The thirteenth General Meeting of the Society was held at the Rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, on Friday, April 24, 1885.

Professor Balfour Stewart, F.R.S., President, in the Chair.

The President made the following address:—

II.

You will permit me on this occasion to allude to the great loss which our Society has sustained in the resignation by Professor Sidgwick of the office of President.

I cannot imagine one better fitted than our late President to develop into vigorous action a struggling body such as ours, and we must all feel deeply grateful to him for his successful accomplishment of this object.

He has procured the recognition by men of education of a society whose advent was at first somewhat coldly welcomed by the fraternity of knowledge.

Under these circumstances everything depended on the choice of guardians for the infant Society. Had it been injudiciously led it would certainly have proved a failure, and have thus strengthened the widespread belief that no good result is to be obtained by discussing subjects of a certain class. But things have happily turned out far otherwise, and the recognition which our Society enjoys to-day is greatly due to its guidance by a President and officers who, through a happy mixture of boldness and prudence, carried energetically into action, have succeeded in bringing it into its present position. Professor Sidgwick's benefits to the Society were not merely those of a wise and energetic guidance of its affairs. He was unsparing in every sense where he felt that the interests of the Society required support, and he is not only our first and honoured President but one of our chief benefactors.

Success of this nature cannot be equalled or even approached. But it is not, therefore, with a feeling of despair that I commence this evening the duties of the office with which I have been honoured, knowing that gratitude to my predecessor should prompt me to give
him what relief I can, and to do what I can for the benefit of a Society which has strong claims upon all who are desirous to promote knowledge.

It may not be out of place to bring before you a few statistics of our progress.

A preliminary conference was convened by Professor Barrett (whom we honour as our founder) on the 5th and 6th of January, 1882. At this meeting a Committee of sixteen were appointed, to which a few additions were afterwards made.

The Society was next formally constituted in accordance with the report of the Conference Committee at an adjourned meeting of the Conference held on 20th February, 1882, the Committee being constituted as the Council of the new Society under the presidency of Professor Henry Sidgwick.

At the first meeting of the Council, held on the 3rd March, 1882, a number of proposals for election were brought forward, and at its second meeting on the 17th March, 20 Members and 11 Associates were elected.

At the end of 1882 the total number of the Society was 150; at the end of 1883 it was 288; at the end of 1884 it was 520; while at the present moment the total number is 586.

If these results are very encouraging as regards numbers it is a source of equal gratification to think that men of the highest standing in all departments of knowledge have consented to join our ranks; and you have been already informed by Professor Barrett that a kindred Society has recently been started in America under very favourable circumstances, embracing, likewise, amongst its members men of the highest attainments and standing.

In reply to the question, what has the Society done? I may state that since its commencement it has issued seven parts of Proceedings, of which a total number exceeding 12,000 has been distributed to Members and others, placed in public libraries, sent for review, and sold through the ordinary channels. An eighth part will be published very shortly.

Early in 1884 a Journal was commenced, which has been continued monthly for private circulation amongst members.

In the autumn of last year a Report of the Committee on Theosophical Phenomena was issued for private circulation only.

A large number of slips has also been printed comprising a selection of the evidence collected in the various departments of inquiry.

All these schemes could not have been carried out by means of the ordinary income of the Society, and their successful accomplishment is due to the fact that we have Members who are willing not only to
devote their time and energy, but likewise their private means, to the advancement of our interests.

The cost of the slips of printed matter and of the Theosophical Report was borne by our late President. The printing of the slips is now suspended, it being intended to publish selections from the evidence in the *Journal* of our Society. Professor Sidgwick has meanwhile agreed to be editor of the *Journal*, nor while devoting his time in this way to the service of the Society has he discontinued his former liberality, but rather transferred it into this new channel.

The library of the Society consists of more than 800 volumes, of which about 250 are French and German works. A great many of the English books have been presented through the kind liberality of Members and friends.

I have read with much interest in the pages of our *Journal* a correspondence between our Secretary, Mr. Gurney, and Professor Newcomb, the distinguished President of the American Psychical Society.

It would appear from this correspondence that there is a perfect agreement as to the great importance of studying experimentally the subject of thought-transference.

To my mind the evidence already adduced is such as to render highly probable the occasional presence amongst us of something which we may call thought-transference or more generally telepathy; but it is surely our duty as a Society to continue to accumulate evidence until the existence of such a power cannot be controverted. We have not been remiss in this respect, and it will be found from the pages of our *Proceedings* that the main strength of our Society has been given to prove the existence of telepathy, in the belief that such a fact well established will not only possess an independent value of its own, but will serve as an admirable basis for further operations.

But our Society has not only its staff of observers and experimenters, it has likewise its literary staff, whose duty it is to collect and scrutinise the existing evidence on the various subjects embraced in Psychical Research. Now, it would appear to me to be the one unpardonable offence if this Literary Committee were to decline to invite, to listen to, to examine, or to register the contemporaneous evidence on any branch of psychical inquiry.

It is no doubt quite conceivable that after a quantity of evidence on some subject has been collected, the result of its discussion should prove that there is nothing in it worth inquiring into, at least nothing new. But a definite settlement, even of a negative character, is not without its value, and this can only be obtained as the result of an exhaustive discussion. On the other hand it is conceivable that the result of such a discussion may be the establishment of new facts.
eminently worthy of record, and the next generation of our Society would greatly blame the present if we declined to bring together, examine, and register the contemporaneous evidence, so as to fit it, if not for our own final discussion, at least for that of those who shall come after us.

But perhaps the best justification of the labours of the Literary Committee is to be found in what they have already done. As regards apparitions at the moment of death, I will quote the following statement by Mr. Gurney: "We have," he tells us, "collected more than a hundred first-hand cases of apparitions closely coinciding with the time of death of the person seen; and it is only in a small minority of such cases that our informants, according to their own account, have had any other hallucination than the apparition in question." The great importance of this statement will be manifest to all.

It has, however, been objected that the evidence brought forward by this Committee is a mixture of the strong and the weak; and some have even hinted that the effective strength of such evidence is that of the weakest portions of it. As I know from experience that this mixed character is a stumbling block to many, I will take the present opportunity of repeating what cannot be too widely known—that the Literary Committee are themselves very well aware of this difference between the various items of evidence which they have brought together. Some of these are regarded by them as peculiarly of an evidential nature adapted to force conviction into the minds of those who are sceptical. Other items again, while deficient in this respect, may yet be of importance in bringing out the laws which regulate these strange phenomena. For example, the question, Do apparitions of the dying actually occur? is to be replied to by quoting evidence of one kind while the question as to the exact meaning of these appearances, and their possible relation to telepathy, is to be replied to by evidence of another kind less important, perhaps, in its value as regards those who are unconvincing. Similar rules apply to all branches of knowledge.

The thanks of our Society are due to Mr. Myers for the pains he has taken in classifying the various items, and it is, indeed, abundantly obvious that without such a preliminary process the full value of the evidence could not possibly become known.

I have dwelt at some length on this subject because of its importance, and because the public are, perhaps, apt to attach too exclusive a value to the experimental part of our work. I have fully recognised the claims of the experimental part; we need in it far wider assistance—especially in the way of systematic trials of thought-transference in private—than we have yet received. But none the less, I think, must the codification of the current evidence be looked upon as a pressing and paramount duty.
We may be told in the kindest manner that there are regions which it is utterly hopeless to approach—groups of recurrent phenomena so wrapped about with the garments of confusion that we cannot possibly disentangle them so as to find whether there is anything new in them or not.

Our reply to such remarks should not be doubtful. It ought, I imagine, to consist in a prompt refusal to believe in the existence of any such region or of any such phenomena. Is it not at once the privilege and the duty of the human intellect to gain, as time goes on, a clearer and still clearer insight into the principles which underlie all terrestrial occurrences? The ultimate explanation of certain classes of these may, no doubt, be different from what we imagined on our setting out. This, however, is not the question.

The point is, rather, whether there exist around us groups of recurrent terrestrial phenomena which it is utterly hopeless to grapple with. Surely there is only one proper way of replying to this suggestion, and that is by making the attempt. Everything is possible to courage and prudence, coupled with perseverance. Such qualities will enable us to overcome the preliminary Dragon which guards the entrance to these interesting regions, and our united efforts will ultimately result in obtaining for us the golden apples of truth.
III.

NOTES ON THE EVIDENCE, COLLECTED BY THE SOCIETY, FOR PHANTASMS OF THE DEAD.

By Mrs. H. Sidgwick.

In the following paper I propose to consider the evidence which the Society has hitherto collected for Phantasms of the Dead, including under this term all kinds of impressions on human minds which there seems any reason to refer to the action, in some way or other, of deceased persons.*

Most of those to whom this paper is addressed probably belong to some Christian denomination, and to them the continued existence of the soul after death is, of course, no new theory invented to account for such phenomena as we are discussing, or requiring such phenomena to support it. But few will have any difficulty in agreeing with me that (1) the possibility of receiving communications from the dead, here and now, would not follow as a necessary consequence from the immortality of the soul; (2) that if communication of what I may call an objective kind—distinguishable, I mean, from our own thoughts and emotions—is possible to all those of the departed who desire it, we should naturally expect it to occur more frequently than the most sanguine can suppose that it actually does; and (3) that its possibility, while not in contradiction with any of the known facts of physical science, is certainly not supported, or in any way suggested, by any of these facts. However firmly, therefore, we may believe in the continued existence of dead human beings, we cannot regard the supposition of their action on the minds of the living as if it were merely the reference of an effect to a vera causa known to be adequate to produce it. We must treat it as we should treat the hypothesis, in any department of physical investigation, of an entirely new agent, for the existence of which we have no evidence outside the phenomenon which it is introduced to explain. If this be so, it will, I think, be admitted that we should be violating an established rule of scientific method if we introduced such

* This evidence does not of course include appearances at the moment of death, or a few hours afterwards, since these, as my readers will remember, have been classed with Phantasms of the Living.
a hypothesis except in the last resort, when all other modes of explanation seem clearly to fail.

Exactly at what point of improbability this failure of other explanations is to be regarded as established, cannot, I think, be defined—at any rate, I feel quite unable to define it. But I may perhaps say that, in my opinion, it is a point which can hardly be reached in the case of any narrative of a single event considered by itself: if we had only a single ghost-story to deal with, I can hardly conceive the kind or amount of evidence which would lead me to prefer the hypothesis of ghostly agency to all other possible explanations. The existence, therefore, of phantasms of the dead can only be established, if at all, by the accumulation of improbabilities in which we become involved by rejecting a large mass of apparently strong testimony to facts which, as recounted, would seem to admit of no other satisfactory explanation: and in testing the value of this testimony we are bound, I think, to strain to the utmost all possible suppositions of recognised causes, before we can regard the narrative in question as even tending to prove the operation of this novel agency.

Of course, if its operation should ever be rationally established, by the cumulative process that I have described, it will then become reasonable to reconsider our evidence from the new point of view thus reached; and to refer to this cause, when once proved to exist, many of the phenomena which, in the first instance, it was right to put aside as otherwise explicable. I have made these preliminary remarks, lest the explanations I shall endeavour to apply to some of the cases before us should seem unreasonably far-fetched to such of my readers as may already believe in phantasms of the dead, or are trembling on the verge of belief.

The Society now possesses, as the residue of a much larger number, a collection of about 370 narratives,—that seemed to deserve some consideration,—of phenomena, not clearly physical, and which believers in ghosts would be apt to refer to the agency of deceased human beings. These narratives are printed on slips for consideration and criticism, and they constitute, probably, a fairly representative collection of the kind of evidence that we are likely to obtain on the subject.

I shall not, of course, attempt here to go through each case in detail and explain my reasons for the view I have formed about it, but shall merely give the general results of a careful examination of them, with some examples. The slips themselves are at 14, Dean's Yard, open to the inspection of any member of the Society; and to anyone who is sufficiently interested in the question to wish to examine into it for themselves, I could furnish, if desired, a list of the narratives classified according to my view of them, for comparison with their own results.
In the first part of this paper I shall explain and illustrate the different grounds on which I think that the greater number of the cases in the Society's collection should be set aside at the present stage of our investigation, as having no important evidential force, for the purpose of proving the existence of phantasms of the dead. In the second part I shall examine the residue, consisting of some twenty-five* narratives, in detail, with a view of ascertaining what psychical theories, if any, they seem to point to. This residue, though comparatively small and not suggestive of any satisfactory view as to the conditions of communication with the other world, nor, indeed, by any means conclusive as to the possibility of such communication, is still, in my opinion, quite sufficiently important to deserve serious consideration, and to justify the pains that have been taken in collecting and sifting it.

The possible non-ghostly explanations of what pass as ghostly phenomena may be conveniently classified with reference to the various sorts of error by which the evidence to such phenomena is liable to be affected. I should state these as (1) hoaxing, (2) exaggeration or inadequate description, (3) illusion, (4) mistaken identity, (5) hallucination.

I. To begin with hoaxing. Probably most sceptical persons, who have not examined the evidence actually collected, would suppose that this is likely to be a very fruitful source of fallacious narratives, either (1) through the narrator hoaxing the collector, or (2) from his having himself been made the victim of a practical joke. I think, however, that any one who has read the evidence will at once discard the first of these alternatives, at any rate so far as the great mass of the first-hand narratives is concerned.† In most of these cases enough is known of the narrators to make it highly improbable that they are intentionally deceiving the investigator; and even were this not so, the stories are mostly so tame and dull in comparison with the thrilling narratives which from time to time appear in the magazines, that I can hardly imagine a hoaxter feeling any pride in having got them accepted as

* I purposely give the number vaguely because there is of course no clear and unmistakable line between stories that should be placed in the first class and those that belong to the second. Different people would take different views of some of them, and I should myself probably estimate them slightly differently at different times. Moreover, it is not impossible that further evidence may expose fatal weaknesses in one or two of those I have selected, and on the other hand it is probable that some of those which I have for the present set aside as in various ways insufficiently evidenced, may by additional evidence be raised into the first-class.

† It should be observed that the collection contains a small number of anonymous stories, printed, as I understand, only in the hope of obtaining further information about them through members of the Society who may see them. It is not improbable that one or two of these may turn out to be pure inventions.
genuine. This last remark applies also, generally speaking, to the sup­position that the phenomena described are the result of practical jokes perpetrated on the narrator. I think, however, that there are a few which can plausibly be explained as the result of trickery. In some of these, the ghost only does what, according to the narrative, would be clearly within the scope of human personation; and in one, though the apparition can hardly have been a living being of any sort, the immo­bility and persistence of the figure, and the behaviour of one of the actors in the scene seem to me to suggest a practical joke. But I do not think that the number of cases in which this explanation is applicable can be more than half-a-dozen—at least if we exclude the narratives which I am disposed to set aside on other grounds.

II. But it is obvious that without the slightest intention to deceive, the stories may contain unintentional exaggeration, or may omit important details which would give us a clue to some non-psychical explanation. We have no means of excluding this possibility in any case, and we can only form a judgment as to the probability of its having been realised in the same way as we are constantly forming judgments in ordinary life. We know roughly in common life what sort of things we may believe on the testimony of any ordinarily truthful person, and what sort of things are liable to be forgotten, imagined, misinterpreted, or badly observed; and the weight that we attach to what people tell us is in accordance with this knowledge.

We have, of course, to do the same thing with "ghost stories," taking care, moreover, to allow full weight or the witness's state of mind at the time and other attendant circumstances. This is a general remark applying to all the narratives, but some rules for dealing with special classes of cases may, I think, be laid down under this head.

All stories at second-hand (and a fortiori those that are more re­ mote) in which it is fundamentally important to know accurately the details, should be regarded as of low value, so far as the evidence directly supplied by them is concerned; because it is well known that few people can repeat quite accurately in detail what they have been told, and because there is a special tendency to distortion in narratives of the kind we are dealing with (just as there is in scandalous stories), owing to the fact that certain elements of the story, in the present case the marvellous ones, are usually more striking to the imagination, and therefore more likely to remain in the memory than the qualifying circumstances. Besides, no description can reproduce to the mind's eye with certainty the actual scene—no description can include every detail: the very best may be compared to a photograph—correct as far as it goes, but incomplete. And thus when the hearer repeats the story—unless he does it with absolute verbal accuracy—he is liable to describe a mental picture of the scene differing from the original in
just the details which would have enabled us to interpret the occurrence correctly. Hence, in my opinion, a second-hand story, even when reported by a good witness, can rarely amount for us to more than this: that in B's opinion A believed, on good grounds, that he had seen a ghost. This, if we have reason to respect the veracity and judgment of A and B, is doubtless an important fact, but it is less important than it would be if we could ourselves criticise the grounds on which A's conclusion was based, and could compare his experience in detail with that of others.

On somewhat similar grounds but little definite weight can be attached to stories which are told with too little care or detail to enable us to judge what reasons there were at the time for supposing the phenomenon described to be a "psychical" one. And, again, the value of a narrative diminishes steadily as the interval between the event and the record of it increases—not only because the details fade owing to defective memory, but because they are liable to be confused and supplemented by subsequent suggestions. Hence it is much to be desired that anyone who has what he regards as a "psychical" experience should write it down at once with as much detail as possible.

I may here observe that there are certain narratives where the nature of the phenomenon described seems to preclude the possibility of obtaining evidence of a "psychical" cause. For instance, we have several accounts of horses being frightened in places supposed to be haunted, where their riders or drivers see nothing. Horses are nervous animals, and it is difficult to exhaust the possible causes of their alarm. Moreover, they are good readers of both conscious and unconscious muscular indications—otherwise what is called a good hand in a rider would not be so important as it is—and thus nervousness of the horse's master, perhaps conscious of the reputation of the haunted spot, may sometimes be imparted to the horse. Even when it is a human being who has a feeling of dread or horror, or of something being wrong, or of an unseen presence (a not unfrequent occurrence apparently in so-called haunted houses), it is very difficult to obtain sufficient evidence that this feeling was quite peculiar. One might, perhaps, be sure of it in one's own case if one ever experienced it, but one could not expect to convince other people.

On the whole, the evidence appears to me to be, at present, too weak, or otherwise seriously defective, on such grounds as I have been discussing, in about one-third of the printed stories, which I, therefore, set aside for the present. In those that remain we have to consider whether any known physical explanations will apply, even, as I have said, with some straining.

III. Illusion, or misinterpretation of what is perceived by the senses is an explanation, which is, perhaps, possible in a considerable
number of cases. Most of us have experienced illusions in some degree though usually if the misinterpreted phenomenon is of more than momentary duration, we almost immediately correct our impressions. It must, however, be noted that short-sighted people have to interpret much smaller indications, and are consequently more liable to visual illusions than persons whose sight is good. This makes it very important to know whether our witnesses have good sight or not. I would venture to suggest to the Committee that somewhat more information should, if possible, be obtained on this point, especially as short sight and other defects of vision are, of course, extremely common. I am told by a short-sighted friend that illusions will sometimes last with her till she is quite close to the misinterpreted object, and that, owing to the blurring of the images, she is liable to be mistaken both as to the size and shape of what she sees—taking, for instance, a man on the road in front of her for a man on a pony, or for two or three men walking close together abreast. In a bad light we are all somewhat in the position of short-sighted people, obliged to infer from small indications what it is we see, and moreover some persons with good sight in ordinary light become short-sighted in a bad light.

Of course, in most cases, whether we are short-sighted or not, the true interpretation of what we see is ultimately forced upon us, but it is easy to imagine circumstances in which this would not happen, and it is then that what is really an ordinary natural phenomenon is liable to assume the appearance of inexplicable mystery.

I do not think that our collection includes, among the narratives of apparitions seen once by a single person, any that can be fairly explained as ocular illusions; but in examining the rarer cases of those seen by two persons together, or successively in the same place, I have found some in which this explanation seems admissible. Two persons seeing something rather indistinctly from the same point of view may sometimes help each other to interpret it alike; and a figure frequently indistinctly seen in a particular spot, especially if in a particular light, may be due to some constantly recurring effect of light and shade, or arrangement of trees or other objects, sufficiently like what it is taken for to deceive. Perhaps about 16 of the narratives may, with some straining, be explained in this way. One or two specimens may be given. The following (G. 10)* is one:—

In 1845, my late husband, William Man Townsend, and self, were residing in a pretty cottage half-way between Thame and Aylesbury, had

* The number in brackets appended to each story quoted, is its number among the "G." slips, and the number attached to the original documents concerning it.
Phantasm of the Dead.

gone there on account of his health, had been there two years, derived great benefit; liked it very much; had serious thoughts of buying it.

We had gone to bed at our usual time, say 10; soon after our dog, a very intelligent but untrained field spaniel, began to bark in a sharp short way, and continued to do so till 3; it vexed my husband and kept him awake and gave him a bad headache, as it sounded so plainly in our room, and as the dog obeyed my voice quicker than his, he asked me if I would go to the window at the back of the house and make him go to his kennel. I had done so before, but had to cross a landing, go through an empty room into the room our servant, a woman about 30 years old, was sleeping in, as we only had one window that looked over that yard. I may say, we neither of us had any fear of anything and did not believe in ghosts, or anything of that sort, and I preferred going about my own house in the dark to taking the trouble of carrying a candle at any time, as I always knew where to find what I wanted.

I called to my dear old dog, tried to soothe him, he answered with a whine, but I heard his chain rattle as he went in, did as I told him, and we heard no sound of him again.

My servant slept, did not know I had been in her room. I turned to go back to my own room and in passing the landing window just outside my own door I lifted the blind, always liking to look out into the sky; it was, as I said, between 3 and 4, and in October, and we had been having heavy dews at night, and it seemed a grey quiet sort of morning, no moon, no stars, all very still, yet I could see distinctly. We had a night-light burning and my husband was sitting up in bed. I had stayed at the back window looking out some time and thought what a strange light it was, so I held the blind only a little on one side to get a better look at the front, but dropped it and started, made an exclamation, and my husband heard me and asked what it was; at first I did not answer, did not, in fact, choose to believe what I saw; he sprang to the window, did just as I had done; we asked each other, what can it be, or rather, who can it be. Standing looking at our room window just at the point of one of my flower beds was an old man in dressing gown and nightcap; he looked about 60.

"Is it any one you know?" asked my husband. I did not. Did he, I asked, or had he ever seen anyone at all like it? No. In speaking of it afterwards to each other, as you may be sure we often did, we always called it Scrooge, from Charles Dickens' Christmas Carol, so no one knew whom we meant. My husband at once began to prepare to go out to the garden. I wouldn't hear of it, a terror came over me and stiffness. I had only my nightdress on, no slippers; he saw me change and took me up and put me in bed and returned to the window. I made him promise me he wouldn't leave me, which he never quite forgave me. He told me after a little time it was getting shorter and then that it had disappeared underground. I seemed to lose all the use of my limbs for a time.

I was so anxious to get into the garden in the morning to see if the grass had been at all disturbed and the dew showed any foot prints, but no, not a blade of anything had been interfered with. My husband said, "Now you must not speak of this to anyone, if your maid has any idea of it she will leave at once, and we shall have all the country folk here. We will make all
the inquiries we can as to who has lived here, what sort of persons they were." We did so, and found the house had been built by a farmer who had retired there with his wife; they had no children; they had been dead some years, and there had been several tenants; no one used to stay in it long; no remark was ever made to us as to any reason, nor did we make any. I asked one of our friends to give me a description of the owner of the place as she had known him well; it was exactly like our visitor.

The last time we spoke of it, we were just as unable to account for it as when we saw it; had we not both seen it at the same time we agreed we should never have named it, nor have expected anyone to have believed us.

We did not leave for some time after, but never saw anything else, nor have I since, but I have never looked out into the night with the same pleasure, and it always crosses my mind.

_July 9th, 1883._

M. Townsend.

[Strange noises were heard on two occasions, which could not be accounted for. Once Mrs. Townsend was greatly startled by a tremendous crash, which Mr. Townsend did not hear at all.]

Thirty-eight years seem to have elapsed after this experience before it was written down, and in that time the definiteness of the figure, and the exactness of correspondence between it and the old farmer may have, perhaps, grown in recollection. Besides, considering what an inadequate thing a description is, exactness of correspondence such as is here meant can never come to very much. I suppose no one feels that he could at once recognise an escaped burglar from the police description of him. All he would know would be that certain persons were excluded by the description while certain others were not. But to go back to our ghost; some of its characteristics, namely, its being rooted to the spot and in a fixed attitude, and its disappearance by apparently sinking into the ground, suggest an effect of light, e.g., of a rising or setting moon shining through the house on to a shrub or plant. If Mr. Townsend had but gone down to the garden as he wished, he would, doubtless, have ascertained definitely whether what is here suggested, or any other physical explanation, was or was not possible; and had the occurrence been recent, an examination of the house and garden might even yet have been worth making. But as the story stands, it can hardly be thought unreasonable to regard the above explanation as more probable than any "psychical" one.

I will here add a narrative (G. 117) of a kind quite unique in our collection, and which I am inclined to think may be explained as a case of collective illusion, though, if so, the illusion was so remarkable on account of its persistence and repetition, as almost to suggest a borderland between illusion and hallucination.

It has been received directly from the elder of the two ladies who witnessed the phenomenon; the younger sister has read it through and
appended a brief comment to the account. The maid cannot now be traced.

"I daresay it is ten or twelve years since this happened. One night in November my sister C. and myself, with the maid, had been to evening service in our village church. There was thick fog; the moon was full, but it made a sort of steam in the fog, instead of shining brightly.

"As we walked we met a man: he was whistling, and we heard his whistle and his footsteps long before we saw him; he passed us on C.'s side, whistling still. Shortly after he had gone, I was surprised to see another man at C.'s side, who had come there without making a sound; he was a much shorter man than the first. C. apparently did not see him; I was walking beside her, and I pulled her sleeve, whispering 'Let that man pass.' C. was walking on the outside of the three, next the carriage road. As I spoke, the man disappeared—it seemed, into C.'s dress; neither C. nor the maid had seen him, and he had made no sound. In another moment we were all bewildered at the sight around us; it was as if we were in a crowded street; innumerable figures were round us; men, women, children, and dogs, all were moving briskly about, some singly, others in groups, all without a sound; they appeared mist-like. There was a broad strip of grass on our right, and a narrow strip on our left; the figures were hidden directly they got on either of these dark strips, or when they passed into ourselves; but as we walked on they came from every quarter. Some seemed to rise out of the grass on either side of us; others seemed to pass through us, and come out on the other side. The figures all seemed short, dwarf-like, except one, of whom I write after. The women were dressed in bygone fashion, high bonnets, big cloaks or shawls, and large flounces on their dresses, such as I remember my mother wearing when I was a child. We three were never mistaken as to the identity of the different shapes; if one saw a man, all saw a man; if one saw a woman, all saw the woman; and so on. Overhead it was perfectly free of them; they were all walking on the ground, as we ourselves were. We saw two men (at different intervals) that had sparks all round their faces; they appeared to grin. As we saw the second of these, looking hideous, close to us, one of my companions said 'I can't pass that,' and I answered, 'Look at the sky, you don't see them then.'

"There was one man taller than all the rest (he looked very tall), who took great strides, though perfectly noiseless; he wore a kind of cape; he was the only one who walked beside us, and he was on the carriage road; the rest all went on in an aimless kind of way, losing themselves in the grass, and so on; but this one never changed his step or swerved.

"As we walked on, and he kept near us, we cast frightened glances at him, and kept bidding each other in a whisper to look at him, though he never turned his head to look towards us. We approached our own gate, where we should turn in, and then we had a long drive to walk up before we should reach the house. I think that by the time we reached our gate all the figures had disappeared except this one tall man. He had quite a different look to any of the others, looked more horrible altogether. His way of walking was quite different to the rest, and he was, I should think, twice as tall or more than any of the others. He looked as if he had a purpose; the rest seemed quite different. As we had to cross the road and enter our gate,
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I thought I could not go if that horrible figure went too, but to our intense relief, he passed our gate, and went on with his measured stride up the middle of the road. As we turned into our gate, he was the only form in sight.—E. F., February 7th, 1882."

Mrs. F.'s sister adds:—

"The only thing I do not recollect in this story is where E. says the men had a grin. All the rest is true. I cannot say I recollect the faces. The sparks I did see; the faces appeared to me, as did the figures, mist-like.—C. M. B., February 11th."

In two further letters, Mrs. F. writes:—

(1) [As to the distance actually traversed in company with the "spirits."] "After talking together and recalling the road, we think we may safely say we were among them for 200 yards, or thereabouts." [So that the probable duration of the vision would be from two to three minutes.]

(2) "As to the sparks round the two faces, I certainly think they were on the faces; they were around the faces, as it might be, on the edge of the faces; they were yellow sparks; the two figures who had the sparks appeared to me thin and cadaverous, for the faces did not look round, but seemed to fall in under the cheek bones. I wish I could draw, for I can see the 'things now just as plainly as I saw them then, and I could point out the exact spot of ground on which they stood. We were close to them. As to the number of sparks I cannot speak definitely: they were placed at regular distances round the face; there might be about ten or twelve round each face, so I think. They appeared yellow and bright, and they made a slight steam in the fog. Their light was not nearly so beautiful as a star's light" [this last a suggested simile]; "it might be more like a small yellow candle's flame. There was nothing beautiful about them.

(3) "You ask whether I have any theory as to the apparition. I have none whatever, and should be extremely interested if anybody could throw light upon the matter. The style of the women's dress seemed to take me back as far as I could remember (perhaps to 1857), when I seemed to remember my mother wearing the same sort of fashion, but, as you know, fashions come and go, and repeat themselves a hundred times. I think the men chiefly wore capes or long cloaks; but, you must remember, they all looked dark and mist-like. . . . I should be myself about 20 when I saw this appearance, and my sister 16. . . . One might imagine it to be a kind of mirage, only the whole appearance was so unlike what one would have seen in any town at the time we saw it. No woman in any English town was dressed in the least as were all the women in our vision.

(4) "We were all very much frightened. The maid and my sister were crying aloud; I was not, for I felt I must keep my wits about me; the tears were rolling down my cheeks in a kind of bewilderment, yet I was not crying, and my voice was strong and firm. We kept pulling each other from one and another side of the road, as the spirits came thicker towards us from different sides, for it was an uncomfortable feeling to see them disappear into ourselves.

"When we burst into the house with the history of our curious apparition
my father and mother came out with us again, to see if anything was to be seen, but the road was quite free of anything, and after walking about for half-an-hour we went indoors again."

Illusion is certainly not a very plausible explanation of this occurrence, but it is perhaps possible that the small figures were irregularities in the density of the fog interpreted into shapes of men and women, the witnesses confirming each other in their interpretation, and that the large figure was a real man walking noiselessly, as a man does, for instance, in goloshes. The fact that the small figures disappeared directly they got on either of the dark strips of grass, affords, I think, a strong reason for regarding them as illusions; for it is difficult to see why a hallucination, veridical or otherwise, should be affected so much by the background, while on the other hand, an illusion caused, as I have suggested, by irregularities in the density of the fog, would depend on the background almost entirely. If the phenomenon was really a "psychical" one it is peculiarly unlucky that the one fact of this kind, recorded in a collection of 370 narratives, should have occurred in a fog.

