it. Go on as you wish.)

Do you remember what I said when you told me about the dreams and what answer I gave you in regard to it ?

(No, I have forgotten that, but I think some one else may remember it who was present.)

I said there were doubtless a great number of these cases when summed up they . . . summed . . . would be of great importance in trying to explain a life elsewhere, but they seemed to indicate it. Don't you remember it now ?

indicate . . . [not read above.]

Do you remember it now, and one of our own family had an experience some years ago. Do you remember anything about this either? (Yes. I remember that. Can you say which one had that experience?) [I was thinking of the incident told by my stepmother in the conversations on psychical research. (November 3rd, 1899.)—J. H. H.]

[I remember our talking about coincidental and premonitory dreams, Mrs. D.'s having been the subject of our talk at the time already mentioned, but I do not recall the instance of his remark as here indicated. Nor do I know anything of this experience by my uncle "Clarke" referred to a little later. But when I said that I did remember it I had in mind the experience, mentioned in a previous note, of my stepmother's father or mother, I forget which, on his or her deathbed, as it was referred to by my stepmother on that occasion. But evidently father was distinguishing between two different cases.—J. H. H.]

I intended to [N. B. : *too*] and I wanted to remind you of it before, but I was too far off to say it before I came here. I have often thought about it. In fact we have spoken of it together since I came here. I mean since I passed out. [Change to spiritistic lingo interesting.—J. H. H.] It was Charles who came and took my place before I had time to finish it. I will try and finish it before I go. And he saw the light and spoke of it before he came here, James.

Oh dear, I want to say a great deal more and cannot they give us more light.

[Hand bows as in prayer.]

[I never heard any mention of this incident until at this sitting. It is not spoken of as mentioned and discussed in the conversation here in mind, and I never talked with my uncle about the subject of psychical research, so that he could not have mentioned it to me.—J. H. H.]

The light is not so good this day as we would have it be, yet we will help give it.

I am still here, James, and I am thinking about the experience your uncle had before he came here. It was your uncle who had it, and we have often spoken of it together here, James.

(Yes. That is the uncle who married your sister Eliza.) [I asked this question for purpose of identification, as the name Clarke is not correct.—J. H. H.] [Hand assents.] yes, Clarke. And it was a notification of his coming suddenly. He often refers to it.

Is this clear to James, friend?

[R. H. motions to S. to speak.] [I understood by this that Rector wished to ask me if James would understand the significance of the "notification," as I did at the moment, remembering a statement made to me in 1897 by the Emperor group that the *spirit* always knew some time beforehand that it was about to leave the body by death.—R. H.]

(Yes, that is clear. Yes, that is clear.)

[When I said the statement was clear I meant that I understood what my father meant in regard to the nature of the experience, and I supposed that the question presented to Dr. Hodgson was meant to see that he should see that I understood it. But it seems to have been an interpolation of Rector's

directed to Dr. Hodgson, and referring to previous statements of Rector to him about premonitions of sudden death. I had never known of this fact. It is Rector's wish, understanding the situation and meaning as he does, that I appreciate the full significance of the phenomenon as well as the statement, and to see the interpolation thrown into the narrative in this way, with the intelligence that it shows, is a fine piece of work and difficult to explain on any theory but the spiritistic.—J. H. H.]

I did wish to say this when I was referring to it last time, but as I say I was too far off. I remember very well the facts and you must. Do you remember his father, James? I do not think you do. (No. No, I do not remember his father.) I have met him here once. (S. to R. H. : * * * [not heard by R. H.] ask for his name.)

I hope to be able to tell you a great deal more about them, as I think you did not know what I can tell you. [See Note 84, p. 528.]

I will speak for a moment, and say I do not see any reason for anxiety about Margaret. [Correct name of my stepmother.—J. H. H.]

(R. H. : Who says this ?) George.

(S. : Margaret is right. The rest of it. Margaret is right. Can you tell the rest, George ?)

He said I suppose I might just as well tell you first as last and have done with it, or James may think I do not really know. Go tell him this for me. You see I got it out of him for you, H., but you no need to get nervous about it, old chap. (R. H. : All right, George, thanks.)

Well, I cannot hold him any longer, and you will get more later.

[This is another interesting display of evidence for independent intelligence. The mechanical play of secondary personality has no resemblance to the natural appreciation of a situation and interchange of ideas here indicated. G. P. goes away with father to get the name of my stepmother, talks about it just as anyone would who had done as here indicated, and chaffs Dr. Hodgson for getting nervous about it!! This is a psychological miracle, like much else in this sitting, if it is not the work of an independent intelligence.—J. H. H.]

I . . . (R. H. : Yes. Good.) am glad to meet your friend even though you fail to say anything about him. I am . . .

(S. to R. H. : I knew his brother in Columbia.)

George Pelham, and glad to see you. I will stand by you at all costs.

(I am glad to meet you, especially as I know your brother in Columbia University.) Yes, Charles. (That is right.)

[The prompt mention of the brother that I know and the mode of address that follows is another interesting play of intelligence.—J. H. H.]

Good. I'll see you again. Auf Wiedersehen. (R. H. : Auf Wiedersehen, old chap.) (Auf Wiedersehen.)

We would say the light is failing fast. (R. H. : Yes.)

and we cannot remain longer with thee this day. (R. H. : And the time is up.)

Go forth in peace and worry not. (R. H. : Kindly send the light back quickly.)

God be with thee + {R.}

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

[Inarticulate] * * *

Margaret. Margaret. Margaret. * * *

Last sat? (S. : Last Saturday?) (R. H. : What was that name?)

that's that's. (R. H. : Margaret *what*?) That that was . . . that's it.

Oh, dear, I saw Rector. I saw Rector and a lady.

Yes, that's funny, they kept whispering, whispering it all the time until Rector turned.

[Margaret is the name of my stepmother, but it is also the name of two on the other side. Hence Mrs. P.'s allusion to the lady with Rector prevents my interpreting the name given as intended for that of my stepmother who is still living.—J. H. H.]

INTRODUCTION.

The first indication of the trance to me to-day was a slightly dreamy look and far away gaze for a few seconds. Then Mrs. P. seemed to become a little more lucid and moved her head a little, following this act with the statement: "I am going to send those to Mrs. M. to-day." This referred to some instructions about proofs of her photos by Dr. Hodgson. They had been examining them and talking about them some five minutes before, and the voice when uttering the sentence was a little dreamy and weak. Presently she began rubbing her face with her hands, and yawning. This was followed again after a little interval by rubbing the face and eyes, with arrested coughing. Presently she said in a very contented tone of voice: "I don't mind going to sleep any more." Then her mouth opened slightly and after a short silence a strange dry hacking and short cough was made. This was just before the head fell on the pillow.—J. H. H.

June 8th, 1899.

Record of Sitting, June 8th, 1899.

Prof. J. H. H. and R. H.

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

I don't mind . . . I don't mind going to sleep . . . any more.

(R. H. : You don't? It's pleasant, isn't it?)

[Rector writes.]

H A I L. (R. H. : Imperator and Rector.)

Hail thee, friends of earth once more. (Hail to thee, Rector and Imperator.)

We are glad indeed to be with thee this day. We have many duties to perform this day, and a few words of advice and a few explanatory remarks to make for thy better U D of our friend's confused condition. He came with his thoughts full of things concerning his last memories at the meeting before, and could not be made to U D that he should speak of other things.

Consequently we sent our helper to instruct him according to his U D of the way in which he could best express himself. Besides the light was a little low, and under such conditions we cannot do our best.

[This is an interesting account of the confusion the day before. It is, of course, nothing more than we knew in general, or could surmise, but it is one of those little touches of intelligence and fitness of speech that make up the problem in these phenomena, on any theory we propose to adopt.—J. H. H.]

We now advise that we meet thy earthly friend no more until after we have restored the light as we have previously stated to thee, friend. Otherwise we would prefer to go on with him for a time longer. (R. H. : Yes, I understand.)

But after we have arranged our work [{} and through prayer and otherwise restored the light }, bring him to us again, as it will be of great help to his friends on our side, and we ask thee to be wary and rest thyself until we are prepared . . . wary . . . to meet thee again. (Yes, I understand, Rector.)

Be ye not too anxious, but keep in thy memory the thought that thou art not alone, and guarded thou wilt be throughout the silence of thy father's speech here. (Yes, I understand.)

Believe ye in the omnipotent and Allwise God, fail not to send thy tender thought to Him . . . tenderest thought . . . and He will guard and keep thee in His Holy keeping. (R. H. to S. : [in low voice] Get away.) [S. was stooping over so close that I could not get near enough to read the writing.—R. H.]

Ponder well, dear friend, and think not when absent of these as idle words, but let their meaning be what we *desire them to be*. In other words throw thyself in all confidence upon . . . on [?] Him and there is not . . . ask for nothing more. + R.

[R. H. reads last sentence over. Hand dissents.]

(R. H. : “upon Him and”) ask for nothing more . . . (R. H. : “upon Him and ask for nothing more.”) [Assent]

Now, friend, whilst we are holding thy friends here ere they be allowed to speak, ask for anything thou dost desire for thine own help. Also ask anything which thou wouldst have us do for thee, no matter how difficult it may seem.

(I would ask you to be with me always and to help in this work. I should also like you to say how I should care for the body in order that I may carry on this work.) [Cross in air.]

We ask thee to think over seriously and earnestly what our teaching really doth mean, and think that without His Will nothing can be. Have charity for thy fellow creatures who hath been less blessed than thyself. (I understand.)

and partake only of the liquid called water in thy world.

Eat fruit fish . . .

[The word *called* above not read, and *fruit* read as *freely*.

He saith called . . .

fruit, fowl [*fowl* not read immediately.]

bird, bread, and little meat. U D.

To us this is a most important thing as we see and are conscious of what thou dost need. (Yes. I understand exactly.)

We are pleased, if thou wilt follow our instructions thou wilt have health, strength (R. H. : "health and strength.")

It will not fail thee. And we ask thee at the closing [closing] of each day to thank Him for His watchfulness over thee. (Yes, I understand.)

(R. H. : Rector, do you mean by water, to exclude, for example, tea or coffee or chocolate or mineral waters ?) [Hand dissents.]

No, none of these so-called . . . or milk.

(R. H. : But all alcoholic ?)

ABSOLUTELY. [Hand bows as if in assent to Sp.]

Yes, the stomach is not strong, and from a worldly point of view it should not be overtaxed. [True and pertinent.—J. H. H.] We know *all*, even the most minute things concerning this body, also its spirit. U D. (Yes, I understand perfectly.)

We desire spiritual growth and perfect health of mind and body. (Yes, I understand the necessity of this.)

Thou art well developed in a vast number of ways, but in order to carry out the laws of the Supreme Being thou shouldst go on and live in the highest possible light, and by so doing thou wilt not only be helping thine own life, but the lives of all God's children.

Keep thy body clothed, fed, and thy mind and thoughts in the highest. (Yes. Yes, I understand this.)

Let it be thy guide daily, and at the closing of one of thy so-called years come to us and speak of the results. [S. seemed about to speak.]

Listen, friend.

Care for no mortal other than to help him.

(Yes, I understand this.)

In other words, live in the thought that thou art a part of God and that that part is the man. U D. (R. H. : Yes.)

At the closing of each day relax thy mind and body, and rest from thy *earthly work*.

[A perfectly pertinent piece of advice which I have often had given me, and which I have wished to carry out, but the large tasks created by my work have generally prevented it. I cannot treat it as more than a coincidence, but it deserves to be mentioned as that at least.—J. H. H.]

Speak, as we have much to do in other ways, while the light doth burn this day. (Yes, I shall be glad to consider all these things.)

If there is any one thing of which thou wouldst ask advice or for help, speak now.

(I think I shall not ask father to-day. I can receive this some time in the future.) [The word *father* above should be *farther*. On reading over these notes on the day of the sitting it occurs to me that Professor Hyslop may have meant *farther*, although I supposed him at the time to mean *father*. He says that it should be *farther*.—R. H.]

and . . . all well.

I have nearly repeated [requested] all right as He gave it me. R. . . . repeated.

[This whole passage giving me both physical and spiritual advice is an interesting bit of by-play in this business, and will be interpreted by most persons as a piece of presumption. It certainly has a most humorous side to it. Spiritistic proselytising from the other world is a new kind of propaganda, unless we accept similar attempts on the part of less accredited mediums than Mrs. P. But it repeats the advice given to Dr. Hodgson and followed by him with no special tendencies in him that I can observe toward dissolution of body and soul. However, I am not concerned with either the correctness of such advice or the possible effects of accepting it, but with the dramatic play of personality which it shows, in connection with the previous promise to give the advice, and with the humorous aspects of its proselytism.—J. H. H.]

I see George and Mr. Hyslop coming now with our leader.

[Slight perturbation in hand.]

I am here, James, once more.

(Good morning. Good morning, father ; glad to hear from you.)

Good morning, James ; I am glad to hear good morning once more, and I am quite near to-day. [Hand moves towards R. H.]

I know your father very well. (R. H. : I am very pleased that you have made his acquaintance.) [See sitting of February 16th (p. 389). I had asked Mr. Hyslop to become acquainted with my father.—R. H.]

I find our minds were not quite the same when on earth, but our ideas of God *were*.

[This is quite a correct statement of the relation between the beliefs of my father and those of Dr. Hodgson's father, in so far as it can be determined by a comparison of creeds. My father was a strict Presbyterian Calvinist and Dr. Hodgson's father a Wesleyan Methodist, and so Arminian. (June 10th, 1900.)—J. H. H.]

You see they have told me that James is going away, and I want to know you and have you take my messages for me sometimes.

I am glad you U D me better, James. Are you going home soon ? (Yes, I am going home in about two weeks.)

I want you to feel that I shall be there also, and I will remind you of some of things I see you do while there. Do you hear ? (Yes, I hear, and shall be very glad indeed to have you do that.) I will repeat them to our friend here. (R. H. : I shall be very pleased to take them.)

I shall watch you very closely, James, and when you are talking to any member of our family I will remind our friend of it, and what I hear you say. (Good, that is fine. Good, that is fine.)

You will see that I will prove that I am with you still, even if I cannot always speak my thoughts.

Do you hear me ? (Yes, I hear you perfectly.) Give me something to think over and I will speak to you . . .

(S. to R. H. : Is that something to hold ?) [R. H. nods towards bag containing articles.]

Do you recall the books I referred to yet, James ?

(I think I do, but I shall find out when I see my stepmother.)

Will you ask her about the paper knife, not because I care for so trifling a thing, only as a test for you ? (Yes, father, I have already asked her. She remembers it and so does Frank.)

I am glad of it because I like to get these things off my mind. I . . . do you remember that Eliza's name was really Elizabeth? (No. I did not know that. I am very glad to find it out.) She was named Elizabeth as a child, and as time went on we began to call her Eliza. (Good. I am glad to learn that. That is a splendid test.) And you cannot mistake it, James. [See Note 85, p. 528.]

There was a Henry [?] McLellan also. I think perhaps you may know of this. (No, I did not know of it, but I shall certainly inquire.)

he was . . . he was, I think an uncle of our McLellan boys . . . Yes, (All right.) let me . . . let me see . . .

[I did not recall at the sitting that this name had been given before (see sitting of May 29th) and hence my negative answer, but I see now what it means, and the relationship is correct. It is possibly an attempt to give the name of Dr. Harvey McClellan, who is an uncle of the McClellan boys. (Cf. p. 422)—J. H. H.]

[I have made careful inquiry and have found that the "McClellan boys" had no uncle by the name of Henry, and that their uncle Harvey is the only person who can answer to this probable attempt at his name (June 10th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

What did I tell you about Jennie a short time ago?

(We only got the name, and I could not make out its meaning. We only got the name, and I could not make out its meaning.)

Let me see . . . I think . . . H A R . . . M A R G A R E T had some relative of [written above after *whom* was written] whom she used to speak as Jennie, but I won't be sure of this, as I cannot quite remember, but I think she did . . . I think she did.

[This about Margaret and Jennie is not clear to me, in fact is meaningless.—J. H. H.] [See Note 86, p. 529.]

I thought of it several times, but I could not quite remember. You see, James, I was not wholly conscious when I came here, and I suddenly thought of every one of my dear ones the moment I awoke. I go over and over them in my thoughts daily, and I often wonder if they know how near I am to them. I want you some time to talk with me as we used to talk together. (Yes. Yes, father, I think I can say a few words now.)

[Hand listens to Sp. and then makes cross in air.]

I would be so glad to hear you, as it will help me to keep my thoughts clear.

(Well, I shall talk a few moments about some earthly things that have happened since you passed out. I bought the house in which you lived out West in order to avoid expenses with the courts.) Oh, I U D *well*. I am *glad*.

(George is still on the northern land.) and will be I fear. [Perfectly pertinent.—J. H. H.]

(Well, we shall see what we can do with it.)

I will be on the look out and see what I can do by using my influence from this side of life. I may do much.

(Very well. I shall be glad if you can. You . . .)

[Hand starts as if to write, then returns to listen again.]

(You will remember Harper Crawford, I think.) [Excitement in hand.] Yes I do, very well. What about him? I have tried, and tried, and tried to spell his name for you, but I could not seem to articulate for their U D.

(Yes. I understand perfectly. I shall mention another, too. Do you remember Robert Cooper?) Certainly I do, very well indeed, and I have intended to speak his name for you also, but tell me about the mortgage.

[This reference to a mortgage in connection with my cousin Robert Cooper is very pertinent. He was badly handicapped by debt at the time of my father's death and had his farm heavily mortgaged.—J. H. H.]

(I have not heard about it, but shall learn this summer.) And then let me know about H A R P E R S (Harper Crawford, you mean?) [Assent.]

(All right. I shall ? do so.) [I did not catch the word missing.—R. H.]

I want to know this one thing only. Are they doing anything about the church?

yes only [re-reading of sentence above.]

(What church do you refer to, the church in your old Ohio home?) [Assent.] (I have not heard but shall inquire.)

They have put in an organ . . . Organ.

[R. H. turns from his note of S.'s remarks to read the writing, and sees that the order of the words is not clear.]

(R. H. to S. : When was that written?) [pointing to the *yes only*]. [S. indicates that *yes only* was written first.]

They have put in an Organ, James. [I know nothing of this.—J. H. H.] (Very well. I shall look that up. Do you mean the first church? Do you mean the first U. P. church?)

I cannot seem to get that, James. [Hand listens again.]

(Do you mean the first United Presbyterian Church?) I cannot get that. Can you say it for me slowly?

(Do you mean . . . do you mean the First United Presbyterian Church?) Say the two last slowly . . . got it all but that.

(United) yes. (Presbyterian, Pres-by te-ri-an.) *Yes, I do.*

(Very well. I understand. You say they have an organ now)

I say yes.

Very well. (I shall be glad to find out about it.) Yes, but I am telling you.

(I understand perfectly; that will be a good test.)

Well, it is so, James. [See Note 87, p. 529.] Tell me something more about George. He always did look out for number one.

(Yes. I cannot tell very much about George, because, as you know, he very seldom writes letters. You understand.)

Yes I think I do, perfectly well. [S. laughs.] [A very pretty recognition.—J. H. H.]

(When I come back here again I think I can tell you many things about him.) Yes, but, James, I know a great deal myself and did worry . . . worry . . . as you *must know*. . . Worry as you . . . [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I understand, and you know I worried much also.)

Yes. Who could know better than I do? Remember what we *talked over* when you came out there. (Yes.)

Well. I can say only one thing, do not . . . not . . . worry any more about him or anything else. (No, I will try not to worry.)

[See Note 88, p. 531.]

And about the fence [fense] I am thinking about the tax I left. (R. H. : "about the fence?") Yes, fence [fense].

(The tax has been paid. I settled that all right. Nearly all the debts have been cleared off. We owe only aunt Nannie a little.) *Oh* what a relief to my *mind*. I have thought and thought and thought what would Frank or George do if they had a hand in it.

[This is terribly pertinent. My brother Frank is an invalid, and it is pertinent that he was named in father's will as one of the executors. My brother George was always so busy and so slow to answer letters on matters of business that the two facts explain this allusion very clearly, and all that has previously been said about him.—J. H. H.]

[See Note 89, p. 531.]

Do you remember what you did for *me once*?

(I am not sure just now, but if you will remind me)

in regard to a tax *one year*. It was what I wrote to you [the *to* crossed out] . . . It [I] was what I wrote you about . . . about . . . and you actively *helped*. (I do not remember it, but you must not be surprised because I helped you so often with money you remember.)

Yes, but about . . . dear James, do you not remember just before I came here I was not well at the time and I wrote to you about the *tax*. I should never forget it. (I do not exactly recall it, but I think it most probable, because I know just what the situation was.) Well, it will come back to you, I hope, as it will live with me for ever.

What about the fence? Do you know what I mean? (I think I do. I know that we have repaired the fence.)

All right. I intended to have it done before I left, and I also had this on my mind. (Yes, that is now all straightened out.)

[The reference to the taxes and the fence is pertinent, very pertinent indeed, though it is possible that the instance of the fence is a little equivocal. I know that father was exercised about the time of his death about the condition of the fences on his farm, and that when I with my brother assumed our executors' duties we had to look after this matter and to settle some accounts connected with father's orders about it. But I also know that my brother Frank had urged his removing the rough fence about his house in the West, and my brother once told me, if I remember rightly, that he thought father was about persuaded to accept this course. I am less certain, however, about this part of the matter than I am about the needs of the fence on the farm in Ohio at the time of his death, and our completion of the work.

I do not remember any correspondence about the taxes to which he refers. I think I have his letters, and may find whether the statement is true or not. But the facts are these. The wheat crop had completely failed, and the previous corn crop had brought very little, so that father had absolutely no money to either pay the taxes or to live on without borrowing, and no man ever hated more than he to borrow money when he saw little chance of repaying it. He was also very prompt and scrupulous in paying his taxes, but this time the want of money prevented his paying them, and the date for paying them without a penalty was nearly up. It was about the 26th or 27th of August. He took sick about ten days previous to this, and died on the 29th. I found out by calling at the tax office a day too late that the

penalty could not be avoided, and I never told father this fact. But when he mentioned his situation on his death-bed I told him not to worry about it, that I would see to the matter, and I paid the taxes after the funeral and before I left for the east.

But I can hardly think that the language of his statement here can be correctly interpreted as referring to this incident of his condition at the time. It apparently refers to some other occasion about the same time. But I do not remember any particular incident regarding it. I know only that father was very anxious about the taxes at the time of his death, and that I promised to see that there was no trouble about them. As here said to him, I so often helped him when he called on me, and I was so busy with my work at the college that I remember no special occasion of such help, except after his death, and this does not seem to be pertinent.—J. H. H.] [See Note 90, p. 532.]

Do you know how you are helping me unburden my mind? I shall be so glad when these things are off from it.

(Very well. Do not worry about things. They are in very good order. Remember, we had very hard times when you passed out . . .) (R. H. to S. : Not so fast.) (But the presidential election) (R. H. to S. : Wait a minute.) (turned in favour of better times.)

What turned . . . what turned? (The election of Mr. McKinley.)

Oh, I U D ; the president, you mean. Did you say election ?

(Yes, that is right.)

Oh, I U D perfectly. I could not at first U D the words election and President ; they seemed so muffled . . . muffled, James.

(All right. Do you remember how you shook a walking-stick to my cousin about that time? Do you remember how you shook a walking-stick or cane to cousin Robert McClellan about that time?) [Excitement in hand.]

Well I do, I never was more excited in my life I think I was right too.

[True. Father was as much interested and excited about the issues in that campaign as he was about slavery during the civil war. I remember in speaking to him about the issues of the campaign that he threw up his hands and exclaimed as best he could with his lost voice, "you can never reconcile debtors and creditors." The expression, "I was right, too," is perfectly characteristic. Both the phrase and the tone of belief are his. Father knew when he was not certain about political and economic problems, and if he found something to be true which he saw disputed, he would break out in this way when he expressed his conviction and the satisfaction of his mind. The recognition of my question is also interesting.

My cousin Robert McClellan had called to see him in this his last illness. He asked father on which side of the political question he sided, the issue being between the gold and silver parties. Father's voice was too weak to speak and seizing an opportunity for a display of humour, he reached for the walking stick which I had given him some time before and on which was fixed a beetle in representation of a "gold bug," and shook it, laughingly, toward my cousin. My cousin saw the point, and had a hearty laugh about it. I heard the fact from both of them and from my mother afterward.—J. H. H.] [See Note 91, p. 532.]

(Well, who gave you that walking-stick?) [S. touches R. H. to draw his attention to hand.]

[Forefinger of listening hand is tapping on left temple of S.]

You did, and I told him about it. [indicating R. H.]

[This was as dramatic a play of personality as I ever witnessed, as well as being absolutely correct in regard to the facts. I did give him the cane, and from the reference to the curved handle in the sitting with Dr. Hodgson (p. 397) I had inferred that, if we were to treat the communication as intelligible and true, it was probably this "gold bug" cane that was meant. Hence the pointing of the hand toward Dr. Hodgson confirms my conjecture.—J. H. H.]

[Later inquiries slightly modify the statement about the "absolute" correctness of the message, but leave it mainly correct. See Note 92, p. 533 (May 7th, 1901).—J. H. H.]

(Yes, I thought so. What was on it?)

What was on it? I think I know that it had the little top [?] I . . . I think it had the little ring [?]

(S. to R. H. [in a whisper]: not quite.)

Ring  on it.

(I think I know what you mean by that. That is near enough. Do not worry. You recall it well.)

[This attempt to draw the beetle or "gold bug" which was on the stick in lieu of struggling with the name was another interesting performance, and suggests the resources which have to be adopted for accomplishing the purpose of the communicator in embarrassing emergencies.—J. H. H.]

[My discovery in the West of the curved handled cane which I had forgotten, which had been mended by a tin sheath or ring, and which the mimic incidents in the sitting of February 22nd (p. 400) fit more accurately than any other supposed stick makes it necessary to admit an equivocal meaning in this symbol. It might be taken to represent this tin sheath or ring and the manner of fastening it on the broken part of the cane. But for a more detailed examination of the facts I must refer the reader to Note 92, p. 533. (June 10th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

I will refer to it again later. (All right. You remember it was connected with the campaign.)

Yes, *well*, and I remember the talk I had with R. about the President. [Correct incident and initial of the name I had mentioned a few moments before.—J. H. H.] [See Note 92, p. 533.]

E E * * [undec.] Ellen. (R. H. : Ellen? Ellen?) Eln . . . E Helen . . . I tried to give it to Rector. I will when I go out.

It has . . . I wonder if your mother has got that old chest . . . chest . . . I had when I left it had . . . (R. H. : "when I left it.") when I left. [Period strongly marked.] It had some clothing in it. I bought it at an auction I think years ago. (Well, I shall ask her. I do not know just now.)

Do you not remember of seeing it up on the attic [*attic* not read.] (R. H. : Again, please.) attic floor [?] near the stairs . . . stairs, just as you go up.

(Yes. I think I remember very well, though I am not certain, but I think my stepmother Maggie will know.)

Yes, but ask . . . and ask her if she didn't put the stick in it. (I shall ask her.)

I want my stick. I mean [or *near* ?] stick. It was my stick, I *mean*. I mean [or "*near* I mean"] and . . . do you hear? (Yes. I hear perfectly.)

[I remember a good old chest father had, but where he got it I do not know, and it is barely possible that I saw it in the place mentioned, but I have no recollection of the fact.—J. H. H.] [See Note 93, p. 534.]

And there are many things I wish to refer to later, James.

(Very well, I shall be patient about all these things.)

Well, I hope so, because it is not as clear to me as the man who is kindly helping me.

(R. H. : Rector, perhaps he'd better go now.)

I am being called myself by our leader and he will have more to say.

(Well, father, it is a great joy to have been here again. And when I return we shall have much more to talk about. In the meantime) (R. H. to S. : Not so fast.) (I will take your love to all I see.) (R. H. to S. : No, I can't follow. Stop !)

You will give my love to Maggie, Nannie, Eliza. Oh, she is not there, but take it to her.

[This is a correct list of the names to whom father would be most interested in sending his love ; the first is my stepmother, and it is by the name she was always called. But I had purposely used it a few minutes before, and the only significance that can now attach to his mention of it is the fact just mentioned regarding his natural interest, and more especially the correct distinction of place implied in the exclamation : "Oh, she is not there, but take it to her." My stepmother does not live where my old home was, and father had already been told by me that I was going home, as the reader may remember. My aunt Eliza does live at the place of this old home, and my aunt Nannie is always visited on the way to it.—J. H. H.]

Go on. I am going away now. (Good-bye, father. Good-bye, father.) James, good-bye. God protect you, my boy, and may [you] be well and happier. (R. H. : "May you be well and happy.") I am going. I will go with you.

Friend we cease now and (R. H. : Can't read.)

May God's blessings rest on thee + {R} + Farewell. (R. H. : Amen.) (Amen.)

[Mrs. P.'s sublim.]

[Several inarticulate sentences.]

Tell Hyslop . . . father.

Imperator says tell me to take it.

I want the tall one.

Yes. I'll tell * * [inarticulate].

Isn't that lovely !

Oh, that's . . . that . . . that's Imperator.

That little gentleman took the flowers off with him.

That's my body . . . it prickles.

I add here the final references to myself and my father as given at the two last sittings held by Dr. Hodgson before Mrs. Piper rested for summer.

[Rector writing. Sitter, R. H.]

July 3rd, 1899.

* * * And to thyself and Hyslop we would say one word. (Yes.) Fear not the scorn of mortals, but serve God in all things, remembering that nothing can be without His will. (Amen.) * * *

July 6th, 1899.

* * * (First, I have a message to send to Hyslop's father. He says that his father was right about the fire incident and the religious controversy with "friend Cooper," so that he may put those off his mind.) Amen, this will help him *much*. (That is all about Hyslop, specially.) Yes, but there is much for him to do and look up yet, and his father is assisting him silently. (Yes, he is hard at work and will be most of the summer, writing and thinking and inquiring about it.) + All well in so doing. It will be the only way by which we can prove to him absolutely the true fact that his father is *alive here*. (Yes. He is faithful and persistent.) There must not be any neglect of duty in regard to this, viz., the broken wheel, the visit of the sister to church, the prayer meeting *in the barn*, the sunstroke of one of the McLellan family. U D. (Yes.)

Good day, I am off. [I then realised that Hyslop Sp. was there.]

(Good day, Mr. Hyslop.) God be with you. (Amen.)

I would say one word more only. Some of the things date back many years. (Yes, I understand.) Adieu (Adieu.) * * *

LATEST NOTES TO APPENDIX III. ; SITTINGS FROM MAY 29TH TO
JUNE 8TH, 1899.

July 21st, 1899.

The following notes are made from answers to personal inquiries made in the West whither I went for the purpose of investigating the statements made in Boston and of which I knew nothing myself. I took full notes of the answers and remarks made by all persons who were connected with the names given at the sittings or who could be expected to know anything about the incidents mentioned.

New York, November 8th, 1899.

Note 37.—As this Maltine incident was the only one in the whole record that appeared on the surface of it to indicate a fact known to me and not common to the supposed knowledge of my father, I thought it necessary to examine into it. I knew from my observation in all the sittings at which I was present that Mrs. Piper had not seen the box to which I have alluded in

her normal condition. But I did not know whether Dr. Hodgson¹ had concealed the box from her as effectually as the articles it contained, and hence as an alternative to telepathy we could have the possibility of an admission to the subliminal through the supraliminal, though this was more than improbable in the sittings personally attended, and inconsistent with all that we know of Mrs. Piper's recent trances. I had then to reckon with the possibility that it was obtained telepathically, assuming that it was not a medicine that my father would use for his disease at all. Hence I considered the coincidence with reference to what I knew of the medicine and the box in question. But not knowing what my father may have taken I did not permit the incident to go uninvestigated. Hence I wrote to my brother, stepmother and sister to know whether father had ever taken any Maltine or contemplated taking it. The answer of my sister and stepmother is that they do not know positively, but very much doubt it. The answer of my brother is as follows :—

Bloomington, Indiana, *November 7th*, 1899.

MY DEAR JAMES,—Received the questions from you to-day and reply as soon as possible. No, father did not use any of the Maltine. But while I was visiting at Will's, mother wrote that he was losing flesh. This showed that he was not getting sufficient nourishment from his food. And as I knew that Maltine was a good digester and tonic I wrote and advised father to get some and use it. But he did not do it. However, it is likely that he had some talk about it at the time of my writing to him about it.—Love to all,

FRANK E. HYSLOP.

This case turns out then somewhat like that of "Munyon's . . . Germicide." It was a medicine which he was advised to take and most probably contemplated, and so comes near enough to specific incidents in his mind while living to prevent any dogmatic decision in favour of the exclusive application of either the telepathic theory or that of Mrs. Piper's accidental knowledge filtered into the subliminal. The fact that my father would at least know the name of this medicine could not be given any weight in an apology for spiritism, but the specific place which my brother's advice would have in his mind would naturally occur to him or anyone else trying to think over the efforts to stay the disease with which he was suffering, though we must wonder why he did not name a more familiar medicine which I

¹ I was careful in all my own sittings not to unwrap the box labelled *Maltine* until Mrs. Piper was in trance, and to wrap it up again before she came out of the trance, and I believe that prior to the incident in question the box was never within the field of Mrs. Piper's vision. I had also inferred from something that Professor Hyslop had either said or written to me that this box had nothing to do with his father.—R. H.

Though I did not state in so many words, as my letters show, to Dr. Hodgson that the Maltine box had nothing to do with my father, the only rational meaning of elaborate statements describing packages that I sent him for use is exactly what he suggests here. I indicated the relation of the Maltine box to the experiments in three separate letters which I still hold, namely, one of January 2nd, one of January 31st, and one of February 3rd, 1899. I described it as merely containing the articles which I sent as having been used by my father.—J. H. H.

had in mind when I put my question, but which he never mentioned at all. Whatever the difficulties in such a fact and in spite of the circumstance that we cannot apologise for the spiritistic view by emphasising the possibilities of this reference to Maltine, yet they are great enough to preclude any attempt to insist on telepathy as the exclusive alternative, especially if we are permitted to use the reference to "Munyon's . . . Germiside" as an automatism.

October 15th, 1899.

Note 38.—When the name "Nani" was given here, I supposed that the intention was to mention my aunt Nannie, as other notes indicate in similar situations. But after the large number of cases in which the name Nannie without the qualification "aunt" was used most probably, or certainly, for my stepmother, it is more natural to put this interpretation on the use of that name here, especially as she was the one who would be most likely to remember the way he used to read his paper. But I refer to the case again because another fact has occurred to me that may explain why the mistake of "Nannie" for "Maggie" may have occurred. Rector must be supposed to know that my own mother was with my father "on the other side." But nothing had been said to indicate to him that I have a stepmother, until the attempt was made in the sitting of June 6th to get the name of my stepmother correctly. In this attempt it will be observed that Rector recognises at once the absurdity of calling my mother by the name Nannie, as he at once explains that they know better over there, inasmuch as my Aunt Nannie had only acted as our mother after the death of my real mother (p. 483). This had of course been intimated in an earlier sitting (p. 449) in a message from my father, and Rector might have inferred it from my statement in the letter from me to my father read to him by Dr. Hodgson (p. 400). Rector's mind was thus in the situation to apperceive messages referring to my stepmother under the name "Nannie." But I cannot insist upon this way of looking at the facts because the mistake was committed in the name at my first series of sittings where we cannot suppose that any intimation from my side had been given of the relation between my aunt and domestic affairs. Hence it must be treated as the usual mistake of "Nannie" for "Maggie" by the trance personality.—J. H. H.

Note 39.—The latest notes of Appendix II. (Note 29, p. 410, and Note 30, p. 412) reveal the results of inquiries that cleared up the interpretation of the Cooper incident and show at the same time the source of my illusion in the note made at this sitting of May 29th (p. 421) regarding the name John. Moreover I had explained the pertinence of the reference to "John" only tentatively, as I had no assurance that this John Cooper was not living, But I wanted the apparent significance of the coincidence to be seen, on any theory possible in the case, as it actually represents what I should have expected father to mention in connection with *Samuel* Cooper and when I consider his specially kind feelings and sympathies for John Cooper in his mental misfortunes, in spite of the alienation between himself and the father of this John Cooper. But having found that this John Cooper is still living, the scepticism indicated in the note of May 31st is confirmed,

while the discovery of an extraordinary pertinence in the reference to "the Cooper school and his interest there" removes the difficulty that I felt and expressed in my first note on the case. There was also a misrepresentation on my part of the first mention by my father of Cooper after my question sent to Dr. Hodgson. (See sitting of February 16th, p. 386.) The distinction is actually drawn there between the Cooper I had in mind and this Dr. Joseph Cooper that father evidently had in mind, but my complete ignorance of this latter person made me assume that I was either dealing with a confused memory or with the complexities of secondary personality. But the fact that father had known of a "Memorial School" for this very man, the pertinence and relevancy of the allusion to philosophical and religious discussions with him, and the removal of the difficulty in connection with the name "John" show a perfectly definite unity in this allusion here in the sitting of May 29th. The following facts will explain the source of my father's knowledge regarding this school and the importance of the reference to Dr. Cooper and the incidents of the sittings.

My father had taken the *Christian Instructor* ever since its organization some seventeen or eighteen years before his death. It was edited by my uncle, the husband of my aunt Nannie mentioned in these records, and who had suddenly died seven weeks before my first sitting. Dr. Cooper took sick in the year 1886, and the fact was mentioned in the columns of the *Instructor*. He himself, conscious of being on his death-bed, as indicated by the language of his letter, wrote to my uncle a short letter on his views of the resurrection, and it was published in the *Instructor* of July 29th, 1886, with a lengthy editorial by uncle in reply, taking issue with Dr. Cooper's view. On the date of August 26th the paper gave a notice of Dr. Cooper's death in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 22nd, in a prominent article. On September 22nd a phototype memorial of Dr. Cooper was offered to subscribers by the editor. In the issue of December 2nd mention was made of the college at Sterling, Kansas, and also on December 9th. Cooper Memorial College was mentioned by name on the dates of January 20th, 1887, and November 3rd of same year, and then special attention called to it by name in a considerable article on September 20th, 1888. I did not examine farther into the record of the paper, as the conspicuousness of all the notices is ample evidence that my father most likely obtained his knowledge of the "Cooper school" in this way. All the notices were as prominent as editorials.

It is perhaps worth observing that my father's allusion to the philosophic discussions and correspondence may be confused references to the correspondence of Dr. Cooper with my uncle, as the subject was the resurrection and immortality. The misunderstanding would probably be Rector's. The mistake, taking the exact language of the record (p. 397), as it bears rather upon the question of communication, would be considerable, but it is conceivable that it might occur.

One of the most interesting features of the incident, after ascertaining its pertinence to Dr. Joseph Cooper, is the reference to "a journey which we took together." The "Memorial School" which I have mentioned as having been built in memory of this man, was situated in Kansas, whither my father and stepmother went on a journey in 1884, and it is a pretty case of association

to note even that a journey is mentioned in this connection, though my stepmother's name is not mentioned with it. A similar possible interest attaches to the mention of the name Lucy, as discussed in the next note. (Note 40.) My note (p. 421) shows, however, that the connection here might imply that the journey was either with this Cooper or with myself. There is no specific mention or reference to my stepmother under any name. But the journey as a fact was never taken with this Cooper, and the rapid movement of thought all along here from one incident to another makes it unnecessary to make the associative implication that the journey was with this man, while the law of association would be correct on either assumption regarding my stepmother or myself: for it was on the journey with her in 1884 that father visited the State in which the Cooper School was afterwards built and visited me in Chicago on his return (*Cf.* Note 53, p. 507), while I took a journey with him West in 1861. But the more natural association here would be my stepmother. Assurance that this is the meaning is wanting for the reason that no name is mentioned. It is interesting, however, to see that a natural and pertinent connection of thought is discoverable in the passage, even though we cannot regard it as evidential in specific characters.—J. H. H.

Note 40.—My stepmother tells me that she had a cousin who was always called Thusie, her full name being Arethusa. Father visited this cousin in Pennsylvania with my stepmother. The only reason, of course, for putting any possible meaning on this incident is the following. (1) The previous use of "Nannie" for my stepmother, as finally shown by the reference to "Hettie's mother" in the cap incident. (See sitting of June 7th, p. 478.) (2) The easy mistake which might occur in the regular difficulties connected with proper names, especially when there is some resemblance between "Lucy" and "Thusie." (3) The fact that the right relationship is stated in the message, if the interpretation of the name be correct. (4) The reference to my brother Frank in this connection associating him with a visit.

It was while reading the proofs that the fourth point in evidence occurred to me. It came to my memory like the vague recollection of a dream that my father, together with my stepmother, had paid a visit *with* instead of *to* my brother Frank in Pennsylvania, and I inquired to find that I was correct. But this was in 1873, one year after my father's second marriage, while the visit to my stepmother's cousin was in 1882 or 1883, when my brother Frank did not accompany them. Have we here confused remnants and associations of both visits? It is to be noticed also that this second visit was just a year or two before father made the trip West with my stepmother, and while he was thinking of moving West. Have we then in the later allusion to having mentioned a trip West with my stepmother (p. 480) any reference to the present message? This later allusion looks too much like an echo of my question, as the reader will observe, to entertain this conjecture with any confidence, but if we could suppose that the later spontaneous mention of this previous reference was less confused than it may be, and was not a suggestion, the induction in favour of the present possibility would be more plausible. But it can in no case be evidential. It depends on supposing

that "Lucy" is a mistake for "Thusie," while the supposition that the reference to "Nannie's cousin" is a different mistake from the one assumed makes the case a possible reference to Lucy McClellan, and not what is here imagined.—J. H. H.

Note 41.—On investigation I find that my sister Anna died when she was nearly three years old, and we are hardly entitled to suppose on our ordinary knowledge of psychology that she would remember such an incident as is here mentioned. Besides, we knew of no "Allen boys." There were no Allens in our acquaintance. If we could suppose, however, first that we have an abbreviation for "McClellan" in the word "Allen," as that name and relationship figures here so frequently, and would fit, and second that the incident is gotten in the same way that my brother Charles got the chimney incident, there might be a possible meaning to the case. But it certainly cannot be verified, and has all the probabilities of ordinary mediumistic phenomena against it.—J. H. H.

Note 42.—My impression regarding the disposal of this horse was correct. I wrote to my brother regarding the matter, and his answer is as follows. The special pertinence in the mention of this horse lies in the impetuous character and excitable nature of the horse, always terribly afraid of the whip, and the perpetual reminders which father used to give us not to excite him with the whip or to overwork him. This was very frequent after the horse became windbroken. My brother's account of the death and burial of the horse explains itself. When he wrote the letter he did not know that I had to publish it, though its humour is not out of place.

Deshler, Ohio, *May 31st*, 1899.

Poor old Tom is dead, and was given a decent burial near the creek on the Savel farm. I do not know whether he was shot when he became feeble or just "went dead," but I was the sexton who officiated at his funeral, and I know that he was put four feet under the ground with his heels up. I do not know any more about "de-tail" except that he always turned it over his back.

GEORGE L. HYSLOP.

Note 43.—Father's habit of reading his paper in this rocking chair was confirmed by my stepmother and it continued up to the time of his death. The chair was a favourite of his, and had been long in his possession.—J. H. H.

Note 44.—I find on inquiry that my impression here was incorrect. I remembered very distinctly special arrangements in connection with his chair when sitting up during his last sickness, and inferred the probability, though doubtful of it as my note shows, that a stool had been used. But in the process of stating that the incident as I supposed it is not true, my stepmother remarked that during the last years of his life father suffered from cold feet, and that she had provided him with a stool on which to place his feet while warming them at the stove, but that he always refused to use it, preferring to put his feet into the oven for his purpose, and shoving the stool aside. The mention of the name Nannie again in this connection has its pertinence and confirms my conjecture in the case.—J. H. H.

Note 45.—If I were entitled to stretch things in this mention of names, especially in connection with the clear name of my brother Robert, I could give some meaning to them, for the next older brother is named William Wallace. But the confusion is too great to say more than that this interpretation is not impossible, though we must have sufficient evidence of automatism and meaning in such instances elsewhere to justify any tolerance for the possibility.—J. H. H.

Note 46.—Inquiry does not make this incident of the injured foot any clearer. None of my brothers suffered such an accident. It may be that later notes on the recurrence of the same incident will suggest a possible interpretation to it, though I have no confidence in the matter, and would be the last person to suppose it evidential in any case. (See sittings of May 31st, p. 444, and June 1st, p. 450.)—J. H. H.

Note 47.—Since writing the note on father's constant habit of reproving me for hard work I have read his letters to me since 1892, and they are full of reminders that I was overworking.—J. H. H.

Note 48.—On reading this reference to a fire, which is said to have given father a fright, to my stepmother and sister, both recognised its meaning at once. Both remember the incident very distinctly that gave father and themselves a very decided fright. They were returning from a social party at a relative's, and saw evidences of a fire in the direction of the home, it being toward evening. Father had always been afraid of fire in his large and costly barn, and in his fear of this was persuaded to insure the barn, after some hesitation about the legitimacy of insurance at all, his objections to life insurance on religious grounds remaining. On this occasion they all felt certain that the barn was on fire and possibly the home. A freight train blocked the way of haste, but as soon as this obstacle was out of the way there were many hysterical efforts to hurry home, and all the haste made that was possible to reach the scene of danger, and they ascertained that the buildings were safe only when they came over the hill near the house. Father had several frights from this fear of fire to the barn when waking from his sleep at night, and mistaking the moonlight for his burning barn. Once he aroused all in the house only to find that it was an illusion caused in the usual way by the moonlight. But from this story of the facts we can readily see how his memory was likely to be affected by his experience, and that his impression and fright, as here described, or rather alluded to, was what it is represented to be. It is barely possible that I heard of the incident in father's letters of that date, which I do not possess now. But I was not at home then.

It will be apparent to the reader who compares this case with the earlier allusion to a fire, that there is a decided difference between them in their detailed meaning. (See sitting for December 26th, 1898, and also of February 7th following pp. 324, 372.) If there is any proof of instances in which the communicator confuses a true incident beyond evidential recognition, the memory here of having referred to an incident which no one recognised before would be indication of the fact, and may help us to suspect

that there is a basis of truth in other instances where similar confusion mars the evidential value of an incident that is suggested as possible.—
J. H. H.

Note 49.—Subsequent study of this passage, beginning with the name “Charles” and terminating with that of “John McClellan,” suggests an interpretation which is quite free from the difficulties indicated in the previous note. It was the result of Dr. Hodgson’s remark to me that possibly my question just preceding the message, “Brother John,” was either not heard or not appreciated, which is a very common thing, though it may be taken up later. We have then only to suppose that there was no intention to say “Brother John,” as we should most naturally and perhaps justifiably interpret the expression in all conversation where there are no difficulties in communication assumed, but that a single communicator said or tried to say, “Brother and John McClellan,” a part not being heard by Rector, or that as Charles shouted “Brother” my father tried to give the name “John McClellan,” and I get the fragmentary result. The passage, therefore, down to the names which stand for my uncle Carruthers becomes clear and intelligible on either assumption.

But the names under which my uncle passes in these records followed immediately and have to be interpreted either as an incoherence due to automatism or a part of the intention of the communicator. We have then the several possible interpretations of the intentions of the communicator. (1) He may have been trying only to give the name of John McClellan, and that of my uncle comes in as an automatism. (2) My brother Charles and my father try together to give the name of John McClellan, and the name of my uncle slips in as an automatism. (3) My brother and father are trying to give the names of both my uncle Carruthers and this John McClellan. (4) My uncle himself and my father are trying to give the names of this uncle himself and that of John McClellan. (5) That in any of these suppositions this John McClellan is present to assist in getting the name of McClellan through.

The difficulty with the first hypothesis is that it cannot account for the name “Charles” and the allusion to him as brother, if we assume that my father is the only communicator, and on the other hand there is no reason for the later statement that my father is speaking if we suppose that my brother Charles is the only communicator. It is more natural to suppose that they are both present assisting each other, as is often the case, according to appearances and statements in these records. I therefore reject this hypothesis as not the most intelligible one.