So far I have dealt only with visual illusions, but auditory illusions are, I think, commoner. We interpret sounds from smaller indications than sights, and more mistakes are possible about them. If we see a figure, we cannot be mistaken as to the direction in which we see it, and the relation to other objects, called in optics parallax, constantly enables us to estimate its distance, and consequently its size. Whereas in sounds we may easily be wrong about direction, and as to distance, and consequently absolute loudness, we have, I think, no guide at all, unless we know independently what the source of sound is. Any one may experimentally verify this, if he will carefully observe his first uncorrected impressions as to the source of unexpected sounds. This difficulty in the exact localisation of unknown sources of sounds is a very serious obstacle to discovering their possible physical causes, and makes it, I think, on the whole, unwarrantable to assume that mysterious sounds not showing intelligence are physically inexplicable, merely because not yet physically explained.

There are, however, three considerations, which, in a more legitimate way, suggest a "psychical" origin for such sounds, and though I do not think that as at present exemplified in the collection before us, these considerations are very weighty, it would be a mistake, in view of further investigations, to put them altogether out of court. (1) The sounds sometimes seem to show signs of intelligent agency, or of correspondence with external and physically independent circumstances. For instance, raps seem to vary in answer to questions asked, or the sounds are for the first time heard in seeming connection with a very recent death. We have not, I think, at present any very strong evidence for
such psychical signs as these, but if the origin of the sounds be really non-physical it is in this way that there is, probably, most likelihood of proving it.*  (2) In houses where there seems to be good evidence for the occurrence of visual apparitions, mysterious sounds also occur, and if it can be shown that sounds and sights have in these cases some common psychical origin, this will, of course, afford a *prima facie* ground for attributing similar sounds to a similar origin when they occur by themselves.  (3) Many of the sounds in question appear to those who hear them to resemble sounds usually made by human beings, such as footsteps, rustling of dresses, moving of furniture overhead, the crash of falling china, the smack of a whip on door or furniture, raps and blows on walls and doors, cries, groans, sobs, sighs, whisperings and inarticulate voices.  I think, however, that little importance can be attached to this consideration.  For none of the sounds I have enumerated seem to me at all unmistakable in character.  For instance, the chief characteristic of footsteps is their periodicity.  Any recurring tap having about the same period might easily be mistaken for them, and if it gradually increased or diminished in loudness it would suggest a person approaching or receding.† And again, it is well known that draughts of air under certain circumstances will produce the illusion of whispering.

It is clear from our evidence that, in many cases, considerable trouble has been taken to find any physical cause for the mysterious noises without success—the inhabitants having often before them the sceptic's favourite explanation of rats quite as clearly as we have.  On the other hand, obvious causes are no doubt sometimes over-looked, or their effect under-estimated.  In one case, for instance, (312) we learn from the owner of a house that the partition-wall between it and the next house, is probably not so completely impervious to sounds as

* Careful observations on this point should be made by those residing in houses where mysterious noises occur.  It is satisfactory to know that this is being done by General Campbell, the narrator of No. 351, and we may hope for valuable evidence from him.

† In some cases there seems good ground for thinking that sounds of this nature were correctly localised though unexplained.  The following is an extract from a recent narration of experiences which occurred, unfortunately, 30 years ago.  It has been shown to me by the Committee in manuscript, and has not yet been printed among the slips:—"Almost every night I used to hear these footsteps, and used sometimes to sit on the stairs holding the bannisters on each side with my hands.  Nothing corporeal could have passed me; but the footsteps distinctly passed me.  Two stairs in the bottom flight were in the habit of creaking when trodden upon; and when I heard the steps coming I used to count, and the creak came always regularly on these two stairs.  It was like a heavy unshod foot."  In this case, and in others, the footsteps have sometimes been followed about the house.
our informant, who had occupied the former house for some years, believed it to be.

I do not give any specimen of these narratives of houses haunted by noises only, because one has already appeared in the *Proceedings* of the Society. (Part VI., p. 144.)*

There are, I think, about 30 of the stories which come under the head of merely unexplained sounds, and about the same number where there is good evidence for unexplained sounds, and also evidence for other phenomena, but where the latter evidence does not seem to me important for our present purpose. Here I should remark that evidence for the ghostly nature of other phenomena, *e.g.*, apparitions, is not, in my view, materially strengthened by the fact that there are mysterious noises at the same time or place, because the existence of the sounds, and the consequent idea that a house is haunted, may, for aught we know, produce a state of mind conducive to hallucinations. It is noticeable that in some accounts of haunted houses, the figure seen varies with the seer, being seen at different times and places and, perhaps, only once by each person. For instance, in one narrative (168), one person is said to have seen a figure in white on the stairs; another person, when in bed, a man in a shooting jacket; and a third, also in bed, a woman and a baby. Does not this suggest a casual combination of dreams and either illusions or the merely subjective hallucinations of which I shall presently speak, to which importance was attached because the house had already acquired a reputation of being haunted? I will give here, as an illustration, a case (G. 324) where the evidence for the phenomena described seems very good, though they occurred 32 years ago, and where it is, perhaps, possible that real but unexplained sounds, resembling human footsteps, in some way caused a purely subjective hallucination.

From Mrs. Watson (written by her daughter), 42, Old Elvet, Durham, February 24th, 1884.

I am writing at my mother's dictation, her recollection of the circumstance which occurred at Armitage during the summer of 1852. She was alone in the dining-room; her sister and sister's husband were in the kitchen about 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

She distinctly heard footsteps loudly running upstairs, and the door at the top of the stairs "banged." She thought it was her brother-in-law, but he immediately afterwards opened the dining-room door, and asked her if she had heard the sound.

He and his wife had heard exactly the same while in the kitchen, and the latter looking up the stairs had seen the figure of a man at the top of the stairs.

* I rank this narrative in this class because the evidence in it for intelligence in the agency producing the sounds seems, to me, too slight and indefinite for any stress to be laid on it.
stairs, who turned and looked down at her, and then disappeared, the door banging after him. She said it was a figure exactly resembling her father. Every possible search was immediately made, but not the slightest clue ever found to the mystery.

ANNIE M. L. WATSON.

The following independent account is from the Rev. R. L. Loughborough, Pirton Vicarage, Hitchin, brother of Mrs. Watson and of the sister (Mrs. Swann), above mentioned.

Pirton,
20th February, 1884.

It is nearly 30 years since the following account was given to me, in the house where it occurred, by my sister, Mrs. Swann, who then resided in a detached house in the village of Armitage, in Staffordshire. The house is surrounded by a garden having back as well as front entrance; the back entrance led into the kitchen, from whence a back stair, enclosed, led to the upper rooms. Mrs. Swann was alone in the kitchen engaged at a table standing against the enclosure. No door opened, but she was startled by hearing the sound of footsteps as of one ascending the enclosed stair. She immediately opened the door at the foot of the stairs, and being broad daylight saw a figure ascending, which she at once recognised as that of her father, who had been dead several years. She recognised the figure by the hand placed behind, as was his custom when alive and walking; and she recognised the face when he turned at the top and looked back. On reaching the top of the stairs the figure turned round, looked at her for a brief space, then seemed to pass along the passage. Her husband and sister (now Mrs. Watson) were in another part of the house, the dining-room; they both heard the sound as of footsteps, and, as by an impulse, both quickly ascended the front stairs, looked through the house, but saw nothing. I may add that the occurrence took place just before Mrs. Watson's marriage, perhaps two months or so, and that I heard of it when I went to Armitage to perform the ceremony. Mrs. Swann has been dead some years; but when she related the affair to me, was fully convinced of the reality of the vision.

R. LINDSAY LOUGHBOROUGH.

The next account is from a letter from Mr. George W. Swann, East Boldon, Newcastle-on-Tyne, to Mr. Loughborough.

February 29th, 1884.

A clearer and more correct description* could not be given, and I have really nothing to add but that I distinctly heard the noise, and Anne as distinctly saw what she believed to be her father, running up the back stairs. It took Maria and myself very little time to run through the whole of the house. In vain we looked for signs of any one being in; and it was impossible for any one to have got out, for men were working outside close by, and told us they had seen and heard nothing. Maria's version is correct,—that she was alone in the dining-room, and that I went hastily to her, and we both rushed up the front stairs,

* Mr. Swann refers to the above account by Mrs. Watson, which had been sent to him by Mr. Loughborough.
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expecting to meet the intruder on the landing leading from the back to the front. It was after that Anne told us who the figure was like, and to her dying day she was convinced that it was her father. At this distance of time I am quite certain of hearing a man’s feet going up the uncarpeted back stairs.

It will be convenient to mention here that there are a few accounts of phenomena other than sounds—e.g., lights dancing on the ceiling,—which undoubtedly call for investigation, as the sounds do, but which, like the sounds, cannot, I think, at present be referred to “psychical” causes on any better ground than that no physical cause has yet been found for them; while their fleeting nature and rare occurrence make the search for possible physical causes difficult.

IV.—The next explanation which I will consider is mistaken identity in its various forms—including under this head all the cases where we can suppose that what was taken for a phantasm, was a living being in the flesh, or otherwise a real earthly specimen of that which it resembled; and also cases where there has been a mistake as to the fact of death, as when a person taken for a ghost has really been alive all along. About 13 of the narratives may, perhaps, be explained in this way, though generally, it must be admitted, with some difficulty.

The following narrative (G. 300) received from Mr. William H. Stone, 1, Park Avenue, Slade Lane, Levenshulme, Manchester, is one of them:

I think it was in 1854; at that time we were large leather factors, and hide and skin brokers in Hopstown; when I say we, my employers were in the above line of business, and I was manager of the latter department, and in which we used a large amount of stationery, such as weekly catalogues, blackleeds, and memorandum books, &c., for our buyers and our own men. I was going along from our office, in rather a merry mood, to order from a stationer in P— Street a quantity of catalogues wanted for next Friday’s sale, for we sold the hides and skins by auction every Friday, at half-past 1 o’clock to the minute, or nearly so. As I said, I was going along P—— Street,—it might be some six or eight days before the great St. Leger day. I generally had a pound or two on the “Leger,” and it was my intention, as soon as my little order was given for stationery, to see a friend about the horse I had backed. Crossing from left to right in P—— Street, whom should I meet (or as I thought met) but an old customer, as he had been for some years, of my father’s; my father was formerly a brewer, and he had supplied the party I thought I met with ale, as I said. for some years, and I used to collect the accounts from him along with others in the same line: he was a beerhouse-keeper, or as they were then called, a jerry-shopkeeper. I went up to him, called him by his right name, shook him by the left hand, for he had no right, it having been cut off when he was a youth; he had a substitute for a hand in the shape of a hook, and he was, said he, very active with this hook when his services were required in turning anyone out of his house that was in any way refractory; he was what you might call a jolly,
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good, even-tempered sort of a man, and much respected by his customers, most of whom did a little betting in the racing line. He had a very red countrified sort of a face, and dressed quite in a country style, with felt hat, something after the present style of billy-cocks, with thick blue silk handkerchief and round white dots on it, his coat, a sort of chedle-swing, and a gold watchguard passing round his neck and over his waistcoat; his clothing was all of good material and respectfully made. The moment he saw me his face shone bright, and he seemed much pleased to meet me, and I may say I felt a similar pleasure towards him. Mind, this occurred in perfect daylight, no moonlight or darkness so essential an accompaniment to ghost stories; many people were passing and repassing at the time. You may be sure I did not stand in the middle of the street for about seven minutes talking and shaking hands with myself; someone would have had a laugh at me had that been the case. I almost at once, after the stereotyped compliments of the day, launched into the state of the odds respecting the St. Leger, and into the merits and demerits of various horses. He supplied me with what information I required, and we each went our way. He was a man considered to be well posted up in such matters, had cool judgment and discrimination; in fact, he was one of those that would not be led away by what are called tips. I made a memorandum or two, shook his hand again, and passed on about my business, ordered my catalogues, &c.

I came back sauntering along towards the office, not now intending to see the party I had previously intended to see. As I got to the same part of P—— Street, on my way back, I suddenly stood still, my whole body shook, and for the moment I tried to reason with myself. The man I had been speaking to was dead some four years before! Could it be possible that he had been buried alive? This is horribly shocking to think about, but such things have taken place. Decomposition being the only certain indication of death, might he not have been prematurely buried? But, if so, what had I to do with it? I had nothing to do with his death, but I am now sorry I do not know or recollect the particulars of his death and burial. I certainly saw his funeral. [We have failed to obtain the certificate of death or burial.]

As I stood in the street I tried to give utterance to my thoughts and feelings, but no, I felt a sort of dumbness, and fairly gasped for breath. I felt a cold shiver come over me, although the day was warm; the hair of my head seemed as if it would force my hat off; my very blood seemed to object to perform its duty.

The question might be asked: Was I unwell? Had I been indulging too freely in stimulants? In both cases I answer, No! for at that time I was particularly moderate in the use of stimulants, or tobacco, and was enjoying the most robust health, such as I never enjoyed before or since, and had a constitution like a horse. Was I annoyed in my mind in any way? Not in the least. Was it really a vision of the departed? Let the reader judge for himself. I give it up. Had I been deceived in having met the man? No such thing. Then was it someone very like him? Nothing of the sort, for the very words that passed between us could come from no other lips but the man himself, in substantial flesh and blood. Was it an optical delusion? for nothing is so deceptive as optical delusions. Certainly not; we sometimes believe we see what we do not see, but in this case it was
nothing of the sort, nor could it be somebody like him, it was him! As I said before, he had but one hand, and his right hand was his left one, in a sense. I had business transactions with him for many years. He had entirely slipped out of my memory for a length of time. That he was in or out of existence it never occurred to me for one moment till now; and the thought never presented itself throughout the interval between my going and coming, and perhaps never would have done, had I not gone the same way back, by way of P—— Street, and passed the identical spot. It may be asked, am I, or was I, superstitious? I say, No, emphatically.

To conclude, and as I have several times said before, and as I again say, I gave a start, and said, Bless me! how can this be? not an optical delusion, not it. What then? Nothing but a slight mystery, and I was confident I could easily solve it. Never was I more mistaken, for from that day to this I still remain in profound ignorance as to what was the cause or meaning of what I saw.

Mr. F. A. Whaite, writing to Mr. Gurney from Whaite's Fine Art Gallery, Bridge Street, Manchester, October 16th, 1883, says:—

"You ask Mr. Stone if he ever mentioned the circumstance mentioned in your note of the 14th inst." (i.e., the above account.) "He did name it to me and my parents the same day; and I believe it was the truth, for he was so excited about it at the time."

This occurrence may, I think, be possibly accounted for by supposing that the man our informant talked to was a living man, and that he was mistaken as to which of his father's customers had died four years before. This explanation may seem far-fetched, but any other, whether "psychical" or not, is very difficult. It clearly cannot have been an illusion or a trick, and a hallucination or a ghost behaving as this one did—touched, heard, seen, and talked to for several minutes, in broad daylight, in a public street, and presumably seen by all the passers-by—would be unique among the hallucinations and ghosts of our collections.

V. I now come to the discussion of a more important and difficult part of the subject than any which has yet been before us—namely, hallucination. The difficulty which at once meets us arises from the fact that genuine phantasms of the dead such as we are discussing would themselves generally take the form of hallucinations of the senses—that is, they would not (at least in my opinion, but I shall discuss this question somewhat more fully further on) form part of the external physical world around us. It is true that ghosts are alleged sometimes to produce a physical effect on the external world; but this supposition opens up a new field of difficulty, since it really does bring us into primâ facie collision with the physical sciences; and on the whole it has seemed to me best to leave the small group of stories, in which physical, as distinct from psychical, phenomena are definitely alleged.
to have occurred, to be treated in connection with the records of physical phenomena, reported to have been experimentally obtained at spiritualistic séances.

The phenomena with which the mass of the narratives are concerned—if we omit mere feelings and impressions to which I can attach little weight—are almost all, at best, indistinguishable from hallucinations. The question then is how are we to distinguish them from hallucinations which are not what is called veridical. There is nothing, so far as we at present know, either in the phenomena themselves, or in the condition of the percipient, by which they may be distinguished. For careful inquiry shows that solitary, and seemingly non-veridical, hallucinations of persons whom there is no reason to think otherwise than healthy in body and mind, do occur. Clearly, then, we should not be justified in assuming a hallucination to be veridical without some special external reason for doing so, or, in other words, some confirmatory coincidence. When the phantasm is that of a living person, information about that person may afford us the required reason. But in the case of phantasms of the dead, we are cut off from the possibility of any information about the supposed agent, and are reduced to seek for some other kind of confirmation. Several kinds of confirmation are possible, and of these five seem to me to be more or less exemplified by the part of our present collection to which I attach most importance.

Of hallucinations without any such confirmation, we have, I think, about forty, and about as many more where the confirmatory evidence required does not seem to me strong enough.

The first kind of confirmation which I will consider occurs when two people have a hallucination simultaneously. It certainly seems in the highest degree improbable that two people should independently have similar subjectively caused hallucinations; but for those who, like myself, are disposed to regard thought-transference or telepathy as established, the fact that two persons apparently see the same apparition at the same time, does not prove that it is externally caused in both cases. We must admit the possibility that A, having a hallucination, may by thought-transference convey the impression to B, and cause B to have a hallucination too; and even perhaps that A may cause a hallucination to B by some telepathically conveyed impression, though his own mental disturbance does not externalise itself in the same way. At any rate we know as yet too little about hallucinations and the conditions under which they occur, to say that this cannot be so. These suppositions may seem extravagant; but according to the general principle with which I started, it seems to me that I am bound to press the hypothesis of telepathy as far as it will go, no less than the other hypotheses—exaggeration, illusion, mistaken identity, &c. And it should be observed that it is not necessary to suppose that the two hallucina-
tions, even when believed to be similar, are so in every detail. No one takes in every detail of an object seen, especially when seen for so short a time as these hallucinations usually last, and A's description may easily seem to recall to B's mind points which he did not actually observe himself, though he did not observe the contrary. The positive evidence in favour of this hypothesis is not as yet large in amount, or conclusive in quality. But there are cases among the collected narratives of phantasms of the living, which seem more easily explained on this hypothesis than on any other, and which therefore support it as far as they go. For example (L.1531) a lady tells us that her brother and his wife, both now dead, once asked her whether she had been thinking of them in any special way on a certain night some months previously. It appeared that they had both seen her standing at the foot of their bed. She could not remember anything on her part which suggested a cause for this phenomenon. Another very interesting case of a similar kind was printed in the Proceedings, Vol. I., p. 145. Then again there is a curious story (L. 323) in which the mother of a dying woman appears to the nurse at the bedside. There is no evidence of what our Committee call "agency" on the part of the mother, and she was quite unknown to the percipient. It seems here plausible to suppose that the sick person was in some way the agent causing the hallucination, though we do not know what was her own experience at the time.

If this hypothesis, as to the nature of collective hallucinations, be regarded as tenable, then all the stories where there is no other ground for assuming an external cause may possibly be cases of thought-transference between living persons, and cannot be regarded as affording arguments for the possibility of communication with the dead or of apparitions directly connected with them. There are, I think, about 20 such stories in the collection. The following may be given as a specimen (G. 405, printed also as 610), the impression of the little orphan's dream being supposed transferred to the warden. The story was originally printed in July, 1883, in an account of the Orphanage where it occurred, entitled "The Orphanage and Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie," &c. (pp. 44, 45), and we have since obtained confirmation of it from the Warden.

In 1875, a man died leaving a widow and six orphan children. The three eldest were admitted into the Orphanage. Three years afterwards the widow died, and friends succeeded in getting funds to send the rest here, the youngest being about four years of age. At this time the Orphanage contained nearly 30 inmates, for the smaller ones of whom the Warden did everything that was required. There was not a spare room in the house, and visitors to the Orphanage had to be lodged in the parsonage. About six months after the arrival of the younger children referred to above, two visitors unexpectedly arrived late in the evening—too late to get a bed aired
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at the parsonage; it was therefore arranged that they should have the Warden's room, he agreeing to take a bed in the little ones' dormitory, which contained 10 beds, nine occupied. No other change except this was made in the usual order of things.

In the morning, at breakfast, the Warden made the following statement:—As near as I can tell I fell asleep about 11 o'clock, and slept very soundly for some time. I suddenly woke without any apparent reason, and felt an impulse to turn round, my face being towards the wall, from the children. Before turning, I looked up and saw a soft light in the room. The gas was burning low in the hall, and the dormitory door being open, I thought it probable that the light came from that source. It was soon evident, however, that such was not the case. I turned round, and then a wonderful vision met my gaze. Over the second bed from mine, and on the same side of the room, there was floating a small cloud of light, forming a halo of the brightness of the moon on an ordinary moonlight night.

I sat upright in bed, looked at this strange appearance, took up my watch and found the hands pointing to five minutes to 1. Everything was quiet, and all the children sleeping soundly. In the bed, over which the light seemed to float, slept the youngest of the six children mentioned above.

I asked myself, "Am I dreaming?" No! I was wide awake. I was seized with a strong impulse to rise and touch the substance, or whatever it might be (for it was about five feet high), and was getting up when something seemed to hold me back. I am certain I heard nothing, yet I felt and perfectly understood the words—"No, lie down, it won't hurt you." I at once did what I felt I was told to do. I fell asleep shortly afterwards and rose at half-past 5, that being my usual time.

At 6 o'clock I began dressing the children, beginning at the bed furthest from the one in which I slept. Presently I came to the bed over which I had seen the light hovering. I took the little boy out, placed him on my knee, and put on some of his clothes. The child had been talking with the others, suddenly he was silent. And then, looking me hard in the face with an extraordinary expression, he said, "Oh, Mr. Jupp, my mother came to me last night. Did you see her?" For a moment I could not answer the child. I then thought it better to pass it off, and said, "Come, we must make haste, or we shall be late for breakfast."

The child never afterwards referred to the matter, we are told, nor has it since ever been mentioned to him. The Warden says it is a mystery to him; he simply states the fact and there leaves the matter, being perfectly satisfied that he was mistaken in no one particular.

Letter from Miss Venning.

British Museum,
4th November.

My friend, Mr. Farrer, Rector of Bigbury, Kingsbridge, vouches for the truth of the story. A week or two ago he visited the Orphanage at Aberlour, and saw the Mr. Jupp mentioned, whom he describes as a straightforward, rather matter-of-fact Englishman, and who told him the story almost word for word as it is given in the pamphlet.
Letter from Mr. Jupp to Mr. Gurney.

The Orphanage and Convalescent Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie.

November 13th, 1883.

DEAR SIR,—I fear anything the little boy might now say would be unreliable, or I would at once question him. Although the matter was fully discussed at the time, it was never mentioned in the hearing of the child, and yet, when at the request of friends, the account was published in our little magazine, and the child read it, his countenance changed, and looking up he said, “Mr. Jupp, that is me.” I said, “Yes, that is what we saw.” He said, “Yes,” and then seemed to fall into deep thought, evidently with pleasant remembrances, for he smiled so sweetly to himself, and seemed to forget I was present.

I much regret now that I did not learn something from the child at the time.

(Signed) CHAS. JUPP.

The following narrative, (G. 127) received from Mrs. Windridge, is perhaps another instance; the mother here, on the hypothesis under consideration, causing the child’s hallucination.

24, Maitland Park Road, Haverstock Hill, N.W.

9th November, 1882.

About the year 1869, I was much interested in a poor woman who was dying in my neighbourhood. I used to visit her frequently, until my friends prevented me from going any more, as the excitement rendered me ill. Eventually when she died, they concealed the fact from me for some days.

I was taking my little boy, three years old, up to bed one evening. It was dusk; and when half-way up the first flight of stairs, I distinctly felt a pressure and a rustling of a dress at my side as if a woman had brushed past me. There was no one there. On the second flight the pressure was repeated, but more unmistakably. The occurrence made me so nervous that, having put the boy to bed, I decided to remain with him until my husband came in. I accordingly lay down on the bed, facing him.

Suddenly the boy started up. “Oh, mother, there is a lady standing behind you,” at the same moment I felt a pressure which I knew to be that of my friend. I dared not look round.

When my husband returned, I heard from him for the first time that my friend had died three days before.

In the above two cases the percipients had simultaneous, but not similar impressions. The following (G. 151) is an interesting specimen of impressions both simultaneous and similar, which might be explained in the same way. The narrator, who will not allow her name to be published, is known to Mr. Podmore.

February 17th, 1884.

Shortly after my marriage, about the year 1847, I went to stay at my father’s house. I had at that time two sisters at home, unmarried. The elder of the two was nearly two years younger than myself, and would there-
fore be about 22 years of age at the time I speak of. The other sister was much younger than us both, and at this time was about 14 years old. My two sisters slept together in a room adjoining mine.

One morning, on my going down to breakfast, my elder sister said to me, "Sarah, such a strange thing happened in the night. I was sleeping outside" (the other side of the bed was against the wall), "and I was awoken by a feeling of oppression at my chest, as though there was a weight there, and I could not breathe. On opening my eyes I was startled to see a veiled figure bending over me. While I looked I felt Anna's arm come round me. After what seemed to me a few minutes the form disappeared. Then Anna whispered, 'Oh, Lizzie, I thought it was going to take you away.'"

This was my sister's account. I took an opportunity, when my younger sister and I were alone, to ask her what that was that she and Lizzie had seen.

She said she was awoken by a feeling of oppression, as though she could not breathe, and on opening her eyes, in the dim light of the room (the blind was down, but there was a gas lamp in front of the house, which gave some light to the room), she saw a veiled figure bending over Lizzie, and she put her arm round her, as she thought it had come to take her away.

My father and his family shortly after moved into another house, my sisters still occupying a room together. They assured me that once in this other house they were visited by the same appearance, but this time it was over Anna. She only lived a short time after, dying at sixteen and a-half.

On sending this account to my sister, in case I might, through lapse of time, have altered the matter, she assures me that it is substantially correct, and adds that the form was grey, darker and thicker in the middle; she also adds that the feeling of horror was intense.*

The remaining kinds of confirmation with which we have to deal are those which we have (1) When the phantasm conveys correct information previously unknown to the percipient; or (2) when there seems to be some clearly defined object aimed at in the manifestations; (3) when the apparition resembles a deceased person unknown to the percipient so much that he afterwards recognises his portrait, or when it has some well-marked characteristic of the deceased which is unknown to the percipient; (4) when two or more people see, independently of each other and at different times, apparitions which seem clearly to have been very much alike.

Of narratives with the first of these kinds of confirmation we have five or six, but none of them very recent. Sometimes simply the fact of the death is learnt from the phantasm, as in the following case, where the hallucination is auditory (G. 357). It was received by the Committee from the Rev. C. C. Wambey, 39, Canal, Salisbury.

During my residence in B.C., as curate in charge, it was my custom to walk in the summer evenings over the neighbouring downs.

* This sister has had other experiences of the kind, which the Committee hope to obtain accounts of, but there has as yet been no opportunity of communicating with her directly.
On the evening of Sunday, August 20th, 1874, I was strolling on the downs skirting Marlcombe Hill, composing a congratulatory letter, which I proposed to write and post to my very dear friend W., so that he might have it on his birthday, the 22nd, when I heard a voice saying, "What, write to a dead man; write to a dead man!" I turned sharply round, fully expecting to see some one close behind me. There was no one. Treating the matter as an illusion, I went on with my composition. A second time I heard the same voice, saying, more loudly than before, "What, write to a dead man; write to a dead man!" Again I turned round. I was alone, at least bodily. I now fully understood the meaning of that voice; it was no illusion.

Notwithstanding this, I sent the proposed letter, and in reply received from Mrs. W. the sad, but to me not unexpected, intelligence, that her husband was dead.

"What, write to a dead man; write to a dead man!"

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Wambey says:—I have an impression—but only an impression—that I have heard other voices, no visible person being near.

In the following case (G. 306), the information is conveyed by an apparition of the deceased person, accompanied by symbols of death. The narrator is Mrs. George T. Haly 122, Coningham Road, Shepherd's Bush, W.

On waking in broad daylight, I saw, like a shadowed reflection, a very long coffin stretching quite across the ceiling of my room, and as I lay gazing at it, and wondering at its length and whose it could foreshadow, my eyes fell on a shadowy figure of an absent nephew, with his back towards me, searching, as it were, in my bookshelf. That morning's post brought the news of his death in Australia. He was 6 foot 2 or 3 inches in height, and a book had been my last present to him on his leaving England, taken from that very bookcase.

Mr. Gurney saw Mrs. Haly in November, 1884, and learnt that this, and an appearance of lights, are the only hallucinations of sight Mrs. Haly has had, and that she clearly recognised her nephew's figure. The event occurred in the winter of 1872-3, some six weeks after the nephew's death.

The case of the apparition of Canon Robinson to Mr. Tandy, an account of which was printed in the Journal of the Society for January, 1885, p. 246, is somewhat similar, only no impression that Canon Robinson was dead was seemingly conveyed by the phantasm. Both in this story and in the one last quoted a curious point will be noticed—namely, that the apparition occurs just before the news of the death is received. It is not easy to imagine any reason for this—any reason why the supposed agent should intentionally or unintentionally impress the percipient at that moment rather than another, or why the percipient should be at that moment peculiarly impressible. And yet, if the
coincidence be due to chance only, it is curious that we should have two cases of it among so few. It is, perhaps, possible that the immediate receipt of the news may have caused the apparition to assume in memory a definiteness which it had not in reality, though, if recognition be distinctly recollected, it would be rather a strange trick for memory to play; and Mr. Tandy tells us that in his case his recognition of Canon Robinson—an intimate friend—was very definite indeed.

Another case of an apparition of a dead person whose death was unknown to the percipient is the following (G. 477), which has not yet been printed. The writer is Colonel ———, a well-known Irish gentleman, but we are not allowed to publish his name. He writes from Arthur’s on March 1st, 1885:

Some 16 years since Mrs. ——— said to me, “We have some people staying here all next week. Do you know any person I could get to sing with the girls?” I suggested that my gunmaker, Mr. X., had a daughter with a fine voice, who was training as a public singer, and that if she, Mrs. ———, liked I would write to X. and ask if he would allow her to come down and spend a week with us. On my wife’s approval I wrote, and Miss X. came down for a week, and then left. As far as I know, Mrs. ——— never saw her again. Shortly after I called on X., thanked him for allowing his daughter to come to us, and said we were all much pleased with her. X. replied: “I fear you have spoilt her, for she says she never passed so happy a week in her life.” Miss X. did not come out as a singer, but shortly after married Mr. Z., and none of us ever saw her again.

Six or seven years passed away, and Mrs. ———, who had been long ill, was dying, in fact she did die the following day. I was sitting at the foot of her bed talking over some business matters that she was anxious to arrange, being perfectly composed and in thorough possession of her senses; in fact she was right, and my solicitor, who advised that the step she wanted to be taken was not necessary, was wrong. She changed the subject and said: “Do you hear those voices singing?” I replied that I did not; and she said: “I have heard them several times to-day, and I am sure they are the angels welcoming me to Heaven; but,” she added, “it is strange, there is one voice amongst them I am sure I know, and cannot remember whose voice it is.” Suddenly she stopped and said, pointing straight over my head, “Why there she is in the corner of the room; it is Julia X.; she is coming on; she is leaning over you; she has her hands up; she is praying; do look; she is going.” I turned but could see nothing. Mrs. ——— then said, “She is gone.” All these things I imagined to be the phantasies of a dying person.

Two days afterwards, taking up the Times newspaper, I saw recorded the death of Julia Z., wife of Mr. Z. I was so astounded that in a day or so after the funeral I went up to ——— and asked Mr. X. if Mrs. Z., his daughter, was dead. He said, “Yes, poor thing, she died of puerperal fever. On the day she died she began singing in the morning, and sang and sang until she died.”

Last year I saw mentioned that some person or persons were collecting
remarkable ghost stories, and I wrote to Mr. Z., telling him shortly what I have now written at length. Mr. Z.'s answer was, that I had described so accurately the scene of his wife's death that he should like to see me, was coming up to London the week after, and would call. Unfortunately I was obliged to leave London, and have never seen Mr. Z.

In a subsequent communication Colonel —— adds:—

Mrs. Z. died on 2nd February, at six or thereabout in the morning, 1874.
Mrs. —— died February 13th, 1874, at about four in the evening.
I saw notice of Mrs. Z.'s death on February 14th.
Mrs. —— never was subject to hallucinations of any sort.
[For corroboration in this case, see the Note at the end of the paper.]

In this case, as in Mr. Tandy's, no definite impression of the supposed agent's death is given, so that the coincidence is reduced to the simple seeing of a person who is dead, but not at the time known to be so. And it is here further weakened by the fact that dying persons do frequently hear music and see visions, and that the idea of singing might naturally have called up Mrs. Z.'s image to Mrs. ——'s mind. Still, there remains a remarkable coincidence, and the narrative has moreover great interest in connection with these visions of dying persons, whose objective origin is firmly believed in by many, but is very difficult to prove. Cases like this one, in sufficient numbers, would, of course, go a long way towards proving it, at any rate if it could be shown that dying persons do not, under similar circumstances, see apparitions of persons alive and well at the time.

The apparition described in the following narrative (G. 32), abridged from Temple Bar for December, 1882, conveys information of a different kind. The writer is the Rev. Gerrard Lewis, of St. Paul's Vicarage, Margate, who, in a letter to Mr. Podmore, dated December 30th, 1882, says:—

I have nothing to add to my "true ghost story" in Temple Bar. I should not like the young man's name to be published, but will give you in confidence. As to dates, he died on Thursday, September 19th, 1866. I saw his appearance on Sunday, September 22nd, and officiated at his funeral on Wednesday, September 25th.

My wife's mother had in her service a coachman named P., with one son, James Henry P., who had been brought up by friends at a distance, and was apprenticed to a trade in London. His father had only twice casually mentioned him to me, and he had almost entirely slipped out of my mind, for, with a large seaside parish on my hands, of which I was curate, my time and attention were fully taken up with matters nearer home. I mention this, lest in the course of the following story my readers should chance to think that a deep impression, previously made on my own mind, had predisposed me to see what I saw, and afterwards to regard it in a supernatural light. I cannot, therefore, too emphatically repeat that I knew next to
nothing about James Henry P., my friend's son; that I had never seen him; and seldom, if ever, thought of him at all.

It was a hot and bright afternoon in summer, and, as if it were only yesterday, I remember perfectly well walking down the broad bright street in the broad bright afternoon. I had to pass the house of P. I remarked indeed that all his window blinds were drawn carefully down, as if to screen his furniture, of which his wife was inordinately proud, from the despoiling blaze of the afternoon sun. I smiled inwardly at the thought. I then left the road, stopped on to the side pavement, and looked over the area rails, into the front court below. A young man, dressed in dark clothes, and without a hat, and apparently about 20 years of age, was standing at the door beneath the front steps. On the instant, from his likeness to my friend P., I seemed to recognize his son. We both stood and looked very hard at each other. Suddenly, however, he advanced to that part of the area which was immediately below where I was standing, fixed on me a wide, dilated, winking sort of stare, and halted. The desire to speak was evidently legible on his face, though nothing audible escaped from his lips. But his eyes spoke; every feature in his countenance spoke, spoke, as it were, a silent language, in which reproach and pain seemed equally intermingled. At first I was startled; then I began to feel angry. "Why," I said to myself, "does he look at me in that manner?" At last, annoyance prevailing over surprise, I turned away with the half-muttered thought: "He certainly knows me by sight as a friend of his father, and yet has not the civility to salute me. I will call on the first opportunity and ask his reason for such behaviour." I then pursued my way and thought no more of what had just occurred.

On Wednesday it was my turn to officiate at the local cemetery. On my asking who was to be buried, I was told that it was a young man from my quarter of the town, who had died of consumption. I cannot give the reason, but immediately I felt startled and ill at ease. It was not that I had the least suspicion that anything extraordinary was about to happen. I had quite forgotten young P. The feeling which I think was uppermost in my mind was annoyance at the fact that any one should have died of such a slow disease in my parish, but without my knowledge. I asked without delay for the registrar's certificate. My eyes fell on the words, "James Henry P., aged 21 years." I could scarcely believe my own senses.

I lost but little time before calling on P. and his wife. I found the latter at home, and what she had to say only made me more uncomfortable still. James Henry P. bore such a close resemblance to his father that all who saw him remarked on the striking likeness. In addition to this, during the last three months of his life, which he spent under his father's roof, he had often wondered that I did not come to see him. His longing for an interview with me had been most intense; and every time he saw me pass the house without going in he had both felt and expressed a keen disappointment. In fact, he died terribly in earnest, wishing in vain to the last that I would come. That thought pierced me through and through. I had not gone to him but he had come to me. And yet I would have gone, if I had but known. I blame the doctor for not telling me; I blame the parents for not sending for me; and with that awful look he gave me in my remembrance, I blame myself, though I cannot tell why.
James Henry P. had died on the Thursday before the Sunday on which I had seen him. He had died, too, in the front room, on a level with the area, into which its window opened. He had also lain there till the Wednesday following, awaiting burial. His corpse then was lying in that very room on that very Sunday, and at the very moment, too, when I had seen his living likeness, as it were, in the area outside. Nobody, I found, had passed through the area that day; the door there had been locked and unused all the Sunday. The very milkman, the only person who called, had come by the front steps to the house; and P. and his wife were the only inmates at the time.

The fact pretty definitely communicated in this case by the apparition, was the young man's longing, before his death, to see the percipient.

Mr. Podmore has recently seen Mr. Lewis, and also Mrs. Lewis, who heard of the experience at the time, and confirms all that Mr. Lewis says. Mr. Lewis maintains that the likeness of the apparition to the elder P. was unmistakable, but there seem to be differences of opinion as to the degree of resemblance between the young man and his father. Mr. Podmore has also seen the outside of the house, and, after talking it all over he does not think it likely that it was a real man that Mr. Lewis saw. Another explanation had occurred to me, namely, that the apparition was due, not to the agency of the dead man, but to that of old P., or his wife, whose thought of the son in connection with Mr. Lewis would be intensified by seeing him pass. Some little evidence, apart from this narrative, suggesting the possibility of such an explanation could be adduced, and as the blinds of the house are Venetian, a person inside might have seen through them without being seen. But Mr. Lewis does not think it at all likely that the P.'s did see him, as Mrs. P. expressed some surprise when he told her, after the funeral, that he had passed on that day. Mr. Lewis has had no other visual hallucination, veridical or otherwise.

In the case I shall next consider, the information is given in a dream, and as has been often said, the evidence afforded by dreams must always be very inferior to that afforded by waking experiences, because of the immense frequency of dreams, and the large proportion of them which are obviously unveridical. In the case before us, however, there is apparently some coincidence between the dream and the facts in two unlikely and independent points. Mr. D., the narrator, does not wish his name to be published, but Mr. Gurney has seen him, and talked over the subject with him. He narrates as follows (G. 406):

I am the owner of a very old mechanical business in Glasgow, with for 20 years past a branch in London, where I have resided for that period, and in both of which places my professional reputation is of the highest order.
Some 35 years ago I took into my employment a tender, delicate-looking boy, Robert Mackenzie, who, after some three or four years' service, suddenly left, as I found out afterwards, through the selfish advice of older hands, who practised this frightening away systematically to keep wages from being lowered, a common device, I believe, among workmen in limited trades. Passing the gate of the great workhouse (Scotted poorhouse) in the Parliamentary Road, a few years afterwards, my eye was caught by a youth of some 18 years of age ravenously devouring a piece of dry bread on the public street, and bearing all the appearance of being in a chronic state of starvation. Fancying I knew his features, I asked if his name were not Mackenzie. He at once became much excited, addressed me by name, and informed me that he had no employment; that his father and mother, who formerly supported him, were now both inmates of the ‘poorhouse,’ to which he himself had no claim for admission, being young and without any bodily disqualification for work, and that he was literally homeless and starving. The matron, he informed me, gave him daily a piece of dry bread, but durst not, under the rules, give him regular maintenance. In an agony of grief he deplored his ever leaving me under evil advice, and on my unexpectedly offering to take him back he burst into a transport of thanks, such as I cannot describe. Suffice it to say that he resumed his work, and that, under the circumstances, I did everything in my power to facilitate his progress. All this was mere matter of course; but the distinction between it and the common relations of master and servant was this, that on every occasion of my entering the workshop he never, so far as possible, took off his eyes from following my movements. Let me look towards him at any moment, there was the pale, sympathetic face with the large and wistful eyes, literally yearning towards me as Smike’s did towards Nicholas Nickleby. I seemed to be ‘the polar star of his existence,’ and this intensity of gratitude never appeared to lessen in degree through lapse of time. Beyond this he never ventured to express his feelings. His manhood, as it were, his individuality and self-assertion, seemed to have been crushed out of him by privations. I was apparently his sole thought and consideration, saving the more common concerns of daily life.

In 1862 I settled in London, and have never been in Glasgow since. Robert Mackenzie, and my workmen generally, gradually lost their individuality in my recollection. About 10 to 12 years ago my employees had their annual soirée and ball. This was always held, year after year, on a Friday evening. Mackenzie, ever shy and distant, as usual, refused to mingle in the festivities, and begged of my foreman to be permitted to serve at the buffet. All went off well, and the Saturday was held (more workmen) as a succeeding day of festival. All this, however, I only learned after what I am now about to relate. On the Tuesday morning following, immediately before 8 a.m., in my house on Campden Hill, I had the following manifestation; I cannot call it a dream; but let me use the common phraseology. I dreamt, but with no vagueness as in common dreams, no blurring of outline or rapid passages from one thing disconnectedly to another, that I was seated at a desk, engaged in a business conversation with an unknown gentleman, who stood on my right hand. Towards me, in front, advanced Robert Mackenzie, and, feeling annoyed, I addressed him with some asperity,
asking him if he did not see that I was engaged. He retired a short distance with exceeding reluctance, turned again to approach me, as if most desirous for an immediate colloquy, when I spoke to him still more sharply as to his want of manners. On this, the person with whom I was conversing took his leave, and Mackenzie once more came forward. "What is all this, Robert?" I asked, somewhat angrily. "Did you not see I was engaged?" "Yes, sir," he replied; "but I must speak with you at once." "What about?" I said; "what is it that can be so important?" "I wish to tell you, sir," he answered, "that I am accused of doing a thing I did not do, and that I want you to know it, and to tell you so, and that you are to forgive me for what I am blamed for, because I am innocent." Then, "I did not do the thing they say I did." I said, "What?" getting same answer. I then naturally asked, "But how can I forgive you if you do not tell me what you are accused of?" I can never forget the emphatic manner of his answer, in the Scottish dialect, "Ye'll sune ken" (you'll soon know). This question and the answer were repeated at least twice—I am certain the answer was repeated thrice, in the most fervid tone. On that I awoke, and was in that state of surprise and bewilderment which such a remarkable dream, quid mere dream, might induce, and was wondering what it all meant, when my wife burst into my bedroom, much excited, and holding an open letter in her hand, exclaimed, "Oh, James, here’s a terrible end to the workmen’s ball, Robert Mackenzie has committed suicide!" With now a full conviction of the meaning of the vision, I at once quietly and firmly said, "No, he has not committed suicide." "How can you possibly know that?" "Because he has just been here to tell me."

I have purposely not mentioned in its proper place, so as not to break the narrative, that on looking at Mackenzie I was struck by the peculiar appearance of his countenance. It was of an indescribable bluish-pale colour, and on his forehead appeared spots which seemed like blots of sweat. For this I could not account, but by the following post my manager informed me that he was wrong in writing me of suicide. That, on Saturday night, Mackenzie, on going home, had lifted a small black bottle containing aqua fortis (which he used for staining the wood of birdcages, made for amusement), believing this to be whisky, and pouring out a wineglassful, had drunk it off at a gulp, dying on the Sunday in great agony. Here, then, was the solution of his being innocent of what he was accused of—suicide, seeing that he had inadvertently drunk aqua fortis, a deadly poison. Still pondering upon the peculiar colour of his countenance, it struck me to consult some authorities on the symptoms of poisoning by aqua fortis, and in Mr. J. H. Walsh’s "Domestic Medicine and Surgery," p. 172, I found these words under symptoms of poisoning by sulphuric acid. . . . . . "the skin covered with a cold sweat; countenance livid and expressive of dreadful suffering." . . . . . "Aqua fortis produces the same effect as sulphuric, the only difference being that the external stains, if any, are yellow instead of brown." This refers to indication of sulphuric acid, "generally outside of the mouth, in the shape of brown spots." Having no desire to accommodate my facts to this scientific description, I give the quotations freely, only, at the same time, stating that previously to reading the passage in Mr. Walsh’s book, I had not the slightest knowledge of these symptoms.
and I consider that they agree fairly and sufficiently with what I saw, viz., a livid face covered with a remarkable sweat, and having spots (particularly on the forehead), which, in my dream, I thought great blots of perspiration. It seems not a little striking that I had no previous knowledge of these symptoms, and yet should take note of them.

I have little remark to make beyond this, that, in speaking of this matter, to me very affecting and solemn, I have been quite disgusted by sceptics treating it as a hallucination, in so far as that my dream must have been on the Wednesday morning, being that after the receipt of my manager's letter informing me of the supposed suicide. This explanation is too absurd to require a serious answer. My manager first heard of the death on the Monday—wrote me on that day as above—and on the Tuesday wrote again explaining the true facts. The dream was on the Tuesday morning, immediately before the 8 a.m. post delivery, hence the thrice emphatic "Ye'll sune ken." I attribute the whole to Mackenzie's yearning gratitude for being rescued from a deplorable state of starvation, and his earnest desire to stand well in my opinion. I have coloured nothing, and leave my readers to draw their own conclusions.

D.

The following is Mrs. D.'s corroboration:—

In regard to the remarkable dream my husband had when Robert Mackenzie's death took place through inadvertently drinking some aqua fortis, I beg to inform you of what took place as far as I am concerned.

On the Tuesday morning after the occurrence, I was downstairs early, and at 8 o'clock was handed a letter, just received from the postman, and addressed to Mr. D. Seeing it was from our manager in Glasgow, I opened it, and was much grieved to find that it was to tell us that Robert Mackenzie had committed suicide. I ran upstairs to Mr. D.'s bedroom with the letter in my hand, and in much excitement. I found him apparently just coming out of sleep, and hastily cried out to him, exactly as he has described to you. I need not go over the words, which have often been repeated amongst us since, and I can confirm his narrative regarding them, as given to you, in every particular. The whole affair gave us a great shock, and put an end to the workmen's balls for some four or five years. Mr. D.'s dream was a frequent subject of conversation at the time. I knew Mackenzie well. He was a pale, large-eyed, and earnest-looking young man, with a great regard for Mr. D., through circumstances. The next day's post brought us the actual facts.

J. D.

The two points of coincidence here are the fact that Mackenzie was accused of something wrongly, and a certain degree of resemblance between his appearance in the dream and his appearance as, according to Walsh's "Domestic Medicine," it should have been, after taking the poison which killed him. The coincidence is certainly curious, though it might, of course, have been stronger. It would be very interesting to know—though at this distance of time impossible, I fear, to ascertain,—whether at the time of the dream it was known to any living man that Mackenzie had not committed suicide.
Phantasm of the Dead.

These cases are all I find in the collection with this particular kind of confirmation to distinguish them from subjective hallucinations. It will be observed that, with the exception of the narrative concerning the nephew who died in Australia, where there was an interval of some six weeks between the death and the apparition, they have a common characteristic, namely, that the communication occurs within a few days of the death, but it would be absurd to try to infer a general rule from so few instances.

In dealing, however, with these phantasms manifesting themselves very shortly after death, it should be noticed that in the collection of phantasms of the living, cases have been included in which the manifestation occurs a few hours after death. For this there are two grounds, namely, that the exact moment of the cessation of life is, it must be assumed, to some extent uncertain, and that there is some reason to think that a telepathic impression may remain latent for a time and force itself into consciousness only when quiet, or solitude, or some other condition favourable to its development supervenes. If, however, the dead can communicate with us, it is possible that these supposed delayed communications from the living are really communications directly from the dead. I think we should also notice that appearances of those who have recently died, to friends aware of their death, seem to be not uncommon, and frequently these appearances have afforded great consolation to the survivors. If the dead can communicate with us, these appearances, too, may be real messages from them, though we have no means of distinguishing them from subjective hallucinations.

I have named among the kinds of confirmation we have to deal with, that afforded by apparent intention consistently carried out by the spirit. But it is a rather remarkable fact that we have exceedingly little evidence in our collection clearly tending in this direction. We have such evidence to some extent in the dream of Mackenzie, already quoted, where the spirit may naturally have desired to convince Mr. D. that he had not committed suicide. The only other case we have, I think, is our single instance of the old-fashioned ghost who threatens to haunt her husband till he does what she desires, and who carries the threat into execution. But though the threat was not made to the husband himself, so far as we know, it is yet impossible to feel sure that the apparition was not simply a morbid effect of his state of grief and worry, which ceased when the disputed question was settled and the worry consequently at an end. The narrative (G. 425) is in the words of the married daughter alluded to.

A young couple were engaged. Her father withdrew his consent, the mother on her death-bed made its renewal her last request. The father, instead of getting over his sorrow, seemed more and more bowed down with
an ever-increasing sense of "horror." One day he told his married
daughter and her husband that his wife haunted him every morning at 4,
the hour when she died, always talking of the young couple. They asked
him what clothes the apparition wore, and he said, "The last dress I gave,
and a cap of your making." On their way home, the married daughter
told her husband that it was when in that dress and cap that her mother had
said to her, "If I die before your father renews his consent, I shall haunt
him till he does." She was then in perfect health. This was never told to
the father, but he was urged to renew his consent. For some months he
could only escape the visitations by having someone awake with him in the
room. From the day he consented again to the marriage his wife's visits
ceased.

Mr. Sidgwick has had an interview with the narrator of this curious
occurrence, who tells him that she has no doubt that her mother had
made a dying request that he would give consent to the marriage; but feels sure from the way he spoke of the matter that she had not
said anything about "haunting" to him; he clearly did not know that
his consent would put a stop to it, nor did he apparently ever connect
its cessation with her sister's marriage, which followed immediately on
his consent.

In the remaining divisions we shall only have cases of haunted
houses, or what the Committee have called "fixed local ghosts," except
one where the supposed ghost seems to have followed the family. In
discussing these, I shall use the expression, the supposed ghost, or shortly,
the ghost, without intending either to affirm or to deny the existence of a
continuous entity manifesting itself in the apparitions, or even to imply
that there is necessarily any cause for them external to the percipient,
or, in fact, to express any view whatever as to the origin of the alleged
phenomena. I shall use it merely as a convenient name for the
unknown cause or causes of a series of apparitions or other phenomena
of the kind, connected by similarity or locality, or otherwise; or for the
phenomena themselves.

I now proceed to the third kind of confirmation of which the type
is the subsequent recognition by the percipient of the portrait of the sup­
posed ghost. We have two cases of this in the collection, but for different
reasons, which I will mention in their place, they neither of them appear
to me to be of a conclusive kind.

One case has already been published in the Proceedings of the Society (Vol. I., p. 106) in the first report of the Committee on
Haunted Houses. Mr. X.Z. is there described as recognising the supposed
ghost four years after he saw it, in a portrait of the man with whom,
on other grounds, he had connected the apparition. These grounds
were that the man in question was said to wear a costume resembling
that of the apparition, and to have committed murder and suicide on
the spot where he appeared, and on the same day of the year.
The narrative was written in 1882, 30 years after the appearance, but against this must be set the fact that (as I understand) a third-hand account has been obtained substantially agreeing with it, originating in the account given by Mr. X. Z., much nearer to the event, and which forms, therefore, a to some extent independent check on the accuracy of Mr. X. Z.’s recollection. A more serious weakness in the evidence lies, I think, in the interval between the apparition and the recognition of the portrait. Four years seem a long time to keep vividly in one’s mind a face seen only once, for a few moments, at a distance of 35 feet, though no doubt under exciting circumstances likely to impress it on the memory. With regard to the other evidence connecting the supposed ghost and the suicide, the dressing-gown and the site of the death were traditional only (the death occurred more than 50 years before the apparition); the date of the death Mr. X.Z. ascertained, he tells us, from the parish register. But in estimating the evidence afforded by the observance of an anniversary, we must take into account that this is, I think, the only instance of such observance which we have at first-hand in all our collection—except two, which on other grounds I am inclined to regard as possibly explicable by personation.

In the next case, (G. 28), the portrait was seen on the day after the apparition, but it does not seem to have been recognised without a little prompting. The percipient, who will not allow either her name or the address of the house to be published, is known to Mr. C. C. Massey and Mr. Podmore. The account here given was written out in her presence after a prolonged and careful examination of her evidence, and is certified by her to be correct.

About the year 1872 my husband and I spent one night in the house of my aunt, in one of the suburbs of London. The house being a very small one, my cousin gave me up her room, and my husband had to sleep upstairs with the son. Before she left me my cousin insisted, why, I could not understand, on leaving the gas alight—and did, in fact, leave a faint glimmer. In the middle of the night I awoke in a cold sweat, and saw, in the dim light, a man standing close to my bedside. Thinking it was my husband I called him by name, and as my recollection serves, I put out my hand, lying still in bed, to turn up the gas. The figure had disappeared; and I jumped out of bed, found the door locked, and searched the room through to no purpose. I then felt a little nervous, but thinking that I must have been dreaming, I got into bed and went to sleep again. Twice more that night I was wakened by the same cause; I found myself each time, as before, shivering and in a cold sweat, and saw the same figure standing by me. I now clearly saw the features and general appearance. It was apparently a tall, well-built, rather good-looking man, in a frock coat, and with a long reddish beard. After the third appearance I left the gas turned fully on, and then got to sleep without further disturbance.

In the morning I spoke at breakfast time of my nocturnal disturbance,
and my cousin exclaimed, "Now, mamma, you will believe my story: I told you the room was haunted."

Afterwards I went into the dining-room, into which I had never previously gone, and there saw a picture of a man which I appeared to recognise. "Who is that?" I said, "one of your neighbours?" "Someone you have seen," my cousin replied; and it then flashed across me that it was the face of my vision. It was the portrait of the late owner of the house—my aunt had taken the house furnished—who had died of delirium tremens a few months before, in the bedroom which I had occupied: as I then learnt for the first time.

November 23rd, 1882.

The importance of this case is greatly increased by the cousin's apparently similar experience, which had not been previously communicated to our informant; but unfortunately the cousin declines to give us any account of it.

Cases having the fourth kind of confirmation—that which obtains when two or more people see independently of each other and at different times, apparitions which seem clearly to have been very much alike,—constitute the most important part of the evidence in our collection. A very fair specimen of them was printed in full in the Proceedings of the Society, Part VI., p. 141. A lady sees one morning leaning over her in bed, in a certain attitude, a muffled figure of a woman, which cannot, according to her account, have been a real woman since she saw it gradually becoming transparent and vanishing. She is certain that she spoke to no one in the house about it, and to no one outside who could have communicated with her brother; but a fortnight later he tells her at breakfast that he has seen the muffled figure of a woman leaning over him in bed in the same attitude.

The following narrative is an account of a very interesting case of the same kind, only it is more recent, and the figure that appeared was more definite. The different accounts are signed by the percipients, whom Mr. Gurney has seen and with whom he has thoroughly discussed the evidence. They are not willing that their names, or that of the house where the phenomena occurred, should be published, but they have communicated it privately to Mr. Gurney, who hopes to obtain in time more information about its previous history and the experience of other inhabitants. The first account is from Mrs. W.

February 19th, 1885.

In June, 1881, we went to live in a detached villa just out of the town of C——. Our household consisted of my husband and myself, my stepdaughter, and two little boys, aged 9 and 6, and two female servants. The house was between 10 and 20 years old. We had been there about three weeks, when, about 11 o'clock one morning, as I was playing the piano in the drawing-room, I had the following experience:—I was suddenly aware of a figure peeping
round the corner of the folding-doors to my left; thinking it must be a visitor, I jumped up and went into the passage, but no one was there, and the hall door, which was half glass, was shut. I only saw the upper half of the figure, which was that of a tall man, with a very pale face and dark hair and moustache. The impression lasted only a second or two, but I saw the face so distinctly that to this day I should recognize it if I met it in a crowd. It had a sorrowful expression. It was impossible for anyone to come into the house without being seen or heard. I was startled, but not the least frightened. I had heard no report whatever as to the house being haunted; and am certainly not given to superstitious fancies. I did not mention my experience to anyone at the time, and formed no theory about it. In the following August, one evening about 8.30, I had occasion to go into the drawing-room to get something out of the cupboard, when, on turning round, I saw the same face in the bay-window, in front of the shutters, which were closed. I again saw only the upper part of the figure, which seemed to be in a somewhat crouching posture. The light on this occasion came from the hall and the dining-room, and did not shine directly on the window; but I was able perfectly to distinguish the face and the expression of the eyes. This time I was frightened, and mentioned the matter to my husband the same evening. I then also told him of my first experience. On each of these occasions I was from 8 to 10 feet distant from the figure.

Later in the same month I was playing cricket in the garden with my little boys. From my position at the wickets I could see right into the house through an open door, down a passage, and through the hall as far as the front door. The kitchen door opened into the passage. I distinctly saw the same face peeping round at me out of the kitchen door. I again only saw the upper half of the figure. I threw down the bat and ran in. No one was in the kitchen. One servant was out, and I found that the other was up in her bedroom. I mentioned this incident at once to my husband, who also examined the kitchen without any result.
A little later in the year, about 8 o'clock one evening, I was coming down stairs alone, when I heard a voice from the direction, apparently, of my little boys' bedroom, the door of which was open. It distinctly said, in a deep sorrowful tone, "I can't find it." I called out to my little boys, but they did not reply, and I have not the slightest doubt that they were asleep; they always called out if they heard me upstairs. My step-daughter, who was downstairs in the dining-room with the door open, also heard the voice, and thinking it was me calling, cried out, "What are you looking for?" We were extremely puzzled. The voice could not by any possibility have belonged to any member of the household. The servants were in the kitchen, and my husband was out.

A short time after I was again coming downstairs after dark in the evening when I felt a sharp slap on the back. It startled but did not hurt me. There was no one near me, and I ran downstairs and told my husband and my step-daughter.

I have never in my life, on any other occasion, had any hallucination of sight, hearing, or touch.

The following is Miss W.'s account:—

February 19th, 1885.

In July, 1881, I was sitting playing the piano in our house in C----, about 11.30 in the morning, when I saw the head and shoulders of a man peeping round the folding-doors, in just the same way as they had appeared to my mother, but I had not at that time heard of her experience. I jumped up, and advanced, thinking it was an acquaintance from a few yards off. This impression, however, only lasted for a second; the face disappeared, but recalling it, I perceived at once that it was certainly not that of the gentleman whom I had for a second thought of. The resemblance was only that they were both dark. The face was pale and melancholy, and the hair very dark. I at once went to Mrs. W. in the dining-room, and asked if anyone had called. She said, "No"; and I then told her what I had seen. I then for the first time heard from her what she had seen, and our descriptions completely agreed. We had even both noticed that the hair was parted in the middle, and that a good deal of shirt-front showed.

A few weeks later, about 11 p.m., Mrs. W. and I were playing bezique in the dining-room. Mr. W. was out, and the servants had gone to bed. The door of the room was open, and I was facing it. I suddenly had an impression that someone was looking at me, and I looked up. There was the same face, and the upper half of the figure, peeping round into the room from the hall. I said, "There's the man again!" Mrs. W. rushed to the door, but there was no one in the hall or passage; the front door was locked, and the green baize door which communicated with the back part of the house was shut. The figure had been on the side of the dining-room door, nearest to the front door, and could not have got to the green baize door without passing well in our sight. We were a good deal frightened, and we mentioned the occurrence to Mr. W. on his return. He went all over the house, as usual before going to bed, and all windows were fastened, and everything in order.

A few weeks after this, about 11.30 a.m., I was upstairs playing battle-
dore and shuttlecock with my eldest brother in his bedroom. The door was open. Stepping back in the course of the game, I got out on to the landing; I looked sideways over my shoulder, in order to strike the shuttlecock, and suddenly saw the same face as before, and my brother called out at the same moment, "There's a man on the landing." I was startled myself, but to reassure the child I said there was no one—that he had made a mistake—and shut the door and went on with the game. I told my father and Mrs. W. of this as soon as I saw them.

Later in the autumn, I was sitting alone in the dining-room one evening, with the door open. Mrs. W. had been upstairs, and I heard her coming down. Suddenly I heard a deep melancholy voice say, "I can't find it." I called out, "What are you looking for?" At the same time the voice was not the least like Mrs. W.'s. She then came in and told me she had heard exactly the same thing. My father was out at the time, but we told him of the circumstance on his return.

In September of 1882, I was for a week in the house with only the two children and the servants. It was about 7.30 on Sunday evening, and nearly dark. The others were all out in the garden. I was standing at the dining-room window, when I caught a glimpse of a tall man's figure slipping into the porch. I must have seen if anybody had approached the porch by the path from the front gate, and I should certainly have heard the latch of the gate, which used to make a considerable noise, and I should also have heard footsteps on the gravel-path. The figure appeared quite suddenly; it had on a tall hat. I was very much astonished, but ran to the door, thinking it might possibly be my father. No one was there; I went to the gate, and looked up and down the road. No one was in sight, and there was no possibility that anybody could have got so suddenly out of view.

I have never at any other time in my life had any hallucination whatever, either of sight or hearing.

I remember Mrs. W. telling me of her experience of the slaps as soon as she came downstairs.

I ought to add that at the time when we were negotiating about the house, the landlady of the lodgings where my father and I were staying told me that all the villas of the row in which our house was situated, ten in number, were haunted. I was with my father when I heard this. Mrs. W. was not with us. I am certain that the remark made no impression whatever on me, and that it did not even recur to my mind till I saw what I have described. I did not even mention the remark to Mrs. W.

Mrs. W. adds:

I distinctly remember my step-daughter coming to me immediately after her first sight of the figure, and telling me about it. I then told her for the first time of my own experience (I had then only had one), and our descriptions completely tallied. I distinctly remember our agreeing about the parting of the hair in the middle, and about the amount of white shirt-front. We could neither of us remember whether his tie was white or black. We agreed that we should know the face if we ever met it. And subsequently, at an evening party, we both pitched on the same individual as more like our
strange visitor than any one else we knew. The resemblance, however, was not extremely close.

I distinctly remember, also, my step-daughter exclaiming, "There's that man again!" when we were playing bêzique. I rushed at once into the hall and found the door closed as she has described.