That the names of my uncle are not to be treated as automatisms in either the first or the second suppositions is tolerably clear from three considerations. First, in the sitting of the previous day (p. 422) my father had tried unsuccessfully to give the names McClellan and Carruthers in succession, and the attempts were marked with a great deal of confusion, whether we attribute it to him or to Rector. Second, just preceding the present messages and attempts at these names, father apologises for previous confusion and asks that I allow him to straighten it out, an expression similar to one which he again uses later regarding the name of John McClellan

(pp. 448, 450). Third, the evident attempt in this same sitting of my cousin (p. 428) to mention the accident by which my uncle Carruthers lost his life. Hence the probability is that the object of the attempt is to give the names of my uncle and that of McClellan with a view to suggest a *point de repère* about which my mind may work when messages are sent.

There are two suppositions, different in character, which still come out to this same conclusion. As my uncle Carruthers was so often called "Charles" we might assume that he was meant in the first use of that name. Or we may suppose that it was really my brother, as indicated in the language. The latter is to me the simpler hypothesis and consists throughout with the idea that the effort is to give the name of my uncle Carruthers along with that of McClellan. But as an interesting illustration of complicated confusion in conjunction with merely fortuitously favourable conditions to produce it we can show how it might be possible to explain the same conclusion by supposing that it was my uncle himself with my father at the outset, and not my brother. His name was pronounced "Crothers," the "o" being sounded as in "brother," and he was my father's brother-in-law. In ordinary parlance, as well as in communications like these, "brother-in-law" is often abbreviated to "brother" (*Cf.* p. 472). My question with the word brother in it might be interpreted as asking for my father's brother-in-law instead of my real brother, and the answer would be correct, supposing my uncle's presence. If also we suppose, what is entirely possible, that "brother" in the message, "Brother John," is Rector's mistake of the name "Carruthers" (pronounced "Crothers") we have an attempt to say possibly "Carruthers and John McClellan," the first name becoming "brother" for lack of clear understanding on Rector's part, he having his apperception mass determined by my question with the word "brother" in it. This would make especially intelligible the immediate mention of the names under which this uncle had previously passed in the communications. That just such a confusion might occur is well illustrated by the experiments through a tube. Witness "turnips" for "gauntlets," "change" for "strange," "prythee" for "brother," "thought" for "but," "murder" for "weather," etc. (pp. 627, 631). I doubt whether this more complicated interpretation is to be tolerated, but it is interesting to find that it consists with the same conclusion as the more simple view while it has the advantage of indicating the problems with which we have to contend in communications of this sort.

Note 50.—There is much obscurity in this passage referring to "cousin Annie," and the names Hettie and Ruth. I cannot see why they should be connected with the name of John, which I suppose to refer to old John McClellan, unless we assume that he is acting as an intermediary for my cousin Robert McClellan, his grandson. But assuming this, the reference to cousin Annie would be correct, from the standpoint of my cousin Robert McClellan, and the message would be somewhat like that from my brother Charles at the next sitting, that of May 31st, when he referred to his "new sister" (p. 440). The reader will recognise Hettie as the name of my half-sister given a few minutes before the passage under consideration. Ruth is the name of my cousin Robert McClellan's aunt, the deceased wife of the Dr. Harvey McClellan I supposed intended the day before (p. 421), and

hence the daughter-in-law of this old John McClellan. The phrase, "She is only a friend, I think," is apparently Rector's explanatory remark. It is correct in fact, as this Ruth was not a relative of the family, but only an acquaintance of my father. I never met her so far as I know. That my sister should speak of her could only be intelligible on the supposition that it was connected with conversation on the "other side" designed to have some communication made relevant to her husband still living, and in which my sister was to figure as intermediary.—J. H. H.

July 30th, 1900.

Note 51.—In my original note on this passage purporting to come from John McClellan, which was written in the fall of 1899 after the most thorough investigation, I stated that I could find no relevance in it. None of the names had any pertinence in connection with the only John McClellan about whom there could be any plausible reasons for inquiry. I said in concluding: "It is the only case in the whole record (save the group of names in the first sitting) that does not yield some hint of true facts or connections that might start an intelligible clue to something as a reason for such an extraordinary grouping of names." But the circumstance of trying to obtain documentary confirmation other than the History of Greene County, Ohio, for the service of John McClellan in the war of 1812, led to the discovery of the true facts. The details of this discovery and of the inquiries that resulted in it are given in a later note in connection with the incident of the lost finger. (See Note 94, p. 535.)

But the facts pertinent to this passage ascertained during the process of inquiry are that the John McClellan who is apparently meant here was not, so far as I can learn, a relative of the McClellan family with which I am directly connected, but a citizen of another part of the county in which I lived, and who died in 1850, four years before I was born. Hathaway was the name of a cousin of John McClellan's son-in-law and probably associated with the family. The connection of the Williams with John McClellan has not been so definitely traced as yet, though Mr. Jamison, nephew of John McClellan, recalls the name as that of connections with his uncle. My information puts their association probably as far back as 1825.

The most puzzling thing about the passage is to conjecture why I should hear from this John McClellan at all. He was, of course, personally unknown to me, as the date of his death indicates, and neither being a relative, near or remote, of myself or the McClellans, that I knew nor even as much as heard of by the oldest of the surviving McClellans that were my relatives, I cannot imagine why such a person should turn up. I could propose all sorts of excuses as to the reasons on the "other side" for such appearance, but they would have no weight. I can only remark that my grandfather on my mother's side, and hence my mother also, lived in the general neighborhood which was the home of this John McClellan, and may have associated with him or his relatives. But this must have been long before my father's marriage. (January 5th, 1901.)—J. H. H.

Note 52.—Since writing the note in the body of the detailed record (p. 438) I have been able to clear up only one thing in it, and a hint toward this result was given in the message and correction by my uncle

James McClellan in the sitting of June 6th. I have since ascertained that this John McClellan, whom I had in mind at the time, and because of this fact directed my statements and questions accordingly, is still living ; in fact, I called on him for information regarding incidents and names connected with statements here made. But the correction of June 6th (p. 471) makes clear who was meant, so that the John McClellan spoken of all along was a correct name, but I had never known any one by that name, so far as I could recall, except the one just mentioned. But it is apparent, as I suspected at the time of the sitting and afterward, that my cousin Robert McClellan appears in the question, "Do you know where Frank Hyslop is," as his interest in my brother Frank while living would prompt him quite naturally to inquire in this way about him. The John McClellan that I had in mind might also naturally make a similar inquiry, because he and my brother knew each other at the same college that I attended, of which this John McClellan was the treasurer. He knew that my brother had lost his health. Hence, assuming that I was dealing with one whose decease I did not know, I pressed questions with a view to testing telepathy. The whole passage, however, contained too much confusion, as I understood it at the time, either to form any clear idea of its possible meaning or to estimate its bearing upon theoretical questions. But the sequel of my investigations shows that the passage obtains a better unity than I had suspected. (See p. 111 and Note 94, p. 535). It is necessary also to remark that there is a college in the village near where my cousin lived, about which he and I had some correspondence regarding my stepmother's going there to live after father's death. Hence my question and the statements made are relevant enough, only I have not yet ascertained any truth or meaning in the references either to my brother's being "at the library and sending books over to him," or any other "Frank" in the same matter. It is apparent, from the nature of the statements, that the mention of my brother Frank is an association elicited by the name of another Frank in mind whose identity I have not yet been able to trace, and it is still more interesting to note that he adds the surname "Hyslop," in order to distinguish the one Frank from the other.

Note 53.—I have now to reverse this note indicating that the statement about the visit would be pertinent if it had been as that note indicates. My father did visit me in Chicago in 1884, but not "just before" he died. But the most interesting feature of the fact is that I had wholly forgotten this visit, so completely that I cannot recall a single incident of it and would not believe it were it not that my stepmother and sister who were with father at the time, and my sister-in-law also, confirm the fact beyond question. It was on their return from the visit to Kansas in search of a place to which to move, the plan being changed in 1889 to go to another State. I was teaching near Chicago at the time. I had just returned from Germany where I had been for two years, and as father had gone on this Western trip before I returned home, and had not seen me until on his way home, which lay through Chicago, I seem to have gone to the city and stayed all night at the hotel with him and my stepmother and my sister, and the next day to have taken them to a panorama of the battle of Gettysburg, all of which

I have totally forgotten, and have to accept on the testimony of the three parties mentioned.

I do not refer to these facts to show the pertinence of my father's statement, but to show a most interesting defect of memory on my part, as both the psychological relation of the remark and the allusion to the visit being "just before he came here," indicate that the reference is to the subject of our conversations on the question of spirit return with which he closed his communications a few minutes previously (p. 438). Compare a similar error later in the same connection, which was spontaneously corrected (p. 474).

Note 54.—Further study gives this communication a possible or probable meaning which I had not suspected before. It did not occur to me at first to interpret "side" as implying a *blood* distinction instead of *locality*. But if we suppose this to be the intention and that my cousin was speaking of his *own* mother, as of course is most apparent, we have a very clear and correct message. My cousin's mother was my father's sister, and his step-mother was my mother's sister. As I never knew his mother it was most natural for him here to indicate who had spoken the name in order to prevent me from thinking it was his stepmother, who is also not living. It appears thus that his own mother is represented as acting the part of an assistant or intermediary to effect the communication of the name Lucy. The supposition of blood relationship, however, in the use of "side" involves supplying an omitted pronoun before the word "father," referring to my father. This would make the message as follows. "(My) mother said it (Lucy) only a moment ago and she is on (your) father's side, and he comes and speaks of her (Lucy) often." This would be equally correct in regard to previous communications and in regard to the natural relationships in the case.—J. H. H.

Note 55.—Information which I obtained personally in the West makes this whole passage quite clear, and unravels the confusion which I remarked in my previous note. When "aunt Nannie" was mentioned I thought of my aunt Nannie whom father had mentioned and who was also the aunt of my cousin, Robert McClellan, who was communicating, and hence I treated the cousin Nannie mentioned as his sister, but I found her still living. Hence the passage appeared to be absurd, especially when I reflected on the statement that this "aunt Nannie" was said to be my cousin. But when calling attention to some of the absurdities of communications of this kind to my cousin, Nannie Stephenson, the sister of the cousin communicating, I alluded to the contradiction in the passage here, and though all her convictions were decidedly against spiritualism, genuine or spurious, she suddenly and to my surprise exclaimed: "Yes, but brother Robert always called me 'aunt Nannie,' especially during the last few months of his sickness." This was probably in deference to the habits of his children. His sister had spent much of her time with him nursing him during this sickness. This statement of his sister's at once threw clear light on the passage. It must be remembered also that I knew nothing of the facts here narrated. I did not know anything about his illness, except that he was ill, and would not recover. The letter I wrote to his wife to inquire and to express interest in

the case was never answered, and no one else as much as told me the nature of the disease.

It is clear then that this "aunt Nannie," who was his sister, was rightly said by Rector here to be my cousin, and then the statement that she was still in the body becomes correct. But then the "cousin Nannie" who, as I had her in mind, was his sister, is still living, so that the statement that "cousin Nannie is in the spirit" becomes false apparently. But it is possible that my cousin said "cousin Annie," and that the proximity of the name to the writing of "Nannie" referring to his sister, made the machine write "Nannie" over again (*Cf.* Footnote, p. 238 and Note 95, p. 536). This might easily occur either as a phonetic or a mechanical mistake. Now my sister Annie, one of the communicators in this record, and to whom I suppose the "cousin Nannie" referred, was the full cousin of Robert McClellan, the present communicator, and hence assuming this reference to have been his intention the statement would be correct. But it would make the answer to my question absurd, unless we suppose, as is possible, that what was in my mind and language was correctly understood, and that his own reference to "cousin Nannie" (cousin Annie) was ignored, as we may well suppose him ignorant of the machine's mistake.

The confusion as it appeared to my mind was a natural thing in my ignorance of what my cousin called his sister, and it appeared worse as soon as I learned from my aunt that my cousin Nannie was still living, she being said here to be "in the spirit." No difficulty attached to the statement that she was "Lucy's sister," because it is the habit of many people, and especially among those of the locality concerned, to speak freely in less accurate conversation of sisters-in-law as sisters. But the whole case is made clear by a knowledge of the communicator's habit of calling his sister "aunt" out of deference to the habit of his children, and by the possibility that the "cousin Nannie" refers to his niece who is not living. It is simply a case of different apperceptions on the two sides, both being correct though the statements fit only one side. The point that must appear weak to the reader is the interpretation of the "cousin Nannie" that is necessary to make it perfectly consistent and significant from the standpoint of the communicator.

Another interpretation to this whole passage is possible, and in fact results in the same conclusion as the first, though it represents the unity of the case in a much more complex form. It involves also more dramatic play than in the view of the previous note, with perhaps stronger evidence on that account for the spiritistic theory.

If we go back to the appearance of my cousin and accept my conjecture that he failed (p. 442) to finish his sentence in the attempt to say that he wanted to reach "all his dear" *relatives*, we shall notice that the reference to the name of his wife is Rector's statement after my cousin has been told to "go out" and come again. Then Rector explains that the Lucy is not Miss Lucy Edmunds, the sister of the Jessie mentioned, but some one related to me. In the reply that he then makes to Dr. Hodgson's request he states a fact which rather indicates that he thought this Lucy was the one that "Annie and her father," these being my father and sister, had brought with them several times to the communications. The fact was

that this Lucy was still living, and my conjecture is that the one they had brought with them was the communicator's mother, Mary Amanda, sister to my aunt Nannie and my father, and mother to the "aunt Nannie" here called my cousin as explained. Rector's statement, therefore, that "aunt Nannie will know well," assuming that it refers to my aunt by that name and mentioned throughout these sittings, and who also was the aunt of the supposed communicator, my cousin, would still be correct and fitting, and it would not be necessary to suppose that it was either a direct or indirect message from my cousin giving the form in which he called his sister during the illness in which she nursed him. My "aunt Nannie" would know both this Lucy McClellan intended and the "cousin Nannie," whether taken as a reference to my cousin by that name or as a mistake for my sister Annie. She would also know the person said to have been "brought here several times before," whom I have supposed to be my aunt Nannie's sister and mother of my cousin Nannie, and who was always called Amanda. But it would be simpler and just as pertinent to make the "aunt Nannie" refer to the communicator's sister, as the explanation that she was my cousin would indicate, and this would involve no assumption of confusion. When Rector says: "She is a cousin of thine, friend," he does not indicate whether he means my cousin Nannie, sister of the communicator, or the Lucy that had been mentioned, who is also my cousin by marriage, being the wife of the communicator. My opinion is that Rector, not understanding Dr. Hodgson's question, as actually indicated, refers to the communicator's mother whose name he could not get, but hoped to suggest by the reference to the communicator's sister, here called "aunt," as explained, and who was my cousin. But when I make my statement that: "I remember one cousin Nannie and one aunt Nannie," the reply shows a better comprehension of the situation. The statement that "Aunt Nannie is in the body" is correct, and if the statement that "cousin Nannie is in the spirit" can be interpreted to mean my sister Annie, this is also correct, and the next statements in response to my further question as to "what relation this cousin Nannie was to you," the communicator, were exactly correct from the standpoint of my earlier question in which I had my cousin by that name in mind, the sister of the communicator.

Hence, on any interpretation, we either get what is false and inexplicable by telepathy, or what is true from two separate standpoints and too complex both in its truth and misunderstandings to be easily amenable to telepathy as we know its operations.—J. H. H.

Note 56.—This passage has always remained psychologically puzzling. There is nothing in the thoughts with which my father left the "machine" a few minutes before to suggest the connection which my note in the detailed record indicates. Nor is it materially connected with the communications from my cousin, which it immediately follows. I had originally supposed that it was an attempt on the part of my father to resume matters connected with the confusion about my mother and stepmother, occasioned by my statement just before he left. I assumed that the sentence "Don't you remember *her*" came from him and referred to one of the two just mentioned. But this may as well refer to the Lucy just indicated, no matter who the

communicator is, whom I now suppose to have been my cousin who exclaimed this just as he left the "machine." Hence we may assume that my father either begins a new subject with the announcement of his presence, connected with the McClellan family and suggested by what he sees and hears going on while my cousin is communicating, or that he is attempting in a confused manner to unravel the threads connected with my mother and step-mother. I could give a strained interpretation in favour of the latter alternative, assuming certain mistakes, but it would not even then escape a reference to the McClellans, as this connection is unmistakable in the allusion to "John's wife" and the statement that she is still living. But the accidental discovery that the name Sarah, a fact unknown to me, had a direct pertinence for John McClellan's family opened the way to the first interpretation as the more probable. This view is especially reinforced by two facts. (1) The same grouping of names, with the exception of Maria, at a sitting on February 7th, 1900, and not included in the present report. (2) The indications on this occasion, and possibly in the frequent allusions of the present record, of some solicitude for this John McClellan, which his death about seven months later justified (*Cf.* Footnote, p. 471). Hence my adoption of the note embodied in the detailed record (p. 444).

But all who are familiar with pseudo-mediumistic phenomena will remark a very close resemblance to fishing and guessing in the names here given and which seem to have the coincidental import which my note indicates or suggests. I am far, of course, from regarding it as fishing of any kind, after what I have seen in the Piper case, though I would treat it so in any record not fulfilling the demands for evidence of personal identity in a better manner than this. But while I cannot for a moment regard it as supplying the slightest evidence of a spiritistic sort, I have described its possibilities for the two reasons, first, that the fact shows it is not necessarily false, but is possibly true in intention, and, second, to call attention to the resemblance, in external features at least, to the phenomena of fishing and guessing.—
J. H. H.

Note 57.—There has dawned upon me, on re-reading the passage about the injured foot, and remarking the capital letter "F" just before the hesitation about brother Will's name, that instead of "injured foot" we ought to have "injured leg." This would apply very distinctly to my brother Frank, whose initial is here given. It is apparent from my question, as stated in the previous note, that I was after the accident which caused the death of my "uncle Charles," while nothing but "accident" was mentioned by my father. Now it was an accident to his leg that was the occasion of my brother Frank's loss of health. It was a heavy fall while engaged at gymnastics in college. The injury was one that produced the same effect in my brother's use of his leg that father's injury in the sixties produced in his leg. I remember father's speaking of the resemblance before he died. This he intimated in his letters to me. Hence it was the expression: "He got it injured and so did I" that indicated to me the possibilities of the case, on the assumption that there was some confusion of memory, caused partly by the conditions of communication (which cannot be assumed in the evidential problem at first) and partly by the confusing nature

of my own question, as it was not on a railroad that my brother was injured. But with all its possibilities the passage is not clear enough to be given the slightest evidential value, and could only be explained on the spiritistic theory after we had given sufficient evidence that confusion and mistakes of this kind actually happened. There are unmistakable evidences of such errors, whether they are so indefinite as this or not. Besides there are the three facts in favor of the possibilities mentioned:—(1) The initial of brother Frank's name; (2) The recognition of the resemblance to his own injury; and (3) The hesitation about the connection of the injury with my brother Will.—J. H. H.

July 11th, 1900.—Since writing the above note I have recalled the fact that my brother Frank was agent for *Dr. Chase's Receipt Book and Household Physician*, and that it was while walking on his journeys to sell the book that he broke down with spinal irritation and symptoms of locomotor ataxy, due to this overtaxing of his energies so soon after recovering from his fall in the gymnasium. If we could connect the allusion of my cousin to an injured foot of one of the Hyslop boys (pp. 427-8) with this reference to an intention to be a doctor, we might, in spite of the confusion, imagine an attempt here to speak of Frank's work, which was very suggestive of an itinerant doctor. There is no excuse for this supposed possibility except the uniform confusion of my cousin in his communications and the apparent evidence in these experiments and others that association often seems to confuse and distort two separate and similar events. I had asked for the accident to my uncle and it is conceivable that reference to his injury may have been mixed up with the thought of an injury to my brother's back and leg. That is I may get only fragments of two separate events. I do not entertain the possibility of this with any degree of confidence whatever. Nevertheless, I inquired of my brother Frank if my cousin ever talked to him jokingly about his being a doctor, and the reply is that on one occasion, just after his return from college and after Frank had been canvassing for the book, my cousin "chaffed" and joked him about being a doctor.—J. H. H.

Note 58.—There was so much possible pertinence in the statement here put into the mouth of my stepmother that even at the expense of a little personal flattery I inquired whether it was true or not. My stepmother writes in answer to the question whether she ever used such language regarding me, as follows:—"I have many times made this remark to your father when we were both severely tried to know what to do, 'If the children were all like James and Frank we would have no trouble.'" The implied complaint against the others in this and father's language is not so severe in fact as may appear, for it really refers to the consequences of neglecting to respond to father's requests and needs as promptly as should have been the case. But I know from both my correspondence and from my memory that father's worry on such occasions was considerable, as he was himself always prompt in business obligations and disliked delay and negligence. My stepmother's confirmation of the language here, then, shows how very pertinent it is to the question of identity, and hence my justification for dwelling upon such personal matters.—J. H. H.

Note 59.—The allusion to “a cousin John” here in connection with my uncle James McClellan has always puzzled me. I had a cousin John, but he was in no way connected with the McClellans and there is not the slightest indication here that I am dealing directly or indirectly with him. He died when I was a very young child and I remember his death as having given me my first shock in regard to that dread visitor. Nor is there any clear reason to suppose that the person meant is the John McClellan in the earlier communication (pp. 431 and 438), as he was not a relative of either my family or that of the communicator. I have ascertained one fact beyond my knowledge at the time of the sitting and which reflects some light on the case and indicates its possible connection with the John McClellan whom I know. I seem to be communicating with my uncle James McClellan, as the messages make clear. I learned from several parties in the West, members of the McClellan family, that there was a sister Mary Ann and that she is not living. Now it turns out that I knew her while at the university, but knew her only by her married name, Mitchell. I knew nothing of her death so far as I am aware. It may be that I once knew she was a sister of the McClellans. It is more than probable that I did, and probable that I knew her name as Mary Mitchell, but I am quite certain that I never heard the Ann part of it.—J. H. H.

Note 60.—There is a matter of interest upon which I could not comment at the time of the sittings because I was not certain of the fact that I recalled when making my notes. I have ascertained by inquiry what I thought was true; namely, that my uncle James McClellan died of pneumonia. This fact gives a singular interest to the message. I had in mind my “uncle Charles,” or “Clarke” as he is sometimes called, and hence was trying to run down the incident that caused his death. But it is evident from what was said about clearing up matters referring to James and John McClellan, and from the statement that “Clarke” was mentioned for a mere recollection, that father had my uncle James McClellan on his mind. Now, the chief interest to be noted first is that this uncle James McClellan married my father’s sister, and so did also my “uncle Charles” or “Clarke” marry another sister, the Eliza of earlier sittings. (See sittings of December 24th and 26th, 1898.) Hence it is equally true of my uncle James McClellan that he was related “only by marriage” to my father, and also truer of him than my uncle “Charles” that he has been on that side “for some time.” With him evidently in mind the answer “pneumonia” to my question is perfectly correct. The reference to the interruption by Charles, my brother, now obtains a singular interest, as it is correct that he died with a fever. (See sittings of December 23rd and 26th, 1898.) Now the allusion to being “disturbed because of the accident” apparently denotes father’s discovery of the fact that I had my “uncle Charles” in mind, as is also apparently indicated by the interruption of my brother Charles, the whole passage at this point being part of the conversation carried on between Rector and the several persons on the other side. They seem to suppose that when I say “uncle Charles” I mean my brother, and that I am not clear about my uncle. Hence, when brother Charles gets my inquiry here, knowing that I have made it before in connection with the name “uncle Charles”

as I get it, he imagines that I am asking for his illness still, and interrupts with his statement about a fever, as the supposed answer to my question. My father, however, with a more correct suspicion of my misunderstanding, and seeing that I have in mind my "uncle Charles" alludes to "the accident that I (he) could not make clear." The passage thus becomes wonderfully clear and interesting, if we can be allowed thus to reconstruct it consistently with the facts, and with what we know of the sources of confusion in such experiments, precisely as they occur in the telephone.—J. H. H.

Note 61.—Some interest attaches to this name of which I was not certain at the time of the sitting. The name of my older sister who died when I was two years old was Margaret Cornelia. She was named for an aunt Cornelia, whom we called "aunt Cora." But the manner in which my sister speaks of the person named indicates that it is more probably this aunt to whom she refers. This view appears to be suggested by the remark "what father calls her," in connection with the evident difficulty of getting the name right and the fact that my sister can hardly be supposed to remember this aunt, who is still living, as my sister died when nearly three years old. But she can be supposed to know my sister Margaret Cornelia, though not until after her own death, assuming spiritism true of course, as my sister Annie was born after the death of Margaret Cornelia. Moreover in the next sentence my sister asks my mother to help her to give the name she had just tried. Now my mother was always very affectionately attached to this aunt Cora, her own sister, and was possibly present at the first sitting when the name "Corrie" was mentioned (p. 310), in connection with other sisters of both my father and mother. My father is confessedly present at this sitting of June 1st, and the allusion to what he calls her is especially pertinent, because, if I remember rightly, he always alluded to her as aunt Cornelia, while my mother called her "Cora" and we children aunt Cora. There would be no such a conjunction of facts to suppose that the allusion is to my sister Margaret Cornelia, though she would probably have been called "Cora" had she lived. Besides it would have been specially evidential, for two reasons, to have mentioned this aunt Cornelia, both pertinent to my mother.—J. H. H.

Note 62.—I have already made clear, in the previous note, the possible meaning of the name "Cora," and need not repeat the matter to clear up the note made after the sitting. But I have also acquired information that throws light on the reference to "Jennie," and so clears up the whole passage. "Jennie" is the name of the sister to the Lucy who is mentioned, the latter being the wife of Robert McClellan, my cousin, for whom my sister is acting as intermediary, and hence this "Jennie" is his sister-in-law. I never knew her, or even knew of her existence. I knew absolutely nothing of Lucy McClellan's connections. It will thus be quite apparent what significance the linking of the two names means in connection with the intermediation for my cousin Robert McClellan. It is pertinent also for my sister to say that "father knows about her better than I do," referring to cousin Lucy, for my sister never knew her at all, as my cousin's wife came into the acquaintance of our family only after she married my cousin,

which was long after my sister's death. The allusion to grandmother would occasion difficulty to the passage if connected with my cousin Lucy in the plain indication of the message taken in its strict context. But if the two sentences are separated, and the phrase, "Lucy is there" be interpreted to mean that she is on this side, that is, living, the case is perfectly clear, and this was the interpretation that I gave it at the sitting, and see no reason to change it, though it is undoubtedly equivocal, and if it were not for the pertinence and clearness of the rest of the passage would be evidence of some confusion. Two sisters-in-law might be mentioned.—J. H. H.

Note 63.—It will be remembered that in the note to the sitting of May 30th I was unable to attach any meaning to the name Peter. It was the same at this sitting, but as the message purported to come from my cousin Robert McClellan whose older son was named George, I resolved to inquire when in the West whether this George ever had a dog named Peter. When the first reference to it occurred I was thinking of my brother George, as the incident about the injured foot was calculated to keep my mind in the direction of my own family. But I knew that it could have no possible application to my brother in connection with Robert McClellan, and so treated the reference as a case of confusion which is so prevalent with this communicator, and it turns out so with the name "Nanie," so far as can now be ascertained. On the first chance, therefore, I asked George McClellan's younger brother whether George ever had a dog by the name of Peter, and received a negative answer. I did not explain why I asked it. I learned afterward from my cousin that he laughed about my question to his mother as being very funny, and repeated to her his denial of the fact, when she contradicted him and said it was true. I saw her the next day and ascertained that George did have a little ugly black dog named Peter when he was between two and four years of age, and also that his father did not like dogs because of his fear of hydrophobia. When I asked George himself some days after the same question, he being a resident of another city, he said he remembered only a dog by the name of Jack, which he had when he was five or six years old. Thinking then that there might be some mistake about the name on the part of the mother, I wrote to her to know if George's dog was not named Jack instead of Peter, and I have the reply that both are correct, that his first dog was named Peter, and was owned by him between his second and fourth years, and that his next was named Jack, and owned when he was five and six.

It is worth adding in reference to possible telepathy from my mind to account for this incident, that I never knew of the existence of this dog or of any dog owned by this second cousin. I never knew this cousin at all until he was between seven and ten years old, and saw him only a few times after that until he was grown up. His father, Robert McClellan, lived some distance from the old homestead, to which he moved some years after the death of his father in 1876, my uncle James McClellan. (See sitting for June 6th.) I never visited my cousin Robert McClellan until after I graduated from college in 1877, and hence did not see him in the home he had before he moved to his own old home after his father's death. Consequently his son was at least seven and perhaps ten years old before I knew anything about

him except his name and relationship to me. It is apparent, therefore, how little I was likely to know about his pets at two and four years of age.—
J. H. H.

Note 64.—Inquiry in the West throws new light on this whole passage beginning with the reference to my brother George, and changes its possible interpretation considerably. It will be noticed that I said in my note on the reference to my brother George that it was evidentially indefinite. It was applicable to him in its incidents, but not in its emotional tone, as the difference with him about his social relations did not represent so decided anxiety as is implied here. The objections were not moral at all, but were based upon the probable life that my brother would lead as a farmer. But what I learned regarding the incident of the fish, about which I knew nothing until told it here at the sittings, shows that it is probable that my father had my brother Robert in mind, and that he made, strange to say, a mistake similar to the one made later in the guitar incident (p. 461). This is indicated by the association of the name of my brother Frank with the same and following incidents. I ascertain from him that the incident of the fish is not quite right. It was not on a Sunday that it occurred. It seems that Frank and Robert were promised one Friday that they could go fishing on half the day Saturday if they finished their work. They did so, and went the next day to enjoy their fishing, but did not return until late in the afternoon and had to pay the penalty for taking time not given them. My father believed that Saturday afternoon and evening should be employed, as far as possible, in preparing for the religious duties of the Sabbath or Sunday, and often spoke of this to us. At least my brother Frank remembers no case of fishing on Sunday as is implied in the communication. Now another mistake occurs here, which I could not detect at the time because I did not know whether the reference to what appeared to be Frank's social evenings was true or not. It will be seen that I doubted it at the time, and hence I asked the question if Frank was meant on purpose to determine this doubt. The affirmative answer made it necessary to inquire of him personally to ascertain its truth. Now my brother Frank says that neither father nor aunt ever complained of his place of calling, as he had none at all. This confirms my conjecture at the time that the reference would have been more pertinent if made to my brother Robert. In fact it is so pertinently applicable to him and involves such personal and private matters that it is impossible to state the case as the evidential problem would require. It becomes apparent at this point that the reference to George was a mistake for Robert. The whole emotional and moral tone of it applies more distinctly to him than to the event that I had in mind in reference to George, as the evident recurrence to the same facts in the allusion again to spending the evenings and "*temptation*" shows. The mistake of names disturbs the evidential value of the incidents very much, but to me it would have such extraordinary pertinence if this mistake had not been made, and if I could narrate the facts that show that pertinence, that I have suffered myself to reconstruct it in the way I have done simply to indicate how near the truth it comes. Corroborative of my interpretation I have ascertained from two parties, besides my own memory,

that my aunt and father did talk to my brother Robert about the very incident so clearly intimated here.—J. H. H.

Note 65.—I find by inquiry that the chimney referred to here was not taken down on the building of the kitchen, but was modified by means of an iron cover, the chimney never having been restored to its original height after the accident from the cyclone. A part of it was removed after the cyclone. I had merely inferred its taking down from my memory of its foreshortened appearance caused by the building of the new kitchen and the fact that I find it is not so high as I have represented it in my former note. The question, then, about its being taken down must be interpreted either as containing a false implication or as referring to its having been *blown* down by the cyclone, and hence to the same incident implied by the allusion to what “happened” to it. But there is a good lesson here against drawing inferences from one’s memories, even though the facts of the case consist with the inference. I find by inquiry also that we had no aunt Lucy whatever. I was wholly mistaken regarding the name of the aunt in mind.

Note 66.—I refused to comment on this reference to “Dr. Pierce” at the time of the sitting because I thought possibly there might have been a doctor by that name who attended my uncle at his death by the accident, though I suspected that the name was a mistake for another doctor whom I know very well. But I have been absent from this town for so many years that it was possible for any number of unknown physicians to have installed themselves there in the meantime. Hence before venturing to state my conjecture regarding the possibility of this name I waited to inquire. I find that no “Dr. Pierce” attended my uncle and that there is none such in that place. But Dr. Harvey McClellan, who was indicated apparently at a previous sitting and also at a later sitting, in both cases by my father (pp. 425, 491), was one of the attending physicians when my uncle’s leg was amputated. But no “Dr. Pierce” was present. This, of course, is not asserted or implied, but in the sitting for June 5th my brother Charles indicates that he was a friend of my uncle “Clarke” which is true, if the name be interpreted as a mistake for the man I had in mind when reading the record over afterward. The true name should have been Dr. J. P. Dice. It can be seen by those who are familiar with these experiments how Rice and Pierce might be mistaken by Rector for the name I have given. The letter “P” becomes crowded into the attempt at “Dice” and the name becomes “Pierce.” This is of course conjecture, but it shows a possibility at least, though it is not evidential. Cf. case of cat’s name, *Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., p. 20. Also a similar mistake in case of a dog’s name, Vol. VI., p. 620. In both *Pick* was given for *Dick*.

Note 67.—I made personal inquiry of my brother Robert to know whether his eyes have been giving him any trouble and received a negative reply. He says that at no time have his eyes troubled him. I asked him the question before he knew anything about my reasons for asking it, and I plied him with various queries to see if there was even the trace of a truth in the

statement made by the communicator, and the straight answer was always that neither at present nor in the past have his eyes troubled him in the least. I had an impression at the time that the statement was true, though I knew that it would apply more correctly to the next older brother, Will, who has had very considerable trouble with his eyes for more than a year. The difficulty began with what he represented to me as poisoning, and was a source of some danger and alarm to him at one time. But they are now better, though still troublesome. The allusion in the question "Are those his children?" would also have possible pertinence to brother Will, whose two children father knew well enough before his death, and we could assume conversation about them possibly. But as it is interpreted by Rector to have been interruption we cannot attach any evidential importance to it. On the spiritistic hypothesis the mistake involving a confusion of one brother with the other would be natural enough for Charles to make, considering that Robert was not born until seven months after Charles's death and that Will was only two years old at the time. Besides, we may suppose that in the confusion, incident to the interruption, Charles' thought may have passed to my brother Will, and the latter's name escaped the machine. But these facts, while they may explain the naturalness of the mistake, do not give it evidential value.—J. H. H.

Note 68.—The statement of Rector, after I had said: "I do not understand," that it "was only interruption," may show that I have no right to assume that the question: "Are those his children?" has the meaning that I had supposed, namely, a mistaken reference to the children of my brother Robert. It is much rather to be interpreted as an automatism due to a remark of some one on the "other side" which gets written down before Rector discovers its irrelevance to the communications from my brother Charles. This automatism could occur in several ways which it is not necessary to unravel here, as even its very existence has to be conjectured, or accepted on the veracity of Rector, and I will not press the intelligibility of the statement farther than to say that, on any theory, we can discover a unity in the whole passage by treating the reference to children as an irrelevance precisely as the statement about the interruption would most naturally imply that it is. Had my brother Charles given the name of my brother Will when he resumed his messages this view of the case would have been much clearer to the general reader. (*Jan. 20th, 1900.*)—J. H. H.

Note 69.—I ascertained by personal inquiry in the West an incident that makes my conjecture probably the right one, namely, that it was my cousin Robert McClellan that was communicating. When I read the passage to his sister, referred to in the sitting for May 31st as "aunt Nannie" and his "sister," she remarked that there was no meaning in the mention of the book of poems. She went on to say spontaneously, however, and without any indications that she was mentioning a pertinent fact, that as she had nursed him for several months, she had taken to him and read to him a book called "Morning Thoughts." The end of each chapter is made of a rather long poem.—J. H. H.

Note 70.—Inquiry results in the confirmation of only one of the incidents in answer to my request for facts that I did not know, and this is the name of the orphan boy, Jerry, who had been taken into the family, and whom I do not remember personally. My aunts remember none of them except this one, and they recognise the pertinence of this very distinctly. There was the special reason for mentioning this boy, that he was rather good-natured, but dull to learn, and often got into trouble innocently by not knowing the risks and dangers to which his curiosity exposed him. For instance, he got his face badly burnt by powder in a foolish experiment with it; had the skin taken off his tongue by putting it against a frozen axe; was in the habit of going to sleep in church, and when awakened up would drop off into sleep again while putting a clove into his mouth, etc. These and many other incidents made him the subject of much amusement and story telling in the family and elsewhere. He came into the family, according to my aunt's statement, about the year 1855, but she does not remember when he left. All that I can remember is that he enlisted in the Civil War. I recall hearing this told, but do not remember it personally.

There is a peculiar interest and possibility connected with the shoe and sock incident. It is consciously recognised that no one living can verify it. My father says that only his mother and the Rogers girl can testify to it. I have a strong recollection that I have heard my grand uncle (who died many years ago and to whom no allusion is made in this record) mention the name Rogers. He was the brother of my grandmother here mentioned. But as my two aunts do not recall any one by the name of Rogers, I have to discount my own memory in the case. But it is certainly interesting to find the name thus connected with my father's mother and connected in my own memory only with her brother. It is noteworthy, too, that this incident is omitted from the list which I was admonished at Dr. Hodgson's sitting of July 6th to inquire into carefully (p. 497).

It is not surprising that my aunts cannot remember these incidents, assuming that they are even possibly true, because they are so small and trivial that they might well be forgotten by them, though remembered by father. My experiments on the "Identification of Personality" very frequently show the same difference of memory between the communicator and the receiver of messages. (*Cf.* references, p. 268.) But it will interest the advocate of telepathy that the only incident which my aunts recall is also one that I knew, namely, the name of "Jerry," the orphan boy. But they could be expected to remember him, because his place in their experience was too prominent to be forgotten as easily as the other incidents. If they could have been verified they would have had almost irresistible evidential force in the case. But the best that can be said of them is that we do not know whether they are true or false.—J. H. H.

[I may add, however, that by persistent inquiry I found that one of the main factors in one of the incidents was true, and of course unknown to me. By the time that I began to push my investigations into details my two aunts, Nannie and Eliza, became violently hostile to answering my questions and took every opportunity to deny what was not technically correct all the way through. But incidentally it came out that my aunt Eliza did

walk home from a prayer meeting with a certain young man, and was teased about it by father. But his name was not Baker. (June 28th, 1900).— J. H. H.]

Note 71.—This communication direct from my uncle James McClellan, who was the father of my cousin Robert McClellan, and who has communicated so often, has very considerable interest, as much for the error of memory among his brothers still living as for similar errors on the other side.

The first incident is that in which he said that he always despised the name Jim. This could not be taken from my memory for two reasons. (1) I myself never despised the name, and (2) I never knew that my uncle did so. As my former note indicates, I at once saw that the statement was pertinent on the ground of what I did remember, namely, that we always called him "uncle Mack." But I do not recall ever having the fact explained, as we called one of his nephews, my cousin, also by the name "Mack." But I asked one of his daughters, the "Nannie" in the communications from my cousin Robert McClellan, whether this statement about his despising the name Jim was correct or not, and she did not know or could not remember. When I read the passage to another daughter, she broke out laughing and said that it was perfectly true, recalling the fact that her mother often corrected the neighbours for calling him Jim, and would often say to the family that she was afraid she would be called proud on account of her tastes. The community was a pioneer one, and those who chose to adopt certain refinements of civilisation had often to suffer the criticism of their neighbours, who said people were "proud" if they showed any solicitude on matters of this sort.

The correction of the mistake in the name "cousin John" is very interesting, as it was purely voluntary on the part of the persons on the side of the communications. Of course the letter from the son of this John McClellan had put me in knowledge of the fact that he was still living, and the circumstance becomes amenable to telepathy, though the dramatic play of personality involved is a difficulty in the way of the view, especially the statement that I must remember his brother John if I was James, as my uncle, who was rather a favourite of mine, died while I was at college in the town where his brother John McClellan lived, as indicated before. The manner too, in which some confusion occurs between the names of his brother John and his father John is an interesting fact, though it is quickly cleared, and the circumstance represents a fact wholly beyond my knowledge, as I never knew his father personally or by name, so far as I can remember.

The correction of the statement that this brother was in the war is also an incident of some importance. It turns out to be true that the brother was never in any war, and the confusion between the two names is still apparent in the attempt to communicate, though immediately corrected, and the reference made to his father as the one who was in the war, which I find also to have been incorrect.

The inquiries that led to the discovery that this statement about my uncle's father having been in the war is false are detailed in Note 94 p. 535 with the evidence of who was probably meant. The language here clearly refers to

my uncle's father. But there was evidently some confusion in the matter, possibly precipitated by my statement that I did not remember my uncle's father. Compare with this also the summary (p. 111). In any case, however, the incidents of the war and lost finger are not true of him, but of another John McClellan, who was not a relative of my uncle at all, and who was probably the person meant in the sitting of May 31st (p. 431). But in regard to the statement that this John McClellan "had a brother David who had a sunstroke," John McClellan, Dr. Harvey McClellan, William McClellan, sons, and William McClellan, nephew, said that he had no brother by this name. But in order to see if there was anything near the truth in the statement, I asked if he had any relative by that name, and was answered in the negative by all except John McClellan, the son, who said that he had a brother-in-law by the name of David Elder. My aunt Nannie also knew of this David Elder. The fact gave me confidence in the clue. But none of the McClellans remembered whether this David Elder had a sunstroke or not. Through one of them, Dr. Harvey McClellan, I was directed to address an inquiry to the daughter of David Elder, and it turned out that she was not living, the fact being unknown to her cousin who gave me the address! True, she lived in another county, but she had died two years before, as I learned from her daughter, and the fact, we should suppose, ought to have been known to her cousin. Through this daughter I obtained some further information embodied in Note 72.

It is pertinent to see the name of "Nancy" given in this connection, because this is the name of my uncle James McClellan's mother, virgin name Nancy Elder, sister of the David Elder just indicated. This I did not know, and assumed that he was intending to refer to my aunt Nannie, his sister-in-law. There is, however, nothing but its connection and the way it is written to indicate that the reference should be taken as made to his mother. Earlier in life we had called aunt Nannie by the name of aunt Nancy, but for thirty years or more only in the form that it invariably appears in these communications. My uncle most probably called my aunt by the name of Nancy, so that if we assume, as I think there is no reason to do, that he was referring to my aunt Nannie we should have an interesting variation from the usage in these sittings which would be against the telepathic, and in favour of the spiritistic theory. We could escape its cogency for this view only by assigning telepathy an associative power and access to the connections in memory equal to its assumed acquisitive capacity at the same time, a view which is not supported by the mistakes and confusions in this record. Apparently, however, the evidence is that my uncle was referring to the name of his mother, which was Nancy, and I understand that she was always called so. As I did not know the name of my uncle's mother the difficulty with telepathy still remains considerable on this interpretation of his reference.—J. H. H.

Note 72.—September 17th, 1899. After some months' correspondence and much difficulty I have been able to obtain further information of the sunstroke incident. The granddaughter of this David Elder wrote to her uncles asking them whether their father ever had a sunstroke, or had been

overcome with the heat, and whether it had affected him afterward, if he had such a stroke. The answer came from one of them that he thought that his father had been overcome with heat about the close of the war (1865), but that it did not affect him in after years. The other, the one with whom the father had lived, said that his father "never had a sunstroke, nor was he very much affected by the heat of it." I then wrote to the first of these two for particulars, and the reply was dictated to his son as follows:—

Washington, Iowa, *September 4th, 1899.*

DEAR SIR,—My father asks me to say in response to the attached (my inquiry) that in 1865 or '66 or '67 or '68, his father was slightly overheated, but not, according to his remembrance, seriously so. There were no further particulars that he can give.—Yours respectfully,

Jas. H. Hyslop, New York City.

ORVILLE ELDER.

To the other brother who had denied the occurrence I wrote what his brother had said in the affirmative, and he repeats, in reply, that he has no recollection of it, but admits that it is possible, though he insists, no doubt correctly enough, that it could not have been serious. The case thus stands rather in favor of the statement at the sitting, though it was evidently not apparently so serious as the natural interpretation of the language in the communication would imply. But when we consider that even a light stroke of this kind carries with it prolonged consequences we need not be surprised that there should be an apparent discrepancy between the description of the sons and that of my uncle about the person concerned. My father had a light sunstroke in or about 1867, and all his life afterward had to be careful about working in the sun.—J. H. H.

[Further inquiry of persons who have been slightly overcome with heat and of physicians confirms the statement that subjects of sunstroke, no matter how light, never recover from the effects of it (January 20th, 1900).—J. H. H.]

Note 73.—This incident about the minerals cannot be verified by either of the aunts, his sisters. The word "minerals" is not one that would indicate any of the intellectual or other interest that my father ever had within my recollection. He knew nothing about geology, and cared nothing about minerals or jewelry of any sort that I ever knew. He may at one time have had some Indian relics which might pass here for "minerals," but I never knew of his possessing anything of this kind. I merely knew that he did exhibit some interest in such relics, but I know of no collection of them in his possession. He used to tell us a great deal about Indian history in Ohio, and especially about Indian battles.—J. H. H.

[Since writing the preceding note I recalled the fact that father did have a small collection of Indian relics, consisting of an Indian hatchet or two, a mortar and pestle, another whose purpose I have forgotten, and a large number of flint arrows. He used to find these on the farm when ploughing or at work in the fields, and he often spoke of their camping ground as probably near a certain spring on our neighbour's place, that of the Samuel Cooper mentioned in this record. To test my memory of this collection I asked his sister, my aunt Nannie, yesterday (September 23rd, 1899)

if she remembered whether father ever took an interest in Indian relics, and had a collection of them. She replied to both queries in the affirmative, but she could recall only the arrows and the hatchet in it. She had no recollection of the others. She said that he had quite an interest in such things as a young man, though he showed none of the enthusiasm or disposition of the collector.—J. H. H.]

Note 74.—The question about the name of “that Dr.” is equivocal. If there was any consciousness of the mistake in regard to Dr. Dice, it might be interpreted as a reference to him, but as it was my uncle that was trying to give this name I can hardly assume that this was meant by my father. The second possibility is that of Dr. Harvey McClellan, but as this name was suspected once before, and mentioned once afterward (pp. 425, 491) or presumably so in the form of “Henry McClellan,” the communicator would hardly have spoken here as he did. In fact, reading this statement in connection with the attempt to complete the reference to “a doctor who had peculiar religious views” suggested that possibly my interpretation of that passage as referring to Dr. Harvey McClellan might be wrong. Hence when reading the sittings over about two weeks after their occurrence, I recalled another physician of father’s acquaintance who would admirably fit the facts. He was a dentist, and was always called “Doctor” by father and the family. He was of the Unitarian profession, or something like this, and father had many conversations with him on the subject of religion, and “peculiar” (better “strange”) was the term that father would naturally use to describe them. Father was quite a friend of this man, in spite of his heterodoxy. But he is not clearly enough indicated to suppose certainly that he was meant. Hence I mention him only to modify the interpretation of the former incident.

This persistent reference to the books sent me the year before he died is an interesting incident. I have denied its truth all along, and have still to deny it, so far as my recollection goes. When I said to him at the sitting that I had them in my library, I meant to quiet his mind about it while I had in view the books of his which I took and kept after his death. I had in mind, too, what was said at an earlier sitting (December 27th, p. 335). But the reference to “a box containing two or more books” and sent me “before I (he) became so ill,” has an interest as being nearly right. I remembered his sending me a box some time before his illness, and containing something very different from books, and hence I could only interpret this as false. But I read over his correspondence with me and find that in a letter of December 22nd, 1892, he mentions sending me a box containing some things for us, and mentions butter. I do not remember whether this box had any other contents or not. But in a letter of November 20th, 1893, he mentions his and mother’s purpose to send us a box of various things, but it was not realised for some time, as the letter for January 8th, 1894, mentions sending it and apologises for the delay. The box contained two rolls of butter, two dressed chickens and some nuts. But I do not remember any books in it; in fact, am quite confident that none such were sent me at that time. The date shows, however, that it was more than a year before his death, a mistake that is not so bad when we reflect that I made the same mistake until the

reading of the letters corrected it. It is barely possible that he may have sent me some books to read and which were returned. Careful inquiry, however, does not assure anything definite about this possibility.