I also remember her telling me at once about what she had seen, and what her brother had exclaimed when they were playing at battledore and shuttlecock.

She told me about what she had seen in the porch when Mr. W. and I returned from town on the next (Monday) morning.

The following is Surgeon-Major W.'s confirmation:—

I was told of these various occurrences by my wife and daughter at the times which they have specified. I only heard from my wife of her first experience after she had told me of her second. After she had seen the figure during the game at cricket, I went into the kitchen, but found everything as usual. On my return home, after my daughter's seeing the figure peeping round the dining-room door, I went all over the premises as my custom was, and found windows secured and every thing in order.

My wife and daughter are as unlikely as any one I know to suffer from causeless frights. They are completely free from nervousness, and though these experiences were startling and bewildering to them, they did not in the least worry themselves in consequence.

It seems possible that the voice may have been that of one of the children talking in sleep, and the slap some effect of imagination, but it is not easy to account for the apparitions by any such known causes.

The next case I will give (G. 464) is somewhat less striking, but it has, like the last, the advantage of being recent. Mr. Gurney has had a long interview with Miss Leigh Hunt and Miss Laurence, and talked over the phenomena with them.

From Miss Kathleen Leigh Hunt, 81, Camden Road, N.W.

June, 1884

Two years ago last winter I was staying with my cousin at a house in Hyde Park Place, which we were taking care of for my cousin's brother-in-law and sister during their absence from England.

One morning after breakfast, I think it was about 10 o'clock, I was going upstairs when I seemed to see, about two stairs in front of me, a figure, which I took to be the housemaid, going up before me. I went up the entire flight of stairs, under this impression, to the first floor, when suddenly at the top I could see nobody. This puzzled me, as I could not account for any one being able to disappear so quickly, and I went into the room that was the nearest to the stairs, thinking that in some way the housemaid must have gone in there without my seeing her. The room, however, was empty, and so was the drawing-room, which led out of it with folding doors that were kept open. I then went into the only other room on that floor, but no one was there either. I felt that it was impossible that she should have gone
on upstairs, as I should have seen her do so. I was not at all frightened, although I began to believe that it could not have been the housemaid that I had seen; still the hour of the day was not one to suggest ghostly thoughts, and the figure itself had nothing supernatural about it, being simply that of a servant in a light cotton dress (a white ground, with a spriggy pattern all over it), and with white cap on. Of course, being behind it, I had not seen the face. The whole figure had the general appearance of the housemaid, so that she had been the one I had thought of. It was not in the least like the cook, who dressed in much darker cottons, and was besides a very little woman, while the figure I saw was of medium height.

I determined not to tell my cousin about this, as I was going out for the day, and thought she might get nervous in thinking about it alone, and afterwards I forgot about it till seeing it a second time impressed it upon my mind.

It was about the same time in the morning, about two or three weeks afterwards, as far as I can remember, that having, as I thought, heard a single knock at the street door, and wishing to speak to the housemaid as she returned from answering it, I stood in the dining-room, just inside the half-open door, waiting to catch her as she passed back to the kitchen, but standing a little behind the door so that I should not be seen if anybody should come into the house when she answered the door. I saw a figure pass along the passage towards the street door, which I took to be the housemaid again, because I was expecting her to go by, but, owing to my position, I did not see her face, but only a piece of her cheek and the side view of her figure. On neither occasion did I hear any sound of walking, but this did not surprise me, although the figure was not two yards from me, because the housemaid had a very quiet walk indeed, quite remarkably so. As I heard no door open or shut, and no figure returned after waiting two or three minutes, I put out my head and looked in the hall. Nobody was there. I then went across to the only room on that floor besides the dining-room. Nobody was there either. Both the little room and the dining-room have only one door each to them, so there was no possibility of her having left the room any way but the way I went in. This time I felt I must inquire into the puzzle, and I went straight to the kitchen, where I found the housemaid sitting. I asked her if she had not just been to the door. She answered, "No." "Then," I said, "surely you went to the door just now; you must forget, there was a single knock at the door." But she said she had heard no knock, and had not been out of the kitchen. I then told my cousin about my two experiences, and she surprised me by telling me of hers, and of the former housemaid having told her that she often saw "skirts going up round the stairs." We agreed we would not say anything of this to her sister or her husband, as we were afraid we should only be laughed at and thought to be nervous, although we did not find our experiences made us feel so, nor was I nervous when I had them. My health was very fairly good during that time, better than usual indeed; nor ought I to omit to say that never before or since have I ever fancied I have seen anything of a ghostly kind, nor have I ever had any unaccountable experiences of any sort except that twice in that house.

Kathleen Leigh Hunt.
Phantasm. of the Dead.

[April 24, 1884]

In answer to inquiries, Miss Leigh Hunt says:—

July 17th, 1884.

Your conjecture was right regarding the servants at Hyde Park Place. There were only two with us at the time, and I did not question the cook on the matter because the figure I saw bore no resemblance to her. The cook was much smaller, and always dressed in darker cottons; she was, besides, remarkably heavy footed. I do not remember hearing any noise at all when I saw the figure, but this did not surprise me, as the housemaid was very quiet in all her movements. I questioned the housemaid once after the second time of seeing the figure, which was like her in general appearance.

In another communication, she adds:—

During my visit, I frequently heard noises as of persons walking about and moving articles in a dressing-room adjoining my bedroom. This room communicated with mine by a door which was left open, the only other door of the dressing-room being locked. A friend, Miss E. L., who had stayed in the house the previous winter, told me that she had had the same experience. I certainly have never thought I have heard such sounds anywhere else.

From Miss Laurence, 81, Camden Road, N.W.

One morning, about 10.30, I was on my way to my bedroom, situated on the top floor of the house. The flight upstairs leading from the second floor to the top floor was well lighted by two windows and a large skylight overhead. When I reached the second-floor landing I saw a cotton skirt, of a light lilac shade, and indefinite pattern, disappearing round the bend of the stairs leading to the top floor, and, believing it to be the housemaid we then had, I called out, "Harriet," two or three times. She immediately came out of a bedroom door to my left on the second floor, whereupon I said to her, "But you were going upstairs just now, how is it that you are here now?" She answered, "No, I was in this bedroom," pointing to the one she came from, "all the time." I then said, "I saw your skirt going round the bend!" and she replied, "Oh! that's nothing, miss, I often see a skirt go round that corner."

I saw the skirt so vividly that had I not known the parlour-maid was in the bedroom, out of which the housemaid had just come to me, and the only other servant, the cook, downstairs, I should have concluded it to belong to one of them. It was as real looking as possible, and could not have been an effect of light. I saw only the skirt, and it was about four yards in advance of me.

I had never before, nor have I since, been subject to an hallucination.

JESSIE LAURENCE.

In answer to inquiries Miss Laurence says:—

June 24th, 1884.

I am sorry I cannot be more precise as to the date. The house was taken in 1877, and we lived there till the autumn of 1882. It was some time between these years of course, but I really cannot say what year. My efforts to find the housemaid, "Harriet," have failed.
From Mr. Paul Bird, of 39, Strand, Calcutta, who is known to Mr. Gurney.

July 17th, 1884.

I have much pleasure stating, briefly, what I saw, or thought I saw, at my late residence, in Hyde Park Place. I came home as usual one evening about 7.30, the hall lamp being lit, and while wiping my feet on the mat, saw one of the maid servants come towards me a few steps and then pass into the dining-room. I took off my overcoat and then went into the dining-room to tell her to bring dinner, and to my surprise there was no one in the room. There was no other possible egress from the room than the door she went in at. I then went upstairs and told my wife, who exclaimed that a similar figure had been seen by Miss Hunt and others.* I never saw the figure again though I frequently looked for it. My own impression at the time was that it was an optical delusion, that there was a servant where I saw her, but that instead of passing into the dining-room, as I could have sworn, she really passed through another door into the kitchen, which was on the same floor as the dining-room, and was entered from the hall by a door opposite the street door. I delayed verifying this theory till too late, and was besides a little afraid of unsettling the servants if I made inquiry.

Miss Leigh Hunt adds:—

We carefully compared notes at the time, and the descriptions agreed.

It seems possible here that the second appearance to Miss Leigh Hunt may have been an illusion resulting from expectation produced by the fancied knock at the door, and that what Mr. Bird saw may have been explicable in the way he at first supposed. But the combination of appearances of a similar kind in the same house, and independently of each other, to two people who never had similar experiences elsewhere, is certainly curious.

The next case (G. 107) is less recent. Personation of the ghost by some real human being would be the explanation of it that would suggest itself, were it possible to suppose that Sir Arthur and Lady Becher were wrong in believing the door of the bath-room to be effectively locked. The narrative is written by General Sir Arthur Becher, of S. Faith's Mede, Winchester, who in sending it, says: "I am not at all a nervous or superstitious person, but I bear the character of a 'ghost-seer' in my family, as I have seen other, to us, 'uncannie' visions, but not of sufficiently clear details to narrate for the purposes of your

* There seems to be a slight discrepancy between this and Miss Hunt's statement that she and her cousin had resolved not to mention the apparition to Mr. or Mrs. Bird. Miss Hunt is inclined to think that the most probable explanation of it is that it was Miss Laurence really who exclaimed "that a similar figure," &c., since she was present on the occasion.
inquiry, excepting one at the Cape of Good Hope, which I also enclose for you to do what you like with."

April 11th, 1884.

General Sir A. Becher, who held a high appointment on the Staff in India, went, accompanied by his son and A.D.C., to the Hill Station of Kussowli, about March, 1867, to examine a house he had secured for his family to reside in during the approaching hot season. They both slept in the house that night. During the night the General awoke suddenly, and saw the figure of a native woman standing near his bed, and close to an open door which led into a bath-room. He called out, "Who are you?" and jumped out of bed, when the figure retreated into the bath-room, and in following it the General found the outer door locked, and the figure had disappeared.

He went to bed again, and in the morning he wrote in pencil on a doorpost, "Saw a ghost," but he did not mention the circumstance to his wife.

A few days after, the General and his family took possession of the house for the season, and Lady Becher used the room the General had slept in for her dressing-room. About 7 p.m. on the first evening of their arrival, Lady Becher was dressing for dinner, and on going to a wardrobe (near the bath-room door) to take out a dress, she saw, standing close by and within the bath-room, a native woman, and, for the moment, thinking it was her own ayah, asked her "what she wanted," as Lady Becher never allowed a servant in her room while dressing. The figure then disappeared by the same door as on the former occasion, which, as before, was found locked! Lady Becher was not much alarmed, but felt that something unusual had occurred, and at dinner mentioned the event to the General and his son, when the General repeated what had occurred to him on the former occasion. That same night, their youngest son, a boy about 8 years of age, was sleeping in the same room as his father and mother, his bed facing an open door leading into the dressing-room and bath-room, before mentioned, and in the middle of the night the boy started up in his bed in a frightened attitude, and called out, "What do you want, ayah? what do you want?" in Hindustani, evidently seeing a female figure in the dressing-room near his bed. His mother quieted him, and he fell asleep, and the figure was not seen by us on that occasion, nor was it ever again seen, though we lived for months in the house. But it confirmed our feeling that the same woman had appeared to us all three, and on inquiry from other occupants we learned that it was a frequent apparition on the first night or so of the house being occupied.

A native Hill, or Cashmere woman, very fair and handsome, had been murdered some years before, in a hut a few yards below the house, and immediately under the door leading into the bath and dressing-room, through which, on all three occasions, the figure had entered and disappeared. My son sleeping in another side of the house never saw it.

I could give the names of some other subsequent occupants who have told us much the same story.

* The probable address of one only of these other occupants has as yet been obtained, and she has not answered a letter addressed to her on the subject.
Subsequently Sir Arthur Becher writes:—

Winchester, May 14th, 1884.

I write to say Lady Becher does not desire to write anything more personally on the subject of the "Ghost Story" I before detailed, as she says my account of it was given in connection with and entirely in accordance with her recollection of the circumstances. The woman appeared to me in the night, and in the ordinary light of a room without any blinds or shutters.

In answer to inquiries, he further tells us that the bath-room door was locked on the inside; that the rooms were on the ground floor; but that there was no exit but by the doors referred to. Also that the child had certainly not heard of the ghost before he saw it.

The following narrative (G. 378) is sent by Mr. John D. Harry to Mr. Gurney, who is not personally acquainted with him, but learns from two common acquaintances that he is a man of acumen in ordinary affairs. Mr. Harry's residence is in the South of Europe.

December 8th, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your circular on Psychical Research, I have great pleasure in affording you the following facts, of which we (that is, myself and three daughters, with one of the housemaids) have been from time to time cognisant. I think it was in the winter of 1871, an apparition, in the exact likeness of a fair woman draped from head to foot in white, glided slowly through the library of my house and into my bedroom. The face at the time I did not see, as the figure preceded me to my bedroom. She appeared tall and rather slight. On her entering my room, I immediately followed and closed the door after me, with the object of discovering who the person was that was playing some sort of trick, but I could find no one in the room, after searching it thoroughly. I, however, kept the circumstance perfectly secret. It might have been two or three years after this last event that I heard screams from all my daughters, and, as it appeared after, from their maid as well; this was about 10 o'clock at night, and about the same hour I had seen the apparition previously. One of my daughters the next morning rushed to tell me of the fright they had had, but before she had time to explain the cause I at once dared her to talk of any such nonsense as ghosts, as they might be sure apparitions were only in the imagination of nervous people. I did not, however, tell her of what I had seen. From that time to the time my last daughter was married, it was never alluded to between us, and I did not know till then, when my daughter was leaving the house for her marriage journey, that either of my daughters had again seen the apparition. A few minutes before she left the house, she desired to speak to me privately, and when she gave me the full particulars of the female apparition which she had seen repeatedly, I then acknowledged that the same figure had on seven or eight occasions appeared in my bedroom and twice in the library, and that on one occasion it lifted up the mosquito curtains and looked closely into my face. On this occasion I became rather startled, as it was so sudden, and I used not very polite language, when it dropped the curtain and glided slowly away. It never appeared to walk, but to glide. It is now nearly
two years since I have witnessed it for a certainty, as the last time, I believe, I was merely dreaming of it. So impressed has the face become in my imagination that I believe I could distinguish it among thousands,—pale, rather handsome, oblong features, and about 35. My daughter once heard her sister's name called two or three times, but there was no one in the room or near to account for the voice.

Had it not been for the scene at my daughter's marriage it would never have been spoken of (at least, by me); but when she stated in the presence of others that she was glad to leave the house, and hoped never to sleep in it again, I very reluctantly told some of the friends present; but this took place eight-and-a-half years after the first time any of us had seen the apparition.—I am, sir, yours truly,

JOHN D. HARRY.

P.S.—My great reason now for keeping the matter secret is that the property I inhabit might not be depreciated, as the ——— are a most nervous and superstitious people.

I should add that the figure appeared to all three of my daughters and their maid at one time, and on the return of my daughter (the eldest), with her husband, she again saw it, and her husband likewise acknowledged that he saw something, but could not describe it as he had just awoke.

It has never been seen by any of us except on the particular flat where the sitting-rooms and bedrooms are.

The following account is from one of Mr. Harry's daughters,—Mrs. Knight. It will be seen that the details are not in complete agreement with his recollection of what his daughter had told him, but this only illustrates what I have already said about second-hand information. The two accounts agree in the important point that a female figure draped in white has been seen by several persons in the house, and independently by at least two of them. It was apparently seen too indistinctly by the second witness for any clear recognition of the features, or she would hardly have taken it for her sister; unless, indeed, she means us to understand that the face really was exactly like her sister's, in which case it must have been unlike that of the figure seen by her father, and which he believes he could distinguish among thousands. I hope we may ultimately obtain the evidence of Mr. Harry's other daughters as well.

May 6th, 1885.

In the year 1871, about May, we moved into ———, the family consisting of my father, two sisters, and myself. I was unpacking clothes one evening, about sunset, in the first week of our being there, with a woman called Pepina, when we both saw a shadow of a woman rising out of a bed in a room which opened out of the one we were in. I spoke first, when we had recovered our presence of mind, and said, "Pepina, what did you see?" She said, "Miss Louie," meaning my youngest sister. I said, "So did I." We were not frightened, only surprised. The next evening, at sunset again, my other sister and I were sitting on top of the house as is the general custom in ——— for coolness sake. Suddenly a figure came to the low door opening on
to the roof, and disappeared. I said, "Wasn't that Louie?" My sister replied, "Yes, I wonder why she did not come up." She then went to the top of the ladder and called her, but there was no answer. Then I remarked, "That is the second time I have seen Louie in this house. I hope nothing is going to happen to her." Later in the evening I said to my sister, "Did you come up to the roof to-night?" "Oh, no!" she said, "I wasn't near there. I was downstairs all the time." Then I remarked, "Well, something is going to happen to you, for we have seen your ghost twice following," but she only laughed.

I told my father of it, but he was very angry and said there were no such things as ghosts, and that we were never to speak of such things for fear of frightening the servants.

I lived in that house for eight years and never saw it again. The last ten months I was alone with my father, and slept in a room quite away from anybody, but I never saw anything again nor had any fear. It was only on hearing from my father, after I was married, that he had seen it once or twice, that I was afraid to go to the house, and I do not think anything would induce me to go there again.

My father is afraid of nothing, but I know that he often sees this shadow, and yet does not believe it is anything supernatural, only he allows that he cannot account for it. If I had seen it alone I should have thought I was out of health or imaginative, but as there were two people each time it could not have been imagination.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Knight adds:

The figure rose from the bed with its arms outstretched, as if beseeching or asking for something. I also noticed that it had its arms stretched out in the same manner the second time I saw it. It vanished into the wall at the back of the bed as we approached it. It was a white shadowy figure of a young woman. The face looked pretty, but very sad. I couldn't say how it was dressed, it all looked white and flimsy, as if you could pass through it. It is quite as clear in my memory now as at the time I saw it. I daresay you have heard from my father that once he saw it in grey instead of white, and he said it looked to have grown smaller.

Another narrative of appearances last year, in a house in Sussex, has not yet been printed by the Committee, because they hope to obtain some further evidence about it shortly, but it has been shown to me in manuscript, and as it relates to a curious variety of these apparitions I will give a brief account of it. We have, I believe, four first-hand accounts from different percipients, none of whom had previously heard what the ghost was like. They saw in the night, by a wardrobe in a particular room, a column of light vaguely shaped like a woman, which in some cases moved without changing its shape or attitude, from the wardrobe to the fireplace, and then slowly back again, and from the fireplace to the window, there disappearing all at once. The servant, having heard of the ghost, slept in the room with a view to seeing it, and succeeded on various occasions, but to her it appeared more like a ball of light with a sort of halo round it. She saw it once in the
evening as she passed the door of the room, and called others to see it, but when they got there it had disappeared. This seems to have been the only occasion on which it was seen by any one not in bed. One of the percipients has endeavoured to account for the appearance as a reflection from the looking-glass, a light shining in at the window, &c., but does not seem to have succeeded in doing so satisfactorily. Rumour in the village says the house is haunted, and that a woman murdered her mother there, but such village gossip cannot, I think, be taken as of any value without very careful investigation, since it may quite possibly have its origin in the very circumstances which it is supposed to explain and confirm.

I have now, I think, exhausted the cases where we have first-hand testimony from two or more witnesses who, without knowing what the apparition was supposed to be like, seem to have seen much the same thing. But there are other cases which ought not, I think, to be left out of account, where we have first-hand evidence of appearances to one percipient, and second-hand accounts of others, only heard of by the narrator of the first-hand account after his own experience. The following is an instance (G. 629). Names may not be published, and further information cannot be obtained, which is much to be regretted, as the story might become very interesting, and afford us useful information. It was received by Mr. Myers from a friend who writes on January 15th, 1884.

The following was written to me by a relative. She learnt from an old gardener that there is a story connected with the house, but what the story is she could not find out.

"I have had an odd sensation in summer, early in the morning, that there was a woman in the room, but I could not look up till she had gone. I considered this to be a species of nightmare, till last August. I was, as before, lying awake, when the same feeling came over me; this time far more strongly. I heard a dress rustle, and felt a short, dark woman was coming towards my bed. She put her hand on my shoulder, and looked over at my face; then the spell was off, and I could turn round.

I was awake, I know, and was just noticing that the wardrobe door was left a little open. I felt I could not stay in this room after this, and so moved into another. I told my maid what I had seen, saying it must be nightmare, when she said, 'Why, that is what B. used to say. A short, sallow woman used to come into his room, and pass by him to the window.' This B. was our late man-servant, and his room was over mine.

I took an opportunity of asking him, and he said he knew he was awake, and got up to look, but after a few times he got used to it.

We are seldom at home in August. I now remember when we came here, 17 years ago, being told the house was haunted, but never believed it or thought of it again.

The sensation was so dreadful, and yet I felt she (the apparition) meant
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no harm, more as if she were looking kindly at me. Her face seemed in darkness, and yet I could see it. You will laugh, because it was all at my back. I am curious to know if anyone will believe in a non-seeing sight. I saw her in the back of my head; my face was to the wall. I felt I could not move.

This is a correct version of my experiences on the morning of August 11th, 1883."

Here it will be observed, unlike the other cases I have quoted, the sensation of seeing is produced without any possible intervention of the eyes.

The following (G. 383) is another instance. It is an account of the apparent hauntings of a house at Hammersmith, by Mrs. W. B. R—–d, and was written in the summer of 1883.

When we went to live in our house at Hammersmith, we had never heard a word of its being haunted, nor had we any sort of feeling that it was a ghostly house or anything of the sort, nor had we ever in any other house experienced any phenomena of the kind. Almost immediately after taking possession, all the members of the household complained of hearing noises in the lower part of the house—windows would be violently shaken every night between 2 and 4 o'clock, and steps were heard apparently going about the house. I myself frequently had doors opened for me before entering a room, as if a hand had hastily turned the handle and thrown it open. Then occasionally we used to hear sounds as of someone sobbing and sighing (deep long sighs at all times of the day). I used to hear these sounds in my bedroom, and on the little staircase leading to it, and my husband would hear it in the dining-room underneath. Sometimes I would hear a sound of stitching in the room out of my bedroom, as if some very hard and coarse work were being done, and then a sound as of something being dragged across the floor. I got to have a feeling which was most uncomfortable, at times, as of being watched. These sort of things went on for about five years, when, in October, 1878, about 3 o'clock one afternoon I was sitting with three of my children in the dining-room, reading to them. I wanted to speak to the parlour-maid, and I rang the bell for her when the door opened, and on looking up I saw a figure of a woman come in and walk up to the side of the table, stand there a second or two, and then turn to go out again, but before reaching the door she seemed to dissolve away. She was a grey, short-looking woman, apparently dressed in grey muslin. I hardly saw the face, which seemed scarcely to be defined at all. None of the children saw her, and I did not mention the circumstance to them nor to the servants, lest they should get frightened and leave. I only told my husband. I was in perfect health at the time.

During the next two months, a figure, described exactly like the one I had seen, was seen by two different servants, during the absence of the family. One of them saw it in the afternoon in daylight, and the other at 10 o'clock at night; one saw it on the little staircase, and one in the day nursery. Neither of these servants had by any possibility heard of my having seen anything of the sort. They were both in good health, and, having been with me some time, had long grown accustomed to the noises; but one of
them was so upset and frightened by the apparition that she sent word to us at once that she must leave us.

The following summer, in July, I was awake in the night by a frantic scream of terror from my little girl (then six years old), who slept in a tiny room opening out of ours. Her father ran to her, when she said, "Oh! I awoke and saw a little wicked-looking old grey woman standing at the foot of the bed, looking at me with a horrid face, and then suddenly she went down through the floor with a loud noise, and I screamed out." The child was in good health, and had never heard any talk of the apparition.

In the autumn of 1876 I was awake one night, and felt an icy wind blowing through my room, and heard loud sobs; the curtains of the bed were pulled back, and my hair was pulled. Another night I was awake by a brilliant light in my room and the same cold wind. Previously to this, my husband, on one occasion, heard his name distinctly called in his studio, as he sat at work. Since all this (1876) only occasional rappings have been heard, and I have not felt that feeling of being watched, which used to come over me when sitting in my room, the feeling which I had for years before I saw any apparition.

The following are letters written later by Mrs. R—d.

March 11th, 1884.

DEAR MR. GURNEY,—As to the night that I told you of last September, I was, as far as I can remember, awake by the dog barking about 12 o'clock. The barking stopped, but I heard what sounded like steps downstairs. Very soon the old noises began in our little library: jumping about, the window rattling, the whole place shaking, till my windows rattled too. The dog whined incessantly, and the banging and jumping seemed to grow more and more boisterous. I got up and made some noise with the furniture in my room, lighted my candles, and went on to the landing to listen if there were noises in the other part of the house, but all was perfectly quiet there, though in the little room downstairs the dog seemed to grow more and more disturbed, and the noises continued more violently than ever. I listened to them till 3 o'clock, and as there seemed no chance of their stopping, I left my room and passed the rest of the night in Helen's. The dog evidently was still afraid of the room when the morning came. I called to him to go into it with me, and he crouched down with his tail between his legs, and seemed to fear entering it.

That was all that disturbed me, but I found it enough, as I was alone in the house with only Helen and the maid.—Yours sincerely, C. R—d.

April 5th, 1884.

DEAR MR. GURNEY,—I never heard of any Clewer Sisters having lived here. Some person who knew the house, I cannot remember who, told me an old invalid lady once lived here, but she is a misty personage.

About 40 or 50 years ago a Mr. Atwood, the then vicar of Hammersmith, lived here, and we bought it from his son. Our immediate predecessor was a Mr. Seaton, a gentleman much given to horseracing.

In 1804, some people of the name of Scott lived here, as we know by having found some of their invitation cards behind a mantelpiece, but that is all I can tell of the former inhabitants of the house.—Yours very sincerely,
The appearance to the child is not, I think, important, as it may have been merely a bad dream, but there can hardly be a mistake as to the servants having seen independently a figure very much like that seen by Mrs. R——d. It will be observed that mysterious noises occupy a prominent place in this narrative, which has not been the case in any that I have yet spoken of except the one given in the Proceedings, Part VI.

To the present group of cases belong two more which will be printed when a little more evidence has been obtained. I will give a brief account of them on account of their great interest. In the first, the appearances have taken place, so far as we know, only since the present occupants came to the house in April, 1882. They have occurred mainly in the summer, and have been very frequent. The figure seen is that of a lady in widow's garb, holding a hand and handkerchief up to her brow and apparently weeping; the face is concealed. It moves about, and has been seen in various parts of the house and garden, but most frequently is first seen by the original percipient on the stairs, and has constantly been followed down to the drawing-room, where it sits down in a particular corner of a particular sofa—or if the percipient sits in that place herself, the apparition stands behind. At first this lady only saw it, and for some time said nothing about it, but after a time a young brother of eight years old saw independently what he described as a lady in black crying in the drawing-room. Three other persons saw independently what seems to have been the same figure, and since then other members of the family have seen it, though some who have tried to do so have failed. It has once been seen by two together, and on another occasion by one only, though others were present. This, and its apparently disappearing through a closed door, preclude the idea of its being any real person. The house where this occurs is only about 25 years old, and its history is completely known. The figure seen is believed to resemble a lady who formerly lived there, and whose life there was unhappy, but who did not die there. She was not known to the percipients, and as the apparition never, I believe, shows its face, the likeness inferred from photographs must remain somewhat conjectural.

The other unprinted case relates to an old Elizabethan manor house. It is well-known as a haunted house, and various exaggerated accounts of the ghost may be met with. According to some accounts that reached the Committee, the ghost is continually appearing, but usually only shows its back, which is fortunate since the face is so horrible that any one seeing it is frightened almost into fits and insists on leaving the house! The true history, so far as the Committee yet have it, is less sensational and seems in brief to be as follows. The house was, from the summer of 1861 to the spring of 1863, occupied by a Mr. and Mrs. H. Before he rented
it Mr. H. had heard many reports of its being haunted, but these were of a general character; he heard no description of any appearance. We know also from other sources that the house had previously this reputation. The H.'s constantly heard noises for which they were unable to account; and their little dog behaved somewhat oddly at night, refusing, contrary to its usual habits, to leave its basket on any provocation. One night Mr. H. saw an old woman in a dark gown, grey shawl, and poke bonnet standing at the foot of the bed. She vanished, and he got up and examined the room, satisfying himself that it was no illusion. He never spoke of this, while they remained in the house, to anyone except a sister-in-law whom he bound over to secrecy, and he is certain she kept the secret. During his tenancy an old nurse, after sleeping one night in the house, refused ever to do so again, but would give no reason. After they left they persuaded her to tell them why she had acted thus, and it then appeared that she had seen a figure which she described exactly as Mr. H. did his, though she had never heard of his experience. The nurse is dead and we have her account at second-hand only.

The next tenants are believed to have had experiences, but they have not yet been got at, and after 1864 the house remained empty for some time.

From 1867 to 1875 it was inhabited by a clergyman and his family. In the autumn of 1867 the clergyman, Mr. B., while unpacking in a dressing-room opening on to the landing, saw passing the door a lady in blue with her hair down her back, who could not possibly be anyone in the house. In July, 1868, a similar figure was seen by a lady in nearly the same place. She saw it very clearly, including face and bare feet. It went into the dressing-room and there disappeared. Of these two appearances we have accounts at first-hand, but they were probably not independent in the sense in which I have used the word, as I believe the lady knew what Mr. B. had seen. There are, besides, accounts at second-hand of two appearances to a housemaid of a figure apparently not exactly resembling Mr. B.'s; and also at second-hand of two appearances to a gentleman staying in the house, who described the figure somewhat differently again. These four last-mentioned appearances also occurred in 1868. It is not clear whether there have been other appearances to servants or not. The B.'s left the house in 1875. It was then somewhat repaired and altered, and from 1876 till now has been occupied by another family who have seen and heard nothing at all remarkable.

We have here the remarkable feature that the haunting, which continued for at least seven years, and through the occupancy of at least three families, seems to have changed its character in a marked degree.
I may add that the ghost is said to be the spirit of a young lady murdered in the middle of the last century for her jewels. But the story of this murder is very hazy, and has its origin, I believe, in a letter received from America, after the appearances to the B. family. This letter professed to come from a person who had learnt the story from the last surviving member of the murderer’s family, and received from her a secret plan showing the spot where the treasure was hid. From internal evidence, I should judge it to be a hoax.

I will now give some cases where the appearances were not strictly independent, but where it would seem that the previous knowledge possessed by some of the percipients as to the form of the ghost can hardly have operated through expectation in producing it, since their first impression was that they saw a living human being.

The account of an apparition, supposed from a resemblance of figure to be possibly that of Miss A., printed in the Proceedings, Vol. I., p. 108, is a case of this. It is a record, as will be remembered, of a shadowy female figure seen several times.

A somewhat similar case is the following (G. 77), obtained through Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood. The house is in Ireland, but neither its name nor that of the percipients may be published. The first account is from Miss C., the governess.