Previous notes show that the incidents about the reading of the paper and the glasses troubling his eyes are correct, except that the cause of the trouble in the eyes was probably not his glasses, but the gradual breaking up of his system, though my father thought at the time that it was his glasses.—J. H. H.

Note 75.—I could never feel satisfied with the absurd conception indicated in my note of June 7th (p. 476), which had assumed the possibility of continued weakness after death in order to make conceivable the possible amount of truth in the reference to the number 25, or 23, as Mrs. P. went into the trance. But it occurred to me afterwards that this message might have been much more fragmentary than it seems. Assuming then that my father did not communicate all that he intended, and that he was trying to say something about the twenty-third psalm (hymn), and about his inability to sing because he did not have any teeth, we should have a conception that does not involve the difficulties attaching to my original interpretation. It would be specially pertinent to mention this psalm for two reasons. First, my mother recited it in a clear voice on her death-bed after we thought she had become unconscious. Secondly, my father often tried to impress the sentiment of this psalm upon our minds by reminding us of its place among the last words of our mother, and by frequently singing it at family worship. This new interpretation does not involve the assumption of continued physical weakness and defects after death, as my previous note represents it, and hence the possible meaning of these fragments appears without the incredible conception which was stated, not because it was believed or believable, but because it served as an aid to the explanation of the possible pertinence of Mrs. Piper's statements. There is nothing evidential in the message, as it does not clearly state what I have conjectured, but the reconstruction serves to show how near to a significant truth a lot of confusion and absurdity can be.—J. H. H.

Note 76.—Inquiry of my aunt here mentioned fails to verify the fact. The doubt expressed by the communicator himself led me to inquire also of the other aunt, who also does not remember the incident. If it were not for the communicator's own doubt about the person who helped him out of his difficulty we could very safely say that it is false, because I find by inquiry that my aunt Eliza is thirteen years younger than my father, and hence was not born at the time indicated in the incident. It would be quite possible for my aunt Nannie to have been the witness of this little escapade, as she was only eight years father's junior, but we could hardly expect her to remember such an incident.—J. H. H.

Note 77.—It might have been stated here in the previous note that my assumption of the possible meaning of the name "Nannie" for my step-mother is decidedly confirmed by this phrase "my own mother Nannie." For as both were called Margaret, we can suppose that the phrase is a

fragment of what was said explaining that his own mother's name was the same as "Maggie's" which was what he always called my stepmother. This we have seen appeared as "Nannie," which, be it noted, as I have elsewhere explained (p. 342), is probably a mistake of Rector's, or possibly of the "machine" for what was definitely thought by my father as Maggie (Cf. pp. 69, 365).—J. H. H.

Note 78.—The incidents about the "Cooper School" and father's visit to me which I have explained in a previous note (See Notes 39, p. 499, and 53, p. 507) show clearly enough that the communicator was possibly right in thus alluding to this trip as having been mentioned before. But my ignorance of the "Cooper School" incident prevented any recognition of this correctness at the time.

On examination of the two sets of sittings, however, mine and Dr. Hodgson's, I find nothing that justifies assurance about the reference to this Western trip "just before going out West." But the association of the fact with the allusion to my stepmother, though suggestible by my question, obtains such pertinence as it has from the spontaneous intimation that the trip had been mentioned before. The trip was taken for the purpose of looking up a place to which to move, but the decision was in favour of another place than that of the original intention.

There is, however, too much confusion in the present communications, and too much equivocation in the allusion to a journey in connection with the Cooper incident (p. 421) for me to suppose anything evidential in the present references. But I may explain the confusion and indicate two or three interesting psychological features of the passage.

I had been the source of the confusion in the first place by not making it clear that I was asking for my *stepmother* instead of my mother. There would be no apparent reason to my father for my asking about a trip in such close connection with the reference to the cap, since the cap was made in 1895, and the trip with my stepmother was taken in 1884. But as my father presumably alluded to a trip with my own mother at the sitting of Dr. Hodgson on February 7th (p. 371) it was natural for his mind to recur to that on the present occasion, as such a trip had a direct association with myself for him. My special object here, to call out incidents that I did not know, was not detected, and the communicator's mind would naturally be diverted by this apparently abrupt change of subject, which in fact would not appear to him to be a change at all if I was referring to my mother, whose identity enters into the confusion, as the communications show. It is strongly corroborative of the thought unity in the case, in spite of its confusion, and of my conjecture that my father had the trip with my own mother in mind, to see the name *Sarah* mentioned immediately after the allusion to the maker of the cap. For my aunt Sarah was with us, my mother, my father, my sister Annie, and myself, on the trip in 1861, a fact wholly forgotten by me at the time of the sitting, and only discovered accidentally in a conversation with this aunt afterward. The recognition a little later (p. 481) that this was the trip intended confirms my supposition, though its force is made dubious by my statement just previous. So also is the recognition of the trip with my stepmother, though it would possess much

pertinence if I could feel assured that the pronoun "we" and the allusion to a journey in connection with the Cooper incident (p. 421) referred to my stepmother.—J. H. H.

Note 79.—When I made this answer to father's statement about the cap in connection with the name of aunt Nannie I interpreted it to be an answer to my question about it a little earlier, but on careful examination I see that it is nothing of the kind, but is an attempt to clear up the confusion of my stepmother's name with that of my aunt, about which there was so much difficulty, as the sitting shows. The next note will show this view of the case still more clearly, I think.—J. H. H.

Note 80.—From a statement (p. 491) at the last sitting (June 8th) I at first thought that this "H . . . HAR H . . ." might possibly have been one of the attempts to spell out the name of Harper Crawford there mentioned. But more careful examination shows that this is not the most probable interpretation. It is more likely that he was trying to give the name of my stepmother Margaret. Compare Notes 82 and 86. This is evidenced by the mention of his mother, whose name was Margaret (see above), and his sister, with whose name he had confused that of my stepmother. The "No, go on," is probably an interruption of Rector's to have father go on with his explanation of the confusion and to stop the reference to "HAR." But it was a wonderful piece of pertinent reference to say that he thought of his mother and sister, in connection with an attempt to clear up the confusion of my aunt's name with that of my stepmother, as the statement of facts just above clearly indicates.

It becomes clear also that my supposition in the answer to his statement about the cap and thinking it over when I mentioned aunt Nannie was a misunderstanding on my part, representing confusion on my side while his accusation that I misunderstood him is justified by the facts, and hence the clearness was on his side. The reference to "our visit to her also" is wonderfully pertinent here, because, though it was in 1876 on his return from the Centennial at Philadelphia, I had earlier in the sitting referred to a trip out West with her, in asking for my stepmother's name, and still earlier had indicated that her name was confused with that of my aunt. There is a distinct consciousness of this confusion here in the reference to the cap and my aunt's name. It was therefore a perfectly correct piece of association for him to run over the trip that was connected with the visit to my aunt. This fact alone is almost enough to prove identity, in spite of the confusion, and perhaps one might almost say on account of it.

I find also by inquiry that there is no Harriet among the relatives as my note after the sitting supposes there was. Hence, all that was supposed in reference to that name has to be withdrawn. Besides, no Harriet was visited. The whole passage becomes clear enough in the light of the previous explanation, and the fact just learned from my stepmother that father and she visited my aunt at the time I have mentioned, 1876.—J. H. H.

Note 81.—There is an extraordinary interest in the statements here about the visit to the boys and the arrangement to go out West to live. I may have known of these visits, but I did not recall them and had to verify them by

inquiry, and found that on his return home from this Western trip he did visit brother George with mother. It appears, however, to be a statement made to Rector, and not necessarily to me, as the "visit to the boys" must include me, if we take the plural into account, because my brother Will was on the home farm at that time, and it would hardly be proper to say that the return thither to him was a "visit" to him. This is clearly recognised in the statement, "we saw George and Will," etc. But on this return he did have a long consultation with brother Will regarding his willingness to take the farm if he (father) decided to leave. But the most pertinent thing about the statement is that he "arranged to go out there to live," as this is exactly what he did, the time relation being precisely correct here.

The chief interest of this, however, is the relation of it to the theory of telepathy. If it is to be accounted for on that hypothesis, it involves a distinction by Mrs. Piper's subliminal between personal knowledge and experience in connection with my father and what I merely knew by report and thoughts about the matter. I merely knew most of these things by correspondence and inference and not as personal experience, so that the connection with my father is merely a thought connection. Now if telepathy is to account for it, why does that agency not also obtain abundance of other thoughts with the same kind of association? Why does it so uniformly limit itself to the incidents in mine or others' memory that represent the personal unity of my father's consciousness and memory at the same time? This is a tremendous capacity to assume, especially when we note its infallibility in that respect and such decided fallibility in selecting the relevant facts after so correctly discriminating them from the irrelevant. For there is not one case that I have observed in the whole seventeen sittings which can represent a thought alone about my father. The associative unity and synthesis is wholly that of a personality on the other side, and not that of telepathic acquisition from my memory, unless we suppose an infallible distinction between mere thoughts associated with my father and personal experiences so associated, to say nothing of the large number of facts that I did not know at all.—J. H. H.

Note 82.—As I compare different passages in which this "Har" occurs it seems more probable that it is a mistake for "Margaret." This appears almost evident, if not conclusive, in the sitting for June 8th (p. 491), where the "Har . . . MARGARET" occur together though it is probable that another Margaret, my deceased aunt, is intended in the latter case. It would suit this case to interpret it so because the allusion to the trip with this person is so pertinent to her, my stepmother, especially when taken in connection with my question regarding the same, and the remark immediately afterward that he would try and tell me exactly what I wanted.—J. H. H.

Note 83.—The chief interest in this passage is the knowledge of Rector, as later statements would indicate, regarding the relation to me of the parties named. It is perfectly correct, and as realistic as could be imagined. It is not in the least like the passive acquisition of telepathy, if our conception of that process is correct. The indication that there is a Nannie in the

body to be distinguished from my mother who is dead, and the reason assigned for our confusion is a fine piece of independent intelligence, no matter whether we suppose the allusion to be to my Aunt Nannie or to my stepmother with the continued use of the erroneous name.—J. H. H.

Note 84.—I have made diligent inquiry about this alleged experience of my uncle "Clarke," and cannot verify it. His wife and children cannot confirm it. Either they were not told it or they do not recognise in the incident as narrated here anything to recall what they may have been told. All of them, however, state that many years ago he had a waking vision of a chariot and two ways, the chariot being full of flaming swords and passing through a scene of great carnage. But as he had taken a dose of morphine it was treated as the effect of this, except that my uncle often spoke of it as having had a symbolic influence on his religious life. I see no reason for giving it such a meaning or any meaning except the effects of the morphine. It certainly does not fit the incident as here told by my father, so that we have something to deal with that is either false or unverifiable. It would be a most interesting fact if verifiable, as it would afford both a means of identification and an indication of something beyond telepathy. There is an interesting circumstance, however, that may explain why I could not verify it. The statement that he, my uncle, saw the light and spoke of it before he came here, though it seems to imply that it had been mentioned before he died, does not absolutely require this interpretation, as it may mean only that he had spoken of it before he came to communicate "here." He had died some two months or more before I had my sittings. The evidence for this interpretation of the sentence is the fact that in the same passage father very carefully distinguishes between the interval between death and the time and place of communications, and the interval between the alleged conversation and the time of coming to the communications. This is what is meant by the change to the spiritistic lingo which I noticed. If then it be true that there is no reason to suppose the experience had been told to any one, we can hardly assume it to have necessarily been in the possession of those of whom I had to inquire. The statement later that I must "remember the facts very well" does not necessarily imply that I knew the facts of the experience, but may mean only that I must remember the facts which father supposed that he had told before he was "too far off" to complete the story. Consequently, the experience might have been one that occurred to him after the accident by which he lost his life, and when he was in a condition that might either prevent the telling of it or offer no opportunity to tell it. I have no necessary reason, therefore, to suppose that the incident would be verifiable in any case.—J. H. H.

Note 85.—This is an incident about which I knew nothing, and, considering that the aunt of whom it is told is twenty years older than I am, I could not be expected to know it. But I asked my aunt Nannie, who is eight years older than the aunt Eliza of whom it is told, and she emphatically denied the truth of the incident. But this aunt Eliza herself told me that she was nicknamed "Lizzie" when a child, and that afterward the

family began calling her Eliza, by which name I always knew her, and I never heard any mention of what my aunt Nannie herself could not remember.—J. H. H.

Note 86.—This passage apparently indicates a connection between the attempts with “Har” and the name “Margaret.” But there is some confessed confusion in it, and possibly no effort would suffice to unravel it, especially as the name Jennie occurs out of place in this instance, unless we suppose that the Margaret in this case is not meant for my mother at all, but for my aunt, the second wife of my uncle James McClellan, who communicated before. In this case the Jennie could have the significance already given it, as the sister of her stepson’s wife. But the importance of the passage is its connection of “HAR” with “MARGARET.” It shows what the probable meaning of “HAR” in previous messages (pp. 481, 482), though it is probable that the person meant is not the same.—J. H. H.

Note 87.—This incident about the organ turns out to be perhaps as remarkable as any in the whole series of sittings. I knew nothing about the fact. The church to which allusion is made is the First United Presbyterian Church in the town of father’s old home, as indicated by my question, and the Harper Crawford, whom I mentioned just to start father in the direction of memories in connection with this old friend, belonged to this church. I learned from my aunt Nannie (about June 25th, 1899), who keeps in close communication with her sister, that an organ had been put into this church about two months previously, the denomination being opposed to instrumental worship until recent changes in its constitution permitted the introduction of it in churches desiring it. I learned also from her that it was the introduction of the organ into this church (Sunday-school) that was the reason why my uncle “Clarke” and his wife left this congregation and went to the second U.P. Church. I *probably* knew that they had left it, but if I did know it I had wholly forgotten it. The only chance I had to know it was at the time of my father’s death when I was at his old home, but I recall nothing said or done at the time to give me any information on the point. On further inquiry I learned that the organ had been introduced into the Sunday-school of this church two or three years before my uncle’s death, but not into the regular services until two months previous to the time of my last sittings. Now as an indication of my ignorance regarding the facts it is interesting to know that soon after my first series of sittings I wrote to my aunt, the wife of this uncle, the aunt Eliza of these records, and asked her to send me some questions which were to concern facts in the lives of my father and herself, and my uncle and herself, that I did not know. I had her seal the questions in an envelope which I was not to open until the sittings. I had this envelope with me in my pocket, which I had kept there after opening it in Boston for use at one of the sittings. I kept it there very carefully so that no one should see it. One of the two questions in it was: “Why did your uncle and I leave the First Church?” I had, of course, seen the question, but I did not have the slightest conception of what it was expected to elicit. But I did not see the suitable occasion to present the question. The information,

however, which my aunt Nannie gave me about the introduction of the organ into this church turned out to be the proper answer to this question which was never put, and whose answer I did not know.

The most remarkable part of it, however, is the fact that I learned casually in a conversation with my sister and stepmother when narrating the incidents here associated with the name of Harper Crawford. Without the slightest suspicion of the pertinence of the circumstance, my stepmother remarked that Harper Crawford, with his family, was the only person beside my uncle "Clarke" and family who left this church on account of the introduction of the organ. I learned from my aunt later that one other person in the congregation had left on account of it, but this is of no importance except to make the story correct, and to show the limited number of persons involved in the situation. I, of course, knew nothing of this Harper Crawford's action, as I have only spoken to him a few times, when on visits to my old home, in the last twenty years, and have had no communications at all either with him or about him in all that time. I might very well have gotten some hint of the admission of the organ into the Church Sunday School at the time of my father's death, if it was in then, because I stayed for ten days at my "uncle Clarke's" house. But we were so out of sympathy on religious questions that we never talked about them in any shape, and so I was ignorant, at least so far as my memory serves me, of both the fact of the introduction of the organ and its connection with his and my aunt's leaving the church.

Now the interesting feature of the incident is that the statement about the organ should be started by my reference to Harper Crawford and given almost instantly, and then that I should find that there was a real connection beyond my knowledge between the two facts and also with my uncle who had so recently died. It is probable that father did not know the fact of the introduction of the organ before his death. If he did not, his knowledge of it would have to come from this uncle who was one of the parties affected. But considering my ignorance of the main facts and any process whatsoever of acquiring them, the unity of consciousness involved in this incident appears to transcend any possibility of telepathy whatever, short of infinity in the capacities of Mrs. Piper's brain.—J. H. H.

[Since writing the foregoing I have just discovered one of father's letters misplaced from the package already examined, and dated June 10th, 1896, two months and a-half before his death. It states the fact that this Harper Crawford and my uncle "Clarke" had left this church, but does not give the reason. Hence, contrary to my supposition, father probably did know all that is implied here and did not have to get it from my uncle after his death except the putting of the organ into the regular services of worship. (September 17th, 1899.)—J. H. H.]

[I made special inquiries for an official statement from the Secretary of the Session in the church here concerned regarding the exact time that the organ was decided upon and put in. I give the questions and answers as originally presented. The answers I put in quotations.

1. At what date did the Session decide by vote to introduce an organ into the *Sunday School*? *Ans.*: "April 2nd, 1895."
2. At what date was the organ put in? (No answer to this question.)

3. At what date did the Session decide by vote to put the organ into the regular services? *Ans.* : " July 5th, 1898."

4. On what date was it put in for this purpose? *Ans.* : " May 4th, 1899."

5. When did Mr. James B. Carruthers and Mr. Harper Crawford ask and obtain their certificate of departure from the church. *Ans.* : " June 4th, 1895."

This statement makes it apparent that the organ was put into the main part of the church and its services after the death of my uncle Carruthers, though the official decision for it was six months before his decease. But, as shown both by my father's letter mentioned above, and this official statement, the organ was put into the Sunday School before this, and the two men had left the church long before the decision to put it into the main part of the service. Consequently, the allusion of my father to the case may not refer to anything learned from my uncle since his death, but to a matter of common knowledge before either of them died. Father's letter to me makes this clear, though it gives no hint of the cause for the abandonment of the church by the two men mentioned.¹

If we are to apply telepathy to this incident it performs the extraordinary trick of completing the story of my father's letter in 1896, either by selecting from my subliminal self information absolutely forgotten by me and using it as a means to obtain *rapport* with other minds, or by reaching out into the world at large and obtaining the desired information in that way alone. (October 29th, 1899.)—J. H. H.]

Note 88.—This passage beginning with the reference to my brother George is as pertinent and extraordinary conversation as could be imagined. There is not an irrelevance in it. Every statement is charged with meaning that the members of the family know too well. The underscoring suggests facts and pertinent emotional tone that only myself and members of the family can appreciate. It was the negligence of my brother in matters of business letters that was the cause of a great deal of friction and unpleasant correspondence and worry both by father and myself. The underscoring shows the recognition of this fact. All the way through the connection and clearness are as perfect as any conversation between two living persons and superior to much that goes on over the telephone.—J. H. H.

Note 89.—I ascertained in the West, rather accidentally while alluding to the pertinence of this reference to my brothers, a fact that gives additional significance to the mention of my brother George in this connection. My stepmother remarked that George was named originally among the executors in father's will which was drawn in 1887, and that afterwards his name was taken off because of dissatisfaction with his business methods, and another named in his place. The reader can determine for himself the unity of consciousness involved in the incident, as it contains personal features which cannot be any more clearly indicated.—J. H. H.

¹ At a sitting on February 5th, 1900, which is not included in this record, my father spontaneously mentions that he had heard of the organ incident after his death.—J. H. H.

Note 90.—Inquiry develops the fact that both my opinions expressed in the original note (p. 493) were correct, and that the incident about the fence related to the farm. My brother and stepmother say that he did not concern himself about the fence around the house out West, and that he was not impressed with the plan to remove it, though not objecting seriously to it. But they say that he did think and talk very much about putting a wire fence on the old homestead farm.

The tax incident also turns out correct, though my stepmother could not recall it. But I had a resource in this instance that I cannot always command for emergencies of this sort. I read father's letters to me from 1892 to the time of his death in 1896. In a letter of July 9th, 1892, he states his situation regarding his taxes, and speaks very pathetically about it, and any one who ever knew how father felt about not being able to pay his taxes would appreciate thoroughly from his language in this letter what his state of mind was and the readiness with which the incident is recalled here beyond the grave. He says in it that they were due and would have to go on the delinquent list in fifteen days if he could not get the money to pay them, as the income from the farm had not supplied him with the necessary means for it, and he so despised borrowing money for any purpose, especially for paying taxes. He had asked one of my brothers to pay them, because I had frequently supplied him with funds between November, 1891, and March, 1892, and he would not ask me for more. My brother failed to pay them at the time they were due, and father wrote me in this letter that they would have to go unpaid and be settled after he was gone, but asked me to advise him what to do and to write this brother about the matter. My recollection is that I did write an urgent letter to my brother about it, but as my own letters to father have been destroyed and my brother does not recall my having done so, the fact cannot be proved more clearly. At any rate, the next letter from father, of August 1st, 1892, states that this brother had promised to pay the taxes, and I learned from my brother personally this summer that he had once paid father's taxes. Since seeing him he has examined his books and writes me that he finds "that in March, 1893, I (he) paid father's tax which was overdue."

The expression "actively helped" in describing the part I played in the embarrassment seems thus to have been exactly what I did without paying the taxes themselves. I had supposed at the sitting that it meant I had also paid them, but it seems that the communicator was drawing a distinction between what he found I had done after his death and what I had done in 1892, so that we have in the incident a very pretty case of refined accuracy in the message which is much more like independent intelligence than anything we know of in telepathy.—J. H. H.

Note 91.—My cousin, wife of this Robert McClellan, confirms my statement about father's excitement regarding this campaign, and adds a feature which makes the statement here still more pertinent, and which I did not know. I interpreted it to mean excitement with reference to the political situation in general, but it seems that, while this is true, father showed special excitement in his talk, or attempt to talk in a whisper, to my cousin

Robert. His wife, the Lucy of these records, was present at the time, and says that father became so excited and overstrained himself so to talk, that they had to stop him and leave to avoid temptation for him, fearing that he would have a spasm of the larynx.—J. H. H.

Note 92.—After what I have said about father's excitement in the previous note the pertinence of the statement here about "the talk with R. about the President" is apparent without comment. It is to be remarked also that it is not a case of suggestion from me, as my question about the walking stick was not calculated in any respect to suggest any such remark from any one except a consciousness to which the unity of such experiences belonged.

Very considerable interest attaches to the attempt to answer my question regarding the "gold bug" on the cane, which I did not suggest, asking merely what it was. The additional notes which I made to the sitting (February 22nd, Notes 35 and 36, p. 415) in which the spontaneous reference to a cane was made will explain much of the pertinence of this passage. But some features of the case will have to be repeated here in order to indicate the significance of the communication. I stated in that note that I did not know, or had completely forgotten about the stick that was evidently in the communicator's mind, and that I had in mind, as here, the stick with the "gold bug" on it and which I had given him. Now it turns out that he had another cane with a curved end which had been given him by his brother-in-law for the one with the initials on it given him by us children, and which the brother-in-law had lost. This curved cane father had broken in two by some prying, and mended with a tin sheath or ring about four inches long. This is evidently the cane father had in mind in the message of February 22nd (p. 397) and as he had used it for many years (since 1876) it was natural to mention it for identification. But it was the fact that it was broken that moved my aunt Nannie to give me the money to buy him another, asking me not to tell him who gave it to him. I bought the "gold bug" stick and gave it to him without telling him that it was a present from his sister. Now it will appear that when he says in answer to my question "who gave you that walking stick?" that I did so, he is correct from the point of view of the stick which I had in mind, but when he says that he told Dr. Hodgson about it he is technically wrong, though right as to the general circumstance. If we could assume that in the confusion evident on February 22nd the "gold bug" cane was actually alluded to as well as the broken cane, but not definitely enough to be recognised, the reference here would be intelligible. The allusion to the "ring on it" would appear to prove that he had in mind the broken cane, of which I was not thinking, as it was the old broken stick that had this "ring" on it. But "ring" would possibly describe the "gold bug" as accurately as the tin sheath on the older cane. The frequent hesitation and dissent in the communication, however, suggests either that Rector's memory was playing a part in it until corrected, or that father was thinking about the case, and after the writing of the "ring" clearly, he suddenly recalls the right cane and suggests the "gold bug" which is drawn, though it is possible that this was what he had in mind from

the moment that I asked my question, and that it was hard to avoid confusion with the more familiar cane and incidents of the earlier sitting.

But even the technical mistake about the giver of the cane that he had in mind has the great importance of showing the unity of consciousness and personal identity between this and the sitting of February 22nd, and brings out reason for natural confusion in the necessary distinctions to be made between three walking sticks under the difficulties of communication which are so marked in these experiments.—J. H. H.

Note 93.—I find that the chest which I had in mind here was one of my grandfather's brought from Scotland and not bought at an auction by father. The attic too that I had in mind was over the kitchen in his house out West. But my stepmother does not remember any "chest" kept there, but only some empty boxes which, so far as she can remember, were gotten at a store and not at an auction. Moreover the chest I had in mind was left behind in Ohio when he moved West. The incident then remains meaningless as it stands.—J. H. H.

July 6th, 1900.—Whilst revising the proofs and examining the record carefully, a suspicion came across my mind that my father might have had in mind a small *closet* under an attic-like stairway leading up stairs, and in which I knew he kept his clothes. I at once wrote to my stepmother and brother to know if father's cane was kept in this closet both before and after his death, and also if there was a chest kept there that had been bought at an auction. The replies were that he kept all his clothes in this closet, that the cane which he did *not* use was kept there before his death, and that the broken cane which he had so long used and to which reference is here made was put into this closet after his death and kept there until the house was sold; also that there was no chest kept there. The allusion to "attic," to his clothing being kept in the "chest," to the putting of his cane there by my stepmother, are suggestive in spite of the confusion.—J. H. H.

July 11th, 1900.—I have just received a letter from one of my aunts in response to an inquiry about another matter altogether, and in which she incidentally and without any knowledge of its pertinence mentions one fact that I knew and another that I did not know regarding the chest mentioned in my first note. Speaking of his military outfit she says: "All I know of your father's sword was when it was carefully laid away in father's Scotch 'chist' in the old attic. When I was a little girl I would cautiously peek in to see it and your father's military hat. I thought they were the grandest things that could possibly be made."

I myself remember that father kept his military suit in that chest, but do not remember seeing the sword in it, or that the chest was kept in the attic. I remember the chest in the new house built in 1861, when the part of the house in which the old attic existed was taken down.

Have we here then a confusion of two separate facts connected with father's clothes? Have we an attempt to mention the chest in which his military suit was kept, and an association in a confused state with the closet in which later his clothes and cane were kept?—J. H. H.

Note 94.—The difficulties attending the final attainment of my information on the passage from John McClellan, and the reference to his lost finger and connection with the war, should be a matter of record here. The clue to my identification of him with the father of my uncle James McClellan was found in the latter's communications on June 6th (p. 470) in which he apparently meant that it was his father that had been in the war. I asked the three sons then living whether their father had been in any war, and received from all three a negative reply. But finding in the history of the county in which he had lived that a "John McClelland" had been commissioned as ensign in the war of 1812 on July 15th, of 1810, I told each of them about the fact, and they admitted that it must have been their father, as they did not know any other John McClellan in that county. The next difficulty which I had to meet was the spelling of the name with the "d," which I had never known to be a fact. Inquiry, however, showed that the family originally spelled it either way, and as the history mentioned had spelled that of Captain Robert McClellan, about whom and about whose connection with that war there was neither doubt nor difference of opinion, in both ways, I felt that nothing stood in the way of supposing that the John McClellan meant was the father of the McClellans connected with me, though it led necessarily to the rejection of several incidents as either unverifiable or false. But in order to obtain official and documentary evidence of a better sort I applied in Washington, D.C., for information regarding the enlistment of John McClellan in the war of 1812. The only hopeful resource was the Pension Office which, however, keeps only the record of those who received pensions, and not of the enlistments. I did not find there any John McClellan or McClelland who would fit my case, though I found a number of pensioners by that name. In the meantime I found by inquiry among the McClellan family which I knew, indisputable evidence that the John McClellan mentioned in the history of Greene County, Ohio, was not the father of my uncle James McClellan. I found that James McClellan's father, John McClellan, had left Westmoreland County, Pa., in 1813, three years after the date of the commission of the John McClellan mentioned in the history of Greene County, Ohio, and settled that year in Wayne County, Ohio. Here he remained until 1831, when he moved to Greene County, of the same state. I also found that the John McClelland mentioned in the history of said county had resigned his commission on August 15th, 1815. The case was thus clearly against the identification of this John McClelland with John McClellan, the father of James McClellan, and in favour of the memory of his sons that their father had not been in the war of 1812.

But the course of my inquiries brought me upon the suspicion that this John McClelland mentioned in the history of the county was the real person for whom I was seeking, and I employed a lawyer friend living in the county to thoroughly investigate the case for me. Among the first pieces of important information was the following from a relative of this John McClellan (omitting the "d" in further mention of him). Mr. Kyle, my lawyer, says: "A man by the name of Howard Sparrow, who married a daughter of Mrs. Beamer, who was the daughter of John McClellan, of Clifton, came to my office to-day and said that he had heard his mother-in-law,

Mrs. Beamer, speak many times of the fact that her father, John McClellan, had lost a finger, and his best recollection is that it was the front finger on the left hand. This was lost by him while he was in the army." From a nephew of this John McClellan, living in another county of the state, I learn that this uncle was in the war of 1812, and that prior to his death he was generally known as "uncle John McClellan" in the community. There are several corroborations of this fact from other sources. This nephew thinks that his uncle was an officer in this war, but does not know whether his uncle lost a finger in it or not.

A later communication from Mr. Kyle says: "I made a trip to Clifton where John McClellan was buried. I found Henry Jamison, whose mother was a daughter of John McClellan, of Clifton. The old family Bible shows that he died December 18th, 1850, and they also knew that he was sick about six years before his death. Harry Jamison's father died seven years ago, aged eighty-one years, and he, George Jamison, was a cousin of the Hathaways. Henry Jamison was of the opinion that the Hathaways lived over toward Dayton where the Jamisons lived, and of course the inference would be that if the Jamisons lived in the same neighbourhood and were cousins, and the daughter of John McClellan married a Jamison, who was a cousin of the Hathaways, that the families probably associated together."

"Henry Jamison also said he remembered of the name of Williams being mentioned, but could not give any account as to how or to what extent they were connected with the McClellans."

Later information from the same source is: "The Williams are a hard family to trace, for the reason that there are so many branches of this family, and they probably associated with John McClellan along in 1825 or soon after. The Hathaways are a family of early date, but seem to have disappeared in the early part of the century."

Note 95.—While reading the page proofs it occurred to me that my uncle was here alluding to my *cousin Nannie*, and not his sister-in-law. I was prompted to this by the possible mistake a little later in the name "cousin Annie." The statement "Annie (my sister) and she are cousins," suggests the inference also, as it is true on that supposition. The mention of "cousin Annie" follows immediately the mention of my sister Annie, and Rector (or the "machine") may have confused my uncle's "cousin Nannie" with the name "Annie" just mentioned. The obverse error seems to have occurred in the communications of my cousin Robert McClellan (p. 231-235) where the proximity of the attempt apparently to say "cousin Annie" (my sister) to his mention of "aunt Nannie" converted the former into "cousin Nannie." Both are cases of *Opisthomimesis* (*Cf.* Footnote, p. 239). The interpretation in each case is confirmed by two considerations: (1) The phonetic character of many mistakes. (2) The *point de repère* of the relationship in the two cases. My cousin stated all the relationships in his communication with reference to himself. My uncle stated them all with reference to myself. The "cousin Annie" of my uncle's message is the same person as the "cousin Nannie" of my cousin's communication, namely, the sister of Robert McClellan. She was very intimate with my uncle and his family, having boarded her two daughters there while they were in the high school (August 6th, 1901).—J. H. H.

APPENDIX IV.

EXPERIMENTS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONALITY.

Introduction.

The following experiments were undertaken for the general purpose of illustrating certain features of the phenomena that have proved of so much interest in the case of Mrs. Piper. They incidentally illustrate also, if they do not prove, the fact that identification of personality may even be possible under less rigid conditions than we have been insisting upon in our reports. But of this in the proper place. The first duty is to describe the *modus operandi* of the experiments, and then summarise the specific objects in mind when undertaking them.

Now the Piper phenomena represent a type of experiment in which we can determine the conditions only at one end of the line. We know neither whether there is any other personality at the other end than that of the brain through which we obtain our facts; nor what the sources of misunderstanding may be, if such personalities other than that of this brain actually exist. Much less do we know with any definiteness the conditions that may aid or hamper real or apparent communications between two worlds, or two different sets of brain conditions. We have only a set of messages presented to us, purporting to come from discarnate spirits, and without the accompanying criteria which enable us in our everyday experience to test the source of the communications from one person to another. If, for instance, we hear a voice in actual life, what it says may confirm our conjecture as to the speaker, and we can also try for some other and different test of the source of the voice. But in the Piper case we have nothing but the bare content of the message, filtered and probably distorted through the medium's subliminal consciousness, and hence there are serious difficulties in forming our judgment of the case. But if we can institute a system of experiments in which both the communicator and the sitter are limited to conversing with each other through messages resembling those in the Piper case, we may come to some

better understanding of what we must allow for in communications obtained with genuine mediums.

With a view, therefore, to illustrate various aspects of the Piper phenomena by experiments in which I could study the conditions at both ends, I arranged a telegraph line between two of the buildings of Columbia University which were about four or five hundred feet apart. The termini were so arranged that parties could be brought to them without seeing each other. I had two telegraph operators employed for carrying on the experiments. The plan was to select two persons who were well acquainted with each other, and who had enjoyed more or less of a common life together, so that incidents common to both their lives could easily be found for the experiment. But only one of the two persons was to know who was at the other end of the line, and it was his duty to select incidents common to the two lives, while I was to send telegraph messages about them to the other person. This latter had to identify the sender, to whom he had not the slightest clue except such as could be ascertained from the messages.

I usually accompanied the person sending the messages, so as to aid in their formation and proper order. At the other end I had an assistant who was to explain to the receiver what he was to do, and also to send any replies that were necessary as guesses or identifications. The assistant was also to make a note of any remarks of the receiver that had a bearing on his guess or decision, and to ascertain by inquiry the reasons for the receiver's judgment in any instance. Occasionally I took this place, and the assistant directed the sending of messages.

I usually allowed the person who was to act as sender to select the one to whom he wished to send messages, but with a strict understanding that no mention was to be made of the experiment. This enabled me or my assistant to arrange with the would-be receiver to take part in the experiment without his knowing the sender at all, and without his knowing the purpose of the experiment until brought to the end of the telegraph line. Here he was merely told that his duty was to ascertain who it was that was sending him telegrams, and to say when he was convinced beyond doubt of the identity of this person. His inferences and judgments were telegraphed back to the sender, in order to regulate the latter's return messages. This was important, because it was a part of the plan followed in the selection of incidents, to start with as vague general messages as possible and to feel one's way to identification, in order to see how early a suspicion of the right person would arise and how indefinite were the incidents necessary to this end.

Also—in order to make the mental situation as much like the Piper case as the circumstances would allow—I had incidents or statements

selected that were either not true, or irrelevant, nonsensical, and misleading, so that the receiver had to make his decision in spite of contradictions and incidents that were not really what they may have appeared to be, and which often had the effect of turning his mind off some particular scent; since it was important, for the sake of studying the receiver's mind, to keep him reflecting on more than one possible sender. It was found necessary to get the cumulative effect of true and identifiable incidents, to outweigh those that were calculated to produce caution and scepticism.

There are no doubt some disadvantages in this deliberate production of incidents intended to confuse the receiver; since the messages could have been sufficiently vague and indefinite to get an accumulative effect without misleading him, while this policy might suggest a suspicion that no part of the experiment was *bona fide* at all. But this is not a serious disadvantage, as in the Piper case there must be uncertainty in this very respect, and it is precisely these uncertainties that force the sitter to wonder whether the incident is what it purports to be, and whether it has the source that it claims to have. Consequently, in order to imitate that experiment, I considered it best to create as nearly as possible the same mental situation for the receiver of the messages as the sitter must have in the Piper experiments. The construction and arrangement of the telegrams were made with that situation in view. There was only one thing that I could not do, namely, state immediately some striking common incident which might lead at once to identification, as this would have prevented any study of the effect of vague statements upon the judgment of the receiver.

The results of the experiments are arranged in three groups, which I have called respectively Groups A, B, and C. Group A represents experiments in which the main or only purpose was to identify a single person, and not much attention was paid to the question whether the irrelevant and false incidents led to any correct identification or not.

Group B, of which there were two experiments, consists of attempts to personate two or more persons in such a way that the main part of the experiment should point to one person, while others might also be identified and distinguished from the main person by incidents that could not possibly belong to the evidence for that person. Thus, the receiver was to decide spontaneously whom certain incidents represented, and to decide in the same way, without interrogation, the incompatibility of the other facts with the same personality. The results show how far this was accomplished. It was difficult, of course, to keep this group and the first wholly distinct in character. But in one particular they are distinguishable, namely, that they are

designed to represent incidental identification of other persons, while chiefly occupied with the identification of one particular person by cumulative incidents.

Group C represents experiments in imitation of the Piper phenomena in respect of incoherences, nonsense, and various imperfections of spelling and expression. The problem of identification is the same in this group as in the second, except that in it the more important element is the number of persons to be recognised incidentally, in addition to the main personality concerned. But the main characteristic is the more perfect imitation of the Piper phenomena. One difference, too, is the fact that this group was carried on without the telegraph lines. The questions were prepared beforehand, and presented to the receiver to be read and examined without going through the more exciting formality of telegraphing. The same fact is true of the second experiment in Group B.

I may now summarise the several objects of the whole series of experiments. I was extremely careful not to breathe the first of these objects to any one, not even to my assistants, so that the results might be entirely spontaneous and without the influence of suggestion from me.

I. To test the extent to which intelligent persons would spontaneously select trivial and unimportant incidents for the purpose of identification—that is, incidents that were not connected, or not necessarily connected, with the main habits of their lives.

II. To test the accuracy of the identification in connection with both individual and collective incidents, and especially to test how slight or how definite the incident had to be in order to suggest rightly the person it was intended to represent.

III. To test the success and personal assurance of the receiver of the messages in guessing who is the true sender, in spite of some messages that are misleading or even false, but the bulk of which involves sufficient cumulative facts to overcome the natural scepticism and confusion caused by incoherences and contradictions.

IV. To study the sources of misunderstanding that might arise under such circumstances when one party was ignorant of the intentions of the other, and the causes of mistakes in identification which we can determine in my experiments, and which are likely to occur in the Piper case.

In regard to the first of these objects, it is very interesting to observe the uniformity with which perfectly intelligent persons spontaneously chose what would generally be considered trivial incidents in order to be identified. This seemed to naturally

recommend itself to them,—perhaps for the reason that trivial circumstances represent far more isolation than any chosen from the main trend of life, though I noticed no consciousness of this fact in any one. It was simply the instinctive method which every one tended to adopt. The records show very distinctly that, if left to themselves, men will naturally select unimportant incidents for proof of their identity, and it is one of the most interesting features of this choice that the individual relied wholly upon the laws of association to recall what was wanted after deciding on the nature of the incidents to be chosen.

Very often there were interesting illustrations of those capricious revivals in memory of remote incidents which not only resemble so much the incidents in the Piper sittings in triviality, but also represent the caprices and incoherences of associative recall, intelligible to the subject on reflection, but hardly so to the outside observer. At any rate, the results in this regard completely remove all objections to the Piper phenomena from the standpoint of the triviality of the incidents chosen for identification, and that is an accomplishment of some worth. On reflection, most persons will at once admit the superior value of such incidents for scientific purposes; but too often, under the *a priori* assumption—encouraged or created by a false idealism about a transcendental state of existence—that discarnate spirits ought to show an interest in more lofty matters, we suppose that the fact of triviality indicates a greater probability for a mediumistic origin than for a spiritistic one. In reality, if the incidents represented were what we might naturally regard as important, they would be of the sort that would either be unverifiable at all, or so common to the lives of people in general that they would be exposed to the fatal objection of guessing and inference. But if the messages describe uncommon and isolated incidents, this explanation must be rejected and the evidential character of the facts recognised, whatever we may think about the conditions of existence to which they may be supposed to testify.

But after all the spiritistic problem is not at stake here and perhaps allusion to it is irrelevant, as the real question in these experiments concerns only the place of trivial incidents in the evidence.

These incidents, being such as are not likely to occur often, materially assist identification, while it is obvious that we can infer nothing from them as to the general conditions of life of intelligent persons. This fact was evident in the experiments here recorded, as the persons chosen for the experiments were of the class whose intellectual occupations and habits of mind could not be depreciated, and yet the incidents chosen for the suggestion of personal identification were much the same as those with which we have to deal in the Piper case. This first object of the experiments, therefore, has been fully

satisfied, and the evidential value of these phenomena vindicated, whatever the theory we adopt for explanation of them.

The problem presented in the other three objects will have to be studied in the details of the records, and in incidents that I, as the experimenter, could observe more readily than a mere reader of the record would observe without suggestion.

But I must first call attention to an important and characteristic difference between these experiments and the Piper case. In the latter there is presumably the utmost effort on the part of the communicator to be identified, and we cannot suppose that there is conscious attempt to divert, confuse, or deceive the sitter as to the personal identity of the alleged communicator. But the purposes of my experiments required some attempt to hold the receiver of messages back from too hasty identification, and in some cases the use of material for at least possible deception. The object was not merely to see how easily the communicator could prove his identity—for this could have been done under the circumstances with the greatest ease—but it was to imitate as far as possible the conditions of the Piper record, which exhibit the necessity of a cumulative character in the evidence and a corresponding suspense of judgment, with as much freedom from suggestion and illusion of interpretation as possible, in order to justify any rational conclusion whatever. Hence, to effect this result, and to study the nature of the incidents upon which correct identification could be based—that is, the degree of evidence, general or specific, on which a true judgment could rest,—I had to adopt a policy of actually holding the receiver back from immediate identification. The incidents chosen at the outset had to be as vague and indefinite as possible, and the communicator had to feel his way along gradually by giving general, or presumably general, incidents with as little suggestive power as possible. This plan enables us to determine the degree of evidence that is at times sufficient for identification, and it is often remarkable how vague the circumstance may be that leads to correct identification, as may be remarked in the special study of the results.

The necessity of following the reverse method of communicating the incidents to what is naturally supposed to be the procedure in the Piper phenomena is due to the reverse conditions in the two cases. In my experiments identification could be easily effected, while in the Piper case the identification is either difficult, or that form of it is difficult which requires the spiritistic interpretation for its explanation. Consequently I had to cultivate indefiniteness of incidents at the outset with increasingly specific character as the experiment proceeded. One advantage, however, I must claim for the experiments is that they illustrate and prove,—as the Piper case illustrates

but does not prove,—the remarkable way in which even the most general incidents may lead to correct identification, thus strengthening the force of those which are specific. There are also good opportunities here for the study of illusions in interpretation, and I shall call attention to this in the proper cases. The object of the diversions and false incidents, often suggesting other persons than the one to be identified, after what has been said about the use of general incidents and the necessity of suspending judgment, will be apparent without any elaborate explanation. They were important aids in the more complete imitation of the Piper case.

Before describing the results in detail, I must make one more remark. I do not pretend that these experiments have any importance except as illustrations. They are by no means numerous enough to prove much that is important. They are mere suggestions of what can be done in this direction, and studies of the resources of chance and illusion in concrete instances. But they cannot be considered as more than tentative efforts to exemplify and study, in the concrete, the phenomena that are connected with the problem of identification under such exceptional circumstances as the Piper record exhibits. Others more generally occupied with experimental psychology than I am may take up the question and reduce it to more perfect form and results. I have been obliged to content myself with the suggestion of it, and with the illustration and at least tentative vindication of the principles upon which the evidential force of the Piper reports is based.

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTS.

When it comes to a detailed examination of the experiments several problems present themselves. They relate to the complex aspects of the Piper phenomena, which are not always so clear as to be free from a certain kind of criticism and objection, at least of the *a priori* sort, even when we feel ourselves able to overcome it. I have dealt with the objection based on the triviality of the incidents, and have shown that this would apply equally to the cases represented in the experiments here recorded. But there is also one that depends on two false assumptions, which may as well be exposed at once. It is that discarnate spirits, if they are supposed to exist, seem to show arrested development in the kind of talk in which they engage. I have only to say in reply to this that the present experiments would seem to show the same condition, if we relied upon the incidents chosen to form our conception of the habits of mind of the communicators. Few, if any, persons could even guess the character or habits of the communicators in my experiments, and I doubt if it would

often be possible in any tests for personal identity. But, supposing that it is possible, it is not a necessary accompaniment of the effort to prove one's identity. The incidents most conclusive for all such efforts must be those trivial facts which can hardly be duplicated in two lives. This aside, however, the attempt to discredit discarnate spirits and their habits of mind by reflection on their choice of incidents to prove their identity meets its refutation in the necessity of coming to the same conclusion about the communicators in my experiments, whom I specially chose as being sane and intelligent men, with occupations supposed to be above trivialities.

I shall have an opportunity to discuss this problem in another connection, and only mention it here as preliminary to another question closely allied to it. I mean the mistakes of memory which must undoubtedly be attributed to the communicators in the Piper case. It may not appear a sufficient answer to this to say that the same mistake is noticed in the sitters, though this is an interesting fact. But I call attention to the mistakes of memory for the purpose of emphasising the circumstance that they appear in the present experiments, precisely as they appear in the Piper phenomena. The assumptions that are made to discredit the spiritistic character of the Piper case are—(1) that discarnate spirits ought not to make any mistakes; and (2) that our own memories are less liable to illusion than those of discarnate spirits. Both of these assumptions are baseless. The doctrine of evolution ought to make us humble enough to avoid the first assumption, to say nothing of the fact that the wonder should rather be that we should have any memory of this life at all, supposing that we survived. I shall next summarise the several points to come under review, which imitate what we have to deal with in the Piper case. They are:—(1) Errors of memory and their effect on the results. (2) Errors of interpretation. (3) Success and failure in identification. Each of these questions will have its subordinate aspect.

1.—ERRORS OF MEMORY.

The illusions of memory to which attention is here called are on the side of the receiver of messages, and illustrate the difficulty of identification at times when we should have expected it to be easy. Perhaps it would be better to call some of them failures of memory, but in any case they are that type of error in recollection which would adequately explain misunderstanding in a communicator. They often show how unreliable anyone's statement is when not accompanied by a record of the facts written at the time. The first of this kind is that of the receiver in the first experiment in Group A, when reporting to me her reason for her guess. Had not my question been recorded it would

have been suspected of greater definiteness than it possessed. The error on the part of the receiver, however, shows the fusion of mental imagery from her own memory with that conveyed by my question, and would spoil any narrative of the affair which had to depend on memory alone (p. 554).

But more important errors of memory are such as show complete failure to identify the communicator when he was confident that his incident would succeed in his purpose. They are illustrated in the following cases:—Group A, Exp. II., Ques. 3 (p. 555); Receiver's remark after Question 6 (p. 556); Exp. VI., most of the questions (p. 559); Exp. IX., note to Ques. 4 (p. 569); Exp. XVI., Ques. 3, 5, 6, and 7 (p. 589). Group B, Exp. II., Ques. 21 and Ques. 30 (pp. 603, 605). Group C, Exp. I., Ques. 11 and 15 (pp. 612, 613). Also Group A, Exp. XI., Ques. 15, 16, and 17 (p. 578); Exp. XI., Ques. 21, note (p. 579); Exp. XVII., Ques. 17 (p. 593).