On the 18th of April (Thursday), 1867, about 7.40 p.m., I was going to my room, which I at that time shared with one of my pupils, when just as I had reached the top of the stairs I plainly saw the figure of a female dressed in black, with a large white collar or kerchief, very dark hair, and pale face. I only saw the side face. She moved slowly and went into my room, the door of which was open. I thought it was Marie, the French maid, going to see about A.’s clothes, but the next moment I saw that the figure was too tall and walked better. I then fancied it was some visitor who had arrived unexpectedly (Mrs. S. had done so a few days previously), and had gone into the wrong bedroom, and as I had only been at F. H. a short time, I felt rather shy at speaking to strangers, so waited where I was a minute or two expecting to see the lady come out, but I never lost sight of the door. At last I went in, and there was no one in the room. I looked everywhere, and even felt the back of the hanging side of the wardrobe to see whether there was any concealed door leading into the next room. This idea would not have occurred to me had I been able in any way to account for the lady’s disappearance. She could not have gone by the window, as the room was on the second storey. Going downstairs, I met the cook and another maid, and asked them if any stranger had arrived, and was answered in the negative. I had never heard of any strange appearances in the house, and could not account for what I had seen that evening.

Some years after, in December, 1874, as I was going to bed, about 10 o’clock (the house had been slightly altered), I saw most distinctly a lady in black leaning over the fire in the room occupied by the eldest daughter. She was shading
her eyes with her hand, and seemed looking for something by the fender; her other hand was on the chimney-piece. I walked slowly towards the room, and said, "Take care, C., you will burn your face, it is so near the flame." As there was no answer I spoke again, I suppose louder, for at that moment C., whom I supposed the lady to be, came out of her sister's room and asked what I was talking about and why I was in such a fright about her burning her face. There was no one in her room and no one could have passed me unobserved, as I was standing close to the door.

Another time, late one evening in September, I was sitting in the schoolroom with the door open, when I saw the figure again, standing on the far side of the stove in the lower hall. I at once got up to see who it was, but it had vanished. I think it seemed to go up one step of the stairs, but am not sure, as this was the only time I felt rather nervous when seeing it, and that, perhaps, from thinking it was someone who had no business in the house, or that someone was playing me a trick. Each time I have seen "the black lady" she has been dressed in what appeared to be black serge or cashmere—something soft and in heavy folds—with the same large white collar or kerchief on her neck. Whatever it was, I feel as certain of having seen it as that I am now writing this account of it, and it may be as well to mention that I am by no means a nervous person—quite the contrary.

In answer to the inquiry how she knows the dates of the appearances, Miss C. tells us that she "has kept a diary for many years, putting down short remarks of remarkable and interesting events, seeing the 'Black Lady' amongst the rest."

She adds that she "had not heard anything of the house being supposed to be haunted when she saw the 'Black Lady' in the spring of 1867. It was not till some months afterwards that she heard the story of Miss M., and the report that she was seen at times walking about the house and garden."

As regards the story of Miss M., Miss C. says:—"Part of this house, nearly all of it, was burnt down in 1752. The room in which Miss M. slept, and in which, some say, the fire originated, seems to have been near what is now the drawing-room and front hall. Some old people in the neighbourhood, dead now for some years, reported that they had heard long ago that Miss M.'s door was locked by the servants, as she was subject either to fits or to walking in her sleep; that she attempted to escape by the window, which was not a great height from the ground, but that the sash fell down on the hand, cutting off three fingers and causing her to fall back into the burning room. The house was rebuilt in 1762."

Miss A. M.'s Account. June 26th, 1883.

I do not know much of the history of our ghost; all I have heard is, that she is said to be a lady who was subject to fits; she was under the charge of servants only, and one night she was locked up in a room by herself, the house was burnt down at that side, and she was burnt to death. In trying to save herself by getting out of the window she smashed two of her fingers.

I do not remember when she was first seen, or who was the first to see her, but two of my sisters saw her, when they were quite young, at different times. One of them was coming out of the nursery, which is at one end of a passage, and she saw this lady standing in the doorway of the room at the
opposite end. My sister was much frightened, and called out that there was
a woman with a white face looking at her; when some one came, the woman
had disappeared. I forget how she appeared to the other child, I think she
saw her sitting in a chair in a room she had just come into. We did not ask
the child much about it for fear of impressing it on her memory and frightening
her. My eldest sister was one evening standing in her room, and on turning
to the door, there was the ghost standing in the doorway. She disappar­
peared almost directly.

My mother twice, that I know of, saw her, both times on the stairs. The
first time, thinking it was one of us, she called but got no answer; she called
several times but got no answer. She says the person turned round and
looked at her, but my mother, who does not see very well, still thought it
was one of us, and getting angry at not being answered, pursued her up the
stairs. The female went into a very small room at the top and shut the
doors. My mother went in after her but no one was there. The other time
the lady passed my mother on the stairs; she thought she was one of the ser­
vants, which it was afterwards proved she was not. My mother is not at all of
an imaginative disposition. One of my sisters and myself also saw her at
the same time one evening. We were sitting in the school-room rather late;
there is a hall outside the school-room with a large stove in it. We had no
light but the firelight, the door was wide open, and I was standing facing the
hall, and I saw standing behind the stove the same apparition. She appeared
so tall that it did not seem as if she could be standing on the ground. I
said to my sister, "Look round," which she did. We both looked at her for
a second or two, and then the fire went down; we poked it up but saw nothing
again.

Every one who saw her gives the same description of her, that she is
a woman about middle height, dressed in black, with a shawl over her head.
When we saw her in the hall she had her side face towards us, so we could
not see her well.

I also saw a very curious reflection once. I was sitting in my sister's
room, and was leaning back looking up, when I saw on the ceiling the
shadow of a head and a hand that appeared as if it had only three fingers.
Thinking it was my sister's shadow I thought what a curious shadow her
knitting made, and looked down to see what she was doing with it; on looking
up the reflection was gone. We then found that both our shadows were on
the floor. I did not know until after I had seen this that the lady had lost
two of her fingers when trying to get out of the window.

I omitted to say that there was no egress from the little room my mother
followed the lady into excepting the one by which my mother went in.

In answer to inquiries, Miss A. M. writes, on December 1st, 1882:—

We none of us except Miss C. put down the dates of any time we saw the
ghost, and I hardly remember any of them.

I saw the reflection in May, 1877. I think it was the year after that my mother
saw the lady go up the stairs in front of her. I think it must have been in January
or February, 1880, that I and Miss G. M. saw her; Miss I. M. in May, 1880.
I am afraid I cannot remember any of the other dates.

The ghost was seen by Mrs. M. twice; by Mrs. I. [the eldest sister]; by
Miss G. M. when a child, and also at the same time that I saw her myself;
by Miss M. M. when a child; by Miss I. M. Also by Miss C., our governess, whose account I enclose.

I have heard stories of servants seeing her, and one out-of-door servant says he saw her in the garden, but I can't rely upon these.

I have put all names with every confidence that they will be kept strictly private.

Miss I. M.'s Account.

I do not think A. knew or remembered about my having seen her when she wrote her account. It was in June, 1880; I had been out for a walk [to look at a dance at a neighbouring house] with my youngest sister, and one of the maids. (Before we left we had told them not to sit up for us.) When we got back it was about 12 o'clock, but it was a very light night. I went to the window first that we were going to get in by, and looked through the glass and saw a lady standing at the bottom of the stairs, I thought it was my mother at first. She then walked slowly across the hall, and I opened the window, and there was no one there. I could not see her face; she was all in black. That is all I can remember.

The evidence of other percipients cannot be obtained at first-hand. I do not wish to lay much stress on this case because there is some difference in the descriptions given of the figure. All, however, agree that they saw a lady dressed in black. The curious shadow seen on the ceiling cannot, I think, as described, be regarded as important, as it is not shown that it had no ordinary, though fleeting, cause. Of the accounts at first-hand only Miss C.'s and Miss I. M.'s describe appearances taken at first for a real person. Miss A.M. seems to have surmised at once that she saw the ghost.

The next narrative (G. 110) relates to an old house in London, but the names are here also to be kept private. Noises again take a rather prominent place in this account, which has considerable interest, though it is perhaps a little doubtful whether the nurse had no expectation of seeing the ghost; she was certainly in a nervous state.

The first part of the account was written down by Mr. Podmore, and afterwards corrected by Mrs. H. The second part is from Mrs. G., her married daughter. The third part is from the nurse. The history of the house is not known.

The scene of the occurrences mentioned below is a large house in London. The house, which is an old one, has been tenanted by its present occupants for about 12 years. Previously to this it had the reputation of being haunted; Mrs. H. had heard rumours to that effect from the former occupants.

Mrs. H., the lady of the house, has herself seen nothing abnormal in the house, but she has, of course, heard the account given by successive servants, and the facts stated below may be taken to be substantially accurate.

Noises as of footsteps were heard not unfrequently in the dusk and at night along one of the rooms in the building; these noises would appear to
pass quite close to the servant who heard them, but nothing would ever be seen. Other strange noises, as if someone were digging, would be constantly heard in a parlour on the ground floor of the house. These noises would be heard by two or three persons at a time; and either at night or in the daytime. As there are rooms on all sides of this parlour belonging to the house, these sounds could not have been caused by anyone outside the building itself; and no natural origin could be assigned for them within the building.

On several occasions, perhaps a dozen in all, during the 12 years in which the H. family had lived in the house, the servants had been frightened by seeing a woman's figure. They all gave the same description of the figure: a pale woman in black, with an evil face. The figure would only be seen momentarily; indeed in most cases the witnesses appear to have been too much frightened to wait for it to disappear. As Mrs. H. feared, not unreasonably, that some injury might be done to her property if the house acquired generally the reputation of being haunted, she had never questioned the girls closely on what they had seen, being afraid to show too much interest in the matter. She had always laughed off their fears, and endeavoured to make them forget all about it. For the same reason she could not allow us to cross-question the witnesses ourselves. We were forced, therefore, to be content with the following details, with which she and Miss H. supplied us.

The figure was first seen about 11 years ago, by Sarah C., a young servant-girl of about 18. She was coming downstairs in the daytime, when she met the figure, and was so frightened by it that she jumped sideways through the figure and over the stair-rail, dropping a distance of from four to six feet on the other side.

On another occasion it was seen by one of the servants going downstairs to the kitchen, and she, thinking it to be a visitor, who had missed her way, followed it, and found no one there.

The figure was also seen by the cook on one of the upper landings, in full gaslight, and disappeared before the cook came up to it.

Three or four years back, two servants were together in a long room at the top of the house, in the daytime. One of them saw a woman's figure standing by a chest of drawers at the far end of the room. She called her companion's attention to it, saying, "Who is that?" but when they looked again the figure had gone. There was no possibility of retreat for a human being so placed.

The figure was last seen a few weeks ago, by a girl now in the house. She was very much frightened, and could give no particulars.

Mrs. H. and her daughter fancy they have detected some connection between the appearance of this figure, and the subsequent death of children, who have been lying ill at the time.

Miss H. took us all over the house, and we saw each spot where the figure had been seen.

From Mrs. G. (Née H.)

The incident I have been asked to relate happened as follows:—

There were two rooms divided by a fireplace; on the left hand of this was a doorway connecting the rooms; on the right, a partition of glass to within
two feet or so of the ground, and wood below. This partition divided the room I was in from a steep staircase into the kitchen below, which staircase opened into the other room with a door that stood open against the wall. In the further room opposite the staircase was a doorway into a garden, on the right side of this, in the same corner, a door leading by a passage to the street.

The time was about six o'clock on a winter's evening. Gas was burning brightly in both rooms. I entered the room by a door on your right hand as you faced the fireplace, and at the opposite end to it. Thus, as I turned to pass into the second room, the glass partition was in front of me.

Through this glass partition I saw a woman advancing towards me from the opposite end of the further room. She was tall, dark, and pale, dressed in black, indoor dress; her head was sideways, resting quite upon her right shoulder as if her neck was dislocated. Her hair was plainly and smoothly dressed across the sides of her face. She came swiftly towards me, and was so distinct that I did not suppose but that she was some stranger got into the place. When she came to the stairs she suddenly stood still an instant, and then disappeared perpendicularly, like one who falls through a trap-door. I at once ran to the partition, and looked down the stairs, but nothing could be seen, nothing had been heard. I ran down to the kitchen, but the people there had not seen or heard anything. Both rooms were empty. There was only a child with me about six years old, who had seen nothing.

A month or so after, I was sitting in a room in the same house one afternoon, when a cupboard standing against a wood partition between the room and a passage was rapped as if some one were hammering all over it. I opened the door, thinking it was some one in the passage, but while I stood in the doorway commanding both the room and passage, the knocks were as loud as ever. I felt so nervous that I went to the nursery and fetched a child about five or six years old, to come and play in the room with me. She was amusing herself with some toys, and I was reading, when she stopped, and looked intently at the partition just above the cupboard. It was painted a plain colour; there was no picture, or light or shadow where she was looking. I asked the child what she was looking at. "At the face," she replied. "Never mind," I said, "go on with your play," and so she did, but very soon stopped again. She came up to me, and looking at the same place, she said, "Oh, the face." "Some one looking out of window," I replied, inconsequently, as the window was behind us. "Oh, no," she said, "it wants you, Miss Alice, it wants you." I saw nothing, but picked up the child, and took refuge in the nursery.

From the Nurse. February 13th, 1883.

I never feel nervous about my nursing capacity, or the recovery of my patients, except I am nursing in the place where I am writing this.

The house is old, and like most old houses has its haunted room, in addition to a subterranean passage, which was blocked up 50 years ago, and from which, it is reported, strange sounds have come, like the blows from a mallet, and the sound of somebody digging. I have never heard anything of the sort, but this much I know for a fact, that often when taking my notes or watching quietly by my patient, with a good fire, and a light burning, I
have suddenly felt as if a cool wind was blowing about me so that I could not help shivering, and as if fingers were lightly touching my shoulders, and more than once feeling positive that somebody passed quickly through the room. Now I have never experienced these strange sensations when nursing in any other house, but I always feel when called here to nurse that I am about to do battle for the life of my patient, with a foe whose exact power I do not understand, and have always striven to defeat an influence which I felt was evil, by soliciting the protection of One Who is Almighty.

About four years ago I came here to nurse a little girl, five years of age, suffering with whooping cough and inflammation of the lungs.

My patient was isolated as much as possible, as there were other children in the house. The room in which I was to nurse seemed in all respects suitable for nursing—large, lofty, properly heated and ventilated. There was only one arrangement I did not like, and that I did not notice until I saw my little patient more than once look anxiously towards it, being a large window or partition, partly of glass, which had been recently added to make the room lighter. The door, also partly of glass, was at the side of the partition and opened directly on to the stairs. One day, shortly after my arrival, I was informed that the baby, only a few months old, was dangerously ill. The doctor did not think it would recover. Consequently the person who had charge of my patient while I was off duty could not be spared, so when night came I was rather tired. After giving my patient her medicine, making her comfortable and attending to the fire, I rested for a short time on a spare bed which was in the room. When I arose I looked at my watch; it was just 10 minutes to 1. At that moment the child, who had been sleeping quietly, sat up, looked wildly at the partition, gave one piercing scream, then hid her face in the bed clothes. I dared not look at the partition, but turning my head went quickly to the child saying, "Did anything hurt or frighten you?" She would neither answer nor look up. I then heard a sound on the stairs, as if somebody was going down without boots on, thud, thud; so I called out "Who's there? Do speak, you have frightened us. Is it you, Mrs.——?" meaning the person who waited on us. Not receiving an answer I waited awhile, then softly opened the door and looked out. All was quiet; the gas was burning on the lower landing. By its light I saw a woman standing at the foot of the stairs. Her face was turned up towards me. It was perfectly colourless, the eyes and mouth were closed; her hair was of a drabbish colour and her neck appeared to be slightly twisted. I drew back instantly, for the face I had seen shocked me; it resembled the face of a corpse. For a moment I thought, is it possible that anybody would attempt to frighten us! I looked again—the woman had disappeared.

There was a bell communicating with the housekeeper's room. I rang it violently, waited a few minutes, then heard the well-known footstep of Mrs.—— on the stairs. As she came into the room, she said, "Is anything the matter, nurse?" Before I could answer, she said, "The dear baby's gone. She died just 10 minutes to 1." "Well," I remarked, "that is strange." Then I told her what had occurred, and concluded by asking her if she had heard or seen either of the servants about the house. "Oh, it's not the girls," she said. "They are all in bed, except the nurse that has been with the baby. It is not the first time, I can tell you, that strange things have been
seen and heard; to tell you the truth, nurse, I wouldn't sit in this room alone, no, not for a pension. One nurse that was here declared that her patient's medicine and spoon were thrown across the room, and I myself once went through the nursery and saw a woman in a dark dress looking into one of the drawers. I went into the next room and said to the nurse, 'Who's that person at the drawers?' She answered, 'You must be mistaken, there isn't anybody in the nursery.' I went back to see and the woman had disappeared. Yes, it's strange, but it's true, before trouble, sickness or death, that woman is always seen, but there," she said, "it does not do to talk about such things. You know what people are, and there wouldn't be a servant got that would stay in the house if they knew all." Then looking at my patient she said, "I think she seems worse than when I last saw her." "Well," I said, "she has been dreadfully frightened," and I thought, but did not say, if she dies, it will be as much from fright as any other cause. A few days after, I was called away to a very important case. My little patient lived only two or three days after my departure. More than once since then I have asked myself this question, "Was she frightened to death?"

The following (G. 468) is again an account of apparent haunting in an old house in London—15, St. Swithin's Lane. The events took place in 1854 and onwards. Mr. Gurney has seen Mrs. and Miss Vatas-Simpson and discussed their experiences with them personally. I begin with the recollections of Miss Vatas-Simpson (written in October, 1884), whom Mr. Gurney describes as a sensible and clear-headed person, and who has never had any other hallucination, veridical or otherwise.

From Miss Mary E. Vatas-Simpson.

I remember well (when a little girl, with a sister and brothers younger than myself) an old lady who proved the greatest trouble we children had, first because she was a mystery, and secondly because she got us into trouble with our father. It happened in this way. Ours was an old house, the dining-room at the top, three windows front, a fireplace each end, two doors opposite the windows—one leading into my eldest sister's bedroom and the other on to the landing at the top of the stairs, which stairs were narrow, with enormous bannisters turning at every few stairs into a great square post, on which we used to delight to perch ourselves to see what was going on below, particularly if the servants let anyone into the drawing-room, which was under the dining-room.

One day I was sitting thus on a post, when I saw a tiny old lady walk slowly into the room, all alone. This is what surprised me, for this reason. There was across the stairs an ornamental iron gate, which shut off my father's offices from the offices of the lower part of the house. Persons calling had to ring to gain admission, as they would do at a front door. This old lady I saw come from the stairs above the gate, but on leaning over I saw the gate was shut and no one there. After a little whispered conversation with my brother Walter, who was sitting astride on the post above me, we thought we would see who she was. So we went gently into the room, quite expecting to see her; but we were disappointed, she was not there. I came
skipping lightly out of the drawing-room, knowing we had no business there, when I screamed with astonishment, for out of a door always kept locked, at the foot of the very stairs on which we had been sitting, came our old lady. I ran into the drawing-room to tell Walter, and when I reached the top of the stairs again, I saw her below the gate, going slowly downstairs. She was just out of our sight when my father rushed upstairs, and was very angry indeed with us for the noise we made.

A few days after this we were all playing at a very favourite game—chairs put into form to represent a carriage, in which we sat and covered our heads with a blue and white cotton table-cover for a roof. My brother Garry hurt me. I threw off our cover, and just inside the half-opened door stood the old lady, dressed like she was before—black shabby dress, rather large bonnet, and a good deal of velvet on her kind of hanging mantle. I thought she must have made a mistake and come up too far for father's office. Seeing a half-smile on her face I walked towards her, when she went out of the door quite slowly and turned towards my sister's bedroom. I quickly ran into the dining-room, intending to catch her to-day by the door between the two rooms; but I did not see her. Rushed through my sister's room, on to the landing, down the stairs—when I saw, two or three turns of the stairs lower down, Walter was running after the old lady, who went very quickly, keeping close to the wall all down the staircase. Once again my father came out of his office and told Walter he would whip him if he heard another sound. We asked the servants who this old lady was. They looked at each other and said "only an old lady who came to see mamma." Though we often saw her and were not a bit afraid of her, yet no one seemed to believe us; so though we children often talked about her to each other, we did not mention her in public. This we did do: One of us took to riding outside our carriage on purpose to watch our strange old lady. For she always looked a great deal—or seemed to our youthful eyes to do so—and we all thought she would do something horrid to us the first time she caught us under the table-cloth. We even kept a large ruler close to us on purpose to throw at her if she touched us. She was very real indeed to us, and I seem to see her quite vividly now when I recall it all to my mind.

(Signed) MARY E. VATAS-SIMPSON.

What follows is from Mrs. Vatas-Simpson's Diary.

This is very strange. What can it mean? The servants say that they see queer things moving about, and that they hear peculiar noises. One servant has left us in consequence. To-day I was told by a neighbour that the people who lived here before we came could not remain, because there were always noises and sounds about the house at night, and that even his little children were disturbed by them. At last they became so very unbearable he was obliged to go elsewhere. One hardly knows whether to believe such reports or to laugh at them. At present we have had no nocturnal visitors, and I shall not tell my dear ones, to cause apprehension of ghosts and hobgoblins.

There must be some foundation for the rumours regarding the sounds, noises, and appearances in this old house. It has stood here since the Fire of London. The lower part of the house is very extensive; and then, under-
ground, dark, big, cavernous cellargage (which, it is said, has not been thoroughly explored or examined for years) where secret passages are believed to exist, and from whence issue sounds of moaning and sighing, clearly and quite unmistakably, after dark, when the hum of the busy world is hushed. Any one then, by placing themselves over the window grating may hear distinctly the peculiar noises within. I try to turn a deaf ear to all this, and to combat the fears such revelations inspire in the household, but am unsuccessful with the servants, as they leave me in consequence. My husband says the sounds are produced by the contrary winds career ing through the gratings, and perhaps they are.

A severe illness has kept my pen idle for several weeks. Not so, however, events. To-day, L. told me that when the children are playing upstairs an old woman will persist in standing in the doorway, looking in very disconsolately. She believes in the reality of the occurrence; says that it is an annoyance; would I give orders to the servants to keep our gate on the staircase locked?—the iron gate that shuts in the private portion of the house from that which is below, making it thus quite impossible to pass up the stairs from the offices below.

* * * * * * * *

So late, so tired and weary. Every night now L. and I have to sit up long, dreary hours to wait my husband coming home, for we are afraid to go to bed till he returns. There is no feeling of security with only women in this big, grim, and hollow-sounding house, and though we are both free from all superstitious fears, and far from timid, we cannot but be sensible of our unprotected helplessness, left alone, as we are, till the night wanes into morning.

To-night, and for several nights now, we have had our courage put to the test, and most decidedly it has not been found wanting... The first evening, about 11 o'clock, sitting with the drawing-room door open, a man's face was clearly seen above the balustrade, while the old-fashioned size and the carvings of the supports hid his form from our view. Instantly we both jumped up, and as instantly started forward. Both thought that he had come up by mistake, or purposely, perhaps, to see someone in the house. Ere we could speak he was gone.

The servants, not having gone to bed, were summoned, told to go and fasten the iron gate, and reprimanded for their negligence in forgetting to do so. The gas was alight, illuminating the house from the ground-floor to the very roof of the house. We stood upon the landing. The servants went down, protesting that they had locked and fastened securely the gate: and so they had—it was securely fast.

Then I went for the key, and downstairs, and satisfied myself of the fact, and also went below to satisfy myself that all doors and every place below were firmly secured for the night.

Now, then, how did that man get in?—or rather, how did he get out? It is possible he might have been concealed during the evening, and so have been on the stairs—but where could he go, instantaneously as he had been followed, and by both of us, neither of us suspecting anything more than that he had obtained entrance through the forgetfulness of the servants, and nothing doubting but that he would wait to be spoken to? Where could
he go?—for in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye, the spot where he had appeared was vacant.

Well, when my husband came home I told him. He treated it as a good joke, laughed at our bewilderment, and said we must all have been asleep and dreaming. He has such a supreme contempt for any supposition of the supernatural. Has no belief in spiritual visions, in "ghosts," or visions of the night. He is far too practical, and only derides my credulity. At present I have been able to keep all suspicion of these things from the household.

Twice lately, sitting up during the night hours, my L. and I have been disturbed by that same appearance on the stairs, and each time have done our best to discover the mystery. The face is pale to sickliness, and the eye steady and mournful. The figure is shrouded in a sort of dark, shadowy indistinctness, and his departure is sudden and noiseless. The first time he came we slowly advanced to him, side by side, quite silently, and with firm decision of manner, intending to show him our determination to enforce an interview, and ask explanation for his intrusion. All! he is gone.

The second time I was reading an interesting book. L. looked up from her employment and, seeing him, touched me gently (we were close together). when both of us made a sudden dart forward, only to find the spot vacant which had, one instant previously, been occupied by his face and figure. It is impossible that we can be mistaken or deceived. No, no, we are not. There is no misapprehension, because no fear quells our courage; no cowardice prevents the full action of our powers of perception; no alarm frustrates our intention of grappling with him if we can, or of pursuing him, or of holding him if we can come up with him. We are on our guard against surprise, and our nerves steady, prepared to make a decided unequivocal effort to find out who and what this nocturnal intruder may be.

But nothing avails; he is not here; he is not anywhere near. Looking keenly at him one moment, the next he has fled, quick as a flash of lightning. But he was standing there; we both saw him, positively and undoubtedly.

It is useless to contend against facts. Nervous terrors and timorous imaginations have nothing whatever to do in suggesting the various appearances and the indescribable sounds which pervade the rooms, the corners, and the recesses of this great house. Superstition might indeed supply one person with food for miracles or for belief in deception and witchcraft; but when there are several witnesses of all ages there must be a foundation of truth, and, at all events, each and every one could not be deceived. If all that is going on here is a strange delusion, then all would not be affected at the same moment. If it is but a mere sensation or impression, then it would only be conceived by one mind, not by all. If it were capable of detection, then so many persons gathered together would surely find out that it was imposture and deception.

Besides, there is nothing done to annoy any one of us; no attempt is made to frighten or even to surprise us. There seems no system or organisation in all these mysteries. In addition to the little old woman who goes about the upper floor, and the man who comes occasionally upon the stairs,
there are other sights and sounds, and other nocturnal disturbances. Very often a babe is heard wailing and crying in the kitchen, generally in the evening. We heard these piteous wailings when we first came here to live, and then imagined that a babe was really within hearing; but when, after the lapse of many months, the sounds were still those of a new-born babe, no stronger in tone or different in expression, then we began to wonder, and to strive to penetrate the mystery, and are constrained to believe that no living infant causes those sounds.

Then again, close to my bedroom door, in a recess, there are notes of the most mournful singing the ear can hear—real notes—soft and sad, but clear and thrilling. Then, in an instant, the notes are prolonged, and change into short, sharp screams of agony. Then total silence.

All this takes place in the very interior of the house—in parts where there is no outside wall, but where the wall, thick and massive, divides one room from another.

Incredulous as my husband has always been when I have complained of our incomprehensible and spectral visitants, yet last night he was penetrated with the belief that there must be truth in our representations, at all events. So deeply is he impressed by the solemn assurance of his own scrutiny that a vision did really appear to him, that doubting, unbelieving, and sceptic as he is, he confesses himself thrilled and pervaded with unwonted sensations of awe and excitement. I must write it down. It all happened in this way:

After all outer doors were shut and business hours over, my husband had for several evenings past devoted his leisure to writing, and to sorting the piles of letters and papers which had accumulated during his illness. Correspondence was behindhand; so shutting himself up in his own private office, he directed all his thoughts, energy, and attention to reducing the number of letters unanswered, and arranging papers and documents in their several places. His orders were peremptory to the servants to allow no one to disturb him, and I took my part in securing to him that perfect freedom from interruption, so absolutely needed in such an occupation.

This evening the silence in the house was almost oppressive. My husband had not once come up to the drawing-room since he left it after dinner. It was now 11 o'clock, and the hour for the servants to retire for the night, except when we had company. I sat with the door open that evening. I have a habit of doing this when I am alone. The large landing and the outlet gives more freedom and air. The door of the kitchen is in close proximity—an outer door—and always kept shut. Opposite the drawing-room door, across the landing, is the staircase, the balustrade of the stairs forming one side of the landing. All at once there was a great tramping upon the office-floor below; the door of the private office was flung open with much violence. My husband, in angry tones, called to the servant, and demanded "how they dare permit a stranger to come to him at that time of night?" Which servant had disobeyed him?

No one had done so.

"Don't deny it. Who is the woman? When did she come, and what does she want? I see no one at this hour of the night. Let her be here tomorrow if she wants me; show her out and fasten the gate again."

All this was spoken as if the person who had disturbed him was standing
there still; addressed to the domestics that she might know his rules had been transgressed, and that she might hear him say so. It was in vain that the servants protested they had let no one in; and had seen no one pass up or down the stairs, that every door and window was fastened and secure. Astonishment kept my husband mute; he stood still, lost to all outward impressions for some time, like one in a dream. Then, with a sort of shudder he moved away from the door of his office, from whence he had not stirred, and told the servants to go to bed; he would find out on the morrow who had taken the liberty of intruding, or perhaps, the person would call again in the morning.

This was to them, but as soon as we were alone he told me all that had occurred. . . . . Absorbed in deep thought, searching amongst his papers for one of great importance, he raised his head from them, and saw, just within his office doorway, a little old lady standing. Even though an unwelcome intruder, his politeness did not fail; so rising directly he addressed her. Finding that she neither spoke nor moved, but only looked at him, he advanced a little, speaking again. This forward movement made no alteration; still she was mute, still not a finger stirred, the eyes still fixed upon him with a soft, sweet expression, the face very pallid. After allowing sufficient time for a reply (even if the old lady should be short of breath from coming upstairs), and still receiving none, he approached nearer, when she moved gradually and softly a little further into the room, yet scarcely nearer to him, for the room is very spacious. Again he altered his position while she remained motionless, thus bringing himself into closer contact with her; still she was motionless.

Making now a quick step towards her, determined to ascertain the cause of her silence—lo! she was gone! To his amazement he lost all trace of her in one moment. It was then we must have heard the commotion below. . . . After telling me thus far, my husband paused in his narrative. Again he was wrapt in deep meditation. His face was agitated, his lips quivered; evidently he was mastering strong emotion. Rousing himself from the reverie which I had allowed to remain unbroken, he continued to relate the incidents of the visit, and his own conclusions upon it.

Well, he said he didn't know whether his office door was open while she was there; he knew that he had shut it, and did not recollect opening it when he missed her from the room. The gas was giving a full blaze of light, and no shadow of darkness rested anywhere to deceive him. The whole place was illumined.

No suspicion entered his mind of anything like visionary object or apparitions; his whole attention was rivetted upon his letters and papers, and his only idea was that this old lady was in some great trouble, had come to him for advice, and that her age and probable distress might be the excuse for her untimely visit. It was with such considerations that he first addressed her as he would any lady who came to him upon office business, but afterwards, when he became annoyed by her silence, he permitted his irritation to be visible both in voice and manner.

His description of her appearance is this:—"A little old lady, with a very pale face, and her hands clasped before her, a cap round her face, and a dark bonnet, with strings tied under her chin." When I asked him what dress,
then he is at fault. He only saw a dark form. Well, he cannot say, he was only looking at her face. It must have been a dark dress, he believes—it looked dark. She moved with a gentle, gliding motion; looked at him most intently; did not move her hands. His face is quite troubled, and he is much excited. Says that he feels bewildered and embarrassed, and is most unwilling to admit the reality of the vision.

I believe that he would not have named it at all could he have anticipated the termination of the scene. As it is, no explanation can do away with the fact, and it is useless to deny what he has once admitted. Either way, he is in a dilemma, from which he cannot escape. He sums it all up by saying, "I have told you exactly what took place. I know what I saw, and am quite aware that it cannot be explained. As it is, so let it rest." He will never again laugh at us for our absurd notions and experiences of "ghosts," I am quite certain. He is touched in a way that he himself cannot comprehend. He does not like it—his own feelings puzzle him. It will be a long time before he loses the novel impression aroused in his mind by that visit of our little old lady, who seems to wander about our house whenever and wheresoever she pleases.

In the above narrative I only wish to lay stress on the appearance of the little old lady. The man on the stairs, who seems to have appeared always in the same place and to have been seen from the same point of view, may possibly have been an illusion; and the sounds, as Mrs. Simpson suggests, may have been due to wind.

It should be noted that though Miss Mary Vatas-Simpson has not at any other time seen apparitions, the family seem to have a special faculty for doing so. Mrs. Vatas-Simpson and another of her daughters have seen them in two or three houses besides this one, but quite different in each house. Mrs. Vatas-Simpson has also, it would seem, some power of receiving telepathic communications (as one would, perhaps, expect to be the case with a person who sees ghosts, supposing these to be a form of communication with the dead), for she has given us an account of several veridical dreams about a son absent in Australia, between whom and herself there was a very close sympathy.

In the narrative I will next quote (G. 108), it will be seen that the ghost, which has a very well marked character, apparently followed the principal percipient from one house to another.

The committee are not allowed to give names, and the initials used are not the right ones. Mr. Podmore says: "Miss A. T., a younger sister of the principal percipient, Miss T., related to me the incidents described below in great detail, and after questioning her at some length, I drew up the following account in her presence, reading over to her each paragraph as it was written. Miss A. T. has not actually seen the figure herself, but she has heard the particulars of each appearance from the witnesses of it, when the details were still fresh
in their memory, and she has repeatedly heard the whole matter discussed in family conclave, when the disturbances were still going on. Moreover, she has herself heard some of the strange noises described. The account has since been read through by Miss T. herself, and though she declines to give us any further particulars, she admits that this account is 'fairly correct.' Though the narrative, therefore, falls in value somewhat below a first-hand account it is very far superior to an ordinary second-hand ghost story, and may, I think, be taken as almost entirely correct.

Mrs. T. and the unmarried brother mentioned in the narrative are both dead. The family, it should be added, have again removed, but the ghost has not, apparently, followed them."

In 1870 the T—— family took a house in West Brompton on lease for seven years. They entered the house in the spring of that year. This house, it would appear, is now, and has been since 1877, in the occupancy of Captain F——. Captain F—— has been asked by a friend of the T—— family whether anything unusual has occurred in the house during his tenancy, and he has replied in the negative. There would seem, however, to be some reason for doubting the accuracy of this statement.

Nothing remarkable occurred during the first 18 months of the T—— family occupying the house. In the autumn of 1871, when Mrs. T—— and Miss T—— were going upstairs to bed, leaving the hall in total darkness, Miss T——, who was then on one of the upper landings, thought she heard her brother entering the house, and looked over the bannisters. She saw a grey figure leave the dining-room, cross the hall, and disappear down the kitchen stairs. Miss T—— told nobody of what she had seen. This was the first time that anything abnormal was seen in the house.

During their tenancy of the house this same figure was seen repeatedly by at least five independent witnesses,* Miss T—— being the one who saw it most frequently. The figure was very tall, dressed in grey drapery. The drapery also partially enveloped the head, though allowing the features to be seen. The "grey" was a light grey—perhaps such a colour as a white object would assume in partial darkness. The hands, it would seem, hung down and were clasped in front of the figure. The expression of the face was very calm and peaceful—a good face. There was no hair on the face, and it was only from the unusual height of the figure that it was supposed to be that of a man.

There was nothing indistinct about the outline of the figure. The drapery was shapeless—that is, it had no definite shape, such as that of a dressing-gown, or a monk's gown, —but the lines of it were firm and clear. But the whole figure was shadowy and unsubstantial-looking. It was never seen save in the dark, and would appear, therefore, to have been faintly luminous, for it was seen in all parts of the house, and sometimes in rooms almost entirely dark. The figure was seen chiefly in Miss T——'s room, or on the landing near; but it was also seen on the bath-room steps, on the stairs, in the

* It does not seem quite clear that the figure was always identical.
dining-room, and in other bedrooms. The figure never moved its head or hands, and never spoke or made, apparently, any sound (with one exception to be noted below).

Sometimes Miss T— would see it when in bed, and she would then frequently put her head under the clothes to avoid it. But if she saw it when she was about the house she would always look at it until the figure vanished. But she is quite unable to say whether she looked at it for minutes or seconds. It would finally vanish quite suddenly. Occasionally, however, it would glide away into another room. The figure never walked; it glided. There was never any sound accompanying its movements.

The figure was next seen by an old nurse, Mrs. N——, who met it on the stairs (in the autumn of the same year, 1871). She looked at the figure until it vanished. She also told nobody at the time of what she had seen.

Some time afterwards a friend of the family was staying in the house. She complained, on the morning after her arrival, that she had been kept awake by the noise of furniture, &c., being moved about in the rooms above her. These rooms were occupied, and no one else had heard the noises complained of. But the occurrence led to a general family discussion. Unaccountable noises had been often heard before in the house, and Miss T—— and Mrs. N—— then mentioned, for the first time, the figure which they had seen.

Mr. T——, the brother, also saw the figure frequently; on one occasion it was in the hall, when he opened the front door. On another when returning from his club late one night, he saw the figure from the street, standing at the drawing-room window.

Miss T—— frequently saw the figure in her room standing at her bedside, and on the landing near her room. Sometimes she woke in the night, and found it at her bedside.

N——, the cook, complained angrily to his wife that one of the other servants would sometimes come into his room at night. He had, at that time, not heard of the figure being seen, but he subsequently connected these appearances with the figure.

R—— T——, then a little boy of seven, was sleeping in the same room as Miss T——. He complained one morning that he had had a "horrid night"! he had been awake, and had seen L—— (Miss T——) standing at his bedside in her night-dress, "only it wasn't L——." Of course, nothing had ever been told the child about the figure which had been seen. It is not clear whether any peculiar feelings accompanied the appearance of the figure; but Miss T—— when in her room, frequently expressed a feeling which she says is quite indescribable. This feeling she always attributed to the presence of a figure in the room, though she was unable on such occasions to see it.

Miss T—— would very often hear footsteps and sighs in her room, as if someone were walking about and sighing. The most unaccountable noises were heard all over the house throughout the whole of these seven years—most frequently in the autumn. Footsteps, knocks at the door, bells rung in the daytime, &c., &c. There were also noises as if a heavy weight, such as a bundle of clothes, had been dropped from a great height on to one of
the landings—the sound was loud, but muffled. These noises, except the bell-ringing, were heard almost invariably at night.

Sometimes two or three people heard the noises, or were woke up by them. At other times only one person would hear them. On one New Year's Eve, when Miss T—— and N—— were alone in the house, N—— came up from the kitchen to the dining-room where Miss T—— was sitting, to see what was the matter. He had heard loud noises, as of furniture being dragged about in the dining-room. Miss T—— had heard nothing, and the house seemed perfectly quiet.

On another occasion Miss T—— heard the same noise, as of furniture being moved, &c., in the room above hers, which was occupied by her brother, Mr. T——. She went up to see what was the matter, and knocked at his door, but he was fast asleep. These noises, as of furniture being moved about—always in the room above—were of frequent occurrence.

This house formerly belonged to a Mr. G——, an artist, who has now sold it. He was very anxious for Mrs. T—— to buy it. A few months after the T—— family had been in the house, and before they had experienced anything unusual, Mr. G—— came to see Mrs. T—— and asked her if she was quite comfortable in the house. As she rented the house unfurnished, the question struck her as odd, and she remarked upon it at the time.

In the autumn of 1877 the T—— family removed to another house in the same neighbourhood, where they remained until April, 1880. Miss T—— was abroad during the winters of 1877 and 1878; but was in the house during the summer months of the latter year. She finally returned in the spring of 1879. It is to be noted that the T——'s had never mentioned the subject of visions and disturbances to even their most intimate friends whilst they were still in the first house, but on leaving the house, believing themselves to be free from their persecutors, they mentioned the subject freely. In the spring of 1879 Miss T—— heard the same noise as before—footsteps and sighs—but fainter. They gradually, however, increased in intensity until they became as bad as ever. She did not mention the subject. The noises, however, in the autumn were heard by all the household—including Miss A. T——, my informant, who being only a child, had not heard them in the other house. They were even more loud and frequent than hitherto, and their character had somewhat changed. Footsteps were heard as before; doors were banged, where no doors or only locked doors were; there was a noise as of a metal tea tray being rolled downstairs.

There was, also, frequently a sound of a person breathing heavily, and walking about, heard in the bedrooms. Knocks two or three times repeated were also heard at the doors.

A married brother was staying in the house with his wife and little girl of three years. One night they all three heard the sound as of a person walking up and down the room and breathing loudly. Mrs. T—— struck a light and lit the gas, when the noises ceased. They recommenced, however, when the gas was turned out.

One night in September, 1879, when H—— T——, a boy of thirteen, had been ill for many months, and was sleeping in the back dining-room, with Mrs. T—— in the same room to attend upon him, they both heard a noise as of a door opening into a third room on the dining-room floor being
opened, and the window of that room being thrown open. The door then banged, and a match was heard to be struck outside. All the household were upstairs in bed, and the boy became ill with fright. Mrs. T—— had to attend at once to him and so did not open the door. In the morning the window was found bolted, and the door of the back room locked.

This noise, as of a match being struck, was afterwards heard several times, both in the middle of the day and night, and by several persons. Also in different parts of the house; but always outside a door.

From this time, until the date of the boy's death, a fortnight or three weeks afterwards, the noises were louder than at any other time, and disturbed the boy's rest at night.

On Christmas Day, 1879, Miss T——, going to early service, saw the figure standing just below her, at the top of the bath-room stairs. She saw the figure again that afternoon at the foot of her bed, when she had gone up in the dusk without a light. She saw the figure again, more than once before she left the house. On one occasion, when sleeping in the same room with Mrs. T——, Miss T—— woke and saw the figure standing between the beds, near the foot. There was a noise as of a parcel being dropped on the floor, and the figure vanished. The noise woke Mrs. T——, who wanted to know what the matter.

A child of three years (the same as before mentioned) woke up one night with a scream, saying that something had come to take her away. After this occasion the child refused to be left alone, as long as she stayed in the house.

A housemaid met the figure standing on the stairs one evening, and ran down in great fear to tell the other servants.

A nurse, on another occasion, saw a figure which she supposed at the time to be that of her mistress, leaving the bedroom at night.

It is to be noted that during these nine years Mrs. T—— and Miss A. T——, and two younger children, who were constantly living in the house, never saw the figure. Nor did any other members of the family, except those mentioned, though an elder brother stayed until 1875 with his family in the first house, and a cousin lived with them for 18 months in the second house.

It will be observed that in the cases I have quoted or mentioned the ghost has not been traced beyond a single occupancy of the house, except in the one instance where its character seemed to change with the tenants to whom it appeared. It is true that in other cases there are vague reports of previous haunting, but nothing that can be relied on. Nothing can be inferred from this, however, as, except in the case of the weeping ghost in widow's garb, where we seem pretty clearly to have heard about the beginning of the haunting, there is no more evidence of the ghost's previous non-appearance than there is of its appearance.

There is in certain cases evidence of the apparently complete cessation of haunting, but here again it is difficult to draw any certain inference, because the analogy of experimental thought-transference would certainly lead us to expect that the faculty for seeing ghosts should vary in different people and at different times, so that the apparent absence of
the ghost might arise simply from the absence of anyone capable of seeing it, and because the long and irregular intervals that are liable to occur between manifestations make it difficult to determine what length of interval warrants us in concluding that there will be no more. It is worth while, however, in this connection, to give a narrative (G. 317) of a ghost traced back through a considerably longer period than any other yet, I think, in the collection. I give it with some hesitation, as we have it only at second-hand, and it, and in a less degree the narrative last quoted, and one given as an example of collective hallucination, are the only ones that I shall give in this paper where none of the most important evidence is at first-hand, but it seems to be carefully told, and, I should think, may safely be trusted for its main statements. It is much to be regretted that after taking the trouble to make the investigation Mr. Hill did not take the additional trouble to record the results in writing. The narrative is given to us by the Rev. Chas. O. Starbuck, Andover, Mass., U.S.A., a Congregational minister, and described by Mr. Alfred R. Nichols, of 32, Lawrence Hall, Cambridge, Mass., as "a man of much scholarship and absolute trustworthiness."

I wish to give an account of what I call "a well authenticated apparition." I wish to give it, not because it is any better attested than a hundred others, nor because it is in the least startling, for a quieter ghost never was; but because there is so little in it that is unique, and it is therefore an excellent type of the better sort of such accounts, and because the facts are such as cannot possibly be strained into an explanation that treats them as the effects of one or two excited imaginations, and also because their entire want of purpose or dramatic effect makes them more credible, and lastly, because they rest on so eminent and unimpeachable an authority. They were communicated to me in all their details, and in repeated conversations, by the late Hon. Richard Hill, of the Island of Jamaica. Mr. Hill was a gentleman of eminent character and worth, a privy councillor of the island, but much more distinguished as the most eminent naturalist of the West Indies. Charles Kingsley, in his charming book on the West Indies, speaks of Mr. Hill as a man whom it was an honour to know, and regrets that not visiting Jamaica he had not had the opportunity to enjoy his acquaintance. He died about six years ago in the fulness of years and honours, and in the fulness of a Christian faith.

Mr. Hill, somewhere, I believe, about 1840, took a house in Spanishtown, the capital of Jamaica. The house was of brick, and was thought by Mr. Hill, who was a great antiquary, to have been built before 1655, at a time when St. Jago de la Vega was still a Spanish city. There was nothing remarkable about the dwelling beyond any other house suited for the use of a family in good circumstances. Mr. Hill, it appears, moved into it quite unaware that there was anything connected with it above the common. Nor, in the series of facts which he related to me, are there more than one or two which of themselves amount to anything. It is the combination alone which gives them importance.

Mr. Hill, I may remark, was a bachelor, and his widowed sister, Mrs.
Harrison, lived with him and kept house for him. The shutters of his bedroom were each in two pieces. One night it chanced that the upper pieces had been left open, and the rain had beaten in. In the morning he complained to his sister, who promised that the neglect should not occur again. The next evening he was lying in bed awake, while a faint light came into the room from a hall lamp that shone through the transom. While lying thus he saw the door opened, and a woman enter the room, cross the floor to the window, and, as it seemed to him, look up at it. Her face was muffled, and her whole garb peculiar, but, in the faint light, he supposed her to be Ann, his sister's confidential servant. He took it for granted that having just beheld herself of the shutters, she had come in, unaware that he was in the room, to make sure that they were duly fastened. The woman then turned and went out, but as she was leaving the room Mr. Hill called "Ann!" She gave no answer, and closed the door. Supposing that she was startled at finding that he was in bed, he thought nothing of it. In the morning he casually remarked to his sister that Ann had been in his room the night before, and had been thrown quite out of countenance by discovering that he was in bed and awake. "Oh!" said his sister, "Ann would have known better than to go into your room at such an hour." She then summoned Ann, who confirmed her mistress's statement, but intimated, with a mysterious look, that she could give an opinion as to who the intruder was. Mr. Hill then learned that whispers were current in the household to the effect that there was something more than natural in the new house. On what these surmises were founded will presently appear.

Mrs. Harrison herself had thus far not seen the strange visitor, and her little experience with her would not have amounted to much taken by itself. Her bedroom opened into the dining-room, into which a door also opened from the hall, or from some other room, upon two or three steps. This door was at the head of Mrs. Harrison's bed, divided from it by the partition. One night Mrs. Harrison heard it open, and someone come down into the dining-room. She was startled, but presently concluded that a chance breeze had blown the door open and deceived her ear by counterfeiting the sound of footsteps. The next night, however, the door was unmistakably opened by someone who came down the steps and began pacing round and round the dining-table. Mrs. Harrison was now thoroughly frightened, although what had happened acquired significance only from its fitting in so perfectly with what took place at other times.

The second time Mr. Hill saw his former visitor he had been asleep, and awakened with a start, such as we sometimes give when another is gazing at us. He found her standing at the foot of the bed, and apparently looking fixedly down at him, although the garb which she appeared to wear concealed her face. He asked her who she was, and what she wanted. She made no answer, but turned and went out.

Putting together his own remembrances and the description of others who had seen her, he came to the conclusion that she wore the garb which was in use in the colony in the reign of George the First, that is about 115 years earlier.

He only knew of her coming once again into his bedroom. There was
an old negro woman, to whom, in the intermediate period of apprenticeship between slavery and full freedom, which prevailed in the island between 1834 and 1838, he had, as stipendiary magistrate, placed in charge of the interests of the half-emancipated negroes, had opportunity to show peculiar kindness. The old woman's gratitude, like a true negro's, knew no bounds. Whenever she came into Spanishtown from her little place a few miles out, she would be sure to visit her benefactor, bringing some little present—a few cocoanuts, a few yams, or a bunch of bananas. And once, when he was absent from town, her gratitude took the grotesque form of insisting on being allowed to spread her mat at night in his bedroom and sleep there. Mrs. Harrison humoured her; but in the night the door opened, and this mysterious lady came in. It must be that the old woman had never been told of her, or else even her gratitude would never have given her the courage to sleep in a haunted spot. However this may be, she at once surmised a ghost, and rushing out in great affright, dragged her mat to the stable, and spent the rest of the night there.

At another time a new servant-girl had just come. When night fell, she was told to spread her mat in the veranda. Chairs were standing about here and there in it, as they had been used through the day. But in the dead of the night the servant-maid heard them swung back, one by one, against the wall, and some one begin to pace back and forth along the porch. Like a true negro, she too, surmised a ghost, and rushing into the bedroom of another maidservant, squeezed herself into bed with her as well as she could. In the morning she tremulously asked Mrs. Harrison: "Missis, do 'perrita walk this house?" Whether she soon left, I cannot say, but my impression is that my friend was obliged to submit to pretty frequent changes of servants about this time, though I cannot be sure that I was so informed.

Another person, a former servant, had more nerve. This was a respectable and estimable mulatto woman who had had the charge of Mrs. Harrison's little girl in her infancy. She came once to pay a visit to her former mistress and her little foster child, and at night she spread her mat for rest in an unfurnished chamber, through the windows of which the full tropical moonlight poured in. The next morning she said to Mrs. Harrison: "Missis, did you come into my room last night?" Mrs. Harrison, at once imagining what had happened, replied evasively, wishing to lead the nurse to believe that she had. But she was not to be deceived. "Oh, no," she said, "it was not you. You do not wear ——," mentioning a kind of slipper, dragging at the heel, the name of which I cannot recall, but which is now worn only by the women of the common people, and which, I fancy, is going out of use even among them, having probably, like so many styles, descended to them from a higher rank. The nurse then went on to say that in the night the door of her sleeping-room opened, and this same lady (whom, having seen in the full moonlight, she was able to describe), came in, and began to march round and round her mat, apparently looking down fixedly at her, although I do not think that at this time, or any other time, her muffler even permitted her face to be seen. The worthy nurse was terribly frightened, but being a woman of great nerve she held her ground, and after a while her unwelcome visitant went out.

One day, before or after this (for I am unable to give the sequence of
these incidents), Mrs. Harrison, being indisposed, sent out a female servant to bring her a cup of tea or something of the sort from the kitchen, which, as usual there, was a little distance away—across a paved yard. The servant met this lady midway, and supposing her to be some stranger, and probably surprised to find one dressed so strangely wandering about the servants, quarters, asked her what she wanted. She turned, and with some sharpness retorted: "What is that to you?" This was the only time she is ever known to have spoken. Assuming her to have been from the other side, it would seem as if not even death could extinguish the slave-holding pride of an old colonist. Search was made for her, after the servant had returned to make report to her mistress, but she was not to be found.

One day Mrs. Harrison was receiving a call from another lady in the drawing-room, which on one side opened on the veranda. Mrs. Harrison's little daughter and the little daughter of her visitor were in one of the windows looking out upon the veranda while their mothers were talking. Suddenly the children uttered an exclamation, and the ladies, looking up, saw this same strange visitor passing the window at which their daughters were sitting. She appeared to be coming from the street, and to be going towards the other end of the veranda, at which there was only a window. All four looked into the gallery after her, but she was gone.

By this time Mr. Hill began to be greatly interested in his mysterious guest, or hostess, as we may choose to take it. He therefore determined to sound his landlord, a young gentleman to whom the house had passed from an uncle. As I believe his name to have been Osborne, I shall call him so. "Mr. Osborne," said his tenant one day, "there is an interesting peculiarity about your house, as to which I wish to question you. I hope you will answer me frankly, for, in my mind, it adds ten pounds a year to the value of the house, so you need not be afraid I am going to beat you down in the rent." He then described these various appearances, and added: "Now what I want to ask you is, was this visitor known here in your uncle's time?" "Since you think so well of her, Mr. Hill," answered his landlord, "I will be frank' with you. She was well known here in my uncle's time." Mr. Hill next, being or becoming acquainted with a lady who had been in her youth a frequent visitor at the house, asked her what she knew of this mysterious stranger. This friend informed him that the unbidden guest was as familiar then as she had been since he had become a tenant. He then prosecuted his inquiries through the little city of 7,000 people, and was able to trace her back to about 1806, at which time, he was assured by his informants, no one knew how much longer she had been accustomed to frequent the house. At that time, he was told, the house was conveyed by its owner, a Mrs. Deane, or some such name, to a purchaser. As the parties to the sale were sitting in the drawing-room, about to sign the necessary documents, this same lady was seen, as once afterwards, to pass along the veranda in front of the drawing-room windows. One of the company, noticing her quaint, unaccustomed attire, asked Mrs. Deane who that old-fashioned visitor of hers was. "Oh," said she carelessly, "it is a neighbour of ours who comes in occasionally," and the matter passed.

I may remark that, although this personage sometimes appeared to come
from the street, or to go towards it, Mr. Hill's inquiries brought no information that she had ever been seen outside of his house and court-yard. This, in a small city of 7,000 inhabitants, the great bulk of whom were negroes, cuts off the supposition that she could have harboured elsewhere, and resorted at all times of day and night to a neighbouring house. This would be an incredible explanation even if it only applied to a year or two. Applied to a space of time outnumbering a generation, and extending back beyond a time within the memory of anyone known to Mr. Hill that was acquainted with the house, the explanation becomes simply preposterous.

In 1848 the interior of the house was completely remodelled, and she was never seen again. It was not that any hidden passages were blocked up, for the house had nothing mysterious about it except its mysterious visitor. But inside it was no longer the same dwelling. It appeared, as Mr. Hill said, as if she had permission to abide so long as things were as they had been.

Had such an inexplicable manifestation occurred to one alone, or to more than one whose minds were full of the story, or in one part of the house, or only at night, or for a few months, a plausible explanation would be easier. But, as the account shows, she was seen at all times of the day and of the night, in various parts of the house and in the court-yard, by persons who had heard of her and by persons who had never heard of her; by persons who, when they saw her, at once imagined her to be a ghost, and by persons who never suspected but that she was a living woman; while, of the latter, some came to believe her a spirit, and some remained wholly unaware that she was suspected to be anything of the kind. This last point alone is not covered by anything that occurred during Mr. Hill's occupancy of the house, although it is reasonably well attested.

I may remark that Mr. Hill, having African blood in his veins, may be presumed to have inherited with it a certain share of superstition; yet he was an eminently well educated man, schooled in England, and accustomed, through a long life, to the close observation and weighing of facts, both as a magistrate and as a naturalist. Before I had ever heard of the existence of Charles Darwin from anyone else, Mr. Hill mentioned him to me as an able young correspondent of his, and quoted with just gratification a sentence of a recent letter from Darwin to him: "You are an observer after my own heart." And in the previous narrative all that is really involved is his veracity, which is unimpeached. The facts were, for the most part, such as occurred to others, and the combination of them is, of course, open to any one to make for himself. He affected no mystery, and made no confidence of it, but freely communicated all the particulars to anyone of his numerous visitors who showed any desire to ascertain them. I may remark that, rich as Jamaica and the other Antilles presumably are in ghostly legends, Mr. Hill, during my long acquaintance with him, never adverted to one of them. The spirit of the precise antiquary always prevailed in him over that of the story teller. And in his individual experience, with one exception, I never learned that anything had ever happened which bore the stamp of a visit from beyond the grave.

* This one exception was the appearance of a friend apparently at the moment of death.
There are in the collection perhaps half-a-dozen other well-attested narratives of similar apparitions in the same house to different persons, who cannot easily be supposed to have been in a state of excited expectation; but, for various reasons, they do not seem to me quite on a par, from an evidential point of view, with those above given; though they certainly ought not to be left out of account in estimating the whole evidence. It is, of course, quite possible by supposing a sufficient amount of unconscious inaccuracy—varied occasionally by conscious or semi-conscious inventiveness—on the part of our witnesses, to explain away all these narratives, and any number of similar ones that may be hereafter collected. And, as I have already said, we have no exact measure by which to compare the improbability of the required amount of inaccuracy or inventiveness with the improbability involved in supposing the narratives to be substantially true. Hence I can only say that having made every effort—as my paper will, I hope, have shown—to exercise a reasonable scepticism, I yet do not feel equal to the degree of unbelief in human testimony necessary to avoid accepting at least provisionally the conclusion that there are, in a certain sense, haunted houses, i.e., that there are houses in which similar quasi-human apparitions have occurred at different times to different inhabitants, under circumstances which exclude the hypothesis of suggestion or expectation. If this general conclusion be accepted, the evidence for the authenticity of the particular narratives here given appears to me sufficiently good to justify us in regarding them provisionally as accounts, in the main accurate, of actual experiences, and, accordingly, I propose to review and compare these experiences carefully, in order to ascertain what positive or negative characteristics they have in common, and what explanation, if any, their common characteristics suggest.

In the first place, we find no foundation for the very general idea that ghosts haunt old houses only or even mainly.

Secondly, as I have already said, the evidence for appearances on certain anniversaries rests, so far as this collection is concerned, on one story only.

Thirdly, the evidence connecting such appearances with some crime or tragedy is extremely slight. Mr. X. Z. believes he identified his ghost with a person who committed murder and suicide; the other ghost, recognised from his portrait, had died of delirium tremens; but I have adduced reasons for some slight doubt as to the unmistakable recognition in both these cases. A native woman had been murdered near where the ayah appeared to Sir Arthur and Lady Becher. The ghost supposed to be that of Miss A. vaguely resembled in figure a lady who had lived unhappily and died mysteriously in the house, and the weeping lady in widow's garb resembles in figure a former unhappy inmate. But
this is all. In nine cases we have not only heard no rumour of a tragedy, but no attempt is made to conjecture whose ghost it is that is seen. In the four remaining ones there is a report of a violent death, but so vague and hazy as to suggest that it has arisen subsequently to the appearance, owing to the supposed necessity of accounting for it in some such way. As regards identification, moreover, it must be observed that in many cases—seven out of the eighteen I have discussed—there is not enough seen of the face to make certain recognition at all possible. In this connection there is a curious point to be noticed. In these eighteen narratives we have no first-hand account of a ghost appearing undoubtedly in the dress of a distinctly bygone age. Mr. X. Z.'s ghost would apparently have been entitled to such a dress, but both as a man and as a ghost he affected a dressing-gown, which is a vague costume. The blue lady in the old manor house appeared with her hair dressed in Hogarth fashion to one percipient, but we have his account at second-hand only, and both the percipients whose accounts we have at first-hand saw her with her hair down her back. Vague costumes, not specially appropriate to any particular period, are somewhat the most numerous in the eighteen selected cases, though in seven or eight of them the dress seems to have been such as would not at all have surprised the percipients if worn by a living person in the daytime. And these remarks apply not only to these eighteen narratives, but with comparatively few exceptions to the whole collection. It is therefore the more remarkable that among all the fixed local ghosts described in the collection, who, by their costume, would seem to be connected with the more or less recently dead, we have no single case at first-hand, and I think only two dubious ones at second-hand, of an apparition of anyone known to any of the percipients during life.

Fourthly, there is a total absence of any apparent object or intelligent action on the part of the ghost. If its visits have an object, it entirely fails to explain it. It does not communicate important facts. It does not point out lost wills or hidden treasure. It does not even speak, except in the instance mentioned by Mr. Hill, where the ghost replied, "What is that to you?" to an inquiry; but for this incident there is at best third-hand evidence, and it may have been a mistake. Its very movements are of the simplest description in all the cases that I have selected on evidential grounds.*

* There is among the narratives which I have thought in some respects insufficiently evidenced, a case of a ghost alleged to have been seen by one person only, pointing out a missing will; and I will quote here an account of an apparition (G. 474) which went through very unusually dramatic action. I have not included it among the evidentially first-class instances of haunted houses, because with the amount of detail given I am unable to determine whether the figure seen by different percipients was similar and seen independently. But for the occurrence of the apparitions the evidence
Fifthly, as to the light by which ghosts are seen, no rule can be laid down. They are seen in all kinds of light, from broad daylight to the faint light of dawn—from bright gaslight to the light of a dying fire. Sometimes they seem to be self-luminous, and sometimes to bring with them, as it were, an apparition of light (like Mr. X. Z.'s ghost), so that the whole place appears lighted up, though there is no real light there. The ghost of the man who died of delirium tremens seemed to disappear owing to the gas being turned up; and on the other hand, some apparitions, like ordinary external objects, can no longer be seen when the light goes out. There is even one case where the ghost is described as having been apparently seen in the back of the percipient's head.

Sixthly, as to sounds, again no rule can be laid down. In some cases there are unaccounted-for sounds in houses where ghosts are seen, and in others no sounds beyond what may be noticed anywhere seem to have been observed. Where there are mysterious sounds they have for the most part no obvious connection with the apparitions. The apparition itself rarely appears to make any noise. To hear its footsteps, for instance, seems to be unusual. Sometimes an apparition seems to be heralded by a noise—a sound causing the percipient to look in the direction in which they see the ghost, but it is difficult to say whether these noises are not real, and their connection with the ghost accidental.*

is good. The percipient on this particular occasion was Miss N. Vatas-Simpson, a sister of the lady who as a child saw the little old woman in the house in St. Swithin's Lane.

"When my mother was ill, and I sat up during the night with her, I heard some one trying the lock of our door, which I had locked. I thought it was W. come home late, as usual, so I went up close to the door and whispered through, 'Do not come in; mother's asleep.' I went back to the fire, and I do not know what made me do it, but I gave a great jump, and on looking round found we were no longer alone—a short, stout, elderly man was midway between the bed and the door. He went and stood near the bed, but not close, and while I looked I seemed to know he could do no harm. He stood looking a long time. He clasped and unclasped his hands frequently. Upon the little finger of his left hand he wore a wedding ring, and he turned it round and round in his hand as he stood, and his lips moved, though I could not hear a sound. I tried to flap him away with a towel, as I had heard that a current of air will make these things go sometimes, but to no purpose. He took his own time to go. After seeming to speak to some person, whom I could not see, and pointing to the ceiling a good deal, he moved, I cannot say walked, to the door; it opened; he went out; it closed; and I went, too, to try the door. It was still locked. I never saw him again.