There are many others of like import, though not so striking. But these suffice to show many instances in which identification ought to take place, but fails. Of course some of the incidents were made vague for the very purpose of testing whether identification would occur on slight grounds, and the failure should not be surprising. But in some cases the very incident which the communicator thought would without fail identify himself had no suggestive power whatever. This was very noticeable in Group A, Exp. XI., Ques. 21 (p. 579); and Exp. XV., Ques. 19 (p. 588). Such facts, involving what is verifiable on the part of the communicator, show what is possible in cases of alleged spirits—assuming their reality—and show that the failure to identify may be wholly due to the sitter. This is specially to be remarked in Exp. VI. of Group A (p. 559), where the communicator finally came to the conclusion that, if he had been a discarnate spirit, it would have been impossible to identify himself to the receiver, owing to the receiver's inability to remember specific incidents in their common lives. The value of this case for this illustration, moreover, lies in the circumstance that, like most cases of spirit communication, a considerable interval of time elapsed between the period of common life and the communications, and the communicator himself could not recall any incidents other than those chosen to prove his existence or identity. Exp. X. in Group A (p. 572) is a precisely similar case. It ought to be apparent what a large share forgetfulness on the part of the sitter has in the difficulties of identification, when attempting to obtain communications from a transcendental state of existence, to say nothing of the forgetfulness of an alleged spirit. The same fact is illustrated in my own sittings with Mrs. Piper, in which my complete forgetfulness of certain incidents led to confusion on my part and failure to identify the

communicator, or even the accusation of falsehood. Some examples of this have been given in my report of these sittings (p. 131).

2.—ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION.

These are of two kinds in the experiments. The first are those in which the receiver recalled an occasion and the communicator had in mind a totally different fact. The second class represents incidents of an apparent significance which turns out to be wholly due to chance, since they represent very different facts in the mind of the communicator.

As illustrations of the first type the following instances may be observed. Group A, Exp. VI., Ques. 5 and 8 (p. 560); Exp. XIV., Ques. 3 and 6 (p. 583); Exp. XVII, Ques. 10, 17 and 21 (p. 592); Group B, Exp. I., Ques. 2 (p. 596); Exp. II., Ques. 10, 11 and 12 (p. 600). No special importance attaches to these cases of error except that they should put us on our guard respecting the temptation to assurance in identification. There are many incidents common to various persons in life and we may easily forget the fact and assume specific peculiarities that do not exist. This, of course, is a truism, and scarcely needs mention here except as indication of the precautions which I have had in mind in forming my opinion on the more serious case of Mrs. Piper. It should be remarked, however, that the incidents that here occasion misinterpretation are often of that general kind which the communicator would recognise as indefinite and liable to the illusion, so that as objections to the Piper case they hardly hold. One important object in these experiments must not be forgotten, and this is that a deliberate effort had to be made to conceal identity for the sake of testing the accuracy of identification by indefinite incidents, and hence it would inevitably occur that the communicator would state general incidents leading to wrong apperceptions. The incidents which constitute the strength of the Piper case, as well as the identification in the present experiments, are far more specific than those that give rise to the misinterpretations here considered. Besides, there are more numerous cases in these very experiments in which general incidents were correctly recalled by the receiver, and in which the identification was correct and quite assured through them, especially when they were cumulative. The correct judgments quite offset the errors. Nevertheless the errors are reasons for caution.

But the most dangerous source of illusion is that type of coincidence which turns out on inquiry from the communicator to have been due to mere chance. The best illustration of this is the cumulative argument, as it appeared to my judgment as receiver, in Group B,

Exp. II., Ques. 10, 11 and 12 p. (600). Here I thought I had a conclusive case of inductive inference as to the person I named as the sender of the messages, but it turned out that, in spite of this cumulative character of the evidence from my point of view, the communicator had no such incidents in mind as I had imagined. It is true that the messages were extremely vague and had not suggestive power taken alone, except Ques. 11, but they are most important examples of the danger of inductive inferences on indefinite hints. I had, however, no assurance to satisfy me until Question 27 was sent, which confirmed strongly the impression given by 26. But it will be apparent that my assurance was very pardonable here when we recall that Mr. Marvin, who had been mentioned in my reply, just happened to come in as my reply arrived, and seeing the possible meaning of the initials G. P., clinched the case by sending the initials of Phinuit, Rector and Imperator. Cf. G. P. interruptions (pp. 211-213) and Miss X's incident (p. 202). My inference at that point became correct, though up to that point it was an illusion, and the coincidence, in spite of collective incidents favouring it, was due to mere chance. The fact, therefore, has its important lesson of caution, and justifies the demands that both specific incidents and a cumulative mass of facts in spiritistic communications should be sufficient to overcome the possibilities of chance as an explanation.

The next incident of a similar character, though not cumulative, is in Group A, Exp. III., Ques. 6 (p. 557). Somewhat similar cases are Group A, Exp. VI., Ques. 5 (p. 560), and Group B, Exp. II., Ques. 3 (p. 599). They show a temptation to identify through very specific incidents which are not in the mind of the communicator, or which merely chance to be common to both persons or exceptional. Of course, in the case of these experiments the nature of them made it necessary to make some attempts to identify that were not *bond fide*, in order to effect a better imitation of the Piper case, in which confusion often occurs. The objection would not apply in cases where there must be assumed a *bond fide* attempt to identify. Only a misapprehension would be possible in this case, or failure to remember. Moreover the objection is more than offset by the large number of correct recalls of persons to whom the incidents would apply as well as to the communicator. In fact this is so frequent as to favour our confidence in memory in spite of occasional or even frequent mistakes. Still we cannot be too cautious in a matter where chance is possible to any extent. Of course, the Piper case represents too much cumulative evidence to be amenable to this objection. For instance, what passes for an incident in it often involves several coincident facts that can hardly be put together by chance. Thus two distinct names, with their specific relation and some characteristic fact in connection with them, will be mentioned, just as they would be in actual life in any narrative involving the

natural unity of consciousness. But in the present experiments the incidents are rather isolated, so that they get a cumulative character only by the comparison of one with another. Consequently, the result in these experiments, if favourable to identification, must give *a fortiori* force to the evidence in the Piper instance. But without urging this comparison at present, there is the admissible danger of not allowing sufficiently for chance in isolated cases of interpretation leading to identification, and we have always to insist on cumulative and specific evidence transcending all possibilities of mere accident.

3.—SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN IDENTIFICATION.

The mistakes in identification furnish a good introduction to comments on the comparison of the successes with the failures in it. The most striking feature of the experiments in this respect is the fact that identification takes place correctly in so many instances on such slight evidence without any cumulative force. It is a striking fact that the experiments actually contrast with the Piper phenomena in this respect. The latter are not only specific facts of very great argumentative force but have that peculiar complexity of cumulative character which is generally illustrated in all such ordinary matters as the conversation between friends over past recollections. In these experiments the complexity of the incidents is far less noticeable, and yet the identification is assured and correct. Quite often a single incident is sufficient to determine the result, and when we can ascertain the reasons from the communicator as well as the receiver, we find them entirely satisfactory. It is interesting to observe that in no case have we allowed ourselves to be governed by so simple a criterion in the Piper phenomena. There we have insisted on more rigid evidence and methods. If then the identification can be justified in the weaker case, it must be justified in the stronger.

There is another point also of some importance in estimating the value of the evidence in these experiments. It is the fact that the identification has to be effected only by incidents and without any suggestion of names. The communicator has to be ascertained solely by the mention of incidents calculated to suggest him. This is often the case in the Piper experiments, but there we are often given a clue in the definite mention of the name of the person from whom the message purports to come. This gives a decided advantage for identification which my experiments do not give. With a certain kind of incidents this linking of the name with them is liable to produce an illusion of identity; but it affords a definite standard for the distinction between the true and the false, and enables the mind to apply more safely the cumulative argument, while it also puts the

sitter in a position to measure more effectively the nature of test incidents, and gives that complexity which the unity of consciousness ought to show. Hence, if we can be so successful at identification by mere incidents without names, and by far less specific facts than the Piper case exhibits, we ought to appreciate the force of the argument for some enormous supernormal powers on the part of Mrs. Piper, whatever the theory we adopt to account for it.

With the advantage that the name is so often given in the Piper case there goes, of course, the liability to illusions of apperception; since we may forget that general incidents may apply to other persons besides the supposed communicator; yet this is perhaps the only real objection to the importance of the phenomena as evidence of the supernormal of some kind. The synthetic unity of individual groups of incidents, to say nothing of the cumulative unity of the separate cases when taken together, constitutes an overwhelming argument for identity, on any theory we may choose to adopt as an explanation. Illusions of apperception, if memory has any place in scientific evidence at all, appear to be almost completely eliminated.

But I shall not insist farther on the *a fortiori* argument from my experiments to the Piper case. My main object was only to call attention to the fact that such a comparison could be made. What I wish to emphasise here is the surprising readiness and correctness with which identification took place in my experiments under less stringent evidence than that which we have been demanding in psychical research. I can lay no stress upon such cases as Exp. I. in Group A (p. 553), for the reasons there explained. But I may express the astonishment that I felt at the time at the readiness of the receiver's guess when the question was so vague. I saw that identification could easily occur under far less exacting conditions than I had dreamed possible, accustomed as I was to treating the far more pertinent and complex unity of the Piper phenomena with so much scepticism. It became apparent at a glance that the incidents had to be far more indefinite in order to secure failure and to test accurately the question I was considering. Further, in spite of the most careful precautions in the later experiments to make the incidents or questions more indefinite and freer from suggestiveness, the identification often took place in response to surprising indefiniteness and on the most slight evidential clues, if the Piper case be the standard by which to measure such evidence. The record shows this to any one who will examine it carefully, and I need not mention specific instances of it. Only three failures may be said to have occurred, and one of these was caused by a misunderstanding of the nature of the experiment. This was Exp. XV., Group A (p. 586). The other two are Exp. VI. (p. 559) and X (p. 572). The former finally succeeded in

identification, and cannot be marked as a total failure. Hence there is but one total failure in identification, and I was struck at the time with the cause of this failure, which was the undoubted inability to spontaneously apply inductive reasoning to the messages. I found the case an illustration of the difficulties under which a discarnate spirit would have to labour in proving its existence to most people. I exhausted all my resources, except giving my name, in the choice of incidents by which to identify myself, and failed. It is true that they were of a somewhat different kind from those in other experiments, but they were all that I could command in the case, and seemed to me in most instances to be very definite, as I still think they were. But the fault was in the defective observation, recognition, and inductive reasoning of the receiver. In all other cases, especially where the mind of the receiver was alert and interested, the identification occurred on slighter evidence than I had supposed possible.

In two of the experiments this identification and its assurance were very striking. These are Exp. XIV., Group A (p. 583), and Exp. I., Group B (p. 595). In the first of these I threw in incidents for the purpose of diversion and confusion, as well as to test the possibilities of my own identification without any temptation to fuse my identity with that of the person chiefly concerned. The case could be classed in Group B on this account. But the spontaneous distinction between myself and the personality of others by the receiver after Question 8 is clear. The second instance is still better. The distinction between myself and the person I was representing was marked and positive, which was just what I intended or hoped to see, and all this, we must remember, was done without any suggestion of names. [For Remarks on Personation see p. 617.]

The summary of the case for identification involves a distinction between several forms of it. The main distinction must be between the persons that were intended to be identified and those that were not, and both compared with the failures. I shall group them as follows :—

1. Number of cases identified that were intended.	Class A.	
2. Number of correct incidental identifications.	Class B.	
3. Number of failures at identification.	Class C.	
Class A.	Class B.	Class C.
17	51	2

In Class A, I have placed only those representing the persons acting as communicators, or, as in two cases, personated for the purpose. I have placed one in the failures in spite of the fact that it was due to a misunderstanding of what was wanted, and would in all probability have been a success but for that misunderstanding. I

have also placed a large number of successes among the incidental cases, Class B, because they were not communicators. They represent identification on slight but pertinent clues, and were perfectly correct, though not always entitled to any importance from a scientific point of view. Some of them, however, were actually intended in the messages of the communicator, and might very well be reckoned among the cases in Class A. As it is, we have 17 successes against 2 failures, and on evidence immeasurably inferior to that in the Piper case. If we now add to these—as we have a right to do from the standpoint of intention on the part of the communicator—all those among the incidental cases that were intended by the communicator to mislead or encourage suspense of judgment on the part of the receiver, we should have the following tabular account, thus reckoning in Class A 24 intended identifications among those in Class B.

Class A.	Class B.	Class C.
41	27	2

This table makes the case stand 41 successes to 2 failures, with the outstanding possibility that the 27 cases in Class B. might be given some weight on the side of Class A. It must be remembered, also, that I have left wholly out of account Exp. IX. in Group A (p. 567), in which I might have counted several successes.

I add a few remarks concerning Group C. As intimated, it was carried on without the telegraph arrangement. This enabled me to imitate the Piper experiments more accurately. I could work up the incidents so as to imitate the incoherences and confusion of different incidents so common in the Piper record. If the case is examined, it will be found to reproduce many of the features of the Piper sittings. But in spite of incoherence and confusion of distinct incidents, the "sitter" almost unfailingly identified the right person, even when indicated out of his proper connection, or the right event or place, and located them properly. I met the same surprise here, as in my first experiments, at the slightness of the clue necessary to lead to identification. The direct recognition by Mr. G. of his father at the use of the word "anthropogenic" (see p. 610) was a brilliant and suggestive act. Nor was the recognition of his connection with a murderer less interesting. But perhaps the slightest clue of all was that by which he guessed Philadelphia (see p. 611). There was here nothing but a remote symbolic suggestion, and yet it was prompt and accurate. The miserable pun which I made on the name Housatonic (name of a river)—namely, "How's a tonic," with a reference to saying mass for some one's soul for the State in which the river is—did not fail to suggest what I intended, in spite of the incoherence in the message. It was also most interesting to remark that the two incidents which

the father chose with the greatest confidence that they would identify himself or his wife were the names of Harrison Avenue and Ives Place, the latter being the name of the farm where the receiver was born ! But if the reader will examine carefully the messages and the guesses, he will find how astonishingly accurate the receiver was on slight clues and amid difficulties that some of our scientific Philistines would regard as insuperable. In other words, the judgment of identification in this and the Piper case unquestionably represents some claims to scientific consideration, to say the very least that can be said of it. We may not be satisfied with the verdict in favour of spiritism in either case, and I do not care to enforce that conclusion ; but on any theory the significance of the facts for some important conclusion must be recognised, and if experiments of this kind spontaneously reproduce a record like that of the Piper sittings, we must admit that the latter has some weight as evidence of spiritism. We find further that these experiments completely refute all objections based on the triviality of the incidents, and show indubitably that we have no right to draw any conclusions from them as to the character or habits of mind possessed by the communicators.

5.—SUMMARY.

The important matters of interest in these experiments and comments upon them may be summarised in the following manner, which shows further the points of comparison between them and the Piper case.

1. The spontaneous choice of trivial incidents by the communicators for the purpose of identification.

2. The illegitimacy of inferences as to the character or mental condition of communicators drawn from the nature of the incidents for identification.

3. Correct identification of names from mere incidents common to two lives, or correct judgments in regard to facts only hinted at.

4. Identification of persons on slight but pertinent clues, which are without cumulative force.

5. The establishment of assurance in regard to the communicator, in spite of incoherence and diversions or contradictions.

6. Errors of memory on the part of "sitters" that lead to confusion and failure in recognition.

7. The natural differences in the personal equation affecting the choice of incidents for identification, as illustrated in the failure to recognise incidents or persons—*e.g.*, Group A, Exp. I., Ques. 3, and others.

8. Occasional liability to illusion from the element of chance, unless the incidents become cumulative enough to overcome it.

9. Difficulty and confusion in the communicator when trying to select at once incidents for identification.

This last feature cannot be appreciated by the reader of this record, but could be detected only by an eye-witness of the experiments themselves. Being a witness of them I was struck by the fact which is also noticeable in communications with the telephone when the party is limited in time for his communications. The communicator's mind being set in the direction of specifically pertinent incidents for identification in reference to a particular friend, and being limited in time for their choice, there was the interesting mental struggle and confusion which every one could observe for himself in the play of association endeavouring to make the right selection of incidents for the purpose. We can imagine the situation of a discarnate spirit which can have but a few minutes at least for communication, and probably working under enormous difficulties of which we know nothing, to say nothing of the wrench that death might give the memory, if the usual physiological theories of that faculty are to be accepted.

GROUP A.—I.

Columbia University, *January 30th, 1899.*

Communicator : Mrs. H. Receiver : Miss B.

1. Mrs. H. sends telegram : Well, how are you ? It has been a good many years since I first met you. You were about twelve or thirteen years old, and wearing short dresses. We soon became good friends. Am I a man or woman ? Can you guess ?

Miss B. (at other end) : That's Mary.

(I said, "You will have to guess again," and found from her remarks that Miss B. thought she had made a mistake, though, in fact, she was correct.—J. H. H.)

2. Telegram from Mrs. H. : I was married eight years ago, and you are not married yet, I believe. At least, no one has told me of such a thing. I have often seen you since our acquaintance both in New York and elsewhere. In fact, I have spent summer vacations where you did the same, though this was not where we met. It was not so far from New York. Now guess again.

Miss B. : I think that's Mary again.

(I made some remarks to leave the impression that I did not know who was at the other end of the line, and said that both she and I had to find out.—J. H. H.)

3. Telegram from Mrs. H. : Were you ever in Boston ? Have you ever taken a ride up the Hudson ? Do you like music ?

Miss B. : I never had the pleasure of meeting this person in Boston. I have been up the Hudson many times. Yes, I like music.

4. Telegram from Mrs. H. : I remember that you met an aunt of mine

where you used to spend some of the vacations. She was a little hard of hearing. She and I used to talk about it.

Miss B. : Mary again.

("How do you know?" I said—J. H. H.)

Miss B. : Everything in the telegram points that way. She's the only one that will answer to those in my mind.

5. Telegram from Mrs. H. : I used to go with your mother to concerts. That was when you were young. We had such good times together. Afterwards we met in New York, and it has been some time since we have seen each other. If I could well come to see her I would do so, but I have my children to care for, and am too busy to take the time. Besides I live where it is not so convenient to call as it was once.

Miss B. : I am certain of it. It is Mary. I know it cannot be any one else.

(On inquiry why she had guessed my wife so quickly as to be practically certain at the first telegram, though I succeeded in throwing her off the scent for the moment, she replied that she knew from the age mentioned that it could be no one else, and that at that age, "twelve or thirteen," she was only at one place, and that was in Germany during the whole time. This narrowed the guess down very much, and, of course, shows that my question was a mistake on my part. I should have made the time more indefinite. Had I known that this explicit age would have fixed both the time and the number of acquaintances so narrowly, I should have said something more indefinite. Besides, there is the fact that both my acquaintance with Miss B. and the difficulty I had in securing her co-operation, taken with the fact that her family and mine exchange frequent social calls, would tend to suggest my wife. Consequently, I cannot attach any interest to the success of her guessing.)

I do not require to record any of the remaining questions which I intended to telegraph, or have telegraphed to her, but can only say that they led gradually to more specific incidents in the lives of Mrs. H. and Miss B., so that if the guess was not made on the indefinite ones it could be made on the more distinct incidents. The other cases are better.—J. H. H.)

February 5th, 1899.

I wrote to Miss B. a few days after the experiment to ascertain her reasons for making the inference she did at once after the first message, and also to see if my conjecture made above about the mental situation calculated to suggest the communicator was correct. The following is the lady's reply.

J. H. HYSLOP.

DEAR PROFESSOR HYSLOP.—The impression I retain of the first telegram is that it was as follows: "I met you abroad when you were twelve or thirteen years of age in short dresses. I have met you since in this country and we have become good friends. Am I a man or am I a woman?" or words to that effect. I answered, "Mary." This was the first and most natural thing that occurred to me. In fact I did not exert my mind in the least as my belief all along was that the whole affair of the telegrams was a blind to put me off my guard for the real test. I felt, of course, that you had something to do with the concoction of the messages, and this undoubtedly

influenced me. It could hardly be otherwise. She was the only person, I felt, that you knew I could have met in this way, and my answer seemed the inevitable one.—Very sincerely,

O — B —

(The original question will show the reader that I had not inserted the word "abroad" in the message, and that I made no allusion to the communicator's meeting the receiver in this country. This is an interpolation of the receiver's, a very natural illusion in the case. The remainder of the letter confirms my suspicion of the influences that suggested the answer and the mistake of putting the question in the form it has. But I had neither suspected nor prepared myself for the possibility of carrying on the experiment to identify any one else. I merely saw that in all future questions I had to be more indefinite.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—II.

New York, *January 30th*, 1899.

Communicator: Miss O. Receiver: Mrs. H.

In this report, instead of indicating who is sending the telegrams by giving the initials as before, I shall simply adopt the abbreviation "Com." for communicator and "Rec." for receiver.

I had managed to bring Mrs. H. down to the place for the purpose of communicating with Miss B., and before coming told her that it might take until twelve o'clock. I did not tell her that it was my intention that she was to act as receiver. As soon as Miss B. had succeeded in assuring herself of the person at the other end, I telegraphed to Mrs. H. that I wished her to guess for some one. I then ordered the telegrams to begin.

It should be further said that I had called at Miss O.'s home on Saturday last without Mrs. H.'s knowledge. Mrs. H. had understood that I was going to the college. I had talked the telegrams over in order to make them as indefinite as possible and in order to shape them in such a manner as to avoid early guessing.—J. H. H.

1. Com. : Mrs. H., how are you? You ought to know me when you learn that I, at least, know where you live. I think I have met you several times during the last few years. It was in connection with a friend of yours.

No guess made by receiver.

2. Com. : Do you know any one that you met at a reception in this city who might be communicating with you in this way?

Rec. : Is it a person who can be seen on Madison Avenue?

Com. : No. (This answer was sent by my order, but it was a mistake to have done so. It should have been oracular.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : I remember that the first time I ever tasted German coffee cake was at your house. Do you know who that was? (*Cf. Q. 10, p. 564.*)

(Receiver made no guess here, but tells me after her return home that the statement had no meaning for her. I explained that Miss O. told me that the incident was a real one and that it took place at our house, Mrs. H. having thought it nonsense to throw her off the track or confuse her, and not having any memory of any one eating German coffee cake at our house.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Do you remember that either the intermezzo or the largo was played at a reception on Seventy-fourth Street, and that you and I talked about it?

(My assistant at the other end of the line records that Mrs. H. said to him : "I don't know any one that lives on Seventy-fourth Street," and then telegraphed to "Com." the following : "Was the reception on Seventy-fourth Street a junior reception to seniors at the French School?" I had no reply sent to this question, but went on with the next telegram. J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you remember that Mr. Hyslop described to me the process of making wine and that he took me afterward to the cellar to show it to me? Guess again.

(My assistant records Mrs. H.'s remark as follows : "He has done that for too many people for me to distinguish.")

6. Com. : You and your husband once took dinner at our house and Mr. Hyslop talked with my uncle on some interesting questions connected with his work at Columbia. It was in the spring.

Rec. : I think it is Miss Eleanor Osborne.

(I sent back the reply : "Guess again, and be certain about it."—J. H. H.) (My assistant records Mrs. H.'s further remark : "I do not remember the other things in connection with her.")

7. Com. : I met you first at a Barnard tea, and afterward at several functions of this kind.

(My assistant records Mrs. H.'s remark : "I think it must be she. This is the answer to question four." This is correct, but I went on with the next message.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : I remember also an intimate acquaintance of yours who attended Barnard, and with whom I used to study down there. We used often to discuss the Civil War, she defending the Confederate side and I the other. Could you guess me?

Rec. : I'm sure it is Miss Osborne. (My assistant adds Mrs. H.'s remark : "The person with whom she conversed on the war was Miss Hall.")

(I here sent back word that the guess was correct, and said it was not necessary to go any further with the experiment. But I had gone only half-way through my intended questions, which gradually became more specific, though the tenth was intended to throw Mrs. H. off the scent.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—III.

New York, *January 30th*, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. McW. Receiver : Dr. V. I.

1. Com. : I have known you for about a year. Who am I?

Rec. : Go ahead. (My assistant records Mr. V. I.'s remark to him as follows : "Probably some man about the university."—J. H. H.)

2. I met you in the Geological Department.

(My assistant records remark : "That perhaps restricts it to some one in the Geological Department."—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : I met you in your own room—the museum.

(Receiver makes no guess.)

4. Com. : I saw you once at a concert.

Rec. Did I see you there ?

Com. : Possibly.

5. Com. : The concert was at Carnegie Hall.

Rec. : Either McW. or McD. [Nearly correct, as reader can see.—

J. H. H.]

Com. : Have to try again.

(My assistant records Mr. V. I.'s remark : "I don't think McD. saw me."—J. H. H.) [This shows the judgment correct.—J. H. H.]

6. Com. Do you still wear that giddy necktie you had last fall ?

(This question was sent in order to create a diversion and to cause a break in the chain. Mr. McW. told me that he did not know of any reason for asking such a question, so far as his own knowledge went, and that it was simply a wild question. After the experiment was over Dr. V. I. said that the question had thrown him completely off the track, because he had bought a red necktie last fall, and was wearing it then, and had thought of a Mr. B., a freshman, who used to joke him about it, but that he, V. I., could not think him here.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Do you remember that when I met you in the museum you showed me some rare fossils ? Who am I ?

Rec. : Dr. Savage.

8. Com. At the concert we looked at a score together.

Rec. : McW. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

Com. : Well, we shall see.

9. Com. : How are you getting along with the flute ?

Rec. : McW. without question.

(This was correct, and the guess had been so several times, and it seemed unnecessary to do any bluffing, as it would only have taken up time and ended in the same result.—J. H. H.)

REMARKS.—Mr. McW. had met Dr. V. I. only comparatively recently and had not been with him so very often, and was not an intimate acquaintance of the gentleman. It is possible that this fact may have helped to run down the right person in the guessing, but the main facts were vague enough for us to have expected more delay in the success, except perhaps for the possibility always that the incidents or questions may have a much narrower significance than even the interrogator might suppose. The reading of the score together might not have been a frequent incident, as it turned out it was not, in the experience of the receiver. It was *a priori* probable also with McD.—J. H. H.

GROUP A.—IV.

Communicator : Mr. McW. Receiver : Mr. F.

1. Com. : I have seen you about Columbia for several years. Who am I ?

Rec. : Can't guess.

2. Com. : During nearly all this time I have known you.

Rec. : No clue.

3. Com. : A short time ago I met you with another friend about your height.

Rec. : Was this friend a student? There is no clue.

Com. : You must guess.

4. Com. : We walked over to the elevated railroad together.

Rec. : It is McW.

(My assistant adds Mr. F.'s remark : "This is the only one Hyslop would know.")

5. Com. : Have you received your doctor's degree yet?

Rec. : Ask another.

6. Com. : Is Prof. C. at Columbia to-day?

Rec. : Is it German?

(This is the name of another student friend. When I read it and until copying it down I thought that it was intended as a mere bluff or diversion to indicate to us at the other end of the line that the sender did not propose to be thrown off the track. But as I now recall the name of the student, I see that it is intended as another guess.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : We recently talked about recent educational developments at Columbia.

Rec. : Is it Jones?

Com. : Try again.

8. Com. : We spoke especially of the department of Psychology.

Rec. : Is it Judd? (My assistant adds receiver's remark : "Walking to the elevated is the only clue.")

Rec. : Once more.

9. Com. : I invited you to call at my office.

Rec. : Is it McW. ("Decided clue," said to assistant.)

10. Com. : Are you not studying after images? What are they any way?
(Assistant records receiver's remark : "Still think it McW.")

Rec. : Have you forgotten the numerous papers I had in C.'s Seminar?

11. Com. : Which one of C.'s Seminar's?

Rec. : '95-'6. '96-'7. Still think it McW.

12. Com. : I met Houston a few days ago on Broadway. He has a heavy beard.

Rec. : McW. (To assistant : "Decided clue.")

13. Com. : I saw you on college campus this morning.

Rec. : McW.

(This was correct and assured, and there was no use in going any further with it. The main object was to see whether the receiver would come back to his first correct guess.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—V.

New York, January 30th, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. McW. Receiver : Mr. F.

1. Com. : I have known you off and on several years. Who am I?

Rec. : Dr. Hyslop.

2. Com. : I met you not long ago on a car.
Rec. : Where ?
3. Com. : It was a trolley car.
Rec. : Was it in Newark or New York ?
4. Com. : It was in the evening.
(Receiver remarks to assistant : " No clue.")
5. Com. : It was a Sunday evening.
(Receiver remarks to assistant : " Couldn't have been here. No clue. Don't recall any such circumstance.")
6. Com. : I have heard that you teach French at Columbia University.
Is that so ?
Rec. : Did I see you on the car ?
7. Com. : Do you have advanced or introductory courses ?
Rec. : Go ahead.
8. Com. : You mentioned Newark. Do you live there ?
Rec. : Did I see you on the car ?
Com. : Yes.
9. Com. : When I met you on the car it was on a principal street.
Rec. : Go ahead.
10. Com. : I got on the car as you got off.
Rec. : It is McW. Did I step all over your feet ?
Com. : Try again.
Rec. : You took my cousin home from church that night and had just left her house.
(This answer was so explicit and correct that the experiment was not continued.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—VI.

New York, *January 30th, 1899.*

Communicator : Dr. M. Receiver : Mr. McW.

This experiment is a specially interesting one in the influence of preconception, and has its lessons of caution, though in the end the preconception is overcome and the identity of the right person discovered.

1. Com. : How long ago is it since you saw me at an alumni meeting ? They told me that you were assisting in music.

(No reply.)

2. Com. : I never knew you were musical.

(No reply.)

3. Com. : What on earth are these experiments for ? They tell me Hyslop is back of them.

Rec. : Ask him, not me.

(A little suspicion might have suggested that this question was a ruse, as the person sending messages had to be acquainted more or less with both the nature and the object of the experiments.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Did not I see you at the opera the other night ?

Rec. : You ought to know. Did I see you ?

(Receiver remarks to me : " I suspect that it is Keppler.")

5. Com. : I don't know.

Rec. : What night were you at the opera ?

Com. : Last Wednesday.

Rec. : It is Keppler.

(It was a fact not known by the communicator that Mr. Keppler and Mr. McW. had each seen the other at the opera without either knowing this of the other at the time.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : I have been looking at the library building. It is fine.

Rec. : Is it Keppler ? Am surer yet.

(The sender did not intend this question to suggest this person, but only to lead up to something else, and it is interesting to see the receiver's reason for guessing him. He remarked to me that he did so because K. likes opera and is interested in photography, which he had applied to the library. "Everything so far sent belongs to him." A bystander also remarked the same suggestiveness in all messages.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : They might just as well have built the college up in Yonkers if they expect us to get up here.

(No reply.)

8. Com. : I saw the library when building, but life is too short to get to Harlem more than once a decade.

(No reply.) (Receiver remarked to me : "Makes me think of Keppler more than ever.")

9. Com. : Goodnow ought to have jumped on you. [This was a vague reference to conduct of McW.'s in Prof. Goodnow's class some years before while sitting near Mr. M.—J. H. H.]

Rec. : Why ?

10. Com. : They tell me you are in the old lunatic asylum. I suppose you will be glad when it is replaced by a better building.

(No reply.)

11. Com. : "No, not the hangman's axe bears half the keenness of thy sharp tongue."

(Receiver remarks to me : "This is a quotation from Shakespeare. It is mere rambling on the part of Keppler." The fact was that in the Columbian for 1892, the class book of wit and satire, this was the verse that was supposed to characterise the receiver, Mr. McW. The verse was not recognised at all.—J. H. H.) (Cf. p. 561).

12. Com. : There are lots of things I should like to talk over with you.

Rec. : Mention a few. (The statement was only a diversion.—J. H. H.)

13. Com. : If you pricked that it would bleed. That was a good one, wasn't it ?

Rec. : What would bleed ? (To me he remarked : "Goodness sake, what's that?"—J. H. H.)

(This was a striking incident in the class some years ago, which was as follows : The class was reading Heine, under Professor Boyesen, both Mr. McW. and the sender being in the class together, and when a certain fine passage was read, Professor Boyesen sprang to his feet and exclaimed, "If you would prick that it would bleed." Mr. McW. had come out of

the room after the lecture, and, alluding to the remark quoted, said, "Wasn't that fine?" (Cf. p. 560.)

Com. : A passage from Heine.

Rec. : Why don't you own up, Keppler?

14. Com. : What was that amusing experience you had teaching?

Rec. : Please be more specific. (The question was intended to be a diversion.)

15. Com. : Sie sehen aus als ob ich chinesisches gesprochen hatte.

Rec. : Well, what is Chinese for Keppler?

(This German sentence refers to an incident somewhat similar to that in Question 13. Professor Boyesen had asked a man a question and received for answer nothing but a blank stare. Professor Boyesen blurted out the sentence that the communicator here quotes, and after the class Mr. McW. spoke of it as if it was to be remembered.—J. H. H.) (Cf. p. 560.)

16. Com. : Do you remember making any one laugh in college?

Rec. : Yes.

(Receiver remarks to me : "Anybody would guess that. It is certainly nothing but Keppler fooling around."—J. H. H.)

(Receiver had made the practice of making the sender, who sat next him in the class, laugh a great deal.—J. H. H.)

17. Com. : Who?

Rec. : You, I suppose.

18. Com. : You told me about your visit at Cattell's.

Rec. : When did I tell you?

(This question was a true incident of recent date, but rather general, and was intended to bridge the chasm between earlier and later events.—J. H. H.)

19. Com. : What results did you get in your experiments in attention?

Rec. : I never performed any except this one.

(The communicator had only two or three years ago been the subject of some experiments on attention, or the influence of outside incidents upon action intended to be under the control of attention.—J. H. H.)

20. Com. : Say, did we bother Cattell?

Rec. : Do you mean to-day?

Com. : Long ago.

(This question refers to an incident just after performing the experiment alluded to in Question 19. Mr. M. and Mr. McW. went after their experiments into the next room and carried on such a disturbance that Mr. McW. expressed a fear that they would disturb the person named.—J. H. H.)

Rec. : Please tell me just when you refer to.

Com. : When experimenting in attention at 49th Street.

Rec. : Oh, yes, you mean with the telegraph key.

(Receiver remarked to me : "Still Keppler, as I think he experimented with me."—J. H. H.)

21. Com. : I remember you spoke about the difference between a tone when held a short time and when held a longer time.

Rec. : Go ahead.

(This statement refers to a conversation of later date than the previous events, and seems to have had no suggestiveness.—J. H. H.)

22. Com. : You seem to have forgotten some of Boyesen's best remarks.

Rec. : For instance ?

(Receiver here remarked to me : " If Keppler did not help me with those experiments, it is narrowed down to Franz. But Franz did not go to the opera."—J. H. H.)

23. Com. : Questions 13 and 15.

Rec. : Yes, I remember, but say, Keppler, are you not getting tired ?

24. Com. : After Strong's lecture you met me at the entrance to the library going upstairs to read Wundt's Studien.

Rec. : Had you attended the lecture in question ?

Com. : Yes.

25. Com. : I met Morgan of '92 the other day.

Rec. : Did he say, " Hello, Keppler, how are you ? "

(The communicator tells me that he sat between Morgan and McW., the receiver, in the class, and that Morgan was very intimate with McW.—J. H. H.)

26. Com. : Morgan and you used to make me laugh.

Rec. : Were you in the class of '92 ?

(It was astonishing to the sender that this with 25 had not suggestive influence, as ought to be apparent to any one.—J. H. H.)

27. Com. : Don't you ever take lunch here Tuesdays ?

Rec. : Yes, I shall gladly accompany you next Tuesday. (This question was intended as a diversion.)

28. Com. : Didn't Terwilliger get the mathematical prize in the Freshman year ?

Rec. : Yes, go ahead. (Receiver writes on paper that he suspects Marvin.)

(The pertinence of this question will be seen by the receiver's further remark to me :—" Keppler was not in college at this time. Marvin was, and he sat beside me with Morgan on the other side." The communicator, in explaining the question, says that Mr. Terwilliger and the receiver were very intimate, the former having since died, so that the question with the discrepancy of time and the suggestiveness of a few of the later questions began to tell on the receiver, and to break up his pre-conception.—J. H. H.)

29. Com. : Goodnow used to get mad at my laughing, you sinner.

Rec. : I never had a course with Goodnow, did you ?

(As a matter of fact, both students had a course in Sophomore History with the Professor named, and it was in this class that the experience with the laughing took place, which the communicator remembers so well, and the receiver seems to have so completely forgotten.—J. H. H.)

30. Com. : Did Goodnow teach you history in the Sophomore year ?

Rec. : No, Dunning.

Com. : Didn't Goodnow one term and Dunning the other ?

Rec. : Possibly, but I don't remember.

31. Com. : Can't you let a man get some lunch ?

Rec. : Why don't you give me some definite clue ?

(The fact was that only a few days ago Mr. McW., the receiver, was at the window of his room on the college grounds, and said to the sender in

regard to another man that he would be over at his room in a minute, and told the sender to hurry up and get his lunch.—J. H. H.)

32. Com. : You and Morgan used to keep me laughing in Sophomore History.

Rec. : Did you sit near us ?

(Compare this question of the receiver's with his remark to me after receiving Question 28. A discernate spirit would have no chance to identify himself under such conditions.—J. H. H.)

Com. : Yes.

Rec. : In the next seat ?

33. Com. : You might have caught cold in the open window.

Rec. : I guess Marvin.

34. Com. : Have they built a post-office in your town yet ?

Rec. : Something sensible !

35. Com. : I have a lecture to-morrow morning at 11.30.

Rec. : With whom ?

(The statement was the reiteration of what the communicator had said in the receiver's hearing two hours before as he left the room where we were to go over to the other end of the line. It was, of course, as a blind that it was said, and was repeated here as a sort of ruse before the next question.—J. H. H.)

36. Com. : I sat next to you in history.

Rec. : Is it Marvin ? (Receiver remarks to me : "I feel rather sure from some things." But just think of this question after what has already been said in the case.—J. H. H.)

37. Com. : I was going down the steps to lunch when you appeared at the open window and suggested my hurrying up.

Rec. : Marvin, sure.

(At last the preconception was broken and the identification assured. But it was accomplished only by means of the most recent events, and by the clearest incidents that the communicator could imagine.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—VII.

New York, *January 31st*, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. J. Receiver : Mr. B.

1. Com. : Do you remember having met a friend some time ago ?

(No reply.)

2. Com. : Have you lately translated any English poems into French ?

Rec. : Is it Page ?

(The question implies a true incident, and one that the person named in the answer most probably knew.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : Do you know anybody living up town near Amsterdam Avenue ?

Rec. : Give us another.

(This question would imply Mr. Page as well as the communicator.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Have you ever called on President L. ?

(No reply.)

(The communicator and receiver had called on person named together.—
J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you remember some of our walks in the morning ?

Rec. : Go ahead with another.

(Question was a diversion.)

6. Com. : Do you take any lessons in French ?

(No reply.)

(The question again was a diversion, though it implied a true fact. With
a preconception it might have been suggestive.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : I wear glasses.

Rec. : Everybody here wears glasses.

(Statement was pertinent, and so was the answer.)

8. Com. Have you ever had any illusions ?

Rec. : Is it J. ? (Full name given.) [Correct.—J. H. H.]

(After a lecture once which the sender was giving and which the receiver
attended, Mr. B., the receiver, said to the communicator who had influenced
him somewhat: "You have taken away my illusions and given me others."—
J. H. H.)

Com. : Try again.

(This was always used as a diversion, to throw the receiver off the
track and to thus make the result the effect of accumulative evidence.
—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : Whose poems did you recite ?

Rec. : When ?

Com. : A week ago.

Rec. : I am sure it is Page.

(The question implied an incident which the sender knew but did not
witness, though he had talked about it with the receiver, and the person
named had witnessed the recitation.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : It looks like a coffin now.

Rec. : I don't understand.

Com. : You do understand.

Rec. : I do not.

(The phrase here sent to the receiver was one he used in the presence of
the communicator once after cleaning up his desk. His friends made a
standing joke of it, but it should have recalled the communicator, as
intended.—J. H. H.) (Cf. Ques. 3, p. 555.)

11. Com. : Why did you not go to Fall River ?

Rec. : There are many of these questions that suggest Professor Cohn.

(The answer is pertinent, as the receiver had talked about this trip to the
person named and had been "jollied" by him about the coffin incident.—
J. H. H.)

12. Com. : Have you called lately on Professor Speranza's family ?

(No reply.)

13. Com. : Do you remember walking down Amsterdam Avenue recently
with me ?

Rec. : I did with all the persons suggested.

14. Com. : Who knows about your temptation to buy books ?

Rec. : That is J. surely.

(This was correct as before, and was an incident about which there could be no mistake in the matter of identity. After the experiment was completed the receiver remarked to my assistant at the other end of the line : "Most of the questions were closely related to incidents in my acquaintance with Mr. Page. I did not guess Mr. J. at first, as he was Dr. Jones's (assistant at that end of the line) room mate, and because Dr. Jones had asked me to take part in the experiment. I thought that he would not be likely to select Mr. J."—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—VIII.

New York, January 31st, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. McW. Receiver : Professor C.

1. Com. : I have known you for several years, meeting you now and again.

Rec. : Am thinking of Hyslop.

(This would apply to me as it would apply to almost everybody in the University and many outside, so that there is no excuse for guessing me except that fact, and perhaps the suspicion that I was connected with the experiment. But this only shows that it was a mere guess and not an inference from anything that the statement suggests. There was also the habit of mind in C. that induced him to suppose that the party must be about the University. This, again, points to mere guessing and not scientific inference.—J. H. H.)

2. Com. : I once had a ride with you in a buggy.

Rec. : Hallock.

3. Com. : I once spoke with you when you were with James.

(My assistant at the other end wrote down "Hyslop" for the answer, but it is crossed out and was not sent. This is an interesting incident because it is true that I never spoke with the person named when the receiver was present, though such a thing would be an *a priori* probability. The temptation to give my name and then the correction shows that memory does not recall any such fact connected with me.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Do you remember the meeting between us two and Baldwin ?

Rec. : Hyslop.

(No answer being sent to the previous message led me to think that this answer was a good illustration of what I wanted to test by the experiment, for twice in a merely incidental manner B. and I crossed each other's paths in C.'s presence. But there was nothing in the question that would suggest me any more than perhaps a hundred others. But the intended answer to be sent to the previous message indicates what suggests the reply to this one. Having my name in mind the consistency of this incident with it would naturally prompt the reply on that ground and not on that of inference. The reply is therefore liable to the objection that it is an illusion in spite of its correctness.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you not remember telling me about Cope's high position among biologists ?

Rec. : No. (This answer stands in the note of the assistant and was not sent, but in its stead was sent the remark, "Still thinking of Hyslop." The answer "No" would have been correct in regard to myself, but not correct in regard to Mr. McWhood, though it was *a priori* possible that such a remark was made to me ; but unless the incident was explicitly recalled, such a remark should not be interpreted as either a memory of anything or an inference. It is a mere guess and a worthless one at that.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : I called at your house once at Garrison.

Rec. : Franz.

(This was a perfectly absurd guess, because this very man was standing beside the receiver, and could not be the sender of the message according to the whole *bonâ fide* purpose of the experiment. There was absolutely no excuse for such a guess, except that the man mentioned had been at his house, unless there was a misunderstanding on the receiver's part in regard to the nature of the experiment.

Inquiry since writing the note above this line shows that there was just this very misunderstanding, and hence the absurdity of the answer is not admissible from the standpoint of the receiver, but only from the standpoint of my assumption.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : When I called, it was a warm day in summer.

Rec. : Franz.

(This might consist with the message, but it was a wrong guess, and shows the influence of preconception, as was noticeable in more than one of this subject's answers.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : Are you going to lecture at Wood's Holl this summer ?

Rec. : Franz.

(This might be relevant, but it is mere guessing, not inference.)

(This note has to be altered to suit the fact later ascertained about the misunderstanding in regard to the rights of inference. Besides I have since ascertained from Mr. Franz what Mr. McWhood thought was not true, namely, that Mr. Franz had talked about this very thing.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : Should you advise me to read Helmholtz or Stumpf ?

Rec. : Franz or McWhood.

(This was quite a relevant answer in so far as the second name is concerned and if the first person had not been with the receiver it might have been relevant to him, so far as I and the communicator knew at the time. The question suggested authors whom these two students were to read, and most especially Mr. McWhood, they being the chief authors used on the subject of sound, and Mr. McWhood having devoted himself to that of sound.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : Will that article of mine in the *Psychological Review* be reprinted ?

Rec. : Franz.

(This question was intended by Mr. McW. to be misleading, as he had never printed an "article" but only a review in this periodical, and supposing that Mr. Franz would not be guessed, although he had written an article for the *Review*, Mr. McW. thought to divert the clue to some one else than himself, and only got the answer which was perfectly relevant.—J. H. H.)

11. Com. : Will you still edit *Science* next year?

Rec. : Franz.

(This again was a vague question intended to keep the receiver off the track awhile. The answer was recognised as relevant by the sender, but Mr. Franz told me afterward that he saw no reason for such an answer. Mr. Franz, however, has had much to do with the management of *Science*.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : At Garrison we played tennis and you beat me.

Rec. : Witmer or McWhood.

(This was pertinent, though we who were sending the messages had no knowledge of its pertinence to the first person mentioned. But this mention of a person outside the limits of the university illustrates and confirms the principle on which the receiver assumed that the guessing was to be done. There was absolutely no reason to suppose that Witmer was sending the message.—J. H. H.)

13. Com. : I stayed at Garrison a week or two.

Rec. : McWhood, not sure.

14. Com. : While at Garrison I stayed at the hotel and rode out to your house on a bicycle.

Rec. : McWhood.

(This question was intended to close the experiment by a specific incident about which there could be no doubt, and the answer was correct as it had been in several other cases.—J. H. H.)

(NOTE.—There is nothing in this experiment to illustrate as clearly as I should like the correctness of spontaneous inference and verification of 'personal identity by the arbitrary selection of incidents common to two lives. The assumption of the receiver, which is more fully explained in the account of the next experiment, shows that, although the identification was correct in the several instances, it did not represent a process of cumulative facts in reference to one person with irrelevancies which might be calculated to disturb the judgment at times. The assumption that any relevant person could be guessed and recognised spoils this case also. But it still illustrates preconception, though not to the same extent as in the next experiment.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—IX.

New York, *February 2nd*, 1899.

Communicator : Professor Hyslop. Receiver : Professor C.

This experiment turned out absolutely useless for the purpose of the general series. The wrong answer to the first question made it impossible, with the short time of half-an-hour at our disposal, to run the receiver off the track suggested by my name, the reason for which appears in the answer of the same person in the experiment of January 31st.

Before beginning the sending of messages the receiver sent me word that he had only twenty-five minutes at his disposal, while in other cases we had a full hour. The first question was designed to suggest any one of a

group, a small group, of persons about the university and others who may have been at Johns Hopkins University when Professor C. was there. The answer given was absurd, as I was not at this institution until long after the receiver. But in mentioning my name the receiver established the *point de repère* about which some equivocal facts were to turn, and hence their identification with me is liable to the objection of an illusion of identity, though no such illusion is involved. Several later questions were intended to suggest another person in a neighbouring city who was more closely associated with the receiver at the time denoted by the queries than myself. But the false suggestion at first of my name gave an associative clue to some questions that might not have recalled me at all. Hence the success has no value at all in the case. It could only count as a possible illustration of the tendency to accept a hypothesis for a fact that consists with it, but which might not of itself suggest it. This is borne out by the tendency to throw off all irrelevant matter in the case as not calculated to disturb the conviction already formed.

Another fact has some importance in the case. The experimental work of the receiver has been conducted upon the fact that subjects and agents were connected with this university, and his own habits of thought lay at the basis of his first induction, and knowing that I was engaged in the general experiment there was a natural limitation to the number to be guessed from. The same absurd guess was made on the first message on January 31st, as indicated by its language, and more distinctly by his personal statement afterward, when he said that he did not intend it as a guess, because he recognised that the incident did not suggest the name directly. His idea was that being conscious that I was back of the experiment, I had something to do with the message. This is relevant as a guess, but not as a suggestion, and in any case it indicates enough already in consciousness to make the result useless for the problem before us, though the manner of answering and discarding the incidents not relevant to the person suggested at first illustrates more natural control of the clue than was true of many others in the experiments. The experiment, however, is recorded here as it occurred.

1. Com. : Do you remember me while you were at Johns Hopkins ?

Rec. : Hyslop.

(There was no reason, in fact, to suspect this as mine, as I had not been there until long after him. I am not even certain whether any one at this university was there at the time. Hence there is only the name of Johns Hopkins and the fact that I *had* been there to give any pertinence even to a guess, and that only as a person who was connected with the message. But it spoiled the whole result. It would have applied better to another colleague.—J. H. H.)

2. Com. : Do you remember George Morris ?

Rec. : Hyslop.

(This again was a perfectly absurd answer. It was relevant only as implying that I had sent the message, not as a memory of me in connection with George Morris, who had lectured at Johns Hopkins at least near the time that Professor C. was there. But I never knew him, and was not there until seven or eight years after that date. But again the fixity of the

receiver's mind upon my name was such that equivocal incidents were not calculated to throw it off, and the answer to the next question was half suggested by a preconception.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : You and I were at a meeting with T. and S. H. in Philadelphia.

Rec. : I say Hyslop, not sure.

(This answer was pertinent and true. But the two men mentioned have never been at any similar meeting since then, and the receiver had only seen me twice before, and we had not talked together at this meeting. This fact is probably the source of the receiver's doubt in the case. The test of his memory for small incidents independently of these experiments convinces me that it would be too problematic to say that the suggestion had only a possible consistency with the original hypothesis. But this question and several others were designed to lead up to the suggestion of another person, as will appear. But I had to omit two of the intended incidents on account of the *point de repère* already in mind, and consistent with, though not readily suggestible by them.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Who is Dixon Morton?

(This name is the pseudonym of an acquaintance of the receiver's, and more particularly of the man whom I wished to suggest, and who was closely associated with the receiver both as a student and teacher afterwards.)

Rec. : Hyslop.

(This was a perfectly absurd answer to me, except on the supposition that the receiver had read Part XXXIV. of the *Proceedings*¹ and, knowing that I was interested in this subject, inferred that I had sent the message. But this makes the guess absurd in the light of the experiment and its object. The receiver afterward told me that the name had no meaning to him, and that he neither understood it nor sent any reply to it, though I talked with him not more than ten minutes after the experiment. But the fact is that the telegram received from his end of the line stands in the original record in the handwriting of the telegrapher. The probability is that this judgment about it by the receiver is confused with the later reference to the same name where my repetition of it was calculated to throw him off the track. But the persistency of my name in connection with absolutely irrelevant matter appeared to be a case of fixed or persistent ideas that made it impossible to succeed in any reasonable diversions from them. I saw that if this would not break the dominant idea, nothing would do it. But I tried again with an equivocal incident, and the answer remained the same.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you remember any ride to B. M. (name of place) and our talk on your subject?

(We had had the talk, but the ride might have been a possible one with the person in P. whom I wished to suggest).

Rec. : No. (This was pertinent to me, and possibly to the person I wished to suggest.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : Do you remember my squabble with President R.?

Rec. : Think it is Hyslop.

¹ See *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Part XXXIV., pp. 12–22, and 24.

(This is pertinent, but the present tense suggests, especially in the light of the manner of previous guessing, that it is due, not to memory but perhaps to mere conjecture. But afterwards the receiver told me personally that he did not remember any squabble of mine with the gentleman, though he and the man I wished to suggest had had such a difficulty, and he thought it possible that I had had the same experience. It was after all perfectly pointless guessing, so correct in fact that I could only suppose a marvellous memory and give up the task. But I tried again.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : I was in the Associated Press.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(Correct, but is entitled to the same answer even from the standpoint of the receiver's memory as questions that had no pertinence at all.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : I called at your house and talked over psychology.

Rec. : Hyslop.

(This is correct. But there was nothing in the previous answers to suggest that it was due to memory, and I found that the particular visit that I had in mind was actually remembered, though it was quite an obscure incident, and occurring at a time when I should be little remembered by any one. I shaped the question so that it might as easily apply to the receiver's present residence, though it would not be true in that connection, and had my name not already been in the receiver's mind, the statement would not have suggested me, because I had not been able to keep a promise to visit him at his present home.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : You and I were in P., and both know Dixon Morton.

Rec. : Is it D. M. ?

(The guess here was so correct that it confirmed my impression and inference from the mention of my name in connection with this person's pseudonym mentioned above. I felt sure that the receiver had read the *Proceedings* referred to above. But I found, on conversation with him a few minutes afterward, that he had guessed whom I had in mind only from the sound of the name !! and that he did not know who Dixon Morton was. But, imagining that my inference was correct, I resolved to close the experiment, and telegraphed the following.—J. H. H.) (Cf. pp. 540, 551.)

Com. : Yes.

Rec. : Hyslop.

(This, again, seemed pertinent, and I sent the next telegram to settle the identity and not to test the receiver. I had intended it as a conclusive test if some of the others failed, but I threw it in as a finish to the experiment. But the later conversation, which showed that the receiver had guessed D. M. only from a certain resemblance between the names—rather remote in most respects—and hence indicated both that my inference was incorrect and that the guessing of my name in connection with anything in the message sent him, except the allusion to acquaintance, was essentially absurd, and without foundation in memory or suggestion.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : The baby said nothing.

Rec. : Hyslop. (My assistant adds his remark : "Surely.")

(This was the only perfectly pertinent answer in the whole series, though I could not have said so until after my personal talk with the receiver. The incident was one that he could not help referring to me, and the "surely"

only shows that the judgments were mere guesses and not inductive inferences from remembered incidents. The incident, which it is not necessary to detail, would suggest me to any man who had told the story with reference to me at an alumni dinner, and the answer is an unquestionable identification of me, though it adds dubiousness to the pertinence of the others in spite of their objective correctness.—J. H. H.)

NOTE 1.—In regard to the receiver's impression, told me ten minutes after the experiment, that Question 4 had no meaning, and that he had not sent any reply to it, I have mentioned the record in the telegram sent me. The record kept by my assistant at the other end also shows that the receiver's answer was taken and sent.—J. H. H.

NOTE 2.—I had surmised from the answers in this experiment and also the first one with the same receiver, that he was not correctly informed of the nature of it, but that he imagined that he had simply to guess the relevancy of an incident to some person whom it suggested. On inquiry this morning (February 3rd) of the man who was with the receiver at the opposite end of the line, and who was new as an assistant for the purpose of concealing more effectually the probable or possible person communicating, I found that he had not made the duty of the receiver perfectly clear. He reports to me that he had told the receiver the secret nature of certain features of the experiment—that it was one in recognition, and that he would receive messages from some one—but that perhaps he did not make it clear whether the sender was supposed to be necessarily at the other end or not. Afterward Professor C., during the experiment and soon after it had started, inquired whether it could be a person who was there or not. Even this seems not to have evoked any answer sufficiently clear to make the guesses or inferences what they ought to have been and were intended to be on my part. This then fully explains the nature of the answers and the illusion under which I acted from the answers sent.

Nevertheless, though the experiment does not illustrate what I wished to show, it has an interest of another kind. It shows very clearly on the side of the receiver just what influence preconception will have upon the judgment and how many identifications in the Piper case must run this gauntlet before they are granted any evidential value. On the other hand, the similar illusion under which I had to act in the interpretation of the result illustrates the cross purposes under which communications between two personalities must be conducted when there are either extreme difficulties in the way of its being effected at all, or similar difficulties in the way of a ready understanding. There is in this experiment some resemblance to the confusion in the Piper phenomena where the communications, at least so-called, show similar misunderstanding, though there we often have the time and opportunity to correct them. Here I could not do so, as this would lead to my identity in a way contrary to the object of the experiment. Further it illustrates well how that confusion may arise in a sitting and perhaps not be corrected because of the failure to have a second one, and the consequence is that the case is given up as useless. But when we know the cause of failure, if that is possible, we might have reason to see that the facts are at least not opposed to the natural supposition that it is supernatural. The mistakes and illusions in the experiment here described are perfectly

natural to both parties in the case and can be definitely determined and proved, and enable us to say whether the results are good for anything or not. This is not always so easy, if possible at all, in the Piper instance, but the difficulties are of the type here indicated and show that we cannot form a negative judgment on the ground of them.

In connection with the presence of preconception and its influence on the receiver and perhaps the communicator as well, there is a more important resemblance to the Piper case. Here I was endeavouring to suggest another person than myself and one more intimately associated with the receiver at the time of the incidents and the place in which they occurred than myself. Now if we suppose that I was that person and trying to make myself known to the receiver in the broken way that the Piper incidents exhibit, it would appear that I utterly failed in this, and only suggested another person altogether. On the other hand, the receiver, starting out with a false idea of the limitations under which the inferences were to be made, first supposes this other person (myself) and with this preconception—created as much by a knowledge of my connection with the experiment as by the assumed privilege of supposing any one besides the communicator as the sender of messages—it was natural to stick to the personality of the one first thought of, if the incidents mentioned later were consistent with it, and to discard as irrelevant all matter not consistent with it. Hence the only reason that any correctness can be attached to the judgments of the receiver, in the first incidents, is the fact that I had deliberately chosen cases of an equivocal character, which, some of them at least, were relevant to both myself and the person I had in mind. The misunderstanding in regard to the duty of the receiver, the assumption as to possible persons within the limits of the guessing, and the preconception established by the first supposition prevented any suggestibility being found in the incidents intended to suggest the identity of another person altogether. This illustrates many incidents in the Piper phenomena, and we have to be as careful about rejecting it on account of these failures as in accepting it on the ground of its successes.

GROUP A.—X.

New York, *February 1st, 1899.*

Communicator : Professor Hyslop. Receiver : Miss S.

1. Com. : I knew you in Barnard.
(No reply.)
2. Com. : I saw you at a reception on 74th Street.
(No reply.)
3. Com. : Do you remember a man in Ethics who tried to corner the teacher on the antecedent probability of miracles ?
(No reply.) (Remark to assistant : "Don't remember.")

(There was only one other lady in the class to which I refer, and which was conducted by myself. The question refers to a rather sharp *a priori* reasoner, and the interest with which the members of the class and especially Miss S. watched me in my reply to the man's questions.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : Do you know Miss E. ? (Name given in full in message.)
(No reply.) (Remark to assistant : "Yes.")
5. Com. : What other lady was in the class mentioned in Question 3?
(No reply.) (Remark to assistant : "Still don't remember.")
6. Com. : Antithesis.
(No reply.)

(I here mention an obscure class of inferences discussed in my Logic and with which the lady was acquainted. But I did not expect her at this stage of the game to guess anything. The word was intended to be only the first of a number in connection with my work with this lady and designed to suggest me as communicator. They will be mentioned as the record proceeds.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : I remember you sometimes sat near a gentleman acquaintance in the class.

(No reply.) (Remark to assistant : "It is not true.")

(This question is vague, and might be taken to refer to the class in Barnard, in which case the remark would not be true. But I had in mind another class in Columbia in which the lady was doing post-graduate work. It was intended in a vague way to suggest that the class was not at Barnard, where only ladies attend. The answer, or rather remark, to the assistant shows no tendency to break up a preconception.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : What were the circles for in the class in Logic ?

Rec. : I've passed in Logic.

9. Com. : Two and two make four.

(No reply.)

(This statement was intended to suggest, by an illustration in my post-graduate class used to discuss certain problems in connection with the theory of Intuitionism, that I might be the communicator. But it had no effect.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : Do you remember any walks in Central Park and what we talked about ?

(A wild question intended merely as a diversion and not representing any true incident between me and the receiver.—J. H. H.)

Rec. : I took many walks there.

Com. : Mention two or three.

Rec. : Go ahead.

11. Com. : Do you know Felix Adler ?

Rec. : Yes.

(I had to put this question cautiously, as I did not know whether the lady had had any other knowledge of him than that in reference to an incident that had occurred between herself and myself. The next question then was shaped to connect with this, which it was safe to put in spite of the "Yes" that I got in the reply.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : I remember you were interested once in the free-will controversy.

Rec. : I think you are a class-mate.

13. Com. : Do you remember where you stood at the graduation exercises in Carnegie Hall ?

Rec. : To right side of the steps of the platform. Did I dance with you at the reception ?

Com. : I think not.

Rec. : Do I know you socially ?

Com. : That depends on what you mean by social.

(This answer sent back by myself was the question which I always ask a student when I wish to know what a question seeks to know. It is a demand for definition, and I thought it would suggest my habits at least indefinitely. But it suggested nothing.—J. H. H.)

14. Com. : What was Miss S——'s advice on that matter of some importance to you ?

(This question pertained to an important matter between me and the receiver and the lady mentioned in the message, and, though vague, was one intended to lead up to more definite ones.—J. H. H.)

Rec. : Have you ever called on me ?

Com. : You find out.

15. Com. : An immediate process.

(No reply.)

(This phrase was one by which I constantly expressed my position in the Theory of Knowledge which Miss S. attended during different years in my advanced class, and only a short time before with much frequency.—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : Was it James' or Baldwin's *Psychology* we had ?

Rec. : You are a girl.

17. Com. : Do you remember any ghost stories that were told in the class ?

Rec. : Plenty.

Com. : Mention one, and if I can I shall say more.

Rec. : Can't remember any in particular, nor can you.

Com. : Do you recall the one with the scar that was on the face of the ghost ? Man lived in Boston, but was out West when he saw his sister.

Rec. : Don't recall ; be more definite.

(This question was put because there has been much fun outside the classes about my ghost stories in discussing psychical research. The question is equivocal, but the mention of a specific one ought to have created a suspicion.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : Do you ever read the *International Journal of Ethics* ?

Rec. : Seldom.

(This question, coming after the previous one, was intended to suggest myself, because I had been instrumental in having the lady offer a paper to that journal for publication. It was sent to Professor Adler. The query is vague, and connected with questions 11, 12 and 14.—J. H. H.)

19. Com. : Conversion and Fallacies. You must pass Logic again.

Rec. : Go ahead.

(The object of this question is explained in the note to question 6.—J. H. H.)

20. Com. : What work in experimental psychology did you do ?

Rec. : It would take too long to tell.

(This question pertains to the same matter as 14 and later incidents and questions.—J. H. H.)

21. Com. : C—, S—, Miss S—, B—. Important for you.
 Rec. : Carpenter.
 Com. : Think you are on the right track.

(I started to telegraph that this was wrong on purpose to make the question more definite, as I saw that suggestions did not appear to make any impression. But it all at once occurred to me that the name mentioned in the reply to mine was probably correct in connection with the events that I wished to suggest by connecting so many names together in my message, as I vaguely recalled then, and now distinctly, his connection with the affair. But I sent the answer above both as an intimation that the sender was not "Carpenter," while I suggested in this dubious way the probably proper tendency of her mind. But I got the following reply.—J. H. H.)

Rec. : I am not on any track.

22. Com. : I saw you as you got off a car recently. Intuition.

Rec. : Did I see you ?

Com. : Possibly.

(This statement was to remind the receiver of a fact that had occurred a few days before when she sat on a seat in front of me in a street car, and I did not look up to see her until she started to leave the car, and then it was too late to catch her eye. The word "Intuition" was especially apt in this connection to suggest me, at least as I thought, because I used it so much in my classes for the three years during her attendance on my class.—J. H. H.)

23. Com. : What did you come here for to-day ?

Rec. : That's what I'm trying to find out.

(The question was intended to be merely diversionary as a transition to the next.—J. H. H.)

24. Com. : Felix Adler, *International Journal of Ethics*, B—, Miss S—. What do these names mean together ?

Rec. : A great many people know what that means.

Com. : Do you remember the title to your thesis ? I am not certain about it.

Rec. : Stop talking about that matter.

(I had put this last question as one that I thought absolutely certain to put the receiver in mind of me, especially as her answer to 23 showed that she was on the right track. But it failed.—J. H. H.)

25. Com. : Transcendental unity of apperception.

Rec. : In B—'s class.

Com. : No.

(This phrase was one that she would frequently hear in B—'s class, and that some of her class-mates would know well enough, but it was a common one with me when discussing Kant, and recently, in my course in the Theory of Knowledge, I had criticised the doctrine of Kant, and presented over and over again my own position in terms of what was expressed in the word "intuition" in 22, and the statement of 15. Hence, when I sent the answer "no" to her question, she ought to have nailed me at once.—J. H. H.)

26. Com. : Do you remember your trouble with S— ?

Rec. : Yes ; stop that. That means nothing.

27. Com. : Hamilton and Reid.

Rec. : Dr. Hyslop's favourites.

(Here I thought I could soon make myself understood, and put the next statement to effect it, as it was a phrase that I had used a few days before a great many times in her presence when discussing certain questions in the problem of knowledge.—J. H. H.)

28. Com. : Put everything together and draw a "progressive inductive inference."

Rec. : Don't know. I have no idea.

29. Com. : Reasoning is a vehicle for the transmission of certitude.

Rec. : Messages like that give me no clue at all.

(This statement of mine was one that I have very often used in the receiver's presence when showing in the problem of knowledge that the syllogism merely transmits, but does not originate certitude in regard to its contents. I had frequently used it when she was present only a short time before at several lectures.—J. H. H.)

30. Com. : I do not take much stock in "ratiocination."

Rec. : Then you are not Dr. Hyslop.

(This was, of course, the wrong answer, though the term "ratiocination" and its connection had been recognised and placed rightly, but my doctrine was absolutely reversed by her, my statement having embodied what I taught very clearly when showing that the fundamental processes of knowledge were not mediate or apperceptive. Thus it is clear that the clue completely failed.—J. H. H.)

31. Com. : You are not good at telepathy.

Rec. : You are not good at suggestion.

(I intended this statement to nail me, as Miss S. knew that I was interested in this problem, and I hoped with my name in her mind from the previous question that she would reverse her judgment. But I failed again, and as the time was up, I made no further attempts to secure identification.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—XI.

New York, *February 1st, 1899.*

Communicator : Professor K. Receiver : Professor H.

1. Com. : Do you know Farnham ?

Rec. : Professor Sloane.

(Pertinent answer, but wrong. The question represented a mutual acquaintance, though one that the receiver would not associate closely with the sender.—J. H. H.)

2. Com. : Is it true that he is married ?

Rec. : The same.

(The question was intended as a diversion because the first guess was too near the sender to go hastily, and besides the sender knew that this Mr. F. was not married.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : Do you remember that fish story you told me in the presence of Darling ?

Rec. : Possibly the same. (To assistant : "A staggerer.")

(The question was pertinent to myself, and as I was known by the receiver to be conducting the experiment it would act as a diversion, and we at the sender's end of the line knew that the receiver had probably told the story to many persons, and would not easily remember my presence with him and Mr. Darling when he once told it.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : I suppose being a good Episcopalian helped me to my chair in physics.

Rec. : No clue. All adrift.

(This referred to an intimate friend of the receiver who was connected with an event to come later, and it was here put as vaguely as possible so that it might not tell too much.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you recall that disturbance in Wurzburg, when some one burst out of the passage way ?

Rec. : Rather suggests Professor R. of T. Question 4 suggests the same.

(The answer to the question was correct, though this person was not the sender of the message.—J. H. H.) (Cf. Note, p. 579.)

6. Com. : Ole Cloes.

Rec. : Still think it R.

(This phrase was one with which the receiver and the sender among others, and R. in particular, had had much fun, as it alluded to an experience in Yellowstone Park. But the sender of the message was not with the receiver when the incident occurred.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Did I call on you with Farnham ?

(No reply.)

8. Com. : Whom did you meet at Professor W——'s lecture at the American Museum ?

(No reply.)

9. Com. : Zwintscher.

Rec. : Looks like Hyslop himself, but some of the others don't.

(Question 2 might have suggested me, but as it did not, I threw in this German name alone to see if it would recall the *musicale* at my house a year ago, which Professor H. had attended. I wanted both to see the effect of a specific suggestion such as this name was calculated to bring out and to indicate in the vaguest way possible the circle of acquaintances within which the questions and incidents were placed.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : Geyser Bill.

Rec. : I think that's Professor K. now.

(This was the name by which the sender, among others, called the receiver after his trip in the Yellowstone Park. The recognition was thus pertinent, but not yet conclusive.—J. H. H.)

11. Com. : Ilch—he's dead, too.

Rec. : That's K.

(The statement here was intended to be a diversion, and represented the name of a classmate of H. whom K. knew nothing about, but had picked out of the catalogue for the purpose of diversion. We see in the answer the effect of preconception.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : That was fine was er gemacht hat—don't you forget it.

Rec. : That's K.

Com. : Try again.

13. Com. : Do you know Fisher Ames? That was a good entertainment the other night.

Rec. : May be K. yet.

(The question was one of my own to serve as a diversion in the direction of the receiver's wife, whose maiden name was thus indirectly suggested, and it would still be consistent with the knowledge of the sender. This accounts for the nature of the reply. Besides, he and his wife had been at a recent entertainment.—J. H. H.)

Com. : But our fish were fresh.

(No reply. Assistant's note : "The same.")

(The phrase involved a diversion away from both the receiver's wife and Professor K., and was intended to suggest another professor, who had in the presence of the receiver used this expression as a very apt repartee to some guying. No reply coming, we sent the next very pertinent question. J. H. H.)

14. Com. : Do you remember the ice and mince pie with your wheel?

Rec. : K. still.

(Correct in so far as the receiver knew that K. was familiar with the circumstance, but it was not a personal experience of K. in connection with H. It occurred in the summer when they were far apart, and ought to have suggested the receiver's wife.—J. H. H.)

15. Com. : Wireless telegraphy.

Rec. : No clue.

(The receiver and myself had talked about this subject a few evenings before, and I intended to both turn him aside from the sender and to see if his memory would identify me with the incident. It did not, and I put the next question to test him again about the same incident, because we had talked about this subject in the same connection as the previous message suggests. The two topics were associated. But both failed to disturb the preconception formed about K.—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : Telepathy.

Rec. : The same party.

17. Com. : Sandwiches and something to drink.

Rec. : 15 and 16 give no clue.

18. Com. : Quid nunc.

Rec. : That's K. pretty sure.

(K. and H. belonged to a club by this name.)

19. Com. : Where did you see me last?

Rec. : It's K. yet.

20. Com. : Wine.

Rec. : That's Hyslop again.

(This answer was correct and refers to the same occasion as Question 17, by which and this one I hoped to divert the receiver to his wife, who knew all the facts mentioned and alluded to by K., as she was present and K. was not on the occasion referred to.—J. H. H.)

21. Com. : Hier darf ich nicht bleiben, weil mein Name also Kunz ist.

Rec. : Give it up on that.

(This was intended to make sure the recognition, as K. thought H. would have no doubt about his identity from the phrase, which was one he ought be familiar with. While we were wondering what to send next, the second message came as follows.—J. H. H.) (Cf. Q. 10, p. 564, and Q. 3, p. 555.)

Rec. : It's K. I think.

22. Com. : I did not have any of those sandwiches and wine.

Rec. : Well, that's K.

23. Com. : We were at the boat races in 1897, and met after they were over.

Rec. : Yes, that's K.

(The last statement was sent in order to secure the identity of the sender, as it was not necessary to continue the experiment further. The answer was correct.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—XII.

New York, January 31st, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. McW. Receiver : Dr. F.

1. Com. : Is it not Dr. F., of Columbia University ?
Rec. : Yes.
2. Com. : I met you first several years ago.
Rec. : Did I meet you in New York City ?
Com. : Yes.
3. Com. : I heard you talking of some experiment you had performed.
Rec. : Did I meet you in Columbia ?
4. Com. : Did you graduate from Princeton in 1890 ?
Rec. : No, in '88.
5. Com. : Do you still get your brains from the P. and S. ?
Rec. : Did you hear me describing the experiment in a lecture ?
Com. : Yes.
Rec. : Were you one of my students ?
Com. : Guess again.
6. Com. : Do you still teach Psychology, or have you adopted a new line of work ?
Rec. : Have we seen each other constantly since we first met ?
Com. : No.
7. Com. : Don't you remember when we dined together about two years ago ?
Rec. : Did you dine with me, or did I dine with you ?
Com. : I dined with you.
Rec. : Is your name McW. ?
Com. : Try again.
Rec. : Was the lecture you heard me give a public or a college lecture ?
Com. : I heard you give several.

8. Com. : Are you going with Lumholtz to Mexico on his next tour ?
 Rec. : Are you connected with the college now ?
 Com. : You must find out.
9. Com. : I have read your article in the *Psychological Review*.
 Rec. : Did you dine with me at my club ?
 Com. : No.
10. Com. : Did you see me at the last Thanksgiving football match ?
 (Question intended as a diversion.)
 Rec. : Did we dine alone or were there any others with us ?
 Com. : Others.
11. Com. : Do you remember when we cut up those pigeons ?
 Rec. : Is your name Franz ?
 Com. : Try again.
12. Com. : Don't you remember that we performed experiments together ?
 Rec. : Did we know each other well ?
 Com. : It is a question of opinion.
13. Com. : When I dined with you my sister had scarlet fever.
 Rec. : I am pretty sure your name is McW.
14. Com. : You afterward published the results of the experiments I mentioned.
 Rec. : Your name is McW.
 (This was correct, and as the assurance was satisfactory there was no further need for diversion.—J. H. H.)

 GROUP A.—XIII.

New York, February 1st, 1899.

Communicator : Dr. J. Receiver : Mr. M.

1. Com. : I believe this is Mr. M., of Columbia. Are you a student or an instructor ?
 Rec. : Go ahead.
 (Receiver remarks to me : "That rules me out. He does not know me evidently." The receiver thus evidently thought he had to deal with some one he did not know, and so wisely sent the reply mentioned.—J. H. H.)
2. Com. : In what department are you working and where is your office ?
 Rec. : Political science. (Question a diversion.)
3. Com. : You must have a fine view from your windows.
 Rec. : True, Dr. Marvin knows that.
 (The sender says in regard to this statement : "I have discussed the view from Mr. M.'s window a number of times." But the person mentioned in the reply was not the sender.—J. H. H.)
4. Com. : Attendez encore ! Parlez-vous français ?
 Rec. : Suggests nothing.
 (The statement was made in French because the receiver met Mr. J., who is a teacher in that language, at the sender's rooms.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you remember having gone down town with me on the Elevated about a year ago ?

Rec. : No.

(Receiver remarks to me : "But that puts him in a certain class of persons." The sender afterward tells me that the incident did not occur as a fact, and that the question was put partly as a diversion and partly to find how the receiver would guess.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : Did you hear Professor Giddings lecture before the Political Science Association on Expansion ? It was a good lecture. Do you think he will print it ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks to me : "That suggests some one who did not read the *Political Science Quarterly*. For the article has already been published." The sender, however, intended a diversion by it, though he had discussed the lecture with the receiver.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Do you know where Kelly has gone ? I hear he is no longer in Columbia.

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks to me : "That might be a clue on certain conditions. In fact, there are three clues in it." The sender observes in his explanation of question that he had talked with the receiver about this person a few days before, but did not know him personally.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : Where is Whitte this year ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks : "Suggests a fellow-student." The sender explains that he had been speaking to receiver about the person mentioned in message only a few days ago. He was a student in the Department of Political Science.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : I once met you in Central Park. Do you walk there often ?

Rec. : Suggests J. very strongly. [Correct.—J. H. H.]

Com. : Try again.

(Receiver remarks : "I did meet J. there once about three weeks ago."—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : I believe you came from one of the western states. Did you take your college course there ?

(Receiver remarks : "Suggests nothing.")

11. Com. : Have you seen many operas this year ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks : "Suggests J. I had a conversation with him about operas in this room." The sender comments that he had mentioned to receiver in this conversation that he himself, the sender, had gone to one or two of them.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : I think you know a Mr. Washington who was at Columbia for a while. Do you know where he is now ?

Rec. : That suggests J. I had a letter from Washington to-day.

(Receiver remarks : "That would make it almost definite that it is J." Mr. M., the receiver, was one of W.'s best friends, and the latter was also a close friend of the sender.—J. H. H.)

Com. : Guess again.

13. Com. : Do you remember our discussion in regard to trusts ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks : "Suggests nothing except that he might have attended Goodnow's lecture before the Academy of Political

Science." The sender explains that he had no special object in sending this message except as a diversion.—J. H. H.)

14. Com. : What is the make of your wheel ? I think you advised me to get one.

Rec. : Suggests J. again.

(Receiver remarks that this incident regarding the advice had occurred between them. — J. H. H.)

15. Com. : Do you think orthodoxy is a requirement in a teacher of philosophy in a western college ?

Rec. : Suggests J. again.

(Receiver then remarks : "This was another circumstance in a conversation with J. The evidence is accumulative in favour of him." The sender also explains that he had talked over this subject with the receiver about two weeks before.—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : Shall you be in your office to-morrow ? You are rather hard to find.

Rec. : The same.

(The sender explains that he had frequently gone to M.'s room and failed to find him there, and that M. knew the fact.—J. H. H.)

17. Com. : I doubt it.

(No reply.) (Statement a diversion.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : Have you read Professor Hyslop's new book ? What are your criticisms ?

Rec. : Suggests the same person.

(Sender explains that he had talked this book over with receiver several times.—J. H. H.)

19. Com. : Do we have a holiday on February 13th ?

Rec. : The same.

(Sender says that the question was a vague one, though pertinent.—J. H. H.)

20. Com. : That last lecture of yours on American Political Theory was very interesting.

Rec. : Suggests nothing.

(Receiver then adds to me : "Except another clue on another trail." Sender comments that the statement was a diversion to change the trail.—J. H. H.)

21. Com. : When do you give your examination ? Who am I now ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks : "Does not suggest anything, unless it is a subterfuge of J." The sender explains that M., the receiver, had spoken to him a few days before about an examination, the time of which he, the receiver, did not know.—J. H. H.)

22. Com. : Will you come to the laboratory next Saturday morning ?

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks : "Suggests nothing." Sender remarked afterwards that the query was only a diversion.—J. H. H.)

23. Com. : Has Professor Burgess recovered ? Should like to meet him some time.

Rec. : J.

(Receiver remarks : "I had a conversation with J. about this. I have talked with others also about the same thing."—J. H. H.)

24. Com. : Do you recall our walk last week along Riverside Drive ?

Rec. : It's J.

(Receiver remarks : " We took a walk two weeks ago along this drive and discussed the subject of colleges."—J. H. H.)

25. Com. : What are you willing to wager ?

Rec. : I would hang you on that if nothing more was before me.

(This being the correct person and satisfactory assurance of it having been obtained, the experiment did not require to be carried further.—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—XIV.

New York, *February 2nd*, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. B. Receiver : Professor C.

1. Com. : We have seen each other in several places during past years.

Rec. : (No reply.) (Remark to assistant : " Nothing suggested.")

2. Com. : Elizabethtown. [Diversion by myself.—J. H. H.]

Rec. : (No reply.) (Remark to assistant : " Nothing suggested. I have seen Hyslop himself in Elizabethtown.")

(This remark about seeing me in the town of this name is not strictly correct. Year before last we had travelled on the cars together as far as Westport, and parted there, C. going to place named for the summer and I twelve miles further, though through Elizabethtown, to spend the vacation in Keene Valley. But C. did not see me in place named. He only knew that I passed through it.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : I got the man you met in the mountains to lunch with you.

(No reply.) (Remark to assistant : " Nothing suggested.")

(There is a very remote connection between this statement and the name of Elizabethtown. The latter was mentioned in the previous question in order to put the mind of the receiver in general connection with the place in which he had spent his vacation, both at the time suggested by the name of the town and the following summer when he met the man who was in the mind of the sender in the third message. The sender had introduced him to the receiver in the manner here intimated.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : The necrology of Andover Seminary.

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks to assistant : " That concerns my father. It is not identified with other things at all.")

(The sender telegraphed it purposely in order to remind receiver of his father, and to suggest that it came from some one who knew of his father's work on that subject. The phrase did not suggest this, though it did suggest the father rightly, as it must have done in the case.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Do you like punch ?

Rec. : *Punch*, the newspaper ?

Com. : Any old punch.

(This question was put as an obscure way of intimating an incident in the lives of the two men when they were at Harvard. They had a good deal of fun about some punch when Mr. Gough lectured in Cambridge on temperance. We put the case in this equivocal way to see how it would work, and

though it led to no immediate identification, it reminded the receiver clearly enough of the need of distinguishing between the paper and some incident he could recall.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : How do you like the Duchess of Amelia ?

Rec. : Was Chubb the man you got to lunch with me ?

Com. : Try again.

(Mr. B. did not understand the meaning of this inquiry, nor did I at the time, as I supposed that C. had in mind some one who had introduced a person by this name. Afterward C. told me that while in the mountains I had brought together a Mr. Chubb and himself, and hence that he supposed I might be the communicator. With this reminder I recalled the circumstance that I had introduced Mr. Chubb to C., but I had wholly forgotten it.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Have you heard of Hobson ?

(No reply.) (The question was intended to be equivocal, and in this deliberate confusion of the name of an intimate classmate with that of the present popular hero to see how the receiver's impressions would be influenced. But it was evidently too obscure.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : Were we not congratulated for being temperate ?

Rec. : Hyslop suggested by 1, 2, and 3, but no one since.

(This question refers to the same events and time that are associated with 5. The persons in this group at Harvard were often the subjects of much fun on this topic. The answer in reference to me is pertinent.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : Well, they aren't so darned sweet.

Rec. : Some one accustomed to my conversations and habits.

10. Com. : Did you enjoy our lunch at the Players' Club ?

Rec. : The tone suggests Perry. But facts don't agree.

(Question pertinent to sender as well as name of person mentioned in reply.)

11. Com. : Who is chairman of that Committee ?

Rec. : Wheeler suggested, but facts don't agree.

(Question pertinent also to sender, as they had often served on certain committees.)

12. Com. : I have worked with you on committees.

(No reply.) (Receiver remarks to assistant : "Doesn't mean anything except to narrow it in a way to be applicable to Perry and Wheeler.")

13. Com. : Booty.

Rec. : That would be more like Wheeler and Perry. The tone is Perry's.

(The fact is that this is the name which C.'s little child gives one of his assistants in his college work.—J. H. H.)

14. Com. : That's the worst I ever went anywhere.

(No reply.) (This was a phrase that a particular friend and class-mate at college had used, and it had always amused C. very much for its oddness and drollery, and Mr. B. was familiar with C.'s repetition of it, and was associated with both persons.—J. H. H.)

15. Com. : Do you remember Clarence Walter Vail ?

Rec. : It's not Wheeler. (Remarks to assistant : "I was talking to some one about that man the other day.")

(Mr. B. had talked to C. about this man before his appointment as assistant in their department, and one other person at the same time. The policy adopted was against B.'s advice.—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : That is defended.

Rec. : Still like Perry. (Remarks to assistant : "B. might have known about those things. I have forgotten him.")

(The phrase was one used in Paris by C. and B. with another person when they were there together some years ago. They had much fun about it. The French was : *il est defendu*, the equivalent of the German *verboten*.—J. H. H.)

17. Com. : That wine is good to drink.

Rec. : That might be B.

(This was, of course, correct, and if the remark made by receiver to assistant in question 16 had been sent to the communicator, the 17th question would in all probability not have been sent, as it embodied an expression which the receiver had used in Paris on occasions when the wine used at meals was drinkable.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : If we start it will rain, if we do not, it will not rain.

(No reply.) (The sentence was one that I had sent to the receiver over the telephone during the last summer in the mountains when the prospect of a rain spoiled a projected tramp among the mountains. I had especially remembered it because I was struck with hearing his whispered laugh over the telephone at the time and being astonished at it, as it was only the third time that I had ever talked over a telephone. I wanted to test the receiver's memory and identification of myself. But nothing came of it. The receiver said to me afterward that he thought of something in the mountains, but could not locate it exactly.—J. H. H.)

19. Com. : Benedict.

(No reply.) (This was the name of a man whom C. met in the mountains, and I hoped to divert him from B. and to recall myself indirectly. The name would more distinctly suggest Professor Thomas, whom receiver had met at the same hotel and to whom reference was made in question 3. But it failed.—J. H. H.)

20. Com. : How is your friend Jaccachi ?

Rec. : That is more like Perry. (Pertinent to B. also.)

21. Com. : Have you seen any cranes lately ?

Rec. : Still sounds like Perry.

(The term "cranes" was connected with a standing joke between several persons, of whom the communicator was one.—J. H. H.)

22. Com. : How long since you smoked your first cigar ?

(No reply.) (Remarks to assistant : "Going off again.") (The sender expected this to suggest him at once, as he was present on the occasion indicated.—J. H. H.)

23. Com. : "K.O.A."

Rec. : Well, the only man—— That sounds like B.

(This was the name of a Society to which the two belonged.—J. H. H.)

24. Com. : I shall meet you in 4 Hollis next commencement.

Rec. : I should say B.

(This had been the place where the two had been together at college.—
J. H. H.)

25. Com. : Went.

Rec. : That would be B. also.

(This was the name of a friend who was one of two with B. in Paris
together with C. and connected with earlier questions that do not require to
be mentioned again.—J. H. H.)

The answer was correct.

GROUP A.—XV.

New York, *February 1st, 1899.*

Communicator : Mrs. B. Receiver : Professor B.

The present experiment has more resemblances to the report of the phenomena recorded regarding Mrs. Piper than any other that I performed. I felt that I could give it that character more safely than before, because I could assume that the receiver was familiar enough to understand the style of messages to be sent, and the results proved that in that respect I was not mistaken. There was one mistake on the part of my assistant at the receiver's end of the line, due to an earnest but mistaken caution that failed to make perfectly clear what the receiver was to do. My intention was that he should know that he was not only to identify any one that the incidents recalled, but also to decide finally and assuredly who was sending the messages. In this case the receiver did not clearly understand that he was to infer who was sending the telegrams. Hence the result was a failure in this respect, though the experiment has a value of another kind. The failure is not wholly due to the misunderstanding mentioned, as the identification of others intended by the incidents mentioned was correct, and only the improbability that Mrs. B. should be present kept her out of the range of suggestion. She should have been as readily suggested as the persons actually named, and no doubt would have been had not the slight misunderstanding alluded to occurred. The experiment, nevertheless, has an interest for features that will come under notice in their place.

1. Com. : I know you, I know I do. You will be surprised to find me here. I hope to see you after this some time.

(No reply.)

2. Com. : Oh ! I forget one thing. It will come. Yes. Do you remember the teachers' college at—I forget where.

(Receiver remarks to assistant : "Possibly Hervey, but 'I forget where' makes it impossible.")

3. Com. : Do you remember the periodical in the junior year, which showed "United we stand ; divided we fall" ? Great Scott !

Rec. : Suggests a man in my class—Arrowsmith.

(The suggestion was correct, and the person named was the one Mrs. B. had in mind when she gave the incident.—J. H. H.)

Com. : Try again.

4. Com. : Archie, Archie. You know Archie. He left . . . you. came . . .

Rec. : Arrowsmith again or Crosby.

(The incident that we had in mind, suggested by myself, was Professor B.'s succession to the chair in philosophy and the name of his predecessor, somewhat as a diversion. The idea seems not to have been caught.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : S . . . r . . . knew you, am glad . . . I am forgetting.

Rec. : No clue.

(The letters here were part of the name of the receiver's sister and daughter, and the nonsense was thrown in to show incoherence.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : I hope to make it clear. I am satisfied that I can.

Rec. : No clue.

(This was a mere diversion of the same kind as the previous message imitating the Piper phenomena.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Brooklyn wedding. You acted as best man.

Rec. : Suggests H. T. Peck. (Correct. This was the person in the mind of the sender.)

8. Com. : O . . rg . . . I am forgetting. O . . . an. Oh! yes, grin . . der.

Rec. : Suggests nothing.

(This was a simulation of the attempt to say something about an incident respecting an "organ grinder" which it was possible that the receiver would recall. But it was not recognised.)

9. Com. : Now I think I can say what I tried a moment ago. S . . r . . h . . . am here . . . not remember. Oh, yes. You remember me. S . . r . . h S y . . .

Rec. : Nothing.

(This was in part a repetition of the attempt to suggest the name of "Sarah Schuyler"—a pseudonym—the receiver's sister-in-law. The effect is apparent in the receiver's reply.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : Do you know John B. ?

Rec. : Suggests Mr. Pine.

(Suggestion correct, and the question was asked merely as a diversion before the next, which was to complete what was continued in the last.—J. H. H.)

11. Com. : It is Sa . . . h S . . h . . . l . . r.

Rec. : Suggests that Sarah Schuyler may be sending. Number 5 suggests the same.

(This was the correct interpretation.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : Well . . . glad to see you, H . . r . . y R . . le. You know me.

Rec. : (Remarks to assistant, "If the number of dots is right, it suggests no one.")

(This is an interesting remark, as there is no doubt that the number of dots in the original message may have been misleading. But the name intended was that of an intimate friend.—J. H. H.)

13. Com. : Dear me! Do you . . . I forget. Yes, yes. I love her. She is yours. But she is not here. He . . . t . . d . . l . . gh . .

Rec. : Suggests nothing.

(The name was intended to be that of the receiver's daughter, or, rather, the pet name given her, only partly spelt out.—J. H. H.)

14. Com. : Green . . . gone . . . comes . . . parrot. Cup . . . tea . . . London.

Rec. Suggests nothing.

(The full message would have been : "A green parrot and a cup of tea in London," representing an incident which the receiver would be supposed to have recognised at once and located the sender.—J. H. H.)

15. Com. : Juanita.

(No reply.) (The word was intended to suggest in a dark way Mrs. B.'s sister, whom they called "Nita."—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : Do you remember the concert and college songs, Nita?

Rec. : Suggests D. L. Haigh.

(Suggestion correct.—J. H. H.)

17. Com. : Sir Joshua's parrot greets you.

Rec. : Some incident suggested by 13 and 14, but no person suggested.

(This was held until the 17th was sent.—J. H. H.)

(The incident was that of some amusement caused by a parrot in London when only Mrs. B. and Professor B.'s sister were present with him.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : Do you remember the mouse hunt and the purchase necessary to catch them?

Rec. : Incident suggested, but no person.

19. Com. : Thirteen hats and one bonnet, and an ocean trip.

Rec. : No person suggested.

(As the previous question had been intended to narrow down the guessing to Mrs. B. and Professor B.'s sister, this last was intended to narrow it down to Mrs. B. herself. The incidents were evidently remembered, but the probability that I should have secured the presence of Mrs. B. was so slight to the receiver that, with the understanding of the experiment not so clear as I had intended it, no suggestion of Mrs. B. seems to have occurred.—J. H. H.) (Cf. Q. 3, p. 555 ; Q. 10, p. 564 ; and Q. 11, 13, 15, p. 560.)

20. Com. : I am here. Co . . in . . e E. Ca . . l . . n.

(No reply.) (This is the pseudonym for the full name, only partly spelt out, of Mrs. B. It would be "Corinne E. Catlin."—J. H. H.)

GROUP A.—XVI.

New York, February 2nd, 1899.

Communicator : Professor P. Receiver : Professor B.

The feature of this experiment which should be remarked before using it for any purposes of inference so important as the others is that it had to be performed under limitations that did not affect some of the others. I had but half an hour to perform it. This necessitated more haste in the formation of the messages. The success was thus bound to be accomplished more easily than in others. There was a better understanding of the nature of the experiment than the evening before when the same person acted as

receiver. The incidents sent this time, owing to the short allotment of time at command, also assured more ready clues to identity, though there is one interest in the result that is useful in spite of this fact. It is the spontaneous discovery by the receiver of the cumulative force of certain incidents after the clue is detected, which was not suggested at first.

1. Com. : The way is clear. I shall see you. I am glad to know you are here. You and Mrs. B. called on me some time ago.

Rec. : Suggests J. B. Reynolds.

(The statement was not intended to give any special suggestion, but only as a start to the experiment, and though it had statements in it that were true regarding the sender, who expected, for instance, to see the receiver in half-an-hour, and had called on him some months previously, yet the message was not designed to recall any one in particular.—J. H. H.)

2. Com. : I first saw you at your graduation, and have watched your career with the interest of a sympathetic human heart.

Rec. : Professor P.

(Incident and identification correct.)

3. Com. : The waves washed over my back and you only laughed.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

4. Com. : Yes. . . . I cannot think. . . . Oh! do you. . . .

B . . . s e know si r. No, your sist

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(This incoherent message was sent both to test whether the letters would suggest the receiver's sister and to serve as a diversion from the answer to the second question, when the next which was to be pertinent for the same person should be sent.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : Years and seas have separated us, but it made no difference, E.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(The letter "E" in this message was the initial of the first part of the sender's name, and the reference of the whole sentence merely a general one to their friendship, which had been connected with their experiences as suggested by statement.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : I stabbed my enemy and still you laughed.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(This statement refers to an incident which had occurred between sender and receiver when the sender was struggling with a fish. The receiver played some trick on the sender and laughed at him. The suggestive feature was intended to be mainly in the term "laugh," as also found in question 3.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : I laboured under a heavy load and still you laughed. y.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(The sender was once carrying a heavy load of wood on his back and the receiver laughed at him in a way about which the two had some fun. The letter "y" was the last one in sender's name.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : I had your portrait made, but you knew it not.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(Each had taken a picture of the other without the other's knowledge of it at the time.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : Do you . . . I forget. Oh ! here it comes. Our friend Mr. D. What did you say? Dun No, it's gone.

Rec. : Nothing suggested.

(There are here vague hints of a name recalling an intimate circumstance in the lives of the sender and receiver.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : I'll try again. D. U. N. V. I. L. L. E. Good . . .

Rec. : P—.

(This message is a completion and more distinct suggestion of what was intended in the previous one.—J. H. H.)

11. Com. : Chicken—a fowl of any age. Baedeker. Wasn't that funny ?

Rec. : P—.

(Receiver remarks to assistant : "Now 6 suggests P—." Then on being asked whether any person was suggested by other questions, the answer was "that 6, 7, 5 and 3 suggest P—.")

(This is correct and illustrates one of the objects of the experiments very clearly, which was to see the spontaneous effect of cumulative incidents on the judgment, in this case started by the discovery of a connection between 11 and 6, and completed after suggestion to look for more.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : Forbes' messes.

Rec. : Recognised, but confuses me.

(This incident was intended to be the clinax of the experiment, but there was some doubt in spite of that fact. There was, however, no further time for its continuance.—J. H. H.) (Cf. Q. 19, p. 588.)

GROUP A.—XVII.

New York, *February 2nd*, 1899.

Communicator : Mr. W. Receiver : Mr. D.

(In this experiment I record notes that are fuller in regard to the different points of view of sender and receiver than any that have yet been indicated. It will make clearer what occurred in some others or perhaps in all of them, though it is not necessary to record all of them with this detail. The answers sufficiently indicate the general difference of apperception mass in the two subjects. But this case is especially interesting in this regard, because the receiver thought that the experiment was one carried on by the man at his side, Mr. F., who was only an assistant in the experiment. This helped to keep the suggestive nature of some questions in a broader field, as was desired.—J. H. H.)

1. Com. : Ten years ago we were much out of sympathy in several points. (No reply.) (Remark : "No one suggested.")

(The same answer is given to the first five questions.—J. H. H.)

Note by Com. : At that time we were not acquainted, but were attending rival colleges, A. and D.

Note by Rec. : No. 1 is in general absolutely undenotative ; from W.'s viewpoint, misleading, he being unknown to me ten years ago.

2. Com. : But later we got together much more.

(No reply.)

Note by Com. : Later we both went to Harvard.

Note by Rec. : Indefinite.

3. Com. : There have been many coincidences in our lives, but there is one striking contrast.

(No reply.)

Note by Com. : The coincidences are : The same colleges, Harvard and Columbia ; the same general line of study ; many courses taken together ; many points of common interest ; class trips together ; the same college fraternity. Contrast : He is married, I am not.

Note by Rec. : Common circumstances indefinite.

4. Com. : I was once in a room with you alone. We talked about an hour or two.

(No reply.)

Note by Com. : True, but felt that it was common with others also.

Note by Rec. : Mr. F. represented this affair (unintentionally) as his research, and I had no notion that any one else not present with me was concerned. The presumption then made F. naturally the focus of consciousness until replaced. The circumstance suggested was a common one in a psychological laboratory. I could think of no occasion on which the circumstance coincided with F. in particular.

5. Com. : We have a young friend who is making quite a name for himself.

(No reply.)

Note by Com. : Statement refers to Dr. Th., who was with us at Harvard.

Note by Rec. : Indefinite, but a common circumstance.