"NETTIE VATAS-SIMPSON.

"September, 1884."

* I said in the earlier part of this paper, that I had thought it best to defer the consideration of the few cases in this collection of unaccounted for physical phenomena; but it is as well to mention here that there are, I think, only two instances in it, of clearly physical phenomena apparently produced by an appari-
Seventhly, the mode of appearance and disappearance of apparitions is also various. The ghost is usually either seen on looking round, as a human being might be, or seems to come in at the door. Sometimes it forms gradually out of what at first seems a cloud-like appearance. I do not think there are any cases of its appearing suddenly in a spot which the percipient was actually looking at and perceived to be vacant before. It disappears suddenly in this way sometimes, and sometimes if the percipient looks away for a moment, it is gone. Sometimes it vanishes in a cloud-like manner, sometimes, retaining its form, it becomes gradually more and more transparent till it is gone. Frequently it disappears through the door, either with or without apparently opening it, or goes into a room where there is no other exit, and where it is not found.

Eighthly, as to the seers of ghosts we can again lay down no rules. The power is not limited by sex, age, or profession. It does not, so far as has yet been ascertained, depend on any obvious conditions of health, temperament, intellect, or emotion. It is not even certain that it is possessed by some persons and not by others, although there are reasons for thinking this probable. If several persons are together when the ghost appears it will sometimes be seen by all and sometimes not, and failure to see it is not always merely the result of not directing the attention towards it. Perhaps the truth may be that we all have potentially the power of seeing such things, but that it requires a special state of mind, or body in us, to coincide with some external cause, and that that coincidence rarely, and in the case of most individuals, never, occurs.

And this brings us to the question, What external cause or causes operate? Assuming provisionally that there are haunted houses, in the sense in which I have used the words, what theory can we form to explain them?

I must confess myself quite unable to form any satisfactory theory;—any theory which makes us feel that if it be true, the phenomena are just what we should expect. I have doubted even whether it is yet of any use attempting to theorise, but I think the investigation has, perhaps, arrived at a point at which it is worth while to formulate such hypotheses as seem to derive any support whatever from the evi-
dence before us, in order that further observations and inquiries may be partly directed to proving or disproving them. I will, therefore, proceed briefly to state and discuss the only four theories that have occurred to me.

The two which I will take first in order assume that the apparitions are due to the agency or presence of the spirits of deceased men.

There is first the popular view, that the apparition is something belonging to the external world—that like ordinary matter it occupies and moves through space, and would be in the room whether the percipient were there to see it or not. This hypothesis involves us in many difficulties, of which one serious one—that of accounting for the clothes of the ghost—has often been urged, and never, I think, satisfactorily answered. Nevertheless, I am bound to admit that there is some little evidence tending to suggest this theory. For instance, in the account, of which I have given an abstract, of the weeping lady who has appeared so frequently in a certain house, the following passage occurs: "They went after it [the figure] together into the drawing-room; it then came out and went down the aforesaid passage [leading to the kitchen], but was the next minute seen by another Miss D. . . . come up the outside steps from the kitchen. On this particular day Captain D.'s married daughter happened to be at an upstairs window . . . . and independently saw the figure continue her course across the lawn and into the orchard." A considerable amount of clear evidence to the appearance of ghosts to independent observers in successive points in space, would certainly afford a strong argument for their having a definite relation to space; but in estimating evidence of this kind it would be necessary to know how far the observer's attention had been drawn to the point in question. If it had been a real woman whom the Miss D.'s were observing, we should have inferred, with perfect certainty, from our knowledge that she could not be in two places at once, that she had been successively, in a certain order, in the places where she was seen by the three observers. If they had noted the moments at which they saw her, and comparing notes afterwards, found that according to these notes they had all seen her at the same time, or in some other order to that inferred, we should still feel absolute confidence in our inference, and should conclude that there must be something wrong about the watches or the notes. From association of ideas, it would be perfectly natural to make the same inference in the case of a ghost which looks exactly like a woman. But in the case of the ghost the inference would not be legitimate, because, unless the particular theory of ghosts which we are discussing be true, there is no reason, so far as we know, why it should not appear in two or more places at once. Hence in the case of the ghost a well founded assurance that the appear-
Phantasms were successive would require a careful observation of the times, which, so far as I know, has never been made. On the whole, therefore, I must dismiss the popular theory, as not having, in my opinion, even a prima facie ground for serious consideration.

The theory that I will next examine seems to me decidedly more plausible, from its analogy to the conclusion to which I am brought by the examination of the evidence for phantasms of the living. This theory is that the apparition has no real relation to the external world, but is a hallucination caused in some way by some communication, without the intervention of the senses, between the disembodied spirit and the percipient, its form depending on the mind either of the spirit or of the percipient, or of both. In the case of haunted houses, however, a difficulty meets us that we do not encounter, or at least, rarely encounter, in applying a similar hypothesis to explain phantasms of the living, or phantasms of the dead other than fixed local ghosts. In these cases we have generally to suppose a simple rapport between mind and mind, but in a haunted house we have a rapport complicated by its apparent dependence on locality. It seems necessary to make the improbable assumption, that the spirit is interested in an entirely special way in a particular house, (though possibly this interest may be of a subconscious kind), and that his interest in it puts him into connection with another mind, occupied with it in the way that that of a living person actually there must consciously, or unconsciously be; while he does not get into similar communication with the same, or with other persons elsewhere.

If notwithstanding these difficulties, it be true that haunting is due in any way to the agency of deceased persons, and conveys a definite idea of them to the percipients through the resemblance to them of the apparition, then by patiently continuing our investigations we may expect, sooner or later, to obtain a sufficient amount of evidence to connect clearly the commencement of hauntings with the death of particular persons, and to establish clearly the likeness of the apparition to those persons. The fact that almost everybody is now photographed ought to be of material assistance in obtaining evidence of this latter kind.

My third theory dispenses with the agency of disembodied spirits, but involves us in other and perhaps equally great improbabilities. It is that the first appearance is a purely subjective hallucination and that the subsequent similar appearances both to the original percipient and to others, are the result of the first appearance; unconscious expectancy causing them in the case of the original percipient, and some sort of telepathic communication from the original percipient in the case of others. In fact, it assumes that a tendency to a particular hallucination is in a way infectious. If this theory be
true I should expect to find that the apparently independent appearances after the first, depended on the percipient's having had some sort of intercourse with some one who had seen the ghost before, and that any decided discontinuity of occupancy would stop the haunting. I should also expect to find, as we do in one of the cases I have quoted, that sometimes the supposed ghost would follow the family from one abode to another, appearing to haunt them rather than any particular house.

The fourth theory that I shall mention is one which I can hardly expect to appear plausible, and which, therefore, I only introduce because I think that it corresponds best to a certain part of the evidence;—and, as I have already said, considering the altogether tentative way in which we are inevitably dealing with this obscure subject, it is as well to express definitely every hypothesis which an impartial consideration of the facts suggests. It is that there is something in the actual building itself—some subtle physical influence—which produces in the brain that effect which, in its turn, becomes the cause of a hallucination. It is certainly difficult on this hypothesis alone to suppose that the hallucinations of different people would be similar, but we might account for this by a combination of this hypothesis and the last. The idea is suggested by the case of which I have given an abstract, where the haunting continued through more than one occupancy, but changed its character; and if there be any truth in the theory, I should expect in time to obtain a good deal more evidence of this kind, combined with evidence that the same persons do not as a rule encounter ghosts elsewhere. I should also expect evidence to be forthcoming supporting the popular idea that repairs and alterations of the building sometimes cause the haunting to cease.

As I have said, the evidence before us is quite inadequate to enable us to decide among these theories, or even to say that any one of them is strongly supported by it. The only thing to be done, therefore, is to obtain more evidence, both for the occurrence of the phenomena

* In an earlier part of this paper, I mentioned cases of haunted houses where the apparitions are various, and might therefore all of them be merely subjective hallucinations, sometimes, perhaps, caused by expectancy. It is, of course, also possible to explain these cases by the hypothesis we are now discussing. Another class of cases is, perhaps, worth mentioning in this connection. We have in the collection two cases of what was believed by the narrators to be a quite peculiar feeling of discomfort, in houses where concealed, and long since decomposed bodies were subsequently found. Such feelings are seldom clearly defined enough to have much evidential value, for others, at any rate, than the percipient; even though mentioned beforehand, and definitely connected with the place where the skeleton was. But if there be really any connection between the skeleton and the feeling, it may possibly be a subtle physical influence such as I am suggesting.
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in question, and about the houses where they occur, their former inhabitants and history. The investigation is likely to be a long and laborious one, for the difficulties of tracing back such unrecorded history are often very great, and sometimes insuperable; and even if we could learn all the facts bearing on the question in any particular case, we should still very likely find it difficult to draw the right conclusion, owing to the rare and irregular appearances of most ghosts, and the consequent difficulty of determining definitely the times at which haunting begins or ends. Nevertheless, without such investigation we cannot hope to learn the true explanation of the phenomena; and the evidence already collected seems to warrant us in thinking that it is worth undertaking, and not likely to be fruitless. In the meanwhile, it is to be hoped that all who take an intelligent interest in the subject, and have the good fortune to live in haunted houses themselves, and to see ghosts, will help in the search for the truth, by finding out all they can, both about their own experiences and those of others, and about the history of the houses they live in.

And I should like to say here that it would be a great pity if any one thought that hallucinations, when not veridical, were indications of anything seriously amiss with the brain. This is entirely unsupported by the evidence collected by the Society. Hallucinations are, no doubt, sometimes symptoms of disturbance produced by overwork or other causes, but so are headaches, and no one is either ashamed of a headache, or particularly alarmed by it. Moreover, if the theory that the ghosts of haunted houses have their origin in unveridical hallucinations be true, one thing that would follow would be that seeing such things is not necessarily a sign of bad health. For we know that among our witnesses to such phenomena we have persons not only remarkably sensible and practical, but remarkably strong and healthy.

If we now attempt to sum up the evidence afforded by the Society's collection, for phantasms of the dead, * it seems to stand as follows:—

Firstly.—There are a large number of instances recorded of appearances of the dead shortly after their death, but generally there is nothing by which we can distinguish these from simple subjective hallucinations. In a few cases, however, information conveyed seems to afford the required test, but these are at present too few, I think, for us to feel sure that the coincidence may not have been due to chance.

Secondly.—There are cases of single appearances at an interval of months or years after death, but at present none which we have adequate grounds for attributing to the agency of the dead.

* I must again remind my readers that I am not dealing with the evidence for communications at the time of death, which is, in my opinion, very strong. By "phantasms of the dead," I mean communications at least twelve hours after death.
Thirdly.—There are numerous cases of seemingly similar apparitions seen in particular houses, without apparently any possibility of the similarity being the result of suggestion or expectation; but the evidence connecting such haunting with any definite dead person is, on the whole, very small; and the evidence for the operation of any intelligent agency in the haunting, at present absolutely nil; and until we can discover more about the laws that seem to govern such haunting, we are hardly justified in forming any theory as to its cause, except as a provisional hypothesis.

As regards present conclusions, the result of the investigation will, I fear, appear to many very unsatisfactory. But I do not myself think that we ought to expect so quickly to come to a conclusion; and my examination of the evidence has at any rate convinced me that the inquiry, though likely, as I have said, to be long and difficult, is worth pursuing with patience and energy.

NOTE.—On the very eve of going to press, Mr. Gurney has received the following letter from Mr. Webley, the "Mr. W." of case 477, p. 93:

84, Wenman-street, Birmingham,

May 18th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter, I shall be happy to give you the information asked for. My wife died on 2nd February, 1884, about 5.30 a.m. The last hours of her life were spent in singing. I may say notes came from her within ten minutes of her decease; and beautiful as her voice was, it never appeared so exquisitely beautiful as this.

Yours sincerely,

HENRY WEMAIL.
Hallucinations.

By Edmund Gurney.

Synopsis of the Argument.

Hallucinations of the senses are first distinguished from other hallucinations, by the fact that they do not necessarily imply any false belief.

A definition of them is then given which serves to mark them off on the one hand from true perceptions, and on the other hand from remembered images or mental pictures.

The old method of distinguishing the ideational and the sensory elements in hallucinations of the senses is criticised; and it is shown that the delusive appearances are not merely imagined, but are actually seen and heard—the hallucination differing from an ordinary percept only in the fact of lacking an objective basis.

The controversy as to the physiological starting-point of the phenomena is briefly sketched; and it is shown that the creation of sensory hallucinations, which is central and the work of the brain, is quite distinct from the excitation or initiation of them, which may be peripheral and due to some other part of the body that sets the brain to work.

This excitation may even be due to some objective external cause, as is shown by the fact that the view of an imaginary object may sometimes be affected, in just the same way as the view of a real one would be, by a prism or a mirror. The imaginary object becomes (so to speak) attached to some point de repère—some visible point or mark, at or near the place where it is seen—and is thus made to follow the course of any optical illusions to which the said point or mark is subjected. But this dependence on an external stimulus does not affect the fact that the actual sensory element in the hallucination is in these, as in all other cases, created and imposed by the brain.

There are, however, a large number of hallucinations which we must suppose to be centrally initiated, as well as centrally created. Cases are considered where the hypothesis that the hallucination depends on an external stimulus, if possible, is yet very doubtful; for instance, where the imaginary object is seen in free space; or where it appears to move independently of the eye. But there are many other cases where the said hypothesis is plainly excluded; and where the excitation or initiation, if it does not take place in the brain, can only be
due to some morbid disturbance in the sense-organs themselves. A variety of instances are adduced where the assumption of such a morbid disturbance would be gratuitous or impossible; as, especially, in auditory hallucinations; in hallucinations which conform to the course of some more general delusion; in hallucinations which are voluntarily originated; and in the so-called "psychic" hallucinations, of which a new explanation is offered. A further argument for the central initiation is drawn from the fact that repose of the sense-organs seems a condition favourable to hallucinations.

This discussion as to the excitation of hallucinations is followed by a discussion as to their creation—the cerebral process which is involved in their having this or that particular (and often elaborate) form. Where in the brain does this process take place?—in the particular sensory centre concerned? or in some higher tract? Reasons are given for considering that both places of creation are available; that the simpler sorts of hallucination, which are often also recurrent, may take shape at the sensory centres themselves; but that the more elaborate and variable sorts must be traced to the higher origin; and that when the higher tracts are first concerned, the production of the hallucination is due to a downward escape of current to the sensory centre.

Finally, an argument for the higher origin is drawn from the special class of veridical hallucinations; the nature of which often leads us to conclude that those tracts of the percipient's brain which are the physical seat of ideas and memories were the first to be abnormally affected.

1. Definition.

Is it possible to treat hallucinations as a single class of phenomena, marked out by definite characteristics? The popular answer would no doubt be Yes—that the distinguishing characteristic is some sort of false belief. But this is an error: in many of the best known cases of hallucination—that of Nicolai for instance—the percipient has held, with respect to the figures that he saw or the voices that he heard, not a false but a true belief, to wit, that they did not correspond to any external reality. The only sort of hallucination which is necessarily characterised by false belief is the purely non-sensory sort—as where a person has a fixed idea that everyone is plotting against him, or that he is being secretly mesmerised from a distance. Of hallucinations of the senses, belief in their reality, though a frequent, is by no means an essential feature; a tendency to deceive is all that we can safely predicate of them.

If we seek for some further quality which shall be distinctive of both sensory and non-sensory hallucinations, the most hopeful sugges-
tion would seem to be that both sorts are idiosyncratic and unshared. However false a belief may be, we do not call it a hallucination if it has "been in the air," and has arisen in a natural way in a plurality of minds. This is just what an idée fixe of the kind above-mentioned never does: A may imagine that the world is plotting against him; but B, if he spontaneously evolves a similar notion, will imagine that the world is plotting not against A, but against himself. Instances, however, are not wanting where the idée fixe of an insane person has gradually infected an associate;* and as contact between mind and mind is, after all, the "natural way" of spreading ideas, we can make no scientific distinction between these cases and those where, e.g., the leader of a sect has instilled delusive notions into a number of (technically) sane followers. But again, hallucinations of the senses are also occasionally shared by several persons. Most of the alleged instances of this phenomenon are, no doubt, merely cases of collective illusion—an agreement in the misinterpretation of sensory signs produced by a real external object; but, as the result of wide inquiries, I have encountered several instances of genuine and spontaneous collective hallucination. If, then, sensory and non-sensory hallucinations agree in being as a rule unshared, they agree also in presenting marked exceptions to the rule; which exceptions, in the sensory species, are of a peculiarly inexplicable kind. The conclusion does not seem favourable to our chance of obtaining a neat general definition which will embrace the two species; and, in abandoning the search for one, I can only point, with envy, to the convenient way in which French writers are enabled not to combine but to keep them apart, by appropriating to the non-sensory class the words délire and conception délirante.

Let us then try to fix the character of hallucinations of the senses independently. The most comprehensive view is that all our instinctive judgments of visual, auditory, and tactile phenomena are hallucinations, inasmuch as what is really nothing more than an affection of ourselves is instantly interpreted by us as an external object. In immediate perception, what we thus objectify is present sensation; in mental pictures, what we objectify is remembered or represented sensation. This is the view which has been worked out very ingeniously, and for psychological purposes very effectively, by M. Taine;† but it is better adapted to a general theory of sensation than to a theory of hallucinations as such. To adopt it here

† De l'Intelligence, Vol. I., p. 408, &c.
would drive us to describe the diseased Nicolai—when he saw phantoms in the room, but had his mind specially directed to the fact that they were internally caused—as less hallucinated than a healthy person in the unreflective exercise of normal vision. I prefer to keep to the ordinary language which would describe Nicolai's phantoms as the real specific case of hallucination. And I should consider their distinctive characteristic to be something quite apart from the question whether or not they were actually mistaken for real figures—namely, their marked resemblance to real figures, and the consequent necessity for the exercise of memory and reflection to prevent so mistaking them. The definition of a sensory hallucination would thus be *a percept which lacks, but which can only by distinct reflection be recognised as lacking, the objective basis which it suggests*—where objective basis is to be taken as a short way of naming the possibility of being shared by all persons with normal senses.* It may be objected that this definition would include illusions. The objection could be obviated at the cost of a little clumsiness; but it seems sufficient to observe that illusions are merely the sprinkling of fragments of genuine hallucination on a background of true perception. And the definition seems otherwise satisfactory. For while it clearly separates hallucinations from *true perceptions*, it equally clearly separates them from the phenomena with which they have been perpetually identified—the remembered images or *mental pictures* which are not perceptions at all.† It serves, for instance, to distinguish, on the lines of common sense and common language, between the images of "day-dreams" and those of night-dreams. In both cases vivid images arise, to which no objective reality corresponds; and

* I have indeed referred above to *collective* hallucinations; but they may fairly be excluded here, not merely because they are very exceptional, but because it is a nice question for Idealism to determine how far, or in what sense, they lack an objective basis. To put an extreme case: suppose all the seeing world, save one individual, had a visual percept, the object of which nevertheless eluded all physical tests. Would the solitary individual be justified in saying that all the others were victims of a subjective delusion? And it he said so would they agree with him?

† M. Taine's definition and mode of treatment become unsatisfactory here. Regarding perceptions as in essence hallucinations, he naturally regards *mental images*—since they are the shadowy representatives of former perceptions—as hallucinations *of an embryonic sort*. This metaphor commits him to showing how the embryo may develop into the full product—which will happen if the mental image be then and there externalised, as is often the case in delirium. The result of this transformation is inevitably a *false* hallucination; and a special connection is thus suggested between mental images and one particular sort of percept, namely the *incorrect* sort. But in ordinary experience, mental images are of course far more closely and constantly connected with *correct* percepts. M. Taine's *true* hallucinations, whose relics and representatives they are, than with *false* hallucinations, into which not one in a million of them is ever transformed.
in neither case is any distinct process of reflection applied to the discovery of this fact. But the self-evoked waking-vision is excluded from the class of hallucinations, as above defined, by the point that its lack of objective basis can be and is recognised without any such process of reflection. We have not, like Nicolai, to consider and remember, before we can decide that the friends whose faces we picture are not really in the room. We feel that our mind is active and not merely receptive—that it is the mind's eye and not the bodily sense which is at work; without attending to this fact, we have it as part of our whole conscious state. Dreams on the other hand are, as a rule, pure cases of hallucination, forcing themselves on us whether we will or no, and with an impression of objective reality which is uncontradicted by any knowledge, reflective or instinctive, that they are the creatures of our brain.

But, though our definition may be sufficient for mere purposes of classification, it takes us but a very little way towards understanding the real nature of the phenomena. It says nothing of their origin and, though it distinguishes them from mere normal acts of imagination or memory, it leaves quite undetermined the faculty or faculties actually concerned in them. And when we pass on to these further points, we find ourselves in a most perplexed field, where doctors seem to be as much at variance as philosophers. The debate, most ardently carried on in France, has produced a multitude of views; but not one of the rival theorists seems ever to have convinced any of the others. Still progress has been made, to this extent at any rate, that it is now comparatively easy to see where the disputed points lie, and to attack them with precision.

2. The Dual Nature of Hallucinations.

It was, of course, evident from the first that there was a certain duality of nature in hallucinations. In popular language, the mind and the sense were both plainly involved: the hallucinated person not only imagined such and such a thing, but imagined that he saw such and such a thing. But in the early days of the controversy, the attempts at analysing the ideational and the sensory elements were of a very crude sort. The state of hallucination used to be treated as one in which ideas and memories—while remaining ideas and memories and not sensations—owing to exceptional vividness took on the character of sensations. It was not clearly realised or remembered that sensations have no existence except as mental facts; and that, so far as a mental fact takes on the character of a sensation, it is a sensation. This was clearly stated, as a matter of personal experience, by Burdach and Müller; in the French discussions, the merit of bringing out the
point with new force and emphasis belongs to Baillarger.* He showed that when the hallucinated person says "I see so and so," "I hear so and so," the words are literally true. If the person goes on to say "You ought also to see or hear it," he is of course wrong; but when he says that he sees or hears it, his statement is to be taken without reserve. To him, the experience is not something like or related to the experience of perceiving a real external object: it is identical with that experience. To the psychology of our day this may seem a tolerably evident truth. Still it is easy to realise the difficulty that was long felt in admitting that any experience that was dissociated from the normal functions of the sense-organs could be completely sensory in character. Popular thought fails to see that the physical question which for practical purposes is all-important—whether the object is or is not really there—is psychically irrelevant; and a man who has been staring at the sun will, as a rule, think it less accurate to say that he sees a luminous disc wherever he looks than to say that he fancies it. The best corrective to such a prejudice is Delbœuf's experiment, which it will be convenient briefly to set forth, for the sake of subsequent reference.

Two small slits are made in a shutter, and one of them is filled with a piece of red glass. The opposite wall is therefore lit by a mixture of white and red light. A stick is now placed across the red slit; its shadow is of course cast on the wall; the part of the wall occupied by the shadow, though illuminated only by white rays from the other slit, appears—owing to the optical law of contrast—a bright green. † Let this shadow now be looked at through a narrow tube.

* In the long and rather barren debates which took place in the Société Médico-psychologique during 1855 and 1856, Baillarger, no doubt, insisted too strongly on an absolute gulf between percepts (true or false) and the ordinary images of fancy or memory. But his opponents made a far more serious mistake: so far identifying the two as not to perceive a difference of kind, at the point where the sensory element in the mental fact reaches such abnormal strength as to suggest the real presence of the object. Griesinger's statement (Ment. Path. and Ther., p. 89) and Wundt's (Phys. Psych., Vol. II., p. 353) seem too unguarded in the same respect. As long ago as 1832, the late Dr. Symonds, of Bristol, drew exactly the right distinction between images and hallucinations. (Lecture reprinted in Miscellanies, p. 241).

† Wundt (Phys. Psych., Vol. I., p. 463) has described some experiments, on the analogy of which it seems to me that this first result should be explained. I at any rate cannot concur with Delbœuf's explanation of it, which M. Binet adopts. According to them, it is due to two things: to the fact that the rays which pass from the shadow to the spectator's eye are really grey; and to the spectator's knowledge of the further fact that the only colour which, seen through red light, looks grey, is green. They hold then that the sensation, though of grey, excites through association an image of green. To this there seem to be three objections. (1) Not one person in 20 possesses the supposed
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which prevents any part of the wall external to the shadow from being seen. Nothing red is now in the spectator's view, so that there can be no effect of contrast: the red glass may even be removed; none but white rays are passing to his eye from the shadow; yet its colour remains green. And in this case the chances are that, unless previously warned, he will tell the exact truth; he will admit, and even persist, that what he sees is green. He will scout the idea that the green is a mere memory of what he saw before he applied the tube; he will assert that it is presented to him as an immediate fact. And such is assuredly the state of the case; but it is a state which, from the moment that he has put the tube to his eye, is kept up purely as a hallucination, and without regard to the facts of the external world. The delusion is of course instantly dispelled by the removal of the tube—when he perceives that the only light in the room is white, and that the shadow is grey; but for all that he will probably never doubt again that a genuine hallucination of the senses is something more than "mere fancy."

It is impossible to be too particular on this point: for high authorities, even in the present day, are found to contest it. When a person who habitually speaks the truth, and who is not colour-blind, looks at an object and says "My sensation is green," they contradict him, and tell him that however much he sees green, his sensation is grey. Whether this be a mere misuse of language, or (as it seems to me) a misconception of facts, it at any rate renders impossible any agreement as to the theory of hallucinations. For it ignores the very point of Baillarger's contention—that images sufficiently vivid to be confounded with sensory percepts have become sensory percepts.

When once the truth of this contention is perceived, it is also perceived that the previous speculations had been largely directed to a wrong issue; and that the dual character of a false perception is after all, no other than that of a true perception. A hallucination, like an ordinary percept, is composed of present sensations, and of images which are the relics of past sensations. If I see the figure of a man, then—alike if there be a man there and if there be no man there—my piece of knowledge. (2) Even for one who does possess it, the moments in his life during which he has had experience of the fact that green seen through red light looks grey, are surely not sufficiently striking or numerous to have established an instinctive and inseparable association between the sensation of grey, occurring in a place where red light prevails, and the idea of green. (3) Even if this inseparable association could be conceived possible, one fails to see why the result should be the transformation, in the spectator's consciousness, of the idea green into (what at any rate seems to him to be) the sensation green; that being the very sensation which, in the supposed moments of experience, has been conspicuous by its absence. On Delboeuf's theory, the lawn seen through red glass ought not only to excite the idea of green (which it perhaps may do), but to look green.
experience consists of certain visual sensations, compounded with a variety of muscular and tactile images, which represent to me properties of resistance, weight, and distance; and also with more remote and complex images, which enable me to refer the object to the class man, and to compare this specimen of the class with others whose appearance I can recall. If Baillarger did not carry out his view of hallucinations to this length, the whole development exists by implication in the term by which he described them—psycho-sensorial. The particular word was, perhaps, an unfortunate one; since it suggests (as M. Binet has pointed out) that the psychical element is related to the sensorial somewhat as the soul to the body; and so, either that psychical events are independent of physical conditions, or that sensations are not psychical events. Ideo-sensational would avoid this difficulty; but the obverse term which M. Binet proposes—cerebro-sensorial—is on the whole to be preferred. For this brings us at once to the physical ground where alone the next part of the inquiry can be profitably pursued—the inquiry into origin. From the standpoint of to-day, one readily perceives how much more definite and tangible the problems were certain to become, as soon as they were translated into physiological terms. So far as the controversy had been conducted on a purely psychological basis, it had been singularly barren. In the vague unlocalised use, “the senses” and other ever-recurring terms become sources of dread to the reader. But as soon as it is asked, where is the local seat of the abnormal occurrence? and on what particular physical conditions does it depend? lines of experiment and observation at once suggest themselves, and the phenomena fall into distinct groups.

3. The question of Central or Peripheral Origin: the difference between Creation and Excitation.

In its first form, the question is one between central and peripheral origin. Do hallucinations originate in the brain—in the central mechanism of perception? or in some immediate condition of the eye, or of the ear, or of other parts? or is there possibly some joint mode of origin?

For a long time the hypothesis of an exclusively central origin was much in the ascendant. But this was greatly because—as already noted—Esquirol and the older writers did not recognise the sensory element as truly and literally sensation, but regarded the whole experience as simply a very vivid idea or memory. If the central origin is to be established it must be by something better than arbitrary psychological distinctions. Hibbert and Ferriar, going to the other extreme, contended that the memory was a retinal one; if a man sees what is not there, they held, it can only be by a direct recrudescence of
past feeling in his retina. "But," urged Esquirol, "the blind can have hallucinations of vision; the deaf can have hallucinations of hearing; how can these originate in the peripheral organs?" The obvious answer, that this did not necessarily thrust the point of origin back as far as the cerebrum, does not seem to have been forthcoming; and the opposite party preferred to fall back on definite experiment. They pointed out, for instance, that visual hallucinations often vanish when the eyes are closed; or (as Brewster first observed) that they may be doubled by pressing one eyeball. But though there was enough here to suggest that the external organs participated in the process, there was no proof that they originated it, even in these particular cases; while for other cases the observations did not hold. An immense advance was made by Baillarger, who maintained the central origin by really scientific arguments. He pointed out (1) that the external organ may often be affected by local irritants—infiammation, blows, pressure, galvanism—without the production of any more pronounced form of hallucination than flashes, or hummings; that is to say, the peripheral stimulation fails to develop hallucination, even under the most favourable conditions: (2) that there is a frequent correspondence of hallucinations of different senses—a man who sees the devil also hears his voice, and smells sulphur—and that it is impossible to refer this correspondence to abnormalities of the eye, ear, and nose, occurring by accident at the same moment: (3) that hallucinations often refer to dominant ideas—a religious monomaniac will see imaginary saints and angels, not imaginary trees and houses. Hence, argued Baillarger, "the point of departure of hallucinations" is always "the intelligence"—the imagination and memory—which sets the sensory machinery in motion. He naively admitted that how this action of an immaterial principle on the physical apparatus takes place passes all conception; but it might be forgiven to a medical man, writing forty years ago, if he had not fully realised "brain as an organ of mind," and so did not see that what he took for a special puzzle in the theory of hallucinations, is simply the fundamental puzzle involved in every mental act. Passing him this, we may say that his treatment of the question entitles him to the credit of the second great discovery about hallucinations. He had already made clear their genuinely sensory quality; he now made equally clear the fact that the mind (or its physical correlate) is their creator—that they are brain-products projected from within outwards.