6. Com. Do you still insist on raising the window on a cold winter's day ?

Rec. : That suggests several people.

Note by Com. : This was characteristic of Mr. D., and he did it in the Seminar room a few weeks ago and at other times when I remonstrated with him.

Note by Rec. : This suggested members of the family who care for more heat than myself.

7. Com. : Do you expect that Associateship ?

Rec. : That suggests F., or possibly my wife.

Note by Com. : I had in mind a position in a pathological institution, while I recognised that Mr. D. might think of something else of which I knew, though I had not talked with him about the case he would have in mind. The question was general.

Note by Rec. : Distinctly pointed towards F., he besides two or three (whose connection with this research was improbable) alone knowing my plans in this regard. W., as I supposed, was quite ignorant of them.

8. Com. : Are you going to Nova Scotia again next summer ? I know of some pleasant villages on the Jersey coast and Long Island.

Rec. : Surely F.

Note by Com. : F. had talked with Mr. D. about this, and I also

about Nova Scotia, but not about New Jersey. I intended the suggestion to be remote.

Note by Rec. : A recent conversation with F. about Nova Scotia naturally associated him with this question. The latter part of it was especially suggestive of F., W. being concerned in neither to any such extent, and in the latter part not at all.

9. Com. : I once heard you deliver a lecture from the platform.

Rec. : It suggests F. Not literally true.

Note by Com. : I heard D. read a paper before the Seminar at Harvard. When he did so he stepped upon the platform. The word "lecture" here was deliberately chosen for diversion and ambiguity, the stress being upon "platform," that feature not being in the Seminar room at Columbia.

Note by Rec. : Statement untrue of any one. I never delivered what would properly be called a "lecture." There was no reason why it should suggest F., save the present apperception mass and habit.

10. Com. : Do you remember riding in a 'bus with a crowd of men on a cold day ?

Rec. : I remember having done that several times.

Note by Com. : The class under Professor James at Harvard went out to Danvers to visit the Asylum for the insane there, and D. was with us at the time.

Note by Rec. : This recalled events with which no one possibly conceivable could have any relation. The instance referred to by W. was not recalled, having made no impression.

11. Com. : You once invited me to your home.

Rec. : That's F.

Note by Com. : True ; but I did not go.

Note by Rec. : F. took lunch with me at my home very recently ; W., although invited some time ago, has said nothing about it recently.

12. Com. : I was with you once when you were having a good deal of trouble with a machine.

Rec. : That's F.

Note by Com. : True ; the experiment was last fall, and such an incident might apply to several persons.

Note by Rec. : F., being Assistant in the college, would naturally be suggested by this, though it was not memory that prompted my reply. No special incident was suggested.

13. Com. : That was an elegant beef-steak.

Rec. : F. sure.

Note by Com. : I was aware that this applied to F., and not to myself.

Note by Rec. : F. and I had a beef-steak on a special lunch occasion to which this refers, and the statement, so far as W. is concerned, is distinctly misleading. I never had a steak with W., though he had heard F. speak of it.

14. Com. : You once put me through some Sloyd gymnastics.

Rec. : That suggests several.

Note by Com. : True ; the experiment applied to several and was performed last fall.

Note by Rec. : Suggested several men whom I had as subjects in a research including gymnastics—seven or eight men. F. was not one of them ; W. was.

15. Com. : I once asked a famous man a question at your desire.

Rec. : Several possibilities. F. most probable.

Note by Com. : Receiver once requested me to ask Professor Bowditch about flexor and extensor muscles.

Note by Rec. : I have no idea even now of the incident, if not misleading, referred to. The only reason for the association of it with F. was my habits and the present apperception mass.

16. Com. : Some of my friends lived in your wife's town.

Rec. : That's F.

Note by Com. : D. and myself were talking about this a short time ago.

Note by Rec. : This referred to a few remarks once made by some one and myself, and habit made it seem like F. rather than W. I could not recall which of the two.

17. Com. : Do you remember a refined lady who talked with us very sweetly on religious themes ?

Rec. : It suggests nothing.

Com. : It was on the top of a hill.

(No reply.)

Note by Com. : This was a true and specific incident with which D. and I alone were connected besides the lady, and was intended to suggest me beyond doubt. It also represents an incident on the occasion denoted by question 10.

Note by Rec. : This suggested no one and no incident. It was obviously misleading. (Cf. Q. 12, p. 590, etc.)

(The receiver recalls, however, since writing this note, and after talking with the sender, that he once had a conversation with a lady on the top of a hill on serious themes, but it was not the occasion here in the mind of the communicator, and was on a different subject.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : We once walked together alongside a large graveyard.

Rec. : Happened several times to me ; no one in particular suggested.

Note by Com. : This message referred to an incident similar to the one mentioned in question 10, though it was another asylum.

Note by Rec. : The incident referred to was not recalled, but it was known not to refer to F.

19. Com. : Who was the leading homeopathic doctor in Bloomington ?

Rec. : That suggests my wife.

Note by Com. : This referred to the father of the man I knew in the town of D.'s wife, and was also connected with question 10. I was trying to make D. understand who that man was, and by that means suggest myself.

Note by Rec. : This suggested no one but the person intended and others improbably connected with this research.

20. Com. : Mine was the first familiar face you saw as you came to a certain new place to work.

Rec. : That suggests Mr. W.

[Correct.—J. H. H.]

Note by Com. : Mr. W.'s face was the first that Mr. D. recognised as that of an acquaintance when he came to Columbia.

Note by Rec. : As a matter of fact and recollection it was W.

21. Com. : We were once interested in the same girl.

Rec. : Suggests Mr. Breece.

Note by Com. : I had spoken to D. about a certain young lady a few days ago, and he was interested in getting her into a position.

(It should be remarked, however, that the statement is very ambiguous, and can be given a very different meaning from that which the sender might have intended.—J. H. H.)

Note by Rec. : W. was not suggested by this, but rather another student in the laboratory who worked with me at Cambridge.

22. Com. : Do they still call you "Doc" ?

Rec. : Suggests several.

Note by Com. : This refers to an incident at Cambridge that explains itself, and was closely associated with myself.

Note by Rec. : Many familiar acquaintances call me "Doc."

23. Com. : I have less hair on my head than you.

Rec. : That's F. He has very little.

Note by Com. : This I thought quite pertinent, and calculated to suggest me distinctly, though it applied with less force to F.

Note by Rec. : W. has less hair than F. The judgment is accounted for by my apperception mass.

24. Com. : What emotion do you get from valerianite ?

Rec. : I think that's F.

Note by Com. : This was pertinent to me, but was intended to suggest Mr. Huntsman and to break up the preconception evidently haunting the receiver.

Note by Rec. : Suggested laboratory students, but no one in particular.

25. Com. : Two times recently we had to wait for a tardy street car.

Rec. : That suggests Mr. W.

Note by Com. : Coming from the lectures of Dr. Boas at the Museum of Natural History, once two weeks ago, and once a week ago, Mr. D. and myself had to wait for the street cars.

Note by Rec. : The incident referred only to W.

26. Com : Most worthy A—— N——.

Rec. : That's W., sure.

Note by Com. : This was the name of the college fraternity and the sign by which it was known. D. and myself were members of it.

Note by Rec. : Password in a secret college fraternity. W. was the only "brother" concerned at Columbia. This made the conclusion a practical certainty.

As the two gentlemen who engaged in this experiment were entire strangers to me, and as the results must not depend upon my trust in their good faith alone, I secured their signatures to the following statement regarding their relation to the *bond fide* nature of the experiment.

J. H. HYSLOP.

Columbia University, in the City of New York,

February 2nd, 1899.

I, the undersigned, state upon my honour that I have not told Mr. Dearborn anything beforehand that would lead to my identity or prevent this experiment from being entirely secret.

ROBERT S. WOODWORTH.

Witnesses { WALTER T. MARVIN.
 { J. H. HYSLOP.

Columbia University, in the City of New York,

February 2nd, 1899.

I, the undersigned, state upon my honour that I have not heard from Mr. Woodworth nor anyone else anything beforehand that would prevent this experiment from being entirely secret.

GEORGE S. DEARBORN.

Witnesses { WALTER T. MARVIN.
 { J. H. HYSLOP.

GROUP B.—I.

New York, January 30th, 1899.

This set of experiments differs but slightly from those of Group A. But there is enough difference to separate their record from that of the former. The same general problem of identification is involved, but it is a little more complicated and suggestive. The chief aim of Group A was to identify the sender, whether the other persons mentioned were correct or not. The aim in this group will be to represent two or more personalities in the incidents and to test the receiver's judgment in regard to the accuracy of his distinction between the different persons involved in the incidents. This is to some extent attempted in some of Group A, but not in as systematic a manner as in this set. Besides, there may be less uniformity of character in the present set. But with whatever differences between the two groups, there will be very decided resemblances in the fact that the same kind of incidents will be chosen and the same secrecy involved in the situation of the receiver. The proper difference between the two sets of experiments will consist in the attempt simultaneously to secure the identification of two persons by incidents that will not fuse into the same apperception mass. There may also be some variety in the group, representing slight differences in method and complexity, but on the whole it will consist of cases such as have just been described.

This experiment is one in which the subject of it was brought to communicate with another, and was detained as receiver without previous expectation that such would be the case. Hence there was all the secrecy desired. In it I myself personated the incidents in the life of another person, and threw into them expressions that belonged only to myself and the life of ourselves, so that there was the opportunity to discover the identity of more than one person in the case.

Communicator : Professor Hyslop. Receiver : Mrs. Hyslop.

1. Com. : I believe you originally came from Philadelphia, did you not ? I remember that you told me that you used to go to school there.

(No reply.)

2. Com. : Well, you got married at last without being threatened with an old maid's lot. Do you remember any one who moved about the time you did ?

(Before sending the question about the person who had moved, Mrs. Hyslop remarked to my assistant : "I guess it is Mr. Hyslop himself." Then evidently a pause, as the further note by assistant says : "Yes, I do. I was wondering if he would get Mrs. O. down here.")

The suspicion that the statement belonged to me was correct, as no one was likely to allude to an old maid's lot except myself. But the latter sentence in the message had no reference to me whatever, and the distinction between it and the first is clearly implied.

Then after sending the query about where the person in mind had lived before moving, the assistant records the remark : "I think that's Mrs. O. I am sure." Then the question about her son's sleep came, and pertained to incidents familiar to Mrs. O. and my wife.—J. H. H.)

Rec. : Did the person who moved when we did go from 149th Street ?

Com. : It may be. You must say, I can't.

(I had in mind the person who was recognised later as Mrs. W., and I sent my reply here as a diversion, though I thought that my wife had in mind another person to whom this might apply, as I found later that it did, but I had forgotten the circumstance that this party had moved from this street.—J. H. H.) (Cf. pp. 544-546.)

Rec. : Did your youngest son sleep well last night ?

Com. : Yes.

Rec. : Mrs. O., wait and we'll go home together.

Com. : Try the next question.

(The question about the "youngest son sleeping well" was clear to me, as I was aware who was in the mind of the receiver, and though I had not intended to suggest this person, I saw that the question about the moving fitted the person in mind, as further reply by receiver showed. But I answered "yes" in order to keep up the deception for a time, and it seems to have confirmed, as it perhaps should, the impression already formed. The answer asking Mrs. O. was pertinent, though I had not intended her at the outset of my question. I have found since also that my impression about the time that Mrs. W. had moved was not so accurate as I thought, and that the statement fitted Mrs. O. better than Mrs. W. This is an interesting fact, though the difference of time in the moving of Mrs. W. does not exclude her in general from the question. But I was wrong nevertheless about its degree of nearness to our own moving, and so the suggestion was correctly answered from the point of view of the receiver.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : Winifred has quite a plump look, has she not ? I understand she likes to tease. Where did I find out that ?

(No reply.)

4. Com. : Do you remember that my mother was ill for a long time, and that I had much care and worry during her illness ?

Rec. : The same person. (Remarks to assistant: "Don't remember.")

5. Com. : If I said, "dad bob it," would you know me ?

Rec. : Send more. (Remarks to assistant: "Mr. Hyslop says 'dad bob it' sometimes.")

(The expression was one that an old schoolmate had deliberately used in order to avoid the practice of swearing, and it had always struck me as so funny that sometimes when a humorous situation called for an exclamation I would use this expression to my wife, who had been told of its origin. But I had not used the expression at least for a year. I threw it in here to see if it would be properly placed and distinguished from the other incidents, and later this result is apparent.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : Just where was it that you lived in Philadelphia ? I lived there myself, but do not recollect your address for the moment.

Rec. : Send more.

7. Com. : Who says Snobble Snumpkins ?

Rec. : That's what I call Winifred.

(This name is merely a pet name with which Mrs. H. is accustomed to tease our little girl, and it was thrown in here partly for diversion and partly for the object of this experiment.—J. H. H.)

Com. : Whom have you told this ?

(No reply.)

8. Com. : Do you remember where you first met me, and what were the circumstances ?

Rec. : (No reply.) (Remarks to assistant: "The fourth throws me off.")

(It is clear here that the receiver's mind is beginning to look elsewhere for a clue, and the next question shows the readiness with which the two clues are correctly put together.—J. H. H.)

9. Com. : Do you remember that I bought a piano and began the study of music to amuse myself before the illness and death of my mother ?

Rec. : Did you ever live at 167, West 81st Street ?

(This is the correct question to ask, as it names the former residence of the person I had in mind, Mrs. W. But I sent a message to turn the receiver off again as follows.—J. H. H.)

Com. : We'll try further.

10. Com. : Who says Squiggins ?

Rec. : Mr. Hyslop says that. Please come back to the main track.

(The name here was the pet name with which I teased my little boy, and its recognition has no special consequence, but the added request to come back to the main track shows very clearly that the receiver refused to identify it with the suspected Mrs. W., who I knew was not aware of the expression at all. This interpretation of the reply was spontaneously confirmed by Mrs. Hyslop's remark afterwards that Mrs. W. knew nothing of this.—J. H. H.)

(To my assistant Mrs. Hyslop adds the remark: "Mr. Hyslop sends 5th, 7th and 10th questions.")

11. Com. : Do you remember that the last time I saw you I remarked that it was easier to come up to your place than I had thought it was ?

Rec. : Do you live on 121st Street ? Then a moment later: It's time for me to go home ; say yes or no.

Com. : We shall go on until you are correct.

(The misleading nature of this message is apparent without comment. —

J. H. H.)

12. Com. : Don't you remember that funny statement of little George, that "certain neighbouring children would not smile at him until he got tame"? I think that was awfully 'cute. Then he said it without the slightest sense of humour. Guess me, now.

Rec. : 5, 7, 10, and 12 are Mr. Hyslop's questions. Is Mrs. W. there?

(This answer has considerable interest. It shows that the receiver's memory was good enough to recall the fact that Mrs. W. neither knew the incident indicated about my little boy nor could be identified with the reference to the want of the sense of humour in my boy, which was a matter of frequent remark to my wife and only a few others who could not be suggested in any of the messages here sent. This was what I had aimed at.—J. H. H.)

13. Com. : Do you remember that you bought some of your table-ware at the store I know so well in Philadelphia?

Rec. : That's Mrs. W. At the Simons store. I'm going home. Mrs. W. can come out and see me. (Then, a moment later): Is Mrs. W. there?

Com. : You are right in your guess, but Mrs. W. is not here.

Mrs. W. lives in New York, and is a sister of the person whose store in Philadelphia is named. (This 13th question was sent merely to seal the suggestions given in the others, and it was natural from the nature of the previous experiments that Mrs. W.'s presence would be supposed.—J. H. H.)

GROUP B.—II.

This set of experiments can be classed in Group B, though there are many features of it that would justify placing it in Group A. There is the main purpose to seek for the identification of a single person, as the largest part of the incidents chosen relate to the chief person to be identified; but as there was a distinct purpose to throw me off the main track on certain other definite persons, the experiment can be classed in Group B. It also differs from those conducted with the telegraph line in that this method of communicating between the sender and receiver was abandoned for that of using an intermediary who should either bring the messages to me or send them by mail without using the handwriting of the person to be identified. The secrecy and method in all other respects were the same as in the use of the telegraph. I have also the advantage of studying myself the nature of the situation and mental operations directly, where before I had to largely infer it until informed by interrogation of the parties. But in this experiment I was myself the receiver, and was in a position to know quite distinctly the conditions under which the inferences of my other subjects were made. The results were the same, and can be studied with the same interest and profit.

Communicator : Doctor F. Receiver : Professor Hyslop.

1. Com. : I knew you several years ago.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(This message was not intended to have any special pertinence according to subsequent statement of sender.)

2. Com. : Were you not on Amsterdam Avenue about two weeks ago ?

Rec. : Yes, Miss Stettheimer.

(I had in mind the incident which I had sent as communicator to this lady as receiver in a previous set of experiments ; then, assuming that the sender had in view the same part of the Avenue that I had, the inference was pertinent, and since the coincidence could hardly have been true of any one else, it would have been correct ; but afterwards I found that the sender had in view another part—the other end of the Avenue—of which I should never have thought, in spite of the fact that it was the end below the college that I came over every day. Consequently the case is a very pretty illustration of the illusion of apperception. The identification was correct from my memory of the possible persons who saw me about the time mentioned on the part of the Avenue I thought of, but as regards the part thought of by the sender it was a mistake, and illustrates the misunderstanding that can easily occur between communicators and sitters where the statements are capable of a variety of meanings in spite of their apparent simplicity.—J. H. H.)

3. Com. : You seemed to be carrying a copy of *The Sun*.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(Only on two occasions within any recent date had I carried a copy of *The Sun*, and when the question came to me I had some little difficulty in recalling whether it was on Amsterdam Avenue that I had carried both of them. At last before answering I remembered that it was on Third Avenue that I could have been seen carrying it once and on Amsterdam Avenue in the second case, but as I could remember seeing no one on either occasion, I could not even make an intelligible guess. But the communicator's explanation of the question afterwards shows that it had less definiteness and pertinence than I was disposed and entitled to consider it when taken alone. He says that he did not know that this was a fact regarding *The Sun*, but that he had seen me on Amsterdam Avenue from his window with a newspaper in my hand and simply knew about the circumstance that would possibly make a reference to this particular paper relevant, though the statement was not known nor intended to be as pertinent as it seemed to be to me.—J. H. H.)

4. Com. : I should think you might reply to such a so-called critique.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(No special importance was intended by this question. It was only a more specific suggestion of the thought in the mind of the sender, limiting the application in his mind—and unknown to him also in mine—to one of the cases in which I could have been seen carrying a copy of *The Sun*. In this case again, it was only the failure to remember any one seen on the Avenue at the time I carried the copy in question that prevented me from a guess as pertinent from my point of view as the second message, though from that of the communicator it had little but an imaginary pertinence.—J. H. H.)

5. Com. : I once met you in a public conveyance.

Rec. : No suggestion. The statement would apply to many.

(Inquiry of the sender shows that the expression "public conveyance" was used purposely as a misleading form of language, as the thing in mind was a ferry-boat, while I thought of an omnibus and street car. It represented a true occurrence as between myself and the communicator, but was obscure and trivial, as it did not purport to mean anything that I should either necessarily or probably be expected to remember. But my memory had to be tested as preliminary to more specific incidents.—J. H. H.)

6. Com. : Later I saw you at a reception.

Rec. : Would apply to many. No suggestion.

(A true incident, but not specially significant according to the statement of the communicator.—J. H. H.)

7. Com. : Do you know who is to review your book for the *Political Science Quarterly*?

Rec. : No. But it could be Merriam.

(I thought of three persons here as likely to put this question, but I decided for the one mentioned in my answer on the ground of general improbability for the other two, as being too open a question for them to put, and the one named had not only taken part in these experiments, but had been in the room recently and had as an outsider taken the lectures which made up the book. My inference was a mere guess, rather as a possibility than any inference involving any assurance. But the sender intended it as a means of keeping my mind on as many tacks as possible.—J. H. H.)

8. Com. : I shall be very glad to receive a copy if you have any to spare.

Rec. : No suggestion. (Question of no special significance.)

9. Com. : Shall I see you at the next faculty meeting?

Rec. : No.

(Communicator explains that the question was intended to open the way to a more definite suggestion of a colleague later on and to continue the general object of diverting my mind toward as many persons as possible.—J. H. H.)

10. Com. : How is your brother now?

Rec. : No suggestion, though if my memory were good, I could limit this question to a few.

(This question was far more definite than the sender imagined, as the intermediary who was acquainted with its purpose at once noticed and expressed afterward his surprise at the reception it met. Still I had thought of something quite different from what the sender had in mind, and could not have guessed the incident he intended by it. He had met my brother who was here for a short time several years ago, five I think, and I could not imagine who it could be that was in any way acquainted with him. He was somewhat, yes, considerable, of an invalid at the time, and was unable to continue his course on account of his illness. But I thought of acquaintances of this period only as a possibility, my main attention being directed to the possibility that the brother was concerned who was specially mentioned in my sittings at Boston, which I had detailed to only a few students, and I was trying to limit the probabilities to the two or three most likely to think of them. But I had to weigh the probabilities between my invalid brother, with the possible persons who might have known him,

and those who might have put the question from the memory of my narrative, and I could make no probable guess, though the question was much more specific from my point of view than from that of the communicator. The sender also knew nothing of my brother's illness.—J. H. H.)

11. Com. : When did you hear from George last ?

Rec. : No suggestion.

(I betrayed from my manner to the intermediary my consciousness of an interesting pertinence in this question, as I had another brother by this name, and coming after the previous question it definitely excluded my invalid brother from the case, as this brother George had never been in the city and his name could be known only to those who had heard me narrate the results of my Piper sittings, where this brother was mentioned, and he was the one I had in mind as the alternative to the invalid brother. Still I could not definitely identify the communicator in any way. Further his own explanation of the question is that it had no special object, the name George having come into his mind by mere chance. From his point of view it was therefore neither a true incident nor a pertinent question, while as a fact also I had not narrated my experiences to him. Consequently its pertinence was a mere matter of chance.—J. H. H.)

12. Com. : Is Mrs. Hyslop well ?

Rec. : Marvin.

(This answer was suggested by the relative pertinence of this question to the line of thought suggested by the two previous ones. They all fit together, and as there were in my mind only two persons likely to ask all three of them, and one of these was in the room with me, I guessed the other. From my point of view this answer was most probable, but as there was no cumulative purpose in the three questions and no special purpose in this one by the communicator, but only a question of general diversion, we see a most interesting source of illusion between sender and receiver.—J. H. H.)

13. Com. : Were you not a candidate for a position some time ago, for which you were unsuccessful ?

Rec. : Yes, but no suggestion.

(Communicator states that this refers to a true incident of which he knew, but which was a different one from that which I had in mind. The one in his mind was some eleven years ago, and the one suggested to me by the question was not more than four or five years ago. But in either case it was not a very suggestive question, especially the case in his mind, as I was not likely to have mentioned it to him, and not likely to have remembered it if I did. Still it is pertinent, and it might be assumed possible for me to recall the fact, but the more important case in my mind prevented association from going any farther.—J. H. H.)

14. Com. : Do you recall lecturing a few years ago before a body of men ? You talked of depth.

Rec. : Cushing.

(The communicator was present at this lecture, and my answer showed that his question was rightly interpreted, and the name indicated was that of the chairman of the evening. I was asked to talk on experiments in space perception in company with another officer of the college who was to talk on another subject. There were only two names besides my own

suggested by the question, and I had no memory of any others whatever, and, as I was practically certain that my colleague could not be the sender, while the man named was in the institution at present, and could easily have been the communicator, I ventured on his name, though conscious that it could as well or better be some one else whom I could not recall. Hence both question and answer were pertinent, though a defect of memory prevented any nearer suggestion of the right person.—J. H. H.)

15. Com. : Your experiments seem rather indefinite in character. I doubt whether one can draw any scientific conclusions from them.

Rec. : Grannis.

(The communicator explains that the question was intended to divert me in the direction of the colleague in mind in question 9, as this colleague had remarked to me in presence of sender the sentiment here expressed. But this incident was not suggested to me, though I thought of the colleague in the mind of the communicator. But as I knew it was not his day to be at the college and that it was improbable that he was present, I selected the next probable person to make this remark, as I had remarked what I thought a little scepticism in him when present as an observer.—J. H. H.)

16. Com. : Do you still hold the same views regarding Hobhouse and Sigwart that you did two years ago ?

Rec. : Grannis (?) or Stettheimer.

(The communicator explains that he thought this question would suggest either Grannis, Marvin, or Jones, who had been students of mine in connection with this subject, but I could not recall that the first-named person was in the class at that time, and I knew the last was probably the originator of the question because he was present in the room where the messages were brought ; and the second-named person, though I thought of him, and he was one of the very few that I could remember as having been in that class, I decided against, because he had a few minutes before come into the room and left again. Hence I inferred the first name as pertinent to my present class on the same subject, and doubtful in reference to the two years before, and the second name as certainly a member of the earlier class. I was therefore right in my thought of the three persons actually intended, but the circumstances mentioned prevented my decision from being what it might have been.—J. H. H.)

17. Com. : Marvin was misled.

Rec. Grannis.

(This was intended to keep me on the person I named. It represents an incident in an earlier experiment, when the person named in the message was misled in thinking that the person I here named was the communicator when he was not. The real communicator in the present case had been told it, and was not present when it occurred. He thus concealed himself while he kept me on another tack than himself.—J. H. H.)

18. Com. : Did you not have a "naïve and enthusiastic" student in Ethics a year ago ?

Rec. : No definite suggestion, unless it is a ruse by Grannis in reference to practical ethics.

(This was a perfectly definite question intended to suggest a certain student whom the phrase in quotation marks ought to have recalled, but not

doing this, I could only follow the preconception established by several previous messages. If also it had reminded me of the person it was intended to suggest it would also have indicated the communicator quite probably, as I had had a few words with him a short time before on a matter connected with the person in his mind. But here again memory failed and my preconception indicates an interesting source of error that would have been avoided by a better memory, and the circumstance mentioned would have had great evidential force.—J. H. H.)

19. Com. : Hays was a high churchman.

Rec. : Grannis, though Marvin could as well be identified with it.

(My answer was given in these terms because I felt that it was extremely improbable that Marvin should so soon after his experiments with me, when he had sent this very message to me, repeat it in this way. Hence knowing that in those experiments he had thought that Grannis was present at my end of the line, and that no one else but the intermediary in this set, Mr. McW., knew it, I inferred that the incidents had been told Grannis, and guessed him on this ground. The communicator explains that Marvin came in and suggested the message after telling the circumstances, and that he sent it in order to keep me on the very person that I mentioned. My identification was, therefore, correct though I reached it in the wrong way.—J. H. H.)

20. Com. : I heard you lecture on Hypnotism several years ago.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(This is a mixture of true and false, as a diversion and transition to something more directly pertinent. I never delivered any such lecture as this message suggested, but I lectured on, or rather discussed hypnotism in my class, which the sender attended.—J. H. H.)

21. Com. : A year or so before you lectured on the History of Philosophy.

Rec. : Regularly or only on certain occasions? (Cf. p. 545.)

Com. : Regularly.

(I thought of a course which I gave at Barnard College in this subject, and of Miss Stettheimer as the possible communicator, but I knew this was impossible on reflection, and could only feel wholly uncertain. I afterwards learned that the communicator had an entirely different course in mind which I had forgotten for the moment, but which came to me just before the receipt of the twenty-sixth message, as will be remarked there. It is worth saying, however, that even if I had recalled the right course, I had wholly forgotten the presence in the class of the person who turns out to be the real communicator in the present experiment. The fact was, however, that the real communicator was not a member of this course, and merely knew that I gave it and here used the fact as a diversion.—J. H. H.)

22. Com. : You later lectured on Space Perception.

Rec. : No suggestion save that it might be a lady in Barnard College, who also heard me at Plainfield.

Com. : Guess again.

(The communicator explains that this was not a special incident or lecture, but simply refers to lectures in my general course, and was used merely as a general reference to himself preparatory to better identifying incidents. To me it appeared to mean some specific lecture given to the

public, and having forgotten completely that I had given a course in the History of Philosophy during the absence of the head of the department, I naturally interpreted the message, especially from its mode of expression, to refer to incidents which my reply makes apparent.—J. H. H.)

23. Com. : About three years ago I saw you in the lower part of the city.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(A true incident between myself and sender, and refers, according to his statement, to the same fact as Question 5. It is sufficiently vague and indefinite and is designed to test the point at which identification begins. The next message has the same object, and only narrows the field slightly.—J. H. H.)

24. Com. : I think it was in the spring.

Rec. : No suggestion.

25. Com. : I once attended a meeting of the S.P.R. at which you were present.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(True general incident, and not specific or specially important.)

26. Com. : When did you hear from G. P. last ?

Rec. : Marvin. Marvin is also the answer to Question 21.

(This is an interesting question and answer. I at once supposed that the "G. P." referred to "George Pelham," the personality referred to in the last report of Dr. Hodgson, and as I had narrated to the person named in my answer the full details of my own sittings in which "G. P." acted once as amanuensis, and as he knew that I was carrying on the experiments with Mrs. Piper through Dr. Hodgson,—Dr. Jones, who was all the while in the room with me, being the only other party that knew the fact,—I at once felt assured of the identity and so named the person above mentioned. I felt that this was especially confirmed by the coincidence of this question with messages 10, 11, and 12. But, as a matter of fact, the communicator explains that the letters stood in his mind for an acquaintance of mine to whom I had introduced him during the holidays at the meeting of the Psychological Association. Consequently, this is another illustration of mere chance in producing a cumulative case of coincidences in which the personal identity imagined by me to be strongly indicated is illusory in its objective interpretation, correct as it may be from my standpoint. But it in no way represents either the distributive or collective intention of the communicator as it does the cumulative suggestiveness for the receiver. This conclusion by myself was also reinforced by the sudden recall to memory of the fact at this time that I had given a course in the History of Philosophy in Columbia, and that question 21 referred to this instead of to the Barnard course, and as Dr. Marvin was a member of this course and almost the only one that I could remember in it, and certainly the only one about the institution, with probably the exception of Mr. McW., the intermediary in the experiments, who could be a party to question 21, I at once saw the pertinence of the question and in connection with this last message answered with considerable confidence in the identification, especially as this supposition coincided with the cumulative character of the messages already mentioned. But its illusory nature has already been remarked.—J. H. H.)

27. Com. : Ph. Im. R. (Cf. G. P.'s interruptions, pp.211-213.)

Rec. : If these are intended for the symbols of names in the S. P. R. *Proceedings* it is Marvin.

(I learn that as a fact Dr. Marvin happened to come in just after my answer to question 26 was sent and did suggest this message and intended it as his own to see if I would identify him. My answer in any case was correct. But my reason for it is such that the sending of the message by any one else would have led to the same identification. There was probably no other student in the institution who could have given these symbols of the personalities, Phinuit, Imperator, and Rector. Consequently he must have been suggested as the originator of the message, whether he were the immediate sender or not. By this time, of course, I felt tolerably certain of the main person responsible for the messages as a whole, with reckoning for diversions. The issue, however, shows that I was wrong.—J. H. H.)

28. Com. : Do you know anything of Griffing?

Rec. : Franz.

(This was intended by the communicator to turn me on the track of Professor C., the same person intended by messages 9 and 15. But, as seen in my answer, it failed of its purpose, and not only brought a correct answer as to the real sender, since I remembered only a few days before having talked with this person about the one named in the message, but it also quite broke the preconception existing in regard to Dr. Marvin. There was, in fact, whatever the sender intended, less reason for my supposing Professor C. either as the sender or as the proper person meant than the one I guessed. I had not talked to any other person than the one I named for a year or more about the man named in the message.—J. H. H.)

29. Com. : Do you believe there is much demand for psychologists at the present time?

Rec. : Franz.

(The question was a vague one, not referring to any special incident between us, but my guess or inference was based mainly on its close consistency with the previous message and the known ambitions of the person named. It turns out to have been the correct answer, though I had no assurance of it at the time.—J. H. H.)

30. Com. : You once advised me to accept a newspaper position if I could get it.

Rec. : No suggestion.

(This was a true incident between the communicator and myself, though I had no recollection of it. I had made the same recommendation to several students in the past, but could not recall any one of them to whom it would apply. The incident was certainly trivial enough.—J. H. H.)

31. Com. : The baby said nothing.

Rec. : Franz quoting C.—.

(This sentence was quoted from my message some time before to Professor C. for my identification, and as Dr Franz was present with Professor C. as my assistant, my memory made it certain that the person named in my answer was responsible for the question ; and it seems to have occasioned some surprise that my answer came as it did, since the statement was intended to turn me to Professor C. Had I had the slightest reason

under the circumstances to suppose that Professor C. was present at the college, or that he would consent to an experiment of this kind after his expressed opinion about the experiments, I might have wavered at the message. But the whole mental situation made this impossible to me, and as I knew that no other person could know the incident referred to in the message except the sender, who had been my assistant when it was sent to Professor C., I had a clear case of identification with a very strong assurance, and one also that made any other of the persons that I had named in connection with other messages impossible communicators of this message.—J. H. H.)

32. Com. : I must leave in a short while. Will return to college Tuesday.
Rec. : C—.

(Before receiving any further messages, the next day I wrote the following note to Mr. McW., the intermediary, in explanation of my answer to the question, or rather message :—

“February 10th.

“MY DEAR McW.,—I was in such a hurry yesterday that I failed to say in regard to the last message that I regarded it as Franz *personating* C., instead of C. himself. My answer meant that it pertained to C.

“J. H. H.”

It seems that the message was intended to be more effective in diverting me to the belief that C. was the communicator, and the receiver had correctly inferred my state of mind about him, though supposing that it could be overcome by so direct a message in the first person. The object was to break up my preconception in favour of the real communicator. He in reality did not appreciate how conclusive for his identification the previous message had been.—J. H. H.)

33. Com. : Do you still experiment in binocular vision ?

Rec. : This could be Franz, Marvin, or Grannis, and many others as well.

(The question was general and my answer was intended to convey that fact. I should remark, however, that at this stage of the experiment it had to be resumed by correspondence, as the hour was up and I had to go to a lecture.—J. H. H.)

34. Com. : Why did you not come up to my home as you promised ?

Rec. : Franz personating C., except that it is possible that McW. was at my end of the line at the time, which I think was the case. If so, this is McW.'s question.

(It here occurred to me that McW. himself was probably at my end of the telegraph when I sent an incident of exactly the same import to Professor C. for my identification on the same occasion on which I sent the statement quoted in message 31, and consequently I wavered in my assurance about the identification in that message. McW. then seemed to be a possible alternative for both messages, though I had wholly forgotten whether he was present or not, as surmised here. I knew that both messages were pertinent to Dr. Franz, while they were possible with McW. But the communicator intended it to refer to Professor C., but seeing that I failed to take the bait in this direction, and that I had weakened regarding

himself, sent the next message purposely, with the aid of McW., to divert me in another direction.—J. H. H.)

35. Com. : I have been experimenter in at least six of your present series of experiments on identity.

Rec. : McWhood or Marvin.

(I knew that this message could not be true of the person first supposed in messages 31, 32 and 34, as he had witnessed only two of the series, while it was true of the persons named, and if I had felt assured that the first of the two had been present at the sending of 31 and 34 to Professor C., this might still more have weakened my preconception that it was Franz. I knew, however, that this message was not pertinent to him, and whether sent by the persons named or not was true only of them. I learned after the series was completed that the message was one of McW.'s intended to divert me to either Marvin or himself. Hence both the intention and my identification were correct. So definite a message or incident was rather a mistake except on the supposition that the sender was not assured of its inapplicability to any other persons than those named.—J. H. H.)

36. Com. : I am not yet thirty years old.

Rec. : No suggestion except McWhood or Marvin, though this might apply to my children and *some* others!

(Question and answer explain themselves. The message had a definite purpose, and implied no identifying circumstance.—J. H. H.)

37. Com. : My complexion and hair are medium light.

Rec. : Marvin. Would apply to Franz also, but he would not answer to certain other questions involving unity of personality. If then you intend me to judge from this unity of questions, Marvin is the only one that will fit.

(This message definitely excluded McW. from the case, as his hair is black, and I sent my answer with the weaker alternative for Franz for the reason mentioned in my answer. I had not in my possession the series of messages, and had to rely on my memory for a cumulative judgment, and as some of the messages were possible only to Marvin, and others which were very applicable to Franz might still—so far as I could remember them—be borrowed diversions, since I knew Franz must be responsible for some of them, the situation produced a preference in my mind for Marvin. My answer, however, brought the following note :—

“Reply to 37 received. I have 38 ready, but before I send it, will you not please to answer the following question : *Whether or not you have ample reason for your guess? Who do you REALLY think is your questioner?*”

“When the reply comes I shall send you 38.

“L. B. McW.”

I replied to this as follows, hinting at the necessity for seeing the questions, many of which I had forgotten :—

“Most probably Marvin; but not being able to remember the questions I cannot answer with any confidence. I ought to have the questions, and perhaps I could decide.”

“J. H. HYSLOP.”

(The questions, however, were not sent to me, evidently because my answer to Mr. McW. had shown my preference.—J. H. H.)

38. Com. : Recently you recommended me for a position.

Rec. : Franz.

(This incident was quite specific, and I had no difficulty in identifying its sender, though the position was not such a one as he aspired to, and might have been applicable to one other person who had not figured in any of this set of experiments. The answer was correct, though the assurance was not complete for the set.—J. H. H.)

39. Com. : You received a note from one of your former students a few days ago.

Rec. : Franz.

(This incident was also quite specific and pertinent, as it applied to the person named with scarcely a doubt; I could say without any doubt, so far as the memory of the fact that I had received a note from this very person was concerned, but I felt it possible that a forgotten note from some other student might stand in the way of assured identification here. I sent for the questions and after receiving them and examining them for converging evidence, could not decide anything except that the balance was for Franz, as Marvin, though fitting my conception of many of them, would not fit 38 and 39, nor 31 and 34. I did not send this word to the communicator, however, but waited for the next message.—J. H. H.)

40. Com. : A few days ago we talked of the conditions at W University.

Rec. : Franz without doubt. This "W" is meant for Wooster University about which we talked.

(This message was intended to bring the experiment to an end, and was one calculated to make identification assured. The incident was one that the sender could hardly suppose or expect to be duplicated in the experience of any one else and was well chosen to identify himself, though it was, of course, possible that the same fact should be true of others. But as it happened it was true only of himself, and my answer left the sender as assured as I was.—J. H. H.)

GROUP C.—I.

New York, February 18th, 1899.

The following is an experiment of the same general kind as Groups A and B, except that it was conducted without the telegraph lines, and in more distinct imitation of the Piper phenomena. The incidents were worked up on slips of paper and exhibited one at a time to the receiver, as if they had been telegrams, and his judgment obtained with notes of his remarks by myself. In this case, however, I aimed at giving a suggestion of the communicator near the beginning, though first using some incidents that would keep him out of mind, and help in sustaining a little ambiguity and incoherence. I obtained most of the incidents from the father, and worked them up myself with some from my own recollection of his experience, and shall indicate them before giving the account of the experiment.

The material given me by the father consisted of the following incidents in the common life of himself and his son, intended to serve as means of identification.

Harrison Avenue, Springfield, Mass., was the street on which the office of the paper for which Mr. G. worked was situated. Union Street in same city was the place of their residence. Rowing on the Connecticut River here, Mrs. Aldrich and her kindergarten and daughter Gertrude, an old playmate of the son when very young.

Robert's Road, the street on which the family lived in Bryn Mawr. Hannum, the name of the janitor in the Baptist Church there. "Bob," the name of an intimate acquaintance there.

"Lester," the name that the son was called by an acquaintance in New York.

J. A. Bolles, the name of the editor of the *New Milford Gazette*, and called "Ja. Ja." by the son.

Millard Morgan, the name of an intimate friend of the son.

Frank E., name of a relative with the same initials as the father, and always called simply "Frank E." Van Deusenville, the name of a village near where "Frank E." lived, and Ives Place, the name of a part of the estate belonging to the family. Used to go to picnics here.

Charlie, the name of Professor G.'s brother, as he was always called. Monument Mills, the name of some mills in Housatonic; Bob Mack, the name of an intimate acquaintance there; band concerts attended by father and son on bicycles; Rev. Charles A. Mallory, the pastor there.

The incidents which I added on my own account were those in reference to J. R. G.; those about the murderer, his trial, capital punishment, the interview, of which I had been told by Professor G. some years ago, they being experiences common to him and myself, and I supposed probably to his son, as events proved was true. Also the terms "anthropogenic" and "consciousness of kind." I also added those about Philadelphia and the public discussion, for the sake of running the identification down to a certainty.

The incidents will be found to have been worked up with much incoherency and confusion of dates and places. Events that happened at different places are sometimes mentioned in connection with the same place. The reason for this will be apparent to all who are familiar with the Piper phenomena, although I have very much exaggerated this incoherence. My wish was to see how far the receiver would separate the incidents and yet stand by the identification of his father, if he supposed him to be the author of the statements.

Communicator: Professor G. Receiver: Mr. G., his son.

1. Do you remember where we used to live when my work kept me so busy? You were a little lad. It was long ago, and in the east, I think. I often think of it, and wonder whether you delighted in it as much as I did. Do you remember the man out west with my name, J. R. G.? He must have been a relative. Don't you remember our talk about him at M...lf...d? I can't get all of it, before we saw him in Ohio. This was on U...on S.....t.

Mr. G. : That J. R. G. is Joshua R. Giddings.

(This recognition was correct, and there was apparently nothing but the initials and the reference to Ohio to indicate it. But afterward Mr. G. told me that he had recently been reading his life and that he was a distant relative. The places abbreviated were not recognised.—J. H. H.)

2. I am going to see you when I can. You ought to remember me well enough. I was opposed to slavery. J . . sh . . a R. G . . d . . . ng . . It is hard to get. If I remember rightly I was in what you call Congress. We had exciting times about '61. You knew Mrs. Aldrich. What nice things she used to do for you when you were so young, knee high to a duck, while I was making speeches in the campaign.

Mr. G. : (Here the name was again recognised, and the statement made that he was opposed to slavery. Then :) I did know a Mrs. Aldrich in Springfield, Mass. She had a sort of kindergarten.

3. My special science was not yet much known, though many may think it ought to have been. But you would not have understood it then. We had not gotten out of the woods then. Well, things have changed. Do you remember Gertrude? Was there anybody by that name? I think I know her. Or was it Girtie, Guthrie, or something like that? That was a big city then. She was a little girl when I went to interview a man who was to be hung for murder. If I remember rightly it was in a town where there was a college and not far from where we lived. Afterward we moved. I must have told you about capital punishment.

Mr. G. : I remember Gertrude, Mrs. Aldrich's daughter.

4. I often think of the place and the work. That brute made me less sentimental. He might have been anthropogenic, but he tried my patience and that was great. Seventeen miles away I could have been at home. Boston may be a good place, but it has fewer memories than the town on the river and the college where the girls were. The boys were not far off. Do you recall President Sharp? No, Sharkey . . . Is that it? Will come again.

Mr. G. : That is President Sharpless. I know his son. They were at Haverford near Bryn Mawr where we lived. "Anthropogenic" sounds like father. It is his word. I have heard him talk about capital punishment.

(Allusion to "special science" in previous question. I intended President Sharpless by "President Sharp" and following words.—J. H. H.)

5. Your father would be glad to see you doing well at your work. Do you still make shoes at that mill by the monuments? Brother lived there too. The kindergarten was a fine place, wasn't it? Wasn't Gertrude there? Do you remember the tall houses, sky-scrapers, as we used to call them where we lived? Things have changed. This is a strange world here. No newspapers to write.

Mr. G. : Father was a newspaper man. I don't remember the mill by the monuments. There is the kindergarten again. The sky-scrapers I know only in New York.

(The relevance of Gertrude was also recognised again.—J. H. H.)

6. Wait a minute. I am forgetting. Oh! yes, the river we used to row on. Slavery . . . I am wandering. My mind runs on this subject still. I wrote on all kinds of subjects and had many interviews. And I

had to go about very much. You remember we went down to the river to row together. There was a dam across it further up where there were so many paper mills. Sharpless! That's it. He was only a short distance from us.

Mr. G. : These were the paper mills on the Housatonic, where we go in the summer. I was born there.

(These were not the mills that I had in mind when I wrote the incidents down. I had those at Holyoke, Mass., in mind, which were near Springfield.—J. H. H.)

7. Do you recall that murderer whose crime and trial after ten years made so much noise about the country? He was tried where there was a girls' college, not far from home. I went to interview him before he was hung. The paper was to publish what he was to say. But I got tired of this work and went to the kind of work that I like, and helped the girls to learn. It was as good as Mrs. Aldrich's school. But it was not a kindergarten.

Mr. G. : I don't remember this murder trial. The incidents would fit my father. He did go to interview a murderer.

8. Do you remember that trip to Europe? Those porpoises. They were fine. Most of it has gone. But I forgot the Baptist Church. Was it Spurgeon or Hannum that preached? This was in January. Is that right? No. I am thinking of the janitor. It was the parsonage in which we lived. What a lovely city. They called it . . . near the place . . . love. Queer name. Did you ever read the 23rd Psalm?

Mr. G. : Father went to Europe and I remember that he talked about the porpoises. Hannum is right. He was the janitor at the church in Bryn Mawr. We lived in the parsonage. [Reference to porpoises mine.—J. H. H.]

9. You were a little fellow when you came to the office. Do you recall your first pair of trousers? Was it on Han . . . What's that? Hasson shu . . . ave. Let me see. Wait until I am clear. Oh! close to home. H A R . . . N A . . . E N U . . . in a field. I am going, will try again.

Mr. G. : I did often go to father's office in Springfield, Mass. This looks like Harrison Avenue. But I don't remember the place.

(The word "field" was puzzling for a moment, but in a flash Mr. G. saw that it was intended for the name of the town, which was correct, namely, Springfield.—J. H. H.)

10. How good a thing it is and well

For brethren in unity to dwell.

That's the name of the town near where we lived. This was afterward. Where was it? You remember the girls' school, where we made brain, not brawn. Some of it sounds like this: Robert! Who is Robert? Oh! Robert's . . . What's the rest? Is it Road? Yes, yes. Was this in Mass.?

Mr. G. : This is Robert's Road, where we lived in Bryn Mawr. Oh! that means Philadelphia, only ten miles from Bryn Mawr.

(Here Mr. G. put together this and the eighth question and with the manner of an interesting discovery and assured belief mentioned the name of Philadelphia, which was correct.—J. H. H.)

[Short Beach, Conn., August 2nd, 1899.]

I learned incidentally a day or two ago of an interesting mistake made by myself in this allusion to the 23rd Psalm. The mistake is precisely like those so often made by communicators in the Piper sittings. I had intended the reader to suppose from my quotation about brethren living in unity that I was quoting the 23rd Psalm mentioned in a previous question. Now, a few days ago, I had occasion to mention the same sentence: "How good a thing it is for brethren in unity to dwell," and referred it to the 23rd Psalm, as usual, and as in Question 8. But I was laughed at by my wife and a friend with her. I insisted and felt quite confident that I was right, but they were not to be convinced, and reasserted that I was in error. But I would not yield until I took a concordance and found the passage in the *first verse of the 133rd Psalm*. I shall certainly have to be charitable to "spirits" when they commit similar mistakes, especially when we recall the fact that the 23rd Psalm was a favourite one in the family, very often sung at family worship, and more often recited on Sundays, while the 133rd was very often mentioned and recited as a moral lesson to children who frequently had their differences that the sentiment in this Psalm was intended to prevent.—J. H. H.] (Cf. pp. 228-231.)

11. You used often when small to come to the office. I saw you there, and I think mother will recall it. Do you? H . . R . . . SON . . V . . NUE. Wasn't Gertrude there? Where is "Bob"? He is a good fellow. I know how you like him. Where is that street? A man in your class has the name of it.

Mr. G. : That must be Harrison Avenue, because there is a man by that name in my class, but I don't remember it. I know "Bob" well.

12. Is it that Baptist sexton? Sounds like Mark Hanna. Is that right? He lived in the same town as . . . Thomas, who was very bright. I knew it. You knew "Bob" there, I remember. We did better afterwards, and I had more time to write. I must get that name. It . . . Thomas. Can't get it right. There was a . . . Rhodes there, too. He died, and . . . Thomas is still living.

Mr. G. : There was a man by the name of Rhodes, the president of Bryn Mawr College, where we were. I did not know of his death. Thomas I don't know. Oh, yes; it might be Miss Thomas, the Dean at Bryn Mawr.

(The reference to the Baptist sexton was correctly interpreted as an allusion to "Hannum."—J. H. H.)

13. Do you remember who called you Lester? Where is that gazette our boarder worked for? Was it on Union-street? Ja. Ja. . . . I don't hear. Bones . . . Bowl . . . What's that? Sounds like Bonus. Don't you remember Ja? I knew him and mother. That ought to prove who your father is. And somebody else, too.

Mr. G. : When we came to New York, there was a fellow who always called me "Lester," without any reason that I could give, as that was not my name. That "Ja. Ja." refers to John A. Bolles. I used to call an imaginary being "Ja. Ja." in my play, and I called Mr. Bolles this because of his initials, "J. A." We did live on Union-street, Springfield.

14. Where is that book I wrote? I am thinking of it. Where is brother Charlie now? Oh! those mills. It was not at Milford. Do you remember

the band concerts? We had to have bicycles then. Was Frank E. at any of those farm picnics? Was that the name? Sounds like a baker's dozen.

Mr. G. : Charlie was my father's brother. This might be written of last summer. All of it is as if it were from my father. Frank E. is a distant cousin of mine by the name of G—. He was a farmer there.

(Mr. G. here referred to all the past questions with the remark that the whole of them would fit his father, except those alluding to J. R. G. This was correct, as I had used that name for diversion. "Baker's dozen" a bad pun for Van Deusenville.—J. H. H.)

15. I forget a good many things. Only a few come back. But I remember Ives Place and Millard Morgan. Now I am thinking of that place where the girls went to school. Was it Smith College? This was near the Connecticut River where we used to row together. Those were fine times. No, it wasn't there I taught the girls. What's that? Are you saying anything about a kind of consciousness? He says . . . of kind.

Mr. G. : I know Ives Place, but I cannot recall where it is. I know Millard Morgan well. He was in college last year. I have rowed on the Connecticut. We lived one summer in Northampton. That phrase "kind of consciousness" if turned around is a pet phrase of father's. Yes, there it is in the next sentence. (Cf. pp. 544-546.)

16. How's a tonic in mass? Sounds like this. Did you say mass? Who's soul? Wait a minute. Tell Charlie he will be glad to know I am still living. Where is Bob Mack? That's the one I think. It is hard to speak in these conditions. Some one is saying *Milford Gazette*. Ja. Ja. He can't say.

Mr. G. : "How's a tonic," that's Housatonic, the name of the place where we lived. Bob Mack is a man in this place. He was a friend of father and of his brother Charlie.

(The recognition of J. A. Bolles was made again and his connection with the gazette mentioned, and the town corrected to New Milford.—J. H. H.)

17. What did I say about the college? I forget the name of it just now. It has large columns in it, and I said much about consciousness in it. There are girls there too. First it was where there were only girls. Do you remember the Monument Mills? Charlie was there. Who was the pastor? Mal M M A L L O W S. Was it Marsh? No; same name as Charlie. Wait; he'll get it. C H A L E . . A M L O R Y. That's it as I get it.

Mr. G. : There, "consciousness"! It must be my father. I recognise Charles A. Mallory. He married father and mother.

(Some further remarks were made about the "consciousness of kind," which was the pet phrase of his father in sociological discussions.—J. H. H.)

18. Who says Bryn Mawr and Rhode . . . What's the road? I am muddled a little. The newspaper office was at the first place. Do you remember the curve in the railway track near the bridge over the river? We moved to this new place. Oh, yes! that's Hannum I was trying to think of a little while ago. I told you so. I got it wrong about Mark Hanna. I am clearer now. I think I can prove your father even if I do get muddled. But I shall soon be all right.

Mr. G. : There was a curve in the railway at Van Deusenville, near Housatonic.

(I had intended this curve to refer to the one in Springfield, Mass. All the other incidents were correctly indicated and recognised.—J. H. H.)

19. Do you remember my book? I liked social problems. But they forced me to cross swords with Carl Schurz. There was another man too. What was his name? His people used to live in Judæa. He is a kind of preacher. This all comes of studying society. Was Van . . . Van Dew . . . Van sen. Van Deussen there? The newspapers talked about it. This makes me think of Harrison Ave. Mother will remember that, and you too.

Mr. G. : That's father, I know. Were you at that discussion? The other man was F— A—.

20. I said Housatonic. That has nothing to do with saying mass, unless you live there. Do you remember any picnics? After all, teaching boys and girls is better than farming, though it is fine work for a summer vacation.

Mr. G. : Yes, I have been at lots of picnics. That's father, I know, we spent the summers there. All of it applies to him.

There are a number of matters of interest in the results of this experiment. The first one to be noted is that which is characteristic of the whole series,—the trivial nature of the incidents chosen for the purpose of identification. In the case of Professor G., it is especially interesting to remark that the feature that perhaps ought to have been chosen—on the supposition that men would choose what is uppermost and most important in their minds—was not suggested to his mind at all. What bears upon that was selected by myself, namely, the evidential terms and incidents in connection with the author's writings. These are represented in the words "anthropogenic" and "consciousness of kind." All the facts chosen by the communicator were of the unimportant kind that are objected to in the Piper phenomena.

It was a matter of much surprise to me that the receiver inferred so quickly the name for which J. R. G. stood. His remark afterwards sufficiently explained that, however. But it was what I wanted to have come in the second question, as a means of diversion from the immediate suggestion of his father, who was nevertheless represented in the more general statements about the place of living. The preconception thus established did its work in forcing Mr. G. to interpret the incidents with reference to their identity and relation in time and place. He made no mistake in this where any spontaneous mention was made, in spite of the incoherences involved. Even the slightest incidents in a setting of the most remote connection, did not fail to be observed and properly placed. All the names of persons were correctly recognised and located, and the same is true of places, with the exception at first of some which were not fully spelt out and whose form did not at once suggest their purpose, the receiver not being familiar with the Piper reports in this respect.

There was no expressed suspicion that the communicator was his father until we came to the third question, and here the term "anthropogenic" was seized at once and with assurance that the father was connected with the experiment. This was not only true, but I deliberately chose the term and threw it in here with a mass of very general incidents of little suggestive power, in order to see whether it would appear as evidential, or even suggestive at all. The success was very striking, and I may say that the evidential nature of it is apparent from the fact that the term is not a common one with writers generally, but a technical word often used in the father's book. It was the recognition that the term was one of his father's peculiar words, and the unlikeliness of any one else using it that stamped the receiver's conviction with some assurance, and tended to break up the preconception established by the first identification. I did not expect so ready an identification of President Sharpless. But this success at once suggested Bryn Mawr and then at once the false implication that the river referred to was at that place, which was the discrepancy intended. The receiver also recognised the reference of the first sentence in this fourth question to the last sentence in the previous question, referring to the murderer indicated.

There were two errors of judgment as viewed from the standpoint of the communicator. They were, first, the identification of the dam and paper mills alluded to as those on the Housatonic, when those at Holyoke on the Connecticut were intended, and the suggestion of the railway curve at Van Deusenville when that at Springfield was intended. They indicate that what may be supposed to be specific and peculiar may in reality often be common enough to lack all evidential force whatsoever.

Not less interesting was the identification of the city of Philadelphia from the vaguest metaphorical allusion to it. From its Quaker origin it has been called "the city of brotherly love," and in question 8, I had suggested it in too vague a way to secure a guess, but in question 10 the quotation from the 133rd Psalm and the idea expressed by it suggested the right city with a startled expression of discovery. In this latter question the error of putting the town suggested by "Robert's Road," in Massachusetts, was at once noted, though this may be considered quite easy, in spite of some incoherence of statement.

The failure to remember Harrison Avenue was very interesting, because the father had felt perfectly assured that this would be remembered. The quick identification of Mr. Bolles was also striking, because the suggestion was slight.

When we came to question 14, the receiver became tolerably assured that the messages were from his father, and spontaneously remarked

the cumulative nature of the evidence, now observing that much which previously had not suggested his father was meant to do so. And in the fifteenth question the recognition of "consciousness of kind" from a distorted suggestion of it was quick and sagacious, it being in this situation intended as a remote suggestion, and for this purpose readily seen. It very much strengthened Mr. G.'s feeling that he was dealing with his father's messages.

But it was very strange that Ives Place was not at once recognised, but wholly forgotten. This was another instance of a place that the father supposed would be recognised immediately and without fail. But it was only near the close of the experiment that it came to the receiver's memory, and then only in connection with the name of a place near it. That this part of the estate should be so readily forgotten, and other minor incidents recalled with so little effort, only illustrates the misunderstandings that may easily occur in all such attempts at identification. The last two incidents, however, were effective in securing assurance beyond the possibility of cavil and doubt, as they were intended to do. The allusion to Mr. F—A— in the way it was made was remarked as evidence of the correctness of the inference. I had referred to Judæa as if failing to recall the name of the race to which Mr. A. belonged. This was remarked as evidence that the name suggested by the occasion referred to was correct, and that the incident must come from his father, or be meant to identify him with the experiment.

NOTE A.—ADDENDUM.

GROUP C.—II.

New York, *December 9th, 1899.*

Communicator : Miss M. Receiver : Miss B. (*December 5th, 1899.*)

Inasmuch as the area of guessing was limited, as remarked, to a narrow field in my other experiments, I resolved to try a case in which no such limitations could exist. The receivers in all the others could safely act on the assumption that the communicator was most likely connected with the college, and thus it would be supposed that the correct identification would be easier. In the present experiment this objection is eliminated. The communicator was a lady in this city and the receiver one hundred and fifty miles from this place. It was conducted in the same manner as Experiment I., Group C. The results show that the identification was not interfered with on this account, though the tendency of the receiver to limit her guessing at first to the locality in which she lived justifies the suspicion which one must naturally entertain against guessing under the circumstances described in

my experiments. But objection of this sort is much weakened by the fact that in this last experiment it was the intention of the communicator to suggest the persons actually guessed by the receiver in her own locality.

The most interesting incident in the experiment was the correct answer to Question 7, and the spontaneous reconstruction of the facts in the mind of the sender with the cumulative inductive reasoning based upon the previous messages. The process at once broke up the previous preconceptions and established a new apperception mass which made many of the subsequent messages superfluous. The reader can determine for himself the interesting and instructive character of the guess, together with the later confirmations of it. The name Ross had no more special connection with this ride than with hundreds of other experiences with the same person in the same town. All the other guesses are but illustrations of the general nature and purport of these experiments.

The experiments in group B, and also messages leading to incidental identification, show how easy it is to personate the identity of others than the communicator, though this process is largely limited to such identification as can be indicated by mere incidents rather than distinctive personal traits and is likely to develop traces of the identity of the real communicator. In experiment I, group B, I successfully personated two different persons merely by indicating facts which pertained to their identity and not mine. It would not be so easy to reproduce the little tricks of language and phrase of another, or various aspects of character difficult of imitation except after long acquaintance; nor would it be easy to reproduce the psychological traits of another, though perhaps possible under favourable circumstances. The complex incidents representing the unity of consciousness in the identity or personality of the Piper communicators are more natural to a real surviving person than to some one trying to personate them, and it is only a most intimate acquaintance or an amanuensis that can come near to reproducing phenomena of this sort. But from my personation of two persons to the extent of convincing the receiver that they were actually present (p. 596) we can understand the part played by Phinuit in the Piper case, or by any "control." Nor is it any objection that such personation is possible, as it is apparent in the experiments that the communicator must know the facts and the person they represent sufficiently to make the personation successful. This will be true on any theory of the matter, and in cases where we have to suppose telepathy in opposition to spiritism to account for the acquisition of the facts, the only question that can be raised is whether the telepathy can be adequately selective for the purpose.

The same secrecy was maintained as in previous experiments, and I also arranged it so that it was not known that it was I who was conducting the experiment. I prepared the questions after securing the incidents from Miss M., and sent them to a friend who understood the object of the experiment, and he conducted it as if it were his own. The results are precisely like the others. I alter names in all cases calculated to discover identity. In making up my "messages" I endeavoured to imitate the confusion of the Piper phenomena, and so did not try to keep incidents independent of each other, as a comparison of the "messages" with the incidents out of which I constructed them will make apparent. The following are the incidents, obtained from

Miss M., and upon which I proceeded. In the construction of the case I went from the more general to the more specific, in order, as before, to study the point where identification began.

A walk on Pine-street (very common with all students). Miss B. telling Miss M.'s hand in Mrs. Jones' parlor with Miss M.'s sister present. Miss M.'s difficulties in gymnastic exercises, especially with the backward bend. Drinking Russian tea with Miss C. in the spring at Miss Park's. Meeting Mr. Haskins on a certain Sunday in Miss C.'s room. Taking the picture of Miss C. and Virginia Vales, near the Putnam House under a lilac bush. The runaway on Holyoke mountain. Miss Judson and Miss C.'s sister in a buggy in front of the running horse; Miss C., Miss M., and Miss M.'s sister in the runaway buggy. A call by Miss M. on Miss C. just before taking the picture mentioned, and asked by Miss C. where she was going to spend the summer. A talk with Miss C. by Miss M. about basket ball, Miss C. making the rules for it, and a request for Miss M. to write an article about gymnastics for one of the leading periodicals. The party in the runaway had gathered some columbines, and when the runaway began Miss M. cautiously put them down on the floor of the buggy and helped her sister hold the reins.

Incident of Miss C. telling Miss M. about her life in Boston, and her studies and physical training there. Read Betty Parr's poems to Miss M.'s sister, and showed the day's order to the sister. Miss M., Miss C., and Miss M.'s sister together put out of a certain place on the night of the promenade and after eleven o'clock. Listening to a talk on self-sacrifice a year ago after the promenade. Miss M. present, when Miss C. received some photographs from her brother. A long wait to shake hands with the president after the reception of last June.

These incidents were worked up into the following "messages," with as much confusion and mistake as the necessities of the case required. The remarks of the receiver were noted by my friend, and are embodied in the account as in the other experiments. I have only to observe that Miss B. was told only that the guessing "was an experiment in the psychology of guessing, having a bearing on the subject of mediumistic communication, and that the incidents had been furnished by a friend. Further than that she was told nothing till the experiment was over."

1. Com. : Do you remember our walk together? It was down towards the river. What was the street? Oh, yes, Pine-street. That was a favourite place for the girls.

Rec. : Nothing. A favourite walk. Have some idea of the person, but not from the question (message)

2. Com. : I had so much trouble with my gymnastics. Do you remember the backward bend? That was enough to break one's back. But you helped me until I did it not so badly.

Rec. : No idea. Puts me off the track (referring to the suggestion that came to her in reading 1).

3. Com. : Do you remember the photographs your brother sent you? I knew of it, and how you were delighted with them. I have not seen you

for some time, and wish I could step in a moment and surprise you as these questions ought to do. Pine-street and Mrs. Jones.

Rec. : Suggests another person. Falls in better with 2 than the person suggested while reading 1. It might be Miss Judson.

4. Com. : Say that again. A e. No, try once more. What kind of ground? Help a fellow out. Dear old Tom. No, it wasn't this. It was on the other side. Oh, the house on top. Gone.

Rec. : Absolutely off. Suits neither of the two persons already thought of.

5. Com. : I forgot to go on. It was in Mrs. Jones' parlor. Now I know. M . . . s J d . . n. What's that? She was there. Yes, yes, my sister. Something about my fortune. All in your hands. Better say head.

Rec. : Suggests the coming of my sister seven years ago last spring. "Miss Judson." [I use the quotation marks to indicate the reading of a word partly given in the "message."]

[The reading of this broken word was correct. I had intended it for Miss Judson.—J. H. H.]

6. Com. : Do you remember that cup of tea? Spring, I think. Say it again. I am sure it was. Did you say Park? That's it, Russian Park. No, no, the tea. That's not gymnastics. The tea, the tea. You and . . . and I your studies in Bo Wait a minute.

Rec. : "Boston."

[This was the correct guess for "Bo," and is interesting for the reasons that evidently influenced the receiver's mind in it. She had naturally a better memory of where she had prosecuted her studies than the incidents of drinking tea on a certain occasion. It is also interesting as showing that the communicator cannot expect everybody to remember as distinctly the incidents by which he would identify himself. The incident in this message was far more specific than the remark about the "studies in Bo ;" but in spite of this it had evidently little suggestive power.—J. H. H.]

7. Com. : The columbines on M hollyhock. How careful I was the rains no, try again, r ns tight. My, what a fright! Two ahead of us. Sister and ss . . or n. You thought of Ross.

Rec. : Oh, wasn't it Miss Judson? I think it was. I remember this ride perfectly. "Mount Holyoke," "with the reins." I remember the incident perfectly. Rachel [sister of Miss C.] and Miss Judson were in the carriage in front. They went quickly and made us go quickly too. I was with Miss. M. Oh, I've got Alice in No. 4. It may be Alice M. [Miss C. here reviews the previous "messages" as follows]. 1 and 2 suggest Alice, 3 might be she. I think it is she. 4 I can't make out any more than before, except that Tom must be Mt. Tom. 5 can't remember. 7 might be Alice's sister that was with us. Miss Judson. Miss Ross.

[This is a very remarkable guess all the way through and is correct in every detail. I, of course, intended Miss Alice M. to be the person whose identity was to be determined, but I had included her sister in this

"message," and the others somewhat as a foil against too great confidence at this stage. Any one of them might have sent the "message," and the only clue to Miss M. was the first person of the pronoun, and even that was hidden in an equivocal and broken sentence, so that it might be taken as denoting the care of the sister in holding the reins rather than Miss M.'s care in putting down the columbines. But the extremely indefinite nature of the "message," with hardly even a fair hint of the ride intended, makes the constructive interpretation one of the most remarkable things we can imagine, considering the disposition of some of us to attribute the liability to illusion in far more specific and definite incidents in the Piper case. The sudden inclination, as if by inspiration, to study the previous questions for cumulative evidence, and the correct judgment regarding their pertinence for Miss M., are most interesting as illustrating how slight the clue may be for correct identification, and how correct the "sitter" may be in constructing the true meaning of the communicator out of the most broken and confusing messages. The facts are these. The party had gathered some columbines for Miss Ross on Mt. Holyoke, and on the way home the runaway occurred. Miss M. carefully laid the flowers down in the buggy and took hold of the lines or reins to help her sister check the running horse. Miss Judson and Miss C.'s sister were in the carriage ahead, and Miss C. had all her solicitude for Miss Ross. How little of this is told in the "message" is very apparent. It is also the first "message" in which the slightest allusion to it occurs. The correct interpretation and construction of it, therefore, becomes little less than amazing, and added to this is the very slight clue to the name Alice given in "message" 4. The experiment might have been stopped at this point but for the fact that, although the guess was right both in regard to person and incidents intended, I had shaped the situation so that there was no proof that Miss M. was the only person who, in spite of the first person of the pronoun, might have sent the "messages."—J. H. H.]

8. Com. : Do you remember my meeting. Who was it? Say it now. M. . . . MIS. . . . Speak clearly. M. . . H. . . . k. . . . s. What happened? Oh, it was on a Sunday. You know who I mean.

Rec. : "Mr. Haskins." This certain person meets Mr. Haskins. I am still not sure that Alice is right. Was it a Sunday, in the Percy House, when I asked four or five girls to meet Mr. Haskins?

[The construction of the name "Haskins" was correct, and it was also intended that the case should remain equivocal, as another person was concerned in the meeting.—J. H. H.]

9. Com. : Yes, yes, I forgot the ride. Those columbines, you know. Come. She held the reins. Your sister and. J. . . ds . . n. They rode ahead.

Rec. : Evidently my sister and Miss Judson did ride ahead. [She was not positive about this before.] Refers to the same ride. The first dots must mean Miss Judson or Alice's sister who held the reins in our carriage. "Miss Judson."

[I had intended this "message" to suggest the ride, not having thought that the first allusion in such vague terms would indicate it. Hence the

present one merely confirms the guess made in 7. Miss C. was correct in regard to the person holding the reins.—J. H. H.]

10. Com. : Do you remember talking about Betty Parr and the day order ?

This is the main thing one recalls. She is near me. A F Wait, be patient. Al w. Sounds like no, she's gone. I caught it all but the last. Alles, but it wasn't German.

Rec. : How idiotic. "Alice M." "Alice M." [Significance of "Alles" not guessed.]

[The guess is correct and it is evident that the receiver becomes more confident of this correctness, as the answer to the next "message" which follows makes clear.—J. H. H.]

11. Com. : In the fall, when the mellow ground awaits the stealing on of the frost, what a jolly time we girls had. You have mountain day yet, I suppose. I never see or feel this freedom. I am shut up among the multitude, and can only think, and think how fine it would be to have a ride again on Hollyhock What's that? The mountain, I said. Only we must not run away with Miss Ross.

Rec. : Am quite sure of the person now.

[The word "mellow" is a play on the name of the communicator Miss M., and she is at present in New York, so that the general allusion to her being in the multitude was intended to turn the guessing away from the others included in "message" 7. It was successful, more so than I had expected, and I might have stopped with the next "message" with all the certitude that is necessary could I have anticipated the result as it is.—J. H. H.]

12. Com. : You told my hand. You know where that was. King Street, wasn't it? If I remember rightly one of the ladies in the buggy in front of us was there. She will recall me.

Rec. : Alice told my hand, not I hers, except perhaps in fun, when she told mine. Alice's sister, Miss Ross, and myself were there. Per Mrs. R., and two or three others.

[Reference to the incidents from which I worked up this "message" will show that I had deliberately reversed the order of "telling the hand," with the purpose of putting a mistake of memory in the mouth of the communicator. The receiver, it will be noticed, makes the proper correction, and allows for an illusion of memory in herself as possible.—J. H. H.]

13. Com. : What did we do after the prom. last June? Remember the door. It would have taken some gymnastics to get in. Oh, yes, I forgot the Russian tea at Miss Park's. That's it. But it has nothing to do with the prom. I was just thinking of being shut out after 11 o'clock when I all at once recalled the tea.

Rec. : Refers to Miss Park's tea in 6. I thought of Miss Park when I saw that.

[Miss G. either did not catch the meaning of the allusion to the "prom." or there were reasons for not indicating what it meant. The allusion in No. 18 rather intimates uncertainty regarding the incident here, or even no consciousness of it at all, though I had intended it to be so

specific as not to fail of bringing the guessing down to two persons, excluding all others.—J. H. H.]

14. Com. : To whom did you talk basket ball, making the rules, and whom did you wish to write about gymnastics? Maybe it was some one else.

Rec. : Miss M.

[The talk about basket ball was with Miss M.'s sister, but it was Miss M. herself who was asked to write about gymnastics, and as this is the point of interest in the "message" after the previous ones the answer may be considered correct, and perhaps the talk about basket ball is forgotten or mistaken for a talk with Miss M. herself.—J. H. H.]

15. Com. : Now I have the name. Has Hasn't. No, spell it. H . . S K . . . S K N S. Go out and come with it again.

Rec. : "Haskins," of course.

[This "message" was intended to make sure of what might fail in No. 8. The object was to increase the chances of correct guessing as the experiment advanced. The next "message" has the same object.—J. H. H.]

16. Com. : Sunday in your room It was in the afternoon. HACKINS. M No, it was a man. H A S K S. I met him there.

Rec. : Ditto. (That is "Haskins.")

[There was, of course, no chance of mistaking the meaning of the name in this case if it failed before, but no mention is made of the person whom it was intended to suggest. Put the use of the pronoun "she" in the reply to the next "message" shows that Miss M. was evidently in mind.—J. H. H.]

17. Com. : Do you remember the Virginia vales? Wasn't that it? Hard to catch. lady Oh yes, she was there. I took your picture. A L L E S L s.

Rec. : Don't see what she means by "Virginia vales." Yes, Alice was here last June, and she took Virginia Vales' picture and mine. "Alice M." [I did not notice at the time that no notice was taken by Miss C. of the "lady" in this number.]

[The guess is correct throughout in this case. Both names are rightly indicated, and it is probable that the word "lady" was the clue to the right interpretation of "Virginia Vales."—J. H. H.]

18. Com. : Remember the talk What's that? self after the Prom. self fice. Only a year ago.

Rec. : What is she talking about Prom? Don't remember that she was here at the Prom,—unless she means the June promenade. Yes, there were Alice and I and two men from Amherst. Don't remember the subject. but the conversation was interesting and serious.

[The right guess is made here and the identity is narrowed down to the correct person, but it is interesting to remark that Miss M. gave me the incident of the talk about self-sacrifice as one which could not mistake her identity. It was regarded by her and her sister as the most specific of all of

them. But Miss C. does not remember this feature of the occasion, while she does other incidents of it that Miss M. mentioned to me, but which I have not put into the "message."—J. H. H.]

19. Com. : How long did we wait ? Speak clearly wait to shake hands with P R E S N T T N s.

Rec. : We were going, and Alice said we'd better wait and shake hands with President Tompkins at the reception in June.

[This question was intended to draw the experiment to a close by making the intended incident clear beyond doubt, and the name was very thinly disguised. The right construction is put on it.—J. H. H.]

20. Com. : I took your picture under the lilac bush near the P U T M H . . U S E. I called on you just before and you asked me where I was going for the summer. Now I have it. The talk was about self-sacrifice. That runaway came nearly being that of another kind. Miss Ross will remember. A L K. M Gone.

Rec. : Don't recall now that that was the subject of the talk. "Alice K. M." [Miss C. probably didn't think it worth while to give Putnam House. And, of course, there was no particular point in the thin veiling of such names as Miss Judson, President Tompkins, and Mr. Haskins, an old friend of hers.]

[This reply explains itself and so does the purpose of the "message." The certitude wanted was actually reached in No. 11, and there is no reason, but the completion of the record, for going farther, except to discover the discrepancies of memory between communicator and receiver. I had in mind, too, the more thinly disguised names of other persons than the communicator, as this is often a feature of the Piper case. But it is worth remarking that the identification is accomplished here, as usual before the name of the communicator appears to give any definite clue, and at no time is it clearly given. Incidents alone are sufficient for the purpose of identification.—J. H. H.]

APPENDIX V.

EXPERIMENTS IN COMMUNICATION.

The allusions by some of the "communicators" in the Piper experiments and their difficulties in giving proper names, suggested to me the propriety of instituting certain experiments more or less in imitation of these imaginary conditions to see whether the result would in any way confirm our conception of the case. I had in view, of course, the illustration of other points at the same time, namely, phonetic errors which might grow out of resemblances in sounds of different words with different apperception points, or the existence of none at all in the receiver. Hence, I undertook to try communication of certain messages through a speaking tube from my kitchen to my library, containing frequent use of proper names and words singly or combined that resembled in sound words with very different meanings. I shall comment on the results after giving them. But I had first to test for the conditions that would insure some indistinctness in the communications. Hence, I placed my subject, an assistant in my work, at the end of the tube in the library, and at such a distance from it as made talking into it not very clear. I tried at first six inches distance, while I held my mouth while speaking about four or six inches from the other end which was not more than ten feet distant, though separated from the receiver by the floor. The two bends in the tube, itself about an inch in diameter, were the only obstacles to the transmission of the sound. But I soon found that the receiver was too near the tube, and my voice too loud to make the necessary indistinctness in the case. I altered these conditions until there was difficulty in hearing the sounds or words. The receiver held his ear about eighteen inches from the tube, I, my mouth about six inches from the other end, and I spoke in an ordinary conversational tone, though very slowly, and with as clear articulation as possible, the object being in speaking slowly to permit the receiver to take down the words as they were uttered. When I had secured the conditions for indistinctness I began the experiments whose results were as follows. I have arranged the passages that I read or spoke in one column, and the same as received in another, so as to facilitate comparison. They will almost speak for themselves, and anyone familiar with the Piper phenomena will discover at once the resemblances to them in these results.

We require, however, to be cautious about mistaking the nature of these experiments. They do not prove the facts which they

illustrate. We do not know that the conditions of spirit communication, if such exist, have any resemblance to those which I have described in these experiments. At the utmost these results only illustrate the case from the standpoint of the narrators' statements regarding the analogies between communication from a transcendental world, and the same under conditions that we know. Hence, it must not be supposed that I am proving anything in favour of either spirit communication in general, or the difficulties of it in particular. All that I can be supposed to have done is to have suggested a field for a very large system of experiments to establish the relation between the communication of familiar and unfamiliar sounds under the conditions indicated, and the difficulty of getting proper names in like conditions. The experiments can be varied in a thousand ways, and many points in apperception illustrated and determined. In so far as they bear upon the Piper case, my results can be taken for mere illustrations of what may be natural in accepting the analogies which the communicators indicate between the conditions under which they communicate, and those which the language suggests. The confirmation of the peculiarities of the Piper phenomena does not carry with it any evidence of either their genuineness or their significance, but only suggests the limits of our knowledge in the case, while it intimates what may be true if we could only ascertain the nature of the alleged communications, and the conditions under which they occur. This may be the case on any theory whatsoever, and I do not care to limit the possibilities to the spirit theory alone, though I suspect that we should most naturally conceive their superior pertinence to that hypothesis as compared with the telepathic.

Communicator.

Receiver.

1. From Woodstock the Commissioners removed unto Euelme and some of them returned to Woodstock Sunday.

1.
 some

2. Do you remember Jemie Rocheliffe and his tableau in the windlass horse and how he didn't find the climb at the mountain side very agreeable ?

2. Do you remember James Row-cliff, and his in horse and how he the

3. Do you know, prithe, Jennie Cowell, Callwell, Cowell, Cauldwell, Coehill who sang ditties in the presidential election and was put out of the United Presbyterian Church in consequence.

3. Do you know
 who sang
 presidential connection
 . . . was of
 United Presbyterian Church

4. Mr. Wildrake says his son Everard will not come yet, but is good for a long stay with his damaged business.

4. says
. . . not come
. . . business

5. Tomkins had met Kerneguy at Bristol and said he tried Joceline Joliffe until he could not move for a while. Wennie Budge, a little crone of his master, thought he was to call for Phoebe Mayflower, and bring Lodge with him to the *table d'hôte*.

5. Tompkins has met Carnegie .
. Argument a
a while but he
was too and
when not

6. Striking Arthur's shoulder with the frank bluntness of a mountaineer, he said aloud: "Yonder bolt of Ernest whistled through the air like a falcon when she stoops down the wind!" And then proceeded in a low deep, voice, "You merchants sell gloves—do you ever deal in single gauntlets, or only in pairs." (*Scott's Woodstock.*)

6. Striking frank
. of
find when
she stoops and
then proceeds in
order, Do merchants sell
. turnips.

7. This night, both strange and differing noise from the former, first wakened Captain Hart, who lodged in the bed-chamber, who, hearing Roe and Brown to groan, called out to Cockaine and Crook to come and help them, for Hart could not now stir himself. Cockaine would faine have answered, but he could not, not look about; something, he thought, stopt both his breath, and held down his eyelids. Amazed thus, he struggles and kickt about, till he had waked Captain Crook, who, half asleep, grew very angry at his kicks, and multiplied words, it grew to an appointment in the field; but this fully recovered Cockaine to remember that Captain Hart had called for help. "Come hither, O, come hither, brother Cockaine."

7. Night change and .
. first
. who
. and
. . . called out to
and cook and
him not now stir
himself
answer nor look
about Some
. . . troubles
. cook
. . . improvise
. . . but this
. called for
come hither, O come hither, prythee,
come here.

The first incident of some interest is the mistake of "James" for "Jemie" which I had chosen to suggest the possible mistake of Jennie, if the right name was not given. I was surprised on comparing

results with my data to find that the rest of the name, phonetically, was correct. The subject explained, before I had the opportunity to express my surprise, that he recognised this promptly because he knew a friend by this name. I had used the expression "windlass horse" purposely to suggest "windless house," "didn't" to see if the "not" would be omitted, and "climb at" to suggest with what followed, the word "climate." But too little was caught to create even an illusion.

The third case shows the interesting failure to get the proper name, though repeated here in several forms as attempt to get the last form. But the words obtained show that a person was clearly in mind, but nothing comes to give evidence of identity. The mistake of "connection" for "election" is interesting. But the whole is meaningless.

In the fourth case, both proper names are failures. The second name I intended to suggest Edward, if it was not gotten itself. The fifth explains itself with the interesting mistake of "Carnegie" for "Kerneguy." It appears also that the word "thought" is interpreted as "but." It is impossible to tell what suggested the word "argument." The sixth case also requires no comments except to remark that no proper names are received, and the word "turnips" is a funny mistake evidently for "gauntlets."

The last instance is, perhaps, the most interesting, as the confusion is more sustained, and the mistakes more striking. Here, we have "change" for "strange," "troubles" for "struggles," "improvise" for "multiplied," and "prythee" for "brother," and also "come here" for "Cockaine." Not a single proper name is obtained. If "Cook" had been capitalised, it would have been conceived by the receiver as a proper name, but such a conception was not suspected, while it only approximates in sound the real name. Not a particle of the thought is obtained.

How far the results represent greater facility in getting the words having the most familiar sound and the most frequently used, this single experiment cannot determine. We should probably forecast what would be the case from what we already know in psychology, and might not require experimental evidence to support it. But the facts as far as they go sustain the position that proper names are more difficult to communicate, and that familiar words of a simple sort are obtained most easily.

SECOND EXPERIMENT.

Communicator.

Receiver.

1. At the following Postal Telegraph Offices:—
98, Broadway, Williamsburg.
2, Court Street, at the junction of
Fulton Street.

1. At the following
offices:—
98 Williamsburg . . .
. . . Court St., at the junction of
. St.

7, Greene Avenue, at the junction of Fulton Street.

453, Fifth Ave., near 9th St.

77, 7th Ave., Corner Berkeley Place.

1105, Fulton St., near Ormond Place.

1458, Fulton St., near Tompkins Ave.

332, Court St., near Sackett St.

DAY BROTHERS, Drugstore, Ralph Ave., and Broadway.

746, Flushing Ave., near Broadway.

203, Ewen St., near Ten Eyck St.

335, De Kalk Ave., near Ryerson St.

2. Kingsley. "The Greek Heroes." Hawethorne. "The Wonder Book," "Tanglewood Tales," "Twice Told Tales."

Church. "Stories from Homer," "Stories from Herodotus."

Lanier. "The Boy's King Arthur."

Cheney. "A Peep at the Pilgrims."

Mrs. Child. "The First Settlers of New England."

Spofford. "New England Legends."

Irving. "Knickerbocker's History of New York." "Life of Washington."

Beacon Biographies. Farragut, Webster, Lowell, Phillips Brooks, Robert E. Lee

3. The definition of psychology may be best given in the words of Professor Ladd, as the description—

4. What do you think of the weather, and its results on the Dreyfus case? I do not see why Panizzardi and Schwartzkoppen did not testify in it, even if it was warm. I suppose the young Emperor could not very well play the rôle of world reconciler.

7

Hundred 50th St. . . . 99th St.

77

7000 in near College Place.

1388 near Tompkins Ave.

. . 2 St. near Second St.

Day Brothers. Drugstore

736, Flushing Ave.

215, New St. near Ten Eyck near St.

2. Kingsley Hawethorne. The Wonder Book. Tanglewood Tales.

Church

. The Boy's a peep at the

Mrs Chubb. The First Settlers of new England.

. New England Worthies.

Irving. Knickerbocker (?) History of New York. Life of Washington.

. Webster Phillips Brooks Newman.

3. The definition of may be best given in Professor Ladd, as the description—

4. of the murder and its results on the I do not think I testimony was I suppose the young Emperor could not very well send the old regicide.

5. Our leadership in the domain of China and glass becomes more evident every day. We are eclipsing the victories of our own past. The business is carried forward by the magnetism of peerless values. French sorbet sets, liquer sets, glasses for crème de menthe, iridescent glass—it shimmers, twinkles, and changes in different lights. Ginoris Maiolica ware, the euphaneous name indicates its Italian origin.

6. Alle Koerper sind ausgedehnt. Alle Koerper sind schwer. Dass alle unsere Erkenntniss mit der Erfahrung anfangen daran ist gar kein Zweifel.

7. Structure of the nervous system. Distinction between neurally and non-neurally organised beings. Nerve elements. Characteristic of centers and connecting lines. Fibres. Connections between centers and periphery. Sensory and Motor. Cells. Ganglia for the reception and distribution of impressions and movements consist of gray masses of matter.

8. The celebrated definition of Tragedy in the *Poetics* may, I believe, be fairly paraphrased as follows. "Tragedy is a representation of an action noble and complete in itself, and of appreciable magnitude, in language of special fascination, using different kinds of utterance in different parts, given through performers, and not by means of narration, and producing by pity and fear the alleviating discharge of emotions of that nature."

9. Well, how did you like your vacation in the west? You remember Illinois? Springfield and Chicago

5. Our in the of China and Japan come more every day. We are the interests of our own The business is carried on by the menaces irritating perhaps idle origin.

6. Allah allah sind schwer. Das ist alle anfang daran kein schw

7. of the physio. The distinction between neurally and non-neurally organised beings Characteristics connecting spinal sensory gangalia cords perception and disposition of

8. The celebrated of in the fair as follows is a representation of the action the self appreciable magnitude of sufficient conservation, using different kinds of in the different objects and not by discharge of motion of

9. Well how, did you like your vacation in the west? remember Illinois?

ought to please you, but Kohlstaat might not be so interesting, even if he is the friend of McKinley.

. . . Chicago
. . . but Kohlstaat might not be so interested in — even if he is a friend of McKinley.

10. Wohin gehen alle Menschen wann sie sterben? Glauben Sie dass sie untersinken, oder sollen sie noch leben in einer anderen welt?

10. (Recognised first was German.)
. dass ich alles untersuchen, oder sollen sie noch . . .
. ander . . .

It is a fine day. I hope it will not rain. The sky is clear now, and it may continue so until we get back from our walk.

It is a fine day. I hope it will not rain. (The sky is clear) now and it may continue so until we get back from our walk.

11. Arnold Biederman was as an especial advocate for peace, while its preservation was compatible with national independence, and the honor of the Confederacy; but the younger Philipson soon discovered that the landman alone, of all his family cherished these moderate views. The opinion of his sons had been swayed and seduced by the impetuous eloquence and over-bearing influence of Rudolph of Donnerhugel.

11. (French didn't get it.) . . .
. while its preservation was
national tendencies and the honour of the Confederacy . . . younger
. soon discovered . . .
. of all . . . honour and cherish
the opinion of his sons had been
. by the impetuous eloquence and over . . .
. . . of Rudolph . . .

12. Upon the Restoration, Doctor Rocheliff regained his living of Woodstock, with other church preferment, and gave up polemics and political intrigues for philosophy. He was one of the constituent members of the Royal Society.

12. Upon their estimation, Doctor
. of with other judge (?) employment
. was
. . . constituted
of the Royal Society.

13. Outside the blind spot the sensibility of the retina varies. It is the greatest at the *fovea*, a little pit lying outwardly from the entrance of the optic nerve.

13. sensi-
bility of the retina
. greatest
. out
of entrance of the optic nerve.

The first passage was chosen with reference to proper names and addresses in particular, as it shows itself. The experiments were conducted precisely as before. The mistakes generally speak for themselves. They easily indicate what illusions the sitter may act under when he takes definite communications of addresses for guidance. It was interesting to note that the receiver did not get Broadway,

but did get Williamsburg, as the former is the more familiar of the two. But even more familiar sounds than this are unperceived in this case. The mistake of "College Place" for "Ormond Place" was interesting, as possibly a subliminal association of the name Berkeley in the previous sentence, and not heard supraliminally. But the most misleading error up to this point is "Second St." for "Sackett St.," also "New" for "Ewen" is interesting.

The second instance was chosen for proper names, and the apperception mass which they are calculated to excite, and hence, we should expect, when the receiver is familiar with the works of the author, that he should more easily recognise the sounds connected with the name already recognised, and also that the opposite would take place when he did not know the names of authors and their works. These suppositions were borne out in the results, which speak for themselves very largely. Kingsley, Church, Lanier and Cheney would have failed to have identified themselves in these messages. Hawethorne's message was perfect. Spofford did not get his name, and would have depended wholly upon the title of his book for recognition, which would have been a poor test. The mistake of "Mrs. Chubb" for "Mrs. Child" is very interesting for its actual approximation to the right name, but also for the difference which it exhibits to the eye. The name of "Newman" for "Robert E. Lee" is a remarkable error, and hardly conceivable. What a judgment it would suggest if a spirit made this mistake!

The third passage for communication was chosen because the receiver was known to be perfectly familiar with it. It was not long until it was recognised, and the fact stated, so that it was unnecessary to go farther. But the crucial word at the beginning was not gotten, and only when the proper name was obtained did the clue appear for the rest. The next, the fourth case, is especially interesting as illustrating the entire failure to obtain any conception whatever of the message intended. "Murder" for "weather," "send" for "play," "old" for "role," and "regicide" for "reconciler," and the complete omission of the proper names makes the whole passage unintelligible.

In the fifth, the receiver's habit of associating Japan with China, is the explanation of the mistake of this name for glass. Unfamiliar words are missed, and the confusion of others is almost inexplicable. "Interest" for "victories," "menaces" for "magnetism," "irritating" for "iridescent," and "idle" probably for Italian, are striking and wholly unexpected errors. The last part of the message also is interesting because it shows unfamiliar words, and a corresponding failure in communication. On the whole, however, the passage as received has too little resemblance to the original to indicate any intelligibility in it.

The German passage I gave in order to see whether it made any difference in the communications before the receiver was told of the intention to test him in this way. He reported that at first, he thought I was giving him Arabic. But the moment that he got "sind schwer," he recognised that what he had taken for Arabic was German, but the passage, which was taken out of Kant's Critique, was not received fully enough to indicate its identity.

The next, and seventh instance, was chosen also for the familiarity of it to the receiver. He discovered its identity in spite of its fragmentary character and the mistakes. These last seem unaccountable in several instances. "Physic" for "system," "spinal" for "lines," and "cords" for "for" are striking errors. "Perception" for "reception" was a natural mistake to make under the circumstances which rather favoured this apperception of the sound. The next is also wholly unintelligible owing to the mistakes. "Sufficient conservation" for "special facination" is a singular error, but "motion" for "emotion" is quite natural. The proper names are missing as usual.

The ninth passage was taken because it represented references to the receiver's own state with names and places that were familiar to him. This is measurably successful, only one proper name failing. There was some surprise in the receiver's getting the unusual name of the German gentleman given, though it may be that the combination of sounds in this name is especially favourable to recognition. The tenth, containing a German passage with English of a very plain sort was designed to test more carefully the question of familiar sounds, the receiver being less familiar with German than English. The result illustrates the case very clearly. The English was all of it gotten, that part in brackets arising into consciousness as the rest of the sentence was coming. But the German shows no conception of what was in my mind as communicator.

The eleventh is interesting, for the fact, that what was received suggests the American Confederacy, and would appear false under the circumstances that would render the Swiss Confederacy pertinent. The clue in what is received is too slight to give any hint of the real reference of the communicator. In the twelfth instance, the chief interest lies in the fact that the name Rocheliffe was not gotten, though in the first experiment before, it surprised me by being obtained. This sort of variation seems frequent in the Piper case. "Judge employment" for "church preferment" is a singular error, and in the last, and thirteenth message, the interest consists in the fact that the receiver recognised, as I had intended, that the passage was from my syllabus with which he was familiar. But he did not get it with sufficient clearness to locate the subject with complete definiteness. All that he could determine was that it pertained to the eye, but the

essential clues in the words "blind spot" and "fovea" were missed, and hence the communication might easily give rise to all sorts of illusions.

But the most important feature of the whole set of experiments is the result regarding proper names and words that are not the most common in conversation. Wherever any set of terms seems to occur that do not fall easily into the mass of apperception suggested by any given term the tendency to either error or failure is very marked. Long words noticeably show this failure if they are not very common. The incident or clue has to be clear before there is any security that words can even be guessed. Now proper names are notably terms without connotative or descriptive meaning and hence the sounds produced by them have little or no suggestive meaning. They must naturally give rise to difficulties in recognition on that account, as the apperceptive mass is the *point de repère* of all the most probable interpretations. This principle applies to infrequent terms as well as proper names. In fact the two are exactly alike in this respect, and it is interesting to find that experimental results show precisely the same characteristics in this respect. The general resemblance of the Piper case to these conclusions is noticeable in the fact that the vocabulary of easy communication seems limited. In two cases I deliberately tried unfamiliar words and the difficulties here noted occurred. The expressions that I used were "United Presbyterian" and "Presidential Election," and there was great difficulty in getting them understood. In this case, of course, I was the communicator. But either way the difficulty ought to occur, as we have the human organism in the case of Mrs. Piper as the medium through which the message has to be given, while the analogous case to these experiments lies in the manner in which the "control" has to get the communications from the "communicator." But aside from all questions of spirit communication there is in these experiments a complete duplication of the difficulties and errors in the Piper case, with an explanation in the known laws of mental phenomena, virtually indicating that such mistakes ought to occur with proper names and unfamiliar words. And it is not a little interesting to note that the confusion in my experiments is even greater than in the Piper experiments as a whole. Very few of the messages in the present experiments succeed in becoming intelligible at all. Freedom from errors seems to be connected with the simplest language and the most frequently used words. The variations between success and failure are not so common as in the Piper phenomena. There is almost uniform confusion in the present instance. But the error and confusion are like the Piper case in their characteristics, and rather indicate that it is a wonder, assuming spirit communication at all, that we

obtain anything intelligible whatever. This difference between the cases suggests that possibly we have those variations of the mental conditions for communications which I have marked in the conversation with hypnotic subjects who have often, and perhaps generally, to be prodded in order to retain the conditions for conversation at all. If that supposition be correct we can understand the variations between clear and confused messages in the Piper case, while the laws that are marked in these experiments at communication will explain the uniform difficulties in connection with proper names and less common words, whether the communication is clear or confused.

APPENDIX VI.

EXPERIMENTS IN HYPNOSIS.

Last spring one of my students came to me with the following story. He said that he had been knocked down at football and remained unconscious for an hour and a half, and that when he had awakened from his condition he had no recollection of this time or of the events that had taken place while he was apparently conscious, as he had been told of some things that he had done in his secondary state. He asked me to hypnotise him and to see if I could throw any light on the matter. I promised to do so, though I had not previously been very successful in hypnotising people, and arranged for the time of the experiment. My plan was to interrogate the subject for the events and memories of the lost hour and a half, after the manner of the Ansel Bourne case (*Proceedings*, Vol. VII., pp. 221-259). I was somewhat handicapped at the outset by the fact that some of the principal things which the subject had said and done had been told him by his companions afterward, and hence I had but a margin to work upon for traces of a hypnotic memory alone. However, I tried, and the following are the results. I took complete notes at the time and wrote them down immediately on my return home, so that the present record is not wanting on the ground of any neglect in regard to the means of making it useful.

The first attempt was made on April 22nd (1899). I hypnotised Mr. L. with some difficulty, taking some half-an-hour to effect somnambulism. But as soon as I was assured of deep enough hypnosis, which I accomplished in the usual way of trying various suggestions of an absurd sort, I began with the question whether he, the subject, had ever played football. I received the answer, "Yes," and asked, "When?" I got the answer, "Last Wednesday." I then asked Mr. L. to tell me what had happened after this during the whole time he had remained in this condition, not expressing myself in exactly this language, but in a way to intimate my idea. But I soon found that if I got the story it must be by dint of much prodding, because the subject showed a drowsy condition and had to be urged at the end of every sentence to go on with the story, by asking him questions whether anything else occurred. In this way the following statements were made:—

"I was struck by the ball, but I did not know what happened to myself. Mr. S. took my head on his knee. It was there about a minute and a half. I was then laid down. I did not get up right away, but felt all right in a minute. I lay a short time, got up on my side and turned over. I said I would lie down. Mr. Sa. (Sa. to distinguish him from Mr. S. above) asked how I felt. All right, I said, but I did not know what had happened. I walked up the field with one of the boys on each side, Mr. Sa. on the right, I think, and Van H. on the left. They took me up to the end of the field and laid me down with my head on Mr. S.'s leg. I was not told this. I was there about a minute and a half. S. told me I must stop and see the base-ball

game. I stood up and stood around watching the game as they kept on playing. Then they took me by the arms and crossed out at the gate, up the steps, across a little corner of grass down to the Gym. S., I think, unlocked my locker and got out a part of my clothes. I had left them there to play football. They gave me a shower-bath. This was at the end of the Gym., nearest my locker. I used the shower-bath at the right hand side as you go in about the middle, or if not there, the nearest as you go in. I think I did not want to wet my head. I dressed myself and put on a sweater instead of a shirt, and was taken to Dr. Savage's office and lay down on a couch. Dr. Savage was giving an examination, but said that I would not bother him. I was told to go to sleep, but I did not do so. Soon I began to realise where I was and awakened from my condition."

I had some difficulty in finding Mr. S. for an interview in regard to the facts in this narrative, but at last succeeded in getting him on the 24th inst. I had been very careful in the meantime not to say a word to Mr. L. of what he had told me in his secondary state. I was careful also not to explain to him what I had done until I had asked for confirmation or denial of the facts told me by Mr. L. I simply asked him whether the incidents in the narrative were correct or not, and he verified every one of them in detail, except two. The first was that Mr. L. was not struck by the ball, but suffered from collision with the head of another student. The second was that Mr. L. did not turn himself over, but was turned over by Mr. S. All the other details were correct except the equivocal statement about the shower-bath, which was corrected, however, by Mr. L. in the statements of the second experiment. Some of the main features of the incidents thus narrated had been told him by the men who had taken him to the Gymnasium after the accident, and cannot therefore be counted among those belonging solely to the secondary consciousness. But Mr. S. told me those which he had not mentioned to Mr. L. after the recovery of his normal condition. They were the question of Mr. Sa. and L.'s reply, the crossing "the corner of grass," the getting of his clothes by S., the shower-bath, "at the end of the Gym., nearest the locker," and the statement of Dr. Savage that L.'s presence on the couch would not bother him in his examination. What he had been told of these incidents consisted of the names of the persons that had taken him to the Gymnasium, and none of the details. But as the only way from the field to the Gymnasium lay across the grounds, the passage through the gate, up the steps, and to the Gymnasium, would describe as well what he must have done, whether he remembered it or not, and could be imagined from a knowledge of arriving at the Gymnasium. But crossing "the corner of grass" was no necessary part of such a course, and, in fact, was out of the proper path, and forbidden; though students with their field-shoes on often seem to disregard the rule on this point. On the whole, however, the incidents that had not been told him are sufficiently numerous to exclude the supposition of chance, and to support the contention in favour of a secondary memory distinct from the normal state.

In addition to this confirmation, however, Mr. S. also narrated some interesting phenomena occurring during the secondary state that Mr. L. had not told me in either state. Mr. S. reported that Mr. L. asked on the way

to the Gymnasium what day it was, and remarked that he had asked the same question a thousand years ago. Mr. L. also remarked to Dr. Savage, as he observed the latter conducting the physical examination of some student, that he himself, Mr. L., took that examination about one hundred years ago. Mr. L. also remarked, according to the same authority, that he had forgotten all his knowledge and that he would have to go to the "Prep." school again and begin it all over. This statement was made to several persons.

When he recovered from the daze he asked Mr. McK. to return the ring which that person was holding while Mr. L. played football, and in his spontaneous manner indicated to his companions that he had no recollection of what had happened, they being naturally a little incredulous of his asseverations.

It was nearly two weeks before I could secure Mr. L. for another experiment. But on May 6th I succeeded in this object. On this occasion I tried some of the same and some further experiments. I found it more difficult than before to hypnotise him, owing possibly to the presence of another person in the room, one of my assistants. I had to make the trial a second time before I succeeded, but when I did succeed the hypnosis was more profound than before, since the answers to my questions were not so ready, and there seemed to be more marked tendencies to drowsiness. I found on inquiry before he had entered the hypnotic state that he could remember nothing of the experiment two weeks before after I had begun the work of hypnotising him. This was an evidence both of the genuineness of the previous trance and of the unhypnotised condition of the patient at this time. Afterwards I aided in bringing on the hypnosis by suggesting that he should try to feel good and happy as he went to sleep. I obtained evidences after the subject came out that this suggestion had had its influence, as remarks of the subject on the return of consciousness indicate.

When I had satisfied myself that I had secured hypnosis, I asked Mr. L. if he remembered going to a preparatory school, and received an affirmative answer. I asked this question because, as the previous report indicates, I had been told that he had remarked the loss of his knowledge and expressed the fear that he would have to start at the preparatory school again. This remark, as above indicated, he had made to his friends in his dazed condition after the injury in the collision. I then asked him if he remembered saying anything about the loss of his knowledge, and he replied that he did, that he thought he would have to begin study all over again, and that he thought at the time that he was not all right, the last two incidents having been given without further question or the influence from any suggestion that a question might give. I then asked what the preparatory school was to which he went, and he replied, "St. Paul's, in Garden City." I then asked him if he knew anybody by the name of Van H., and he replied "Yes," and I further asked whether this man had done anything for him when he was dazed after the hurt, and he replied that "he was first end on the right, and he himself (L.) was on the left end in the field." The meaning of this was not certain to me at the time, but I understood that it was that Van H. was playing on the right and Mr. L. on the left in the game. Inquiry showed that my interpretation was correct. The incident shows

that the normal state to some extent interpenetrates, even when not recognised as such, with the secondary state. So also do many of the other incidents of a similar nature.

I then asked him with reference to his having made a remark about something occurring a thousand years ago. He recalled having said something about it, and added, spontaneously, that he "thought he had done all these things before," referring to what had occurred to him after his hurt and in the secondary state that followed it. But I could get nothing more definite in regard to the meaning of this alleged memory.

I asked, further, about what he thought regarding the examination of Dr. Savage, alluding, but without suggesting the matter definitely, to the fact told me by Mr. S. My question was just as stated above. He replied that he thought at the time that he had taken the examination before, but was not sure, and thought he had not been marked.

I then asked him who took him to the Gymnasium and was answered by the statement, "S. and N—B—." I followed with the query, how he had gone and he described his going as he did before. He said they "came out of the gate, up the Library steps, and on the right side of the Library crossing the corner of the grass, on the right corner by the tree where the sign was, and down the steps into the Gymnasium at the right hand entrance."

Asked how long he was dazed he said, "one and a half hours;" asked also where he took his bath, he replied at "the end of the Gym., towards Dr. Savage's room in compartment on the right side, not nearest the middle, but nearest the lockers." He went on to say, without further question, that S. dried him, and that he then went out and sat down by the locker, stayed a few minutes, got half dressed, and did not remember what he then did. He did not remember going to Dr. Savage's room, but did remember lying on his couch. He remembered lying there for about ten minutes, and then nothing more.

At this point I began trying questions of a different sort and designed to discover traces, first of his normal sleep life, and then of the connection between both this and the secondary state and that between the latter and his normal consciousness. I first asked him if he could recall any dreams. He replied that he did not. I pressed the question, but received the same answer twice more. I then asked him his name, and he hesitated some time without being able to give it. I said, "I don't think you have any." He answered, "No." I then asked, "How old are you?" and received no answer except the kind of half stammer of a person trying to think what his age was, and I then asked, "About fifty?" and the answer came promptly, "Yes." (He is not over twenty-one or twenty-two, perhaps less.) I asked, "Where were you born?" and he could not tell this, though I waited awhile. I then said, "You have forgotten, have you?" and received the answer, "Yes."

I then tried the following experiments. The patient was sitting on one chair, his feet placed on another, and with his head cushioned on the back of the chair upon which he was sitting, and his eyes closed. I was standing between him and a table which was not more than two feet distant from his body. I stood between his head and the table, so that even with his eyes

open he could not have seen me take anything from the table. Moreover, I could reach anything I liked on this table without making any more noise than would be caused by the friction of my clothes on the skin, and I could also move it to the back of his head without his seeing it even with his eyes open in the normal state, to say nothing of their being closed and him in hypnosis.

I first picked up his glasses, which he had laid on the table before I began my experiment, and held them about six inches from the back of his head, opposite the cerebellum. I had done this in a manner that he could neither see me pick them up nor see me move them to that position. I asked him if he could not see what I had placed at the back of his head, and after hesitating a moment and receiving the question again, he said he saw my hand, and when I asked what else, he replied, "A pencil." The fact was that my pencil was in my left hand in front of him and visible to any one with his eyes open. I then put down the glasses, picked up the ink-bottle as noiselessly as possible and moved it to the back of his head as cautiously as I could, and with movements to prevent any possible perception of it even with open eyes in a normal state, and asked him again if he saw what was there, and he replied with great promptness, "An ink-bottle." I then took up a pink-coloured examination book with the number 416 written on the cover, and asked him, after putting it at the back of his head, what he saw, and received for reply, "A table with pen and papers on it." I last took my watch out of my pocket while purposely talking to him to prevent his hearing my movements, and held it at the back of his head, asking him what he saw there, and he replied, "An ink-bottle again."

The prompt and interesting hit of the ink-bottle in the second experiment was a surprise to me at the time, and I tried the succeeding experiments to verify the suspicion that it awakened. But their failure and the nature of the answers suggested the probable source of the coincidence. His supraliminal knowledge of the table and its natural contents, taken with the suggestion to the secondary state from my movements, in spite of their caution, most probably, or possibly at least, intimated the case of the table, papers, and pen. Thus, the incident of the ink-bottle is easily explained, the imagination of the objects being suggested by an inference from the hyperæsthetic perception of my movements.

Immediately after these experiments, I awakened the subject and asked him if he remembered anything he did. He replied that he remembered getting up and sitting down again, and that he was asked to do something in the way of tests, until one of them created quite a strange impression. At last, he said, he saw a square hole going down towards the centre of the earth. "I felt conscious," he said, "when this started, and then something came and told me to go to sleep, and I at once felt nice and enjoyable."

These statements are a tolerably good reproduction of what took place after awakening him from the first trial of hypnosis half an hour before and during the second attempt. I had thought that I was going to fail in the experiment, as the signs of hypnosis did not occur, and awakened him to test him and assure myself of what his condition was. I found that his answers were favourable to a second attempt, and had him sit down again for another trial, after saying that he might rest a few moments. I then began

the hypnotising again in the usual way by passes over the eyes and forehead. At last I told him to go to sleep and feel happy, because he was going to have a nice time. Soon after this I found him in hypnosis, as the tests indicated.

He also remarked after coming out of the trance that he was deeper in sleep than before (two weeks before) because he could not remember hearing my voice this time.

Two days after, May 8th, and without divulging anything told me either to Mr. L. or anyone else, I had an interview with the N— B— mentioned by the subject in hypnosis as one of the parties who took him to the Gym. But I found that this person did not go with him. He did, however, walk with him to the gate of the ball field, and could not remember who it was that did accompany L. to the Gymnasium. Mr. B., however, remembers that Mr. L. asked him a number of incoherent questions during his dazed condition after the hurt, and among them, as an example, he asked "how he (L.) had gotten his (B.'s) clothes on." Mr. B. had lent Mr. L. his clothes to play in.

The fact that Mr. B. accompanied him to the gate accounts very readily for the discrepancy in L.'s account, while the amount of error in it favours the genuineness of the phenomena with which I am dealing, as against the possible suspicion of foul play with me. It would be quite a natural mistake to make in any confused state. The previous narrative does not contradict it, as names had not been given.

An interview also with Mr. Van H. shows that he was *not* one of the persons that accompanied Mr. L. to the Gymnasium. But he did accompany him, as did Mr. B., as far as the gate at the entrance to the field.

Mr. Van H. also says that it was the collision of his own head with that of Mr. L. that caused the hurt, and not a stroke of the ball, as I was told in the first experiment. Nor was it a kick on the chest, as I had been told in the first experiment, but forgot to record it. The failure of Mr. L.'s memory at this point is interesting and natural, as he had insisted all along, both in his dazed condition and also in his normal condition, that he did not know how he was hurt. Mr. Van H. said that as they brought Mr. L. to the middle of the field after the hurt, he, Mr. L., did not seem to know how he had been hurt, and, looking at the game in bewilderment, asked if that was the way he was hurt. The confusion in the hypnosis at this point then is interesting.

All three men, Messrs. B., S., and Van H., confirmed the truth of the other incidents in the narrative as given in hypnosis, even down to the crossing at the right of the Library and over the corner of the grass where the tree and sign were, except that the confirmation of this last feature was by S., who had accompanied L. all the way. After Mr. L. came out of the trance I asked him where he had gone to the preparatory school, and received the same answer as in hypnosis, "St. Paul's, in Garden City." A number of the incidents had been told him after he recovered consciousness, such as his queer remarks about having lost his knowledge, and thinking that all this had occurred before. But some of the smaller and less striking incidents had not been told him in this dazed condition: for instance, that he himself, Mr. L., was on the left end in the field. But this was, of course,

an incident of the normal consciousness. Nor had he been told the exact direction of his course to the Gymnasium. The incidents of the tree and sign and crossing the corner of the grass were also matters of supraliminal knowledge in so far as previous habits were concerned, and would be the probable course of men in athletic dress in spite of the rules to the contrary in the institution.

Some days afterward I tried to repeat the experiments, but owing to the accident of a sudden shock, like the *quasi* electrical shock which we often experience as we go to sleep, Mr. L. was awakened, after a long attempt to hypnotise him, and I did not have time to continue the experiment.

Most of the incidents in these experiments speak for themselves, and it requires no comment by me to explain their significance, if they have any. They resemble the usual phenomena of hypnosis. But I may recapitulate some of the points of interest. In the first place, there is no trace of a connection between the subject's ordinary sleep and the hypnotic condition. But these experiments are not sufficient to throw any light upon that question, on one side or the other. There is, however, a decided connection between the normal and the secondary consciousness, though it is not one in which the secondary consciousness seems to have any recognition that the incidents common to the two states belonged to a normal condition. But what interested me most in the case was two facts. First, that connection between the primary and the secondary states which indicates a unity of personal ground for the phenomena, whatever disintegration we may observe in the phenomenal unity of the two states, or perhaps, better, whatever segregation we observe in the two series. There seemed to be absolutely no conscious unity whatsoever between the two states, though there is undoubtedly a subject unity in them. The second and most interesting characteristic is the resemblance of the performance to what we have to imagine is the case "on the other side" in the Piper phenomena. I found that I could get nothing out of the subject without constant prodding. The tendency to silent drowsiness was so great that I could get him to talk only in answer to questions. Now, in the Piper Reports, the allegation is that the "communicator" is in a dazed condition and that it is difficult to get any statements from him. The confusion certainly resembles what I here observe. I remember one instance precisely like this. Phinuit, speaking to one of the "communicators," as if to arouse him, says: "Don't go to sleep." Similar intimations seem to be frequent. (See *Proceedings*, Vol. XIII, pp. 464, 466, and 473.) We cannot press this analogy with any great assurance without many experiments and a larger accumulation of facts. But it is worth calling attention to it here as a suggestion of what needs observation. There seems also a suggestive possibility in the subject's inability to give his own name, age, and birth. Is there any connection between this and the similar difficulties and hesitation with which "communicators" in the Piper case give their own names, though they seem more ready to give the names of others, as noticeable here? Mr. L. had spontaneously mentioned some facts representing incidents of his normal life, and he mentioned others in response to questions not calculated to suggest them; but he had, in spite of this, wholly forgotten his name, age, and time of his birth, unless we

suppose that he should have been given more time, as in the Piper instance, to give them. But whatever our view of the case, there is this phenomenal resemblance between the two sets of facts.

New York, *November 9th*, 1899.

We, the undersigned parties to the incidents narrated in the above account of experiments with Mr. Lum, aver that our part in them has been one of good faith and honesty, and that we have not consciously done or said anything that would impeach the character of the facts as reported to Professor Hyslop by ourselves. To the best of our knowledge this is a true account of the events as they occurred within our observation.—Very truly,

THOMAS SIMONS,
H. VAN HEVENBERG, JUN.,
RALPH E. LUM.

Witness : J. H. HYSLOP.

APPENDIX VII.

QUOTATIONS BEARING ON THE MENTAL CONDITION OF THE COMMUNICATOR
WHILE COMMUNICATING.

It has occurred to me while reading the proofs that the reader might wish to have the evidence for the position taken throughout the Report that the communicator was not in his normal mental state while communicating, at least for part of the time. There may be lucid moments enough, but there are times when his mental state apparently borders on delirium or the complete loss of memory, and something like hypnosis or secondary personality. It will be convenient for the reader to have the evidence for this collected together with the references. I have confined myself to my own Report in this evidence, though previous Reports are quite as full of similar indications of an abnormal mental condition while communicating. Besides, I have not incorporated in this list of indications the indirect evidence consisting of certain confused messages, and various passages showing intrinsic marks of some mental disturbance. The reader must determine these for himself by a psychological study of the contents. I have therefore limited myself to the direct statements of the communicators and those messages which do not require study to ascertain the fact asserted.

The first statement that indicates an abnormal mental condition occurred in the first sitting, and shows of itself from the connection in which it took place that it was one of those incoherences that we are familiar with in deliria. It occurred just at the close of the communicator's effort when he had to disappear. It was the expression, "I say, give me my hat" (p. 307). This was repeated in precisely similar conditions at the second sitting. "Give me my hat, and let me go" (p. 313). A little later (p. 313) occurred, "I want my head clear. I am choking." The attempt first to give the name of my uncle Carruthers ended in calling him "uncle Charles," and I disowned him. The reply of the communicator showed the consciousness of some confusion or difficulty, "No, I am thinking . . . let me see" (p. 316). A little later he said, "I know, James, that my thoughts are muddled, but if you can only hear what I am saying you will not mind it" (p. 316). In the same sitting at the close of a rather confused attempt to deliver some messages, he said, "In a short time they tell me I will be able to recall everything I ever did. You could be . . . my . . . knew

does not . . . I will have to go for a moment. Wait for me " (p. 319). A similar remark was made at the next sitting, just after the confused attempt to tell an incident about a fire. It was, "Do you know that in a little while I will be able to recall everything I ever knew" (p. 325). Just after a passage in which two chronologically separated but psychologically connected facts were alluded to, the communicator says, "I feel better now, James. I felt very much confused when I first came here" (p. 327). In reference to something that he could not recall he said, "But strange I cannot think of the word I want" (p. 330), and a little later regarding a similar matter, "This is what I cannot think, and it troubles me a little, James, because I know it so well" (p. 330). In reference to my sister Annie's communication at the third sitting he said, "She has been here longer than I have, James, and is clearer in her thoughts when she is trying to speak, but do not feel troubled about it" (p. 332). It is interesting to remark that both statements are true. My sister died long before my father, and her communications show decidedly less mental disturbance than his. A moment later my father said, after Rector, apparently discovering something wrong, had remarked to me to move, "Yes, my head grows lighter and lighter" (p. 332). At the fourth sitting my father said, "My head seems clearer and I can see you perfectly. I can see and hear better than ever. Your voice to me does not seem so far away. I will come nearer day by day" (p. 335).

After some confusion about the medicine for which I had asked, he said, "I seem to lose part of my recollections between my absence and return" (p. 336). Speaking of the accordion which had been "given him" to "hold" him, as the spiritistic lingo has it, he said, "I am clearer when I see it" (p. 336). This is apparently true of all the communications. In almost the next sentence occurs an automatism quite like the references to his hat (pp. 307 and 313). "Where is my coat. I begin to think of what I do not need" (p. 336). It is most interesting to remark here that the communicator discovers that his mind is wandering, and alludes himself to the incoherence. After some confused message regarding several matters, apparently discovering his difficulties, he said, "I assure you when I can get so I can speak and say just what I like I will straighten out things for you" (p. 338). A little later Rector says, "Give me something that I may hold him quite clearly" (p. 338), indicating the effect of old articles on the communicator.

When I had indicated that I did not remember the subject of our conversation about Swedenborg, my father seemed to think that he might have had the talk with some one else, and said, "In any case I shall soon be able to remember all about it. I am so much nearer

and so much clearer now than when I vaguely saw you here, and when Charles tried to wake me up here" (p. 341).

In Dr. Hodgson's sitting a number of interesting instances occur. The communicator, my father, had had much difficulty in trying to name the contents of a spectacle case that he had been asked to name, and after one effort he said, "Let me go a minute and return I am very blind, and begin to feel very strange" (p. 378). Immediately after his departure Rector says, "He seems a most intelligent fellow, but finds it difficult for him to remain long at a time. In time he will, however, come very near, be quite clear, and do a great work for thee, friend" (p. 379. Cf. pp. 372 and 384). A few moments later, in explaining the difficulty of adjusting himself to the "light," father said, "I think of everything I ever did. All in one minute it comes to me, then seems to leave me when I try to express something of it to you" (p. 379). At the close of a sitting, that of February 16th, Rector remarked of him, "Friend, he is awakening, and seems very clear this day" (p. 390). At the next sitting my father, alluding to the name of a medicine which he could not recall, said, "I took at one time some preparation of oil, but the name has gone from my memory. I know everything so well when I am not speaking to you" (p. 392). After some conversation between Rector and Dr. Hodgson regarding the method of obtaining certain messages and Rector's explanation of what was necessary, Rector said, "Friend, while speaking he is like in comparison to a very sick man, yet when we take his objects it clears him greatly for the moment" (p. 394). A little later my father says, after some confusion and finding that he must rest, as it were, "I cannot really say more to you now. I am getting weak" (p. 395).

The illustrations are perhaps quite as numerous in the last eight sittings as in the previous ones, except that in the sitting of June 8th, which was the clearest I had, there is only one conscious recognition of the mental state connected with communications.

In the first message on May 29th my father said, "If I fail in my memory think not for me, but let me think my thoughts, and they will come to me in time, past memories and all" (p. 418). A little later he said, "I am sorry if I mistake anything, but they tell me if I am patient I will remember all" (p. 419). After a brief respite he said, "I am thinking over the things I said when I was confused." Then, alluding to his belief that he thought it "possible we might live elsewhere," but that communication was doubtful, he said, "We do speak, although vaguely at times," and added, "What is on my mind at present is the conditions which help me to return" (p. 420). Speaking of my brother's disposal of the horse Tom, he said, "I am thinking about it now and everything I ever knew I believe, because my mind travels so fast, and I try to get away from the rest as much as possible"

(p. 424). When I said that I did not remember the stool to which he referred, he said, "Strange, I think, but when I go out I will think it all over and see what I have told you" (p. 424). A few minutes later, when I had indicated that my stepmother knew of the knife to which he had alluded, and that I did not, he said, "Well, that will be all right, but what I am anxious about is for you to know I am not forgetting anything, only I am a little confused when I try to tell you what I so longed to do. I think of twenty things all at once" (pp. 424-425). In a moment he disappeared for a respite, and on his return he immediately said, "Ah, James, do not, my son, think I am degenerating because I am disturbed in thinking over my earthly life, but if you will wait for me I will remember all, everything I used to know" (p. 425). My cousin, Robert McClellan, in his first attempt to communicate remarked in the midst of his messages, "I am a little dazed for the moment, but have patience with me, and I will be clear presently" (p. 428). Alluding to the fire which had been mentioned in an extravagant manner on December 26th (p. 324), and recognising apparently his confusion about it, my father said, "There are some things which I have said while speaking to you here which may seem muddled. Forgive it, my son, and if you wish to straighten it ask me and I will" (p. 431). A few minutes later in a confused passage about my brother Charles, my uncle Carruthers, and apparently John McClellan, he exclaimed, "Oh, speak, James. Help me to keep my thoughts clear" (p. 431). After introducing my mother by name she tried to communicate, but had to give it up with the statement, "I want to speak of the rest, but I am too weak" (p. 432). A little later my father said, "There is more than a million things I would like to speak about, but I do not seem to be able to think of them all, especially when I am here. It was not so long ago that I came here" (p. 433). This last statement is most interesting in connection with the fact which we have found empirically to be true, namely, that persons not long deceased are generally not so good communicators as those who have passed long before. Compare his allusion to my sister Annie and the longer period of her decease (p. 332). After quite a clear reference to Swedenborg on May 31st, he said, "Never mind, I am clearing, James, and all will be well" (p. 438). Apparently my cousin was communicating soon afterward, and in the midst of a very confused set of messages, Rector said, "Wait a moment and he will return and clear it up" (p. 439). The confusion seems not to have diminished, and in a few minutes my cousin himself said, in response to a question from me, supposing that I was dealing with the John McClellan that was treasurer of the university I attended, "Well, of course, but you see I am not quite clear yet, but it will surely come back to me" (p. 440). A little later, in response to my query as to who was speaking,

apparently Rector said, "It is father who is speaking now. But he seems a little dazed" (p. 440). Father took a respite, and on his return he said, "I am going to try and keep my thoughts straight" (p. 441). Later, "I do not seem to be able to express all I want" (p. 443).

After an allusion to myself my father said, "I am really too weak to think more for you, James, and they seem not to hear me so well" (p. 445). Presently he tried to say something about the Cooper incident, and in the midst of much confusion he said, "I am confused, James, and I cannot tell you what I wish, and I will try again. I am going now," and he disappeared (p. 445).

On June 1st Rector said near the beginning, "And we wish to say that we were somewhat confused at the closing of the last meeting owing to the light failing us" (p. 448). This will be apparent to the reader if he examines the record. When father began he said soon after, "I intended to refer to uncle John, but I was somewhat dazed, James" (p. 448-9). In a moment he said "I am all right while Emperor is near me, and my memory comes back to me clearer" (p. 449). Later I tried to have him name the cause of my uncle Carruthers' death, and he having said pneumonia, which applied to my uncle James McClellan, I said, "Do not worry about it now. It will come again." My father's reply was, "I was only disturbed because of the accident that I could not make clear, and Charles interrupted me somewhat because he had a fever" (p. 450). The allusions to the accident and to my brother's fever are important incidents, and taken in connection with the facts of the record, the confusion is quite apparent. Later on and after a very confused set of messages regarding my brothers he said, "I am getting tired, James, will rest a moment and return. This is a very heavy atmosphere to be in" (p. 454). Toward the close of the sitting, after an allusion to myself, he said, "I seem to go back to the old days more than anything else. Don't say you wonder at this, that, and the other, but wait, be patient—all will be clear to you some day. If I fail in my memory, do not say, well, if that is father he must have forgotten a great deal. I really forget nothing, but I find it not easy to tell it all to you. I feel as though I should choke at times (*Cf.* p. 313), and I fail to express my thoughts, but if fragmentary try and think the best of them, will you?" (p. 456). After a short communication from my mother, who could not remain long, my father appeared and said, "Now let me tell you one thing more, and that is about the little errors which I may make when speaking to you. I think many things all at once, and when I try to give mention to them, I fail somewhat" (p. 459). After the best message that my uncle Carruthers gave, my father broke in with the allusion to my sister Lida, and said, "I had

to come to straighten out uncle Clark's mind, James" (p. 460). A little later in alluding to the organ, he ejaculated, "Oh, what was that hymn we used to sing so often?" I replied, "Keep calm. It will come out all right." He then went on, "Well, I will think of it presently, and . . . is it all clear to you, or are you confused?" (p. 461). In the confused attempt to name the relationship of the John McClellan who had recently died, my father said, "Now wait, I am a little confused myself" (Footnote, p. 472). At the close of the sitting he said, "I feel, think, and know as well as I ever did, and yet I am not able in this way to express all I think. I may give out my thoughts in fragments, but if I do I hope they may at least comfort you a little" (p. 475). In the communications connected with the confusion about my stepmother's name he said, apparently alluding to her, "Yes, but it was she who made the cap, and you had better ask her about it. Sarah, SARAH. Let me see what is it I wish to say. Ellen. Help me. Oh, help to [R. H. puts leather spectacle case and brown knife on table, next to hand. Hand moves back the knife and retains the spectacle case.] recall what I so longed to say. My own mother Nannie. I . . . wait. I will go for a moment, wait for me, James" (p. 479). In the name "Sarah" my father evidently recurs to the trip mentioned a little before, as my aunt Sarah accompanied us on that trip, and forgets the cap. The significance of the confused statement "My own mother Nannie" is commented on elsewhere (p. 71, and Note 77, p. 524). In a sudden interruption of his thoughts he exclaimed, "Now what did I . . .," and recovering the thread immediately said, "Oh, yes, I then arranged to go out there to live" (p. 482). Finally on June 8th, explaining his mental condition on first coming to communicate, he said, "You see, James, I was not wholly conscious when I came here, and I suddenly thought of every one of my dear ones the moment I awoke" (p. 491, Cf. p. 341).

There are many less striking passages bearing on the point which I have not included in this list. The reader may remark them for himself if he reads the detailed record with proper care. Besides, I have not put down those automatisms in all cases which indicate the oncoming syncope or unconsciousness which mark the disappearance of a communicator (Cf. expressions "mother," "father," etc., in my uncle's first attempt, pp. 315 and 316). Nor have I mentioned those broken messages which clearly indicate the same fact of automatism or delirium in any number of cases. The reader must watch for them himself. But it is an interesting fact to remark the communicator's frequent observation that the confusion is due to defective memory (amnesia) and rapid thinking when he can remember. We might suppose *a priori* that this would be the case from the fact that the communicator is divested of all motor functions for inhibiting the flow of his thoughts,

while they must at the same time be adjusted to the automatic action of the motor functions in Mrs. Piper's organism.

Apropos of the statements about rapid thinking it may be of interest to narrate a frequent experience of my own recently. I have been suffering from a severe attack of nervous prostration, and I noted during it many (perhaps hundreds of them) instances in which a thought came into my mind and I tried to hold it before attention and could not do so. They passed in a second into irrecoverable oblivion. I say second purposely, as no more time than this in most cases elapsed before the incident was gone. I could remember that there was something which I wanted to remember, but the thought desired was too evanescent, and would not respond to my effort. This is, of course, an abnormal mental condition. I have remarked the same phenomenon in the interval between sleep and waking. The same is a frequent characteristic of dreams. It is common also in functional patho-psychosis.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVI.

(PART XLI.)

1901.

ARTICLES brought to Sitzings for Identification	23, 48, 307, 323, 338, 367, 370, 371, 373-5, 377-80, 384-91, 394, 397, 479, 497-8, 648
"Aunt Nannie," Chief References to	27, 43-8, 61, 62, 69-74, 76, 80, 81, 85, 132, 133, 146, 171, 172, 192-3, 210, 232-3, 240, 310, 331, 342-3, 365, 400-3, 407, 421, 449, 451, 459, 460, 463, 469-70, 478-81, 483, 493, 496, 519, 524, 526, 528, 529
Automatisms	238-41, 259, 260
(See also "Spiritistic Hypothesis"—Characteristic Phrases.)	
,, Normal Automatic Errors	238-40
B., Miss, Experiments in Identification,	616
B., Miss O., Experiments in Identification	553
B., Mr., Experiments in Identification	583
B., Professor, Experiments in Identification	586, 588
Bourne, Ansel, Case of	271, 635
Bramwell, Dr. Milne, On Subliminal Appreciation of Time	154
C., PROFESSOR, Experiments in Identification...	565, 567, 583
Caïrd, Dr. E., On Kant's Theory of Methods of Communication from Discarnate Spirits	243
Carruthers, Mrs. Eliza, Chief References to,	27, 47, 80, 81, 85, 90-5, 100, 132, 146, 192, 193, 310, 314, 315, 317, 469, 470, 478, 491, 496, 519, 524, 528
,, Evidence as to Incidents Communicated,	353, 354, 355, 528
,, James (Uncle Clarke) (See Communicators.)	
Cartesian Conceptions of the Soul	225, 259
Communication Through a Tube, Experiments in	18, 624
Communications, Analysis Showing Proportion of Truth and Falsity in	118-21
,, Classification of Chief Incidents	131-33
,, Statistical Summary	115-23

- Communicator, Mental Condition of—while Communicating ... 249, 643
 ,, and Sitter, Possible Effects of Relationship between 122, 123,
 257, 258
- Communicators, Chief References to :—
- Carruthers, James*, 17, 26, 29, 64, 76, 90-5, 146, 173, 174, 192,
 193, 222, 314, 315, 317, 353-5, 363, 422-23, 428, 431.
 444-6, 450, 459, 484, 504-5, 513, 528, 529, 643, 647, 648
- Hyslop, Anna*, 17, 27, 96, 105, 108, 147, 205, 209, 307, 331, 358,
 421, 425, 451, 482, 502, 644, 646
- ,, "Charles," 17, 23-5, 27, 94, 100, 147, 184-91, 205,
 206, 307, 309, 310, 313, 316, 330, 350, 431, 440,
 450, 455, 462-5, 513-7, 518, 645, 646, 647
- ,, *Martha Ann (Mrs.)*... .. 21, 26, 306, 308, 431, 458
- ,, *Robert*, 12, 17, 22, 26, 28-47, 48-93, 97, 109, 112, 131-33,
 137, 160, 170, 189, 190-214, 221-38, 257, 308, 313, 316-22,
 324-44, 347, 348, 351, 352, 354-62, 370-5, 377-9, 380-95,
 397-416, 418-27, 429-38, 440-1, 443-5, 448-56, 459, 460-3,
 468-75, 478-81, 484, 485, 490-536, 643-9
- McClellan, James*, 17, 26, 64, 65, 77, 108, 109, 146-7, 258, 445,
 446, 450, 463-6, 470-3, 513, 520-1, 529, 536, 647
- ,, *Robert Harvey*, 63, 74, 95, 97, 108, 145, 164, 167,
 205, 211, 223, 231, 258, 427-9, 433, 442, 443, 494,
 505, 508-10, 514, 515, 518, 520-5, 532, 536, 646
- Polham, George* ("G. P."), 15, 26, 73-4, 113, 155, 179, 181,
 184-6, 188-9, 208-14, 235, 263, 264, 266, 300, 305, 429, 435,
 440-3, 468, 479, 481-6
- (See also Trance Personalities—Imperator, Phinuit, Rector, &c.)
- Controls of Mrs. Piper. (See Trance Personalities and Communicators.)
- Cooper, J., R., and S., Chief References to 51-4, 111, 112, 132, 137, 169,
 208, 386, 394, 397, 398, 410-3, 420, 445, 452-4,
 492, 497, 499-501, 525
- D., MRS., Case of 33, 271, 474, 475
- Dana, Dr., Case Recorded by 271
- Dearborn, G. S., Experiments in Identification 590
- Delboeuf, Professor, on Subliminal Appreciation of Time 154
- Dice, Dr. J. P., Chief References to ... 94, 102, 103, 459, 460, 463, 517
- ,, ,, Evidence as to Incidents Communicated ... 329, 356, 517
- Difficulties and Objections to the Spiritistic Hypothesis 242
- ,, ,, Argument of Idealism, The 246-7, 259, 260, 261,
 265, 285-8, 290
- ,, ,, Bearing of Earlier Reports upon ... 250-1
- ,, ,, Clairvoyance and Telepathy at a Distance 126, 250-6
- ,, ,, Identity and Independence of the Trance Per-
 sonalities 262-8, 273-80
- ,, ,, Mistakes and Confusions... .. 285-8
- ,, ,, Objection from the Nature of Proof ... 244-7
- ,, ,, Relation of Secondary Personality to the
 Spiritistic Theory 280-5
- ,, ,, Suggestion as an Explanation 12, 247, 248
- ,, ,, Telepathy and Secondary Personality 268-73, 280-5
- ,, ,, Triviality of the Incidents 248-50, 284, 285-8

" Doctor." (<i>See</i> Trance Personalities.)	
Dramatic Play of Personality. (<i>See</i> Spiritistic Hypothesis.)	
Douse, Mr., On Automatic Errors	238
Dying, Consciousness of the	36-7
EDMUNDS, MISS L., Note as to the Arrangements for Sittings	345
Elder, David, Chief References to	109-11, 521, 522
,, Orville, Evidence as to Incidents Communicated	522
F., DR., Experiments in Identification	579, 598
F., Mr., Experiments in Identification	557, 558
" Fire" Incident. The (<i>See</i> Incidents.)	
Flournoy, M., The Case of Hélène Smith	267
Fraud, Considerations of the Possibilities of	5-10, 124, 291, 298, 299
G., PROFESSOR and Mrs., Experiments in Identification	609
Goodrich-Freer, Miss ("Miss X.") Experiences of	202, 271, 547
H., PROFESSOR, Experiments in Identification	576
Hallucinations, Relation of, to Secondary Consciousness	283, 284
Hathaway Family (<i>See</i> McClellan, John.)	
Hodgson, Dr., Relation of, to Professor Hyslop's Experiments, 6-9, 13, 14, 17, 19	
,, " Sittings held for Professor Hyslop	31, 119, 367
" Hymn" Incident. (<i>See</i> Incidents.)	
Hypnotism, Analogy between Hypnosis and Apparent Condition of Com- municator while Communicating	249, 271, 643
,, Memory, Conditions of	249, 271, 635-42
,, " Revivals of, under	635-42
Hyslop Family, The:—	
Anna. (<i>See</i> Communicators.)	
,, Prediction of her own Death	358, 451
Charles. (<i>See</i> Communicators.)	
Family, Evidence of Living Members of, to Incidents Communicated	
35, 42, 50, 53, 57, 81, 82, 347-61, 363, 364, 382, 383,	
392, 398-9, 406, 408, 409-16, 498-503, 507, 512, 516-20,	
522, 531, 532, 534	
Frank, Evidence as to Incidents Communicated	351, 352, 383, 392,
398, 409, 414, 415, 498, 512, 516	
,, References to. (<i>See</i> Communicators, <i>Robert Hyslop.</i>)	
George, Chief References to	23-5, 27, 29, 42, 44, 62-5, 67, 69, 132,
133, 163, 170, 172, 307, 310, 316, 317, 337, 394, 401, 404-5,	
423, 454, 461, 462, 491, 492, 493, 502, 512, 516, 531, 645	
,, Evidence as to Incidents Communicated	502
Hettie, Chief References to	68, 71, 75, 101, 103, 104, 164, 207, 212,
434, 435, 440, 444, 462, 471, 473	
Margaret Cornelia, References to	21, 27, 310, 349, 514
Martha Ann. (<i>See</i> Communicators.)	

"Nannie" (Mrs. Robert), Chief References to	47, 54, 55, 63, 69-74, 146, 162, 207-10, 240, 342, 343, 365, 387-8, 406, 419, 421, 424, 439, 441-2, 460, 478-80, 483, 484, 486, 487, 495-6, 499, 501, 525, 526
,, (See "Aunt Nannie.")	
Robert. (See Communicators.)	
(See also Carruthers, Eliza and James, and McClellans, The)	
Hyslop, Mrs. James, Experiments in Identification with	... 553, 555, 596
,, Professor James Hervey, Ph.D., A Further Record of Observa- tions of Certain Trance Phenomena 1
I., DR. V., Experiments in Identification 556
Identification of Personality, Experiments in 18, 169, 268, 537
Characteristic Differences between, and Mrs. Piper's Phenomena	542
Errors of Interpretation 546, 557, 560, 583, 592, 596, 599, 600
,, Memory	... 169, 544, 545, 554, 556, 559, 569, 572, 578, 579, 588, 589, 593, 603, 605, 612, 613
Method of Experiments 538-40
Mistakes and Confusions 540, 551, 609, 615, 624
Summary and Analysis 540, 552, 553
Identity, Personal—	
Criteria of 158, 159
Proof of, the Key to the Whole Problem 246, 247, 290-1
Trivial Incidents, The Test of 248, 537-623
(See also Spiritistic Hypothesis, Characteristic Phrases and Dramatic Play.)	
"Imperator." (See Trance Personalities.)	
Incidents in the Communications, Classification of Main 131-3
,, Fire Incident 34, 35, 133, 324-5, 364, 371-3, 430, 497, 503
,, Hymn 56, 87, 133, 166, 249, 389, 413
,, Munyon and Hyomei—(and details of Illness)—	35-9, 87, 131, 132, 327-30, 336-8, 356, 360-2, 364-6, 381, 384, 388, 391-3, 397, 410, 413, 418, 420, 497-9
,, Organ 82, 83, 89, 131, 132, 133, 491, 492, 529-31
,, Swedenborg 31, 131, 166, 169, 341, 361, 365, 368, 370-1
,, "Tom, the Horse," 65, 133, 170, 423, 502
J., DR., Experiments in Identification 580
J., Mr., Experiments in Identification 563
James, Prof., Experiments with Mrs. Piper 8, 9, 17
Janet, Prof., Hypnotic Researches of 269, 271, 272, 279, 287
K., PROFESSOR, Experiments in Identification 576
Kant, Conception of Communication with Discarnate Spirits 243, 261
Kyle, Mr., Evidence on Incidents Communicated 535, 536
LANG, ANDREW, On the Trance Phenomena of Mrs. Piper 9
Leaf, Dr. Walter, Experiments with Mrs. Piper 8, 17
Le Baron Case, The 154
Lodge, Dr. Oliver, Experiments with Mrs. Piper 8, 17, 228-9, 274
Lum, R. E., Professor Hyslop's Hypnotic Experiments with 635

M., Miss, Experiments in Identification	616
M., Mr., Experiments in Identification	580
M., Mrs., References to	17, 18, 202, 370, 379, 380, 437, 458	
Marvin, Dr., Experiments in Identification	547, 559
McClellan, George, Reference to. (<i>See Communicators—R. H. McClellan.</i>)					
,, Harvey, Chief References to	421, 422, 425, 491, 505-6, 523	
,, James. (<i>See Communicators.</i>)					
,, John, Chief References to	66, 97, 101, 102, 109, 110, 111, 263, 431,				
	438, 439, 443-6, 450, 471-3, 504-7				
				511, 513, 520-1, 535	
,, Lucy. (<i>See Communicators—R. H. McClellan.</i>)					
,, Robert Harvey. (<i>See Communicators.</i>)					
McWhood, Mr., Experiments in Identification	558 9, 565, 579
Memory, Attempt to recover through Hypnosis	635
,, Illusions and Lapses of Normal...	214-20, 228-30, 507, 544-5, 554-6,				
	559, 569, 572, 578, 579, 588, 589,				
				593, 603-5, 612, 613	
Mitchell, Dr. S. Weir, Sittings with Mrs. Piper	183
Munyon Company, Letter from	414
,, Incident. (<i>See Incidents.</i>)					
Myers, F. W. H., Experiments with Mrs. Piper	8, 17
• ,, ,, On Problems of Personality...	271
NANNIE. (<i>See "Aunt Nannie," and Hyslop, Mrs. Robert.</i>)					
Newbold, Professor W. Romaine, Experiments with Mrs. Piper	9
Newnham Case, The	154
Noopathy, Definition of the Term	125
Norton, Professor, Sittings with Mrs. Piper	183
OSBORNE, Miss, Experiments in Identification	555
P., PROFESSOR, Experiments in Identification...	588
Parapathy, Definition of the Term	125
Patrick, Professor G. T., on Some Peculiarities of Secondary Personality	154
Peirce, Professor, Sittings with Mrs. Piper	183
Pelham, G. ("G. P.") (<i>See Communicators.</i>)					
Personality. (<i>See Identification of, Experiments in.</i>)					
Personality, Problems of—					
Alternations of	154
Memory, Conditions of	635
Secondary	152-4, 177, 241, 249, 262-4, 271-80
Dramatic Play of	176
(<i>See also Trance Personalities.</i>)					
Pierce, Dr. (<i>See Dice, Dr.</i>)					
Piper, Mrs., A Further Record of Observations of the Trance Phenomena					
of, by Professor J. H. Hyslop	1-649
Plato, on the Nature of Knowledge	233
Predictions, A Child's, of her own Death	358, 451
,, Mediumistic	109, 110
Prince, Dr. Morton, A Case of Multiplex Personality	267, 269, 270
"Prudens." (<i>See Trance Personalities.</i>)					

Q., REFERENCES to 380
 Quotations bearing on Mental State of Communicator when Communicating 643

“RECTOR.” (*See* Trance Personalities.)

S., Miss, Experiments in Identification...	572
Sidis, Boris, On Suggestion	154, 271
Simons, T., Evidence of, in Experiments with R. E. Lum	636-42
Sittings with Mrs. Piper, Detailed Records of	297-536
Slate-Writing, Alleged Phenomena of	14
Spiritistic Hypothesis, Discussion of—	
Argument for, General Statement of	4, 16, 158, 260-2, 289-91
Automatism	238-41
Consciousness and Memory, Unity of	158-76, 184-90, 198, 220-1, 293
,, Synthetic Unity of Incidents	170-6, 184-90, 198, 293
Dramatic Play of Personality	176-214, 219, 224, 231, 236, 237, 255, 256, 263, 268-70, 277-85, 292, 293, 312, 441
,, Characteristic Phrases, &c.,	22, 29, 34, 40, 44-6, 53, 54, 57-9, 61, 75, 88, 89, 106-8, 132, 133, 167-9, 189, 204, 223, 235, 236, 238-41, 307, 313, 314, 317, 318, 320-1, 328, 333, 334, 340, 348, 349, 351, 352, 373 397-400, 416, 420, 430-3, 437, 470, 474, 494
,, Differences between Mrs. Piper's and that of Ordinary Secondary Personality	152-6, 255, 256, 263, 268-85
Intermediary Element	150, 151, 156, 179, 180, 235
Mistakes, Confusions, and Irrelevancies	155, 180, 202, 212, 214-38, 242, 319, 330, 408-9, 423, 436, 437
,, Re-construction of a Message	408-9
<i>See also</i> Difficulties and Objections	242
Statistical Summary of True and False Statements	115-23
Subliminal Consciousness of the Lapse of Time	154
“Swedenborg” Incident—(<i>See</i> Incidents.)	

TABLE of Contents 1

Telepathic Hypothesis, Discussion of—	
Argument, General Statement of	124-57, 295, 296
,, Special Arguments Against	137-57
Classification of Incidents bearing on...	131-3
Magnitude of its Application	139-46, 154-6, 256, 292-6
Main Points bearing on	54, 69-74, 83, 94, 98-100, 104, 124-57, 161-3, 163, 177, 180, 185-90, 194-204, 207-11, 214-38, 242, 249, 251, 253-6, 268, 288, 289, 291-7, 318, 319, 321, 337, 361, 365, 377, 386, 429
Mistakes and Confusions	142-6, 214-21
Personal Identity, Absence of, in Ordinary Telepathy	126, 136, 168
Secondary Personality and Telepathy, Combination of	132, 268-73, 291, 292
Selective Element in the Communications	137-42
Telepathy from the Dead, Indications of	126-8, 137, 280-2
,, from the Living, Terms Suggested to Express...	125
“Tom, the Horse” Incident. (<i>See</i> Incidents.)	

Trance Phenomena, Certain. A Further Record of Observations of, by		
Professor J. H. Hyslop	1
,, Conditions of	10, 13, 303, 304, 311-2, 322-3, 368, 375, 382, 390, 396, 407, 418, 426, 436-7, 446-7, 456-7, 466-7, 475-7, 486-7, 496-7	
Personalities, The, Chief References to—		
"Doctor"	201, 267, 376
"Imperator" and "Rector"	15, 48-9, 51-2, 67, 73, 74, 113-5, 145, 155, 177-85, 194, 196-9, 201, 207, 209-13, 231, 234, 235, 240, 241, 255, 262-7, 272, 273, 299, 304, 311-3, 321, 324, 334, 335, 367-70, 375-7, 379, 381, 384, 391, 393, 395, 396, 417, 418, 426, 437, 447, 457, 458, 465-7, 475-7, 485-9, 496, 497, 499, 644-7	
"Phinuit"	... 10, 16, 127, 138, 180-2, 228, 251, 254, 255, 262, 263, 266, 272-5, 297	
"Prudens"	49, 267, 381
,, Mental and Moral Characteristics of	180
	(See also Communicators, "G. P.")	
,, Consistency of	48, 49, 51, 52, 67, 73, 74, 113, 144, 145, 155, 177-84, 262-7, 447-8	
,, Contrasted with Normal Secondary Personality	152-6, 263, 268-85	
VAN HÖEVENBERG, H., Evidence in Experiments with R. E. Lum	645
W., MRS., References to	369, 370
Wireless Telegraphy not analogous to Trance Communications	139, 140
Woodworth, Mr., Experiments in Identification	590
X., MISS—(See Goodrich-Freer.)		