This is a most important truth; but it is very far from being the whole truth. Baillarger saw no via mediana between the theory which he rejected—that the nerves of sense convey to the brain impressions which are there perceived as the phantasmal object—and the theory which he propounded, that "the intelligence" (i.e., for us, the brain, as...
the seat of memories and images) of its own accord, and without any impulse from the periphery, excites the sensory apparatus. It seems never to have struck him that there may be cases where the sense-organ supplies the *excitant*, though the brain is the *creator*—that irritation passing from without inwards may be a means of setting in motion the creative activity. He took into account certain states of the organ—*e.g.*, fatigue produced by previous exercise—as increasing the susceptibility to excitation from "the intelligence," and so as conditions favourable to hallucination; but he got no further.

The facts of hallucination absolutely refuse to lend themselves to this indiscriminate treatment. Following the path of experiment, we are almost immediately confronted with *two* classes of phenomena, and *two* modes of excitation. We need not go, indeed, beyond the elementary instances already mentioned. Delboeuf's experiment, where green was seen by an eye on which only white rays were falling, fairly illustrates Baillarger's doctrine—the green being produced not by an outer affection of the eye, but by an inner affection of the brain. But in the case of a person who has been staring at the sun, the "after image" or hallucination can be clearly traced to an continuing local effect in that small area of the retina which has just been abnormally excited; and it will continue to present itself wherever the eye may turn, until rest has restored this area to its normal condition. A still simpler form of change in the external organ is a blow on the eye; and the resulting "sparks" are genuine though embryonic hallucinations.

Such cases as these last are, however, hardly typical; for in them the brain is not truly creative; it merely gives the inevitable response to the stimuli that reach it from below. They are moreover normal experiences, in the sense that they would occur similarly to all persons with normal eyes. Let us then take another instance, where the mind's creative rôle is fully apparent, while at the same time the primary excitation is clearly not central. Certain hallucinations—as is well known—are *unilateral*, *i.e.*, are perceived when (say) the right eye or ear is acting, but cease when that action is obstructed, though the left eye or ear is still free. Now this is in itself could not be taken, as some take it,* for a proof that the exciting cause was not central; it might be a lesion affecting one side of the brain. But very commonly, in these cases, a distinct lesion is found in the particular eye or ear on whose activity the hallucination depends; † and it is then natural to conclude that the hallucination was the result of the lesion, and that the one-
sidedness of the one depended on the one-sidedness of the other. The justice of the conclusion has been proved in many cases by the fact that the hallucination has ceased when the local lesion has been cured. Other cases which strongly suggest a morbid condition of the external organ are those where the imaginary figure moves in accordance with the movements of the eye. The visual hallucinations of the blind, and the auditory hallucinations of the deaf, would also naturally be referred to the same class—the seat of excitation being then, not necessarily the external organ itself, but some point on the nervous path from the organ to the brain. In the case, for instance, of a partly-atrophied nerve, the morbid excitation would be at the most external point where vital function continued.*

It should be noted, in passing, that a distinct lesion, e.g., atrophy of the globe of one eye, may give rise to bilateral hallucinations (Vienna Asylum Report, 1858), or to unilateral hallucinations of the sound eye—the latter being no doubt affected directly by the brain.

4. External Excitation of Hallucinations.

But we may now proceed a step further. The excitation may be external not only in the sense of coming from the external organ, but in the sense of coming from the external world. It may be due not to any abnormality of the eye or the nerve, but to the ordinary stimulus of light-rays from real objects. M. Binet is the first who has given the complete evidence for this fact, accompanied by a scientific explanation of it;† and in so doing, he has made a contribution to the learning of the subject second in importance only to that of Baillarger.

M. Binet's experiments were conducted on five hypnotised girls at the Salpêtrière, who could be made to see anything that was suggested to them; and also on an insane woman at St. Anne, who had a standing visual hallucination of her own. The experiments may be divided into two sets—those conducted with, and those conducted without, special optical apparatus. The results of both sets confirmed the rule first enunciated by M. Féré—that "the imaginary object is perceived

* Delusions due to visceral disturbances are often quoted as cases of hallucination excited from parts below the brain. Thus a woman dying of peritonitis declares that an ecclesiastical conclave is being held inside her (Esquirol, Maladies Mentales, Vol. I., p. 211). But here there is a prior and independent basis of distinct sensation; so that the experience would at most be an illusion. And it is hardly even that; for one cannot say that the false object is sensorially presented at all; no one knows what a conclave in such a locality would actually feel like; the conclave is merely a delire—an imagination suggested by sensation, but which does not itself take a sensory form.

† In the Revue Philosophique, April and May, 1884.
under the same conditions as a real one"; but to this M. Binet adds the further conclusion, that a sensation derived from a real external source occupying the same position in space as the imaginary object seemed to occupy, was an indispensable factor of the hallucination. The results obtained without special apparatus do not appear to me at all to justify this conclusion. They were (1) suppression of the imaginary object by closure of the eyes; (2) suppression of the imaginary object by the interposition of an opaque screen between the eye and the place where the object seemed to be; (3) doubling of the imaginary object by lateral pressure of one eyeball. M. Binet argues that the suppression in the first two cases, and the doubling in the third, depended on the suppression and the doubling of a real sensation, physically induced by rays from the direction in which the object was seen. But the fact that external objects are hidden from view by the interposition of our own eyelids or any other opaque obstacle, has become to us a piece of absolutely instinctive knowledge; and we should surely expect that an object which was but the spontaneous projection of a morbid brain, might still be suppressed by movements and sensations which had for a lifetime been intimately associated with the suppression of objects. And as regards the doubling by pressure of the eyeball, it can be perfectly explained on Baillarger's principles—by supposing that an excitation which has been centrally initiated spreads outwards to the peripheral expansion of the optic nerve.

When, however, we turn to the other group of experiments, the case is very different. The instruments used were a prism, a spy-glass, and a mirror. It would occupy too much space to describe the results in detail. It is enough to say that the prism applied to one eye doubled the imaginary object;* that the spy-glass removed or approximated it according as the object-glass or eye-piece was applied to the patient's eye; that the mirror reflected the object and gave a symmetrical image of it; and that the optical effect, as regards angles of deviation and reflexion and all the details of the illusion, was in every case precisely what it would have been had the object been real instead of imaginary. Here then we are fairly driven outside the patient's own organism; it seems impossible to deny that some point of external space at or near the seat of the imagined object plays a real part in the phenomenon.† To this point M. Binet gives the name of

* The observation was first made by M. Féré; see Le Progrès Medical, 1881, p. 1040.

† One reservation must be made. It is just conceivable that the changes wrought on the imaginary percept were due, not to the optical instruments, but to thought-transference. For M. Binet and his assistants of course knew themselves, in each case, the particular optical effect to be expected. An experimenter who has not expressly recognised the reality or the possibility of thought-
point de repère; and he regards it as producing a nucleus of sensation to which the hallucination accretes itself. When the point de repère is in such a position as to be reflected by the mirror, then the imaginary object is reflected, and not otherwise; the object is, so to speak, attached to its point de repère, and will follow the course of any optical illusions to which its sensory nucleus is subjected. According to this view, the only truly sensory part of the phenomenon is supplied by the point de repère; all the rest is a "hypertrophied image" imposed on it by the mind.

These conclusions are entirely foreign to any former theory of hallucination. None of the contending parties, not even the early champions of a purely peripheral origin, had ever dreamt of excitants outside the eye itself. Oddly enough, M. Binet seems hardly aware of his own originality. He remarks that the general view now is that hallucinations are always the product of real sensation; and he divides them into two classes,—those where the sensation is initiated in the sensory organ by an external object ("hallucinations à cause objective"); and those where it is initiated by a morbid local irritation of the sensory organ itself ("hallucinations à cause subjective"). As practically the inventor of the former class, M. Binet is really the first person who has had a right to this "general view." But his modesty connects itself with a serious historical error. For he still retains Baillarger's term—psycho-sensorial—and actually refers to Baillarger as having meant the same by that term as he himself does. With Baillarger—as we have seen—the "sensorial" element was imposed or evoked by "the intelligence," not supplied to it; and was not an unnoticed peg for the hallucination, but its very fulness and substance. Baillarger explicitly lays down, as one of the prime conditions for hallucination, a "suspension of external impressions"; and gives as the definition of a psycho-sensorial hallucination "a sensory perception independent of all external excitation of the sense organs," including excitation morbidly initiated in the organs themselves.* The opposition is really complete. Of all the optical illusions described by M. Binet, the only one which Baillarger's doctrine would explain is the doubling of the transference would never think of so arranging his experiment that he himself should not know, till after the result, which instrument was in use or what was its position; nor indeed is it easy to imagine how such a condition could in practice be carried out. The point seems worth suggesting, as it would be most interesting if a state of hallucination turned out to be one in which the "subject" is specially susceptible to "transferred impressions."

* Baillarger, *Des Hallucinations*, pp. 426, 469, and 470. A similar misreading of Baillarger, contained in a single sentence, is the one point from which I dissent in the extremely clear and concise chapter on the subject in Mr. Sully's *Illusions.*
object by pressure on the side of the eyeball; for this alone could be accounted for by supposing the retina to be excited from the brain. The novelty of M. Binet's own results is that they force us to regard the external impression as not only present but indispensable, at any rate at the moment when the optical instruments produce their characteristic effects.

But while admiring the manner in which M. Binet has marshalled his facts, and recognising that they have led him to a most interesting discovery, I cannot accept his conclusions beyond a certain point. He applies conceptions drawn from his special department of observation to the whole field, and considers that hallucinations are exhausted by the two classes just defined—i.e., that there is no such thing as central initiation. Now even for the cases "à cause objective," to which the novel experimental results belong, it is important to observe that though the excitation comes from outside, the hallucination—the object as actually perceived—is still (as Baillarger taught) a pure product of the mind. Everything about it, including its false air of reality, is brain-created; and the occasioning or evoking cause has no place in it. But if this be so—and M. Binet himself has practically admitted it—we cannot consent to call the external excitation of the organ sensation. M. Binet so treats it throughout—as a sensation atrophied, indeed, and clothed upon with hypertrophical and delusive images—but still as sensation—as a psychical element in the result. Now in considering Delbœuf's experiment above, we objected to the notion that the spectator had a sensation of grey which he clothed with an image of green. The physical rays that met his eye were such as normally produce the sensation of grey; that is the only way in which the word grey can be brought into the account; psychically, no colour but green was present. Just the same objection applies to saying of the hypnotic "subject" that he is receiving from part of the table-cloth a "sensation" of white, which he clothes with an image of a brown butterfly; or of the patient in delirium tremens, that he is receiving from the wall-paper "sensations" of drab which he clothes with images of black mice. In neither case is there a "perturbation of sensorial functions" in M. Binet's sense. The sensorial elements, the brown and the black, spring from a new activity within; they are not the outcome of functions exercised on the table-cloth or the wall-paper—not a perverted transcript of white and drab.

Holding fast to this view, we can still perfectly well explain M. Binet's results, even in the hypnotic cases on which he chiefly relies. If the point de repère is not at, but close to the spot where the imaginary object appears (as seems to have been the case in some of the experiments), there is no difficulty. The point de repère is then itself part of what is all along perceived;
and in any effects produced on it by optical apparatus, it will carry the
neighbouring object with it by association. If, however, the actual
area covered by the object is sufficiently distinguished from its surround­
ings to act itself as point de repère, and no other possible points de repère
exist in the field of vision,* the case is different, but can still be
explained. It will not be disputed that a slightly longer time is neces­
sary for the formation of the image of a suggested object and the
conversion of this image into a percept, than for the experience of
sensation from an object actually before the eyes. When therefore the
operator points to a particular place on the white table-cloth, and says
"There is a brown butterfly," we may suppose that in the patient's
consciousness a real sensation of white precedes by an instant the
imposed sensation of brown. So when the cardboard on which a non­
existent portrait has just been seen is again brought before the patient's
eyes, it is almost certain that the recognition of it as the same piece of
white cardboard (known by its points de repère) precedes by an instant
the hallucinatory process and the re-imposition of the portrait. That
there is this instant of true sensation seems to be shown, indeed, by one
of M. Binet's own experiments. The patient having been made to see
an imaginary portrait on a blank piece of cardboard, this was suddenly
covered by a sheet of paper. The patient said that the portrait disapp­
peared for a moment, but then reappeared on the paper with complete
distinctness. We may thus fairly conclude that an area which was
actually seen before the hallucination was induced in the first instance,
will also be actually seen for a moment when vision is redirected to it
(or its reflexion), after the prism or spy-glass has been brought into play.
During that moment, it will of course be seen under the new illusive
optical conditions; and association may again cause the object which
supplants it to follow suit. There can be no objection, however, to
supposing that the supplanted area continues further to provoke
the hallucination, in the same sense that the white rays provoked the green
percept in Delbœuf's experiment. The rays which are lost to sensation
continue to excite the sensorium physically; and what M. Binet says of
the sensation only needs to be transferred to the physical excitation—
which will have definite peculiarities, corresponding to the distinguish­
ing marks of the area whence it comes. Double this excitation by a
prism, or reflect it from another quarter, and the percept which it

* I cannot quite make out whether these conditions were ever exactly
realised. In the case where an imaginary portrait had been evoked on a piece
of cardboard, and this piece was subsequently picked out by the patient from
among a number of similar ones, I gather that there was some recognisable mark
external to the area of the portrait. It is said that lateral pressure doubled the
image, even when the eyes were "fixed on the uniform surface of the wall." But
this particular optical effect, as we have already noticed, does not imply the
presence of points de repère at all.
Hallucinations.

provokes may naturally be doubled or seen in the new direction. So, if both eyes were employed in Delboeuf's experiment, might the green percept be artificially doubled.

I am aware that this substitution of the physical for the psychical term may appear very unimportant and even pedantic; but in truth it is not so. For it is really his psychical expression of the external stimulus in these cases that has led M. Binet to regard hallucinations as simply a monstrous form of illusion, and to enunciate a general formula for them which—for all its attractive and original air—seems radically unsound. He considers them the pathological—as opposed to the normal—form of external perception. As in normal perception, we have a visual sensation which we associate with true images, so, he holds, in hallucinations we have a visual sensation which we associate with false images. The looseness of this analogy is surely obvious, and the apparent symmetry of the two cases quite unreal. In normal vision, the true images which (according to M. Binet's own account) we primarily associate with the visual sensation, are not visual, but muscular and tactile images, whereby we attach the ideas of weight, solidity, and distance to what we see. The process through which we get the perception of a real external object is thus primarily an association between psychical elements belonging to different senses—a visual sensation, which the brain receives, and non-visual images, which the brain supplies; and if we convert the non-visual images into sensations by touching or pressing the object, we get a verification of its external reality. Now, if M. Binet's formula is to hold, and hallucinations are the pathological form of external perception, we ought to find that they are produced when for the true images of normal perception we substitute false images. Is this the case? Suppose a hypnotic patient to be impressed with the idea that a piece of white paper is a red rose: would it be a right account of his hallucination to say that he receives a visual sensation, and then associates with it false muscular and tactile images? Certainly not: what he does is to see wrongly to begin with, to see false form and false colour—things quite distinct in character from ideas of weight, solidity and distance, and which might exist in the absence of any such ideas. It is true that when he has this visual experience, habit leads him to go on and connect it with false images of weight, solidity and distance; but that is a secondary result. Hallucination does not depend on the falsity of those images; and, indeed, the test of touching and pressing would often fail to demonstrate their falsity, owing to the frequent sympathy of several senses in hallucination. The essential fact is immediate, and consists simply in having a visual experience which others cannot share—in seeing what is invisible to a normal eye. This becomes clearer still, if we make the imaginary object correspond to a real object in everything
except colour. Let the patient be led to believe that a green stick of sealing-wax is a red stick; then, whatever tests be adopted, he will share with normal persons every sensation except the visual; but none the less will the process of hallucination be complete. This process, then, is no way parallel to that of normal perception. It is not, as that was, an association between psychical elements belonging to different senses; and its sensory part, the essence of which is redness, is not—as in the normal perception of a red object—received by the brain, but is imposed by it. By what right can processes so different be represented as co-ordinate—as the healthy and the morbid exercise of the same function?

5. Cases where External Excitation is Doubtful.

So far I have considered M. Binet’s theory only in relation to his own cases—where it was easy to concede the fact of excitation from without, whatever be our view of its share in the phenomena. It remains to consider the numerous cases—the large majority of the whole body of hallucinations—where this excitation is itself doubtful, or more than doubtful. Let us take the doubtful cases first.

In the optical experiments it was, of course, convenient that the hallucination should be projected on a flat opaque surface; and on such a surface the objective points de repère may be easily found. But it is quite as easy to make the patient see objects in free space—say, out in the middle of the room; and such is the common form of spontaneous hallucinations, both of sane and insane persons, where human figures are seen. The eyes are then focussed, not on the real objects from which points de repère would have to be supplied, but on the figure itself; which may be much nearer than the wall behind it, and may thus require a very different adjustment of the eyes. And here lies a difficulty for the hypothesis that the hallucination depends on some definite external excitation of the retina. For the real objects which are the supposed excitants, though in the line of sight, are not within the range of clear vision for eyes adjusted to the imaginary object. Can the points de repère be supposed to excite a percept whose position is such that, for it to be clearly visible, they themselves must cease to be so? It is a good deal to require of them. Still, M. Binet’s experiment with the insane patient is a very striking one. This woman, Celestine by name, had an imaginary attendant called Guiteau. Guiteau lent himself to scientific tests, and was doubled by a prism and reflected by a mirror in the most orthodox fashion. This undoubtedly implied points de repère—probably situated near, and not on, the area which Guiteau concealed. One would like, however, to know exactly how his figure was situated in relation to its background. The distance
between the two may have been ir.considerable; and in that case the fact of the doubling and the reflection would not prove the points de repère to have been an essential condition of the hallucination. For, when the patient is made to look attentively at the figure, as a preliminary to the optical tests, the very fixity of the gaze may then and there establish the points de repère which will enable those tests to succeed. It would be interesting to know whether Guiteau would be reflected when he was not being specially stared at, supposing that there was a mirror in an appropriate position.*

The supposed necessity of the external excitation might be otherwise tested thus. Suppose Celestine to be placed in a white spherical chamber, lit from a point directly above her head. Here there would be no points de repère—no special points of external excitation with which an imaginary object could be connected. The only excitant to the eye would be perfectly uniform white light; and this excitant would

* In the case of the hypnotic "subjects," a certain peculiarity in the fixed regard, such as might establish points de repère, is strongly suggested by the following fact. In some cases, after a screen had been interposed between the patient's eyes and the imaginary object, she continued to see not only that object (say, a mouse), but a real object (say, a hat) on which it had been placed. Thus the hat assumed the property—shared by the imaginary mouse, but unshared by any other real objects—of remaining as a percept in spite of an opaque barrier.

As regards reflexion, the following case from the Society's collection is of interest; it is from Mr. Adrian Stokes, M.R.C.S., of Sidmouth:—

"When I was living in Bedford Street North, Liverpool, in the year 1857 (I think), my wife roused me from sleep suddenly and said, 'Oh! Adrian, there's Agnes!' I started up, crying, 'Where? Where?' but, of course, there was no Agnes. My wife then told me that she had awoke, and had seen the form of her only sister, Agnes, sitting on the ottoman at the foot of the bed. On seeing this form she felt frightened; but then, recalling her courage, she thought if the figure were real she would be able to see it reflected in the mirror of the wardrobe, which she had in full view as she lay in bed. Directing her eyes, therefore, to the mirror, there she saw, by the light of the fire that was burning brightly in the grate, the full reflection of the form seated on the ottoman, looking at a bunch of keys which she appeared to hold in her hand. Under the startling effect caused by this sight, she called me to look at it, but, before I was awake, the form and its reflexion had vanished. It was not a dream, my wife is certain.

P.S.—When my wife saw her sister sitting at the foot of our bed looking at the bunch of keys, she (the sister) was clad in the ordinary indoor dress of the time. I remember the start of surprise with which I awoke and exclaimed. My wife has never, that I know of, experienced any hallucination or delirium; and is a woman of excellent sense and judgment. She never saw any other vision but that one."

Here, however, the expectant imagination of the percipient may have been adequate to conjure up the reflected figure, and the case does not therefore support M. Binet's theory.
remain identical, in whatever direction the eye turned. Consequently, if the external excitation be a necessary factor in the production of Guiteau, he ought, if seen at all, to be seen wherever Celestine looked; there would be nothing to attach him to any particular spot. It is rash to prophesy; but I strongly suspect that he would prove more amenable, and that Celestine would retain her power of turning her back on him. Such, in my view, would be the natural result: a figure spontaneously projected by the brain would be located as an independent object, and looked at or not at pleasure. It would be interesting to know, further, if Guiteau is ever seen in the dark. But it should be observed that light may favour and darkness hinder the projection of a phantasm, owing to the different effect of the one and the other on the general physiological state. The presence of light might thus be a necessity, quite apart from any distinguishable points de repère. In the same way the presence of light is occasionally found to be a condition of auditory hallucinations;* which even M. Binet would find it hard to compound out of a "sensation" of light and an "image" of sound.

But the difficulty of regarding external points of excitation as a necessary condition becomes even greater when the hallucination is a moving one. As to these cases, M. Binet can only say that the point de repère keeps changing; that is, as the imaginary figure passes along the side of the room, in front of a multitude of different objects—pictures, paper, furniture, &c.—the very various excitations from these several objects act in turn as the basis of the same delusive image. We may surely hesitate to accept such an assertion, till some sort of proof of it is offered; and it is hard to conceive of what nature the proof could be. The case of course differs altogether from that where the imaginary figure follows the movements of the eye, owing to some morbid affection of that organ which acts as a real moving substratum for it. Instead of the figure's following the eye, the eye is now following the figure in its seemingly independent course. What is there to produce or to guide the selection of ever-new points de repère? To what external cause can M. Binet ascribe the perpetual substitution of one of them for another? On my view—that the figure may be centrally initiated, no less than centrally created—none of these difficulties occur. Such a figure may

* Ball, *Leçons sur les Maladies Mentales*, p. 116. See also the very interesting case given by Professor F. Jolly in the *Archiv für Psychiatrie*, Vol. VI., p. 495. His paper is on the production of auditory hallucinations by the application of an electric current in the neighbourhood of the ear. In one case, he shows good reason for attributing the hallucination, not to a stimulation of the auditory nerve, but to a transference to the auditory centre of the stimulus given to fibres of the fifth nerve. For the subjective sounds did not, as in all the other cases, correspond in a regular way to the opening and closing of the current, but appeared under all conditions in which pain was produced.
just as well appear in the empty centre of the room as on a piece of cardboard, and may just as well move as stand still. The same sort of argument applies to the case where the percipient is haunted by a figure which, however, can be seen only in one direction.* Thus Baillarger describes a doctor who could not turn without finding a little black cow at his side. The mind may locate its puppet according to its own vagaries; and this experience is very like a sensory embodiment of the well-known delusion that somebody is always behind one.

6. Cases where External Excitation is Absent.

So much, then, for M. Binet's hallucinations "à cause objective." We turn now to the vast body of cases where excitation from the outer world is plainly absent. This class includes phantasms seen in the dark, and probably the vast majority of auditory hallucinations, which have so far been disregarded. To bring these under M. Binet's theory, it has to be assumed that in every case they are initiated by some morbid or abnormal condition of the eye or the ear. The assumption is, to say the least, a very violent one. We have duly noted the cases where hallucinations have been undoubtedly due to injury of the external organ; but this does not establish, or even strongly suggest, the existence of a similar condition in cases where it defies detection.†

* Ball, Leçons sur les Maladies Mentales, p. 73; Baillarger, Des Hallucinations, p. 312. Another type of the moving hallucination is presented by Bayle's case (Revue Médicale, 1825, Vol. I. p. 34), where a spider used first to appear life-size, and then gradually to expand till it filled the whole room.

† The sweeping method seems as much in favour now as at the earlier stages of the controversy. As M. Binet has stated his case in a masterly way, I need not encumber the course of the argument by perpetual references to cognate statements. But there is one mode of presenting the rival views which seems so established in the recent French literature that it will be well to reproduce it here in a succinct form. Writers of authority (Prof. Ball in L'Encéphale, 1882, p. 6, and in Maladies Mentales, p. 111, &c., and Dr. Régis in his classical paper on unilateral hallucinations in L'Encéphale, 1881, p. 44), seem never to have conceived the theory of a purely central origin in any other light than as the "projection of an idea outwards"—a doctrine which they regard as now abandoned, and which they refer only in its most antiquated shape. They start by treating the "mixed" or "psycho-sensorial" theory as if its point and purpose had been to assert that the body counts for something in hallucinations—in opposition to the former crudely "psychical" theory, which made "the imagination" act independently of any bodily affection. They then point to cases where hallucinations have plainly been due to a lesion or morbid irritation of the sensory apparatus; and they adopt this morbid condition as the bodily element or physical basis of the phenomenon—that which gives it its mixed character and makes it psycho-sensorial instead of psychical. Thence they assert, as an indispensable condition of every hallucination, that the imagination must be set to work by some "abnormal sensation" derived from some point of
abnormal condition has been made out, hallucinations have not been its only result. The ulceration of the cornea which initiates visual hallucinations has begun by affecting the vision of real objects. Illusions, or false perceptions of colour, often precede the appearance of more distinct phantasms.* So, in cases of more transient abnormality—such as the well-known illusions hypnagogiques—other signs precede the hallucination. The observer, whose eyes are heavy with sleep, begins by seeing luminous points and streaks, which shift and change in remarkable ways; and it is from these as nuclei that the subsequent pictures develop. Similarly one of the seers of “Faces in the Dark” (St. James's Gazette, February 10th, 15th, and 20th, 1882) described the frequent vision of a shower of golden spangles, which changed into a flock of sheep. Now, since our physiological knowledge leaves no doubt that the points, streaks and spangles are due to the condition of the retina, it is reasonable in such cases to regard this condition as initiating the hallucination. But it is not equally reasonable to conclude that the process must be the same for cases where the points, streaks and spangles are absent. I do not forget that even a normal eye is subject to affections which escape attention, until a special effort is made to realise them. But wherever the hallucination can be gradually traced in its development from more rudimentary sensations, these last are very distinct and exceptional things, unknown in the experience of most of us, and the vision itself is commonly of a changing kind—the features developing rapidly out of one another; often also of a swarming kind—detailed landscapes, elaborate kaleidoscopic patterns,

actual lesion. This is both confused and confusing. Hallucinations, as we have seen, are psycho-sensorial in virtue of their nature, not of their origin—because they present distinct sensory qualities—are things actually seen and actually heard—not because this or that starting-point can be assigned them. As for their physical basis, that can be nothing else than a concurrent state of morbid activity at certain cerebral centres. In some cases this activity is no doubt due to lesion at some point along the sensory track; in others, as I here contend, it may originate at the centres themselves and may be independent of any excitation previous to or other than itself. Whether right or wrong, this contention will certainly not be refuted by confounding it with the antiquated “psychical” view, which took no count either of a physical basis or of sensory qualities. As for the “projection of an idea outwards,” that of course is an expression of the immediate fact of hallucination, apart from the question of the excitant. Why should it be abandoned? Is it not at any rate as well suited to its purpose as the only piece of information that Prof. Ball offers us in its stead—namely, that hallucinations are the creation of a brain predisposed to create them?
The advocacy of the “cerebral origin” must, of course, not be taken to imply that the condition of the brain is isolated from that of the rest of the body. The abnormal excitability of the brain may be intimately connected with morbid conditions elsewhere: all that is contended is that no immediate sensory stimulant is needed as a definite basis or peg for hallucinations.

showers of flowers, lines of writing on a luminous ground, and so on.*

Now, compare such experiences with ordinary cases of "ghost-seeing" in the dark. A man wakes in the night, and sees a luminous figure at the foot of his bed. Here the hallucination comes suddenly, single and complete, to a person whose eyes are open and unfatigued; it is not preceded by any peculiar affection of vision, is not developed out of anything, and does not move, or swarm, or develop fresh features; nor does it fulfil M. Binet's test of hallucinations due to the state of the external organ, by moving as the eye moves.† Such visions are commonly explained—and often, no doubt, with justice—as due to nervousness or expectancy. But nervousness and expectancy surely act by exciting the mind, not by congesting the retina; they work on the imagination, and their physical seat is not in the eye, but in the brain. Why, then, should not the brain initiate the hallucination? Why may not "visions of the dark," which vary so greatly both in themselves and in the general conditions of their appearance, vary also in their seat of origin?

The auditory cases are even plainer. For it is only exceptionally that the waking ear, like the waking eye, is subjected to marked and continuous stimulation from without, such as might serve, on M. Binet's view, as a basis for a prolonged hallucination. It is not even subject to border-land experiences analogous to the *illusio[n*]s* hypnagogiques. The only alternative, therefore, to supposing the phenomena to be centrally initiated, is to suppose some abnormality in the external organ itself. Such an abnormality has often been detected; and even where not absolutely detected, it may sometimes be inferred from other symptoms. Thus, an enlarged carotid canal, or a stoppage which produces an unwonted pressure on the vessels, will first make itself felt by hummings and buzzings; hallucination then sets in, and imaginary voices are heard, and these then we should naturally trace to the local irritation that produced the former sounds. But why are we to treat in the same way cases where there are no hummings and buzzings, and no


† M. Binet treats all "ghost-seers" as so paralysed with terror that they do not move their eyes from the figure—which leaves it open to him to guess that the figure would move if their eyes moved. Having made a large collection of cases of hallucinations of the same, I am in a position to deny this. To Wundt, also, stationary hallucinations that can be looked away from seem unknown as a distinct and fairly common type, and he inclines to regard them as mere illusions. Brewster's case of Mrs. A., and the well-known cases given by Paterson (*Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*, January, 1843) would alone suffice, I think, to refute this view. See also Kandinsky's and Schröder van der Kolk's own experiences. (*Archiv für Psychiatrie*, 1881, p. 461, and *Pathology and Therap. of Mental Diseases*, p. 14.)
grounds for supposing that there is stoppage or lesion of any sort? Among a numerous, though much neglected, class of phenomena—the casual hallucinations of the sane—the commonest form by very far is for persons to hear their name called when no one is by. The experience is often remarkably distinct, causing the hearer to start and turn round. It is not at all connected with conditions that produce blood-pressure, such as lying with one ear closely pressed on the pillow; it comes in a sudden and detached way, and apparently at quite accidental moments. Again, among the insane a well-known form of hallucination occurs in the form of dialogue; the patient returns answers to the voices that haunt him, and is answered in turn. Are we to suppose here an intermittent abnormality of the ear, which always sets in by chance at the very moment when the imaginary speaker's replies fall due? It may be added that even where a distinct morbid cause can be traced, it is as often as not a central cause. After a long course of alcohol, a man begins to hear voices; but alcohol, while admittedly affecting brain-tissue, has no recognised tendency to affect the ear.

A further argument for the central initiation of many hallucinations of the more distinctly morbid sort may be drawn from the course which the morbid process takes. The first stage is often not a sensory hallucination at all; it is a mere delusion; the patient thinks that plots are being concocted against him. After a time his secret enemies begin to reveal themselves, and he hears their abusive and threatening language. We surely cannot ascribe the sensory experience here to a lesion of the ear which happens to occur independently, but regularly, at this particular stage; it follows, on the other hand, in the most natural way, if we regard it as imposed from within, as soon as the disease has gone far enough for the mind to clothe its imaginary fears in a more vivid form. Specially conclusive in this respect are the cases where voices begin to address the patient in the most internal way, without sound, and only after a time talk in a distinctly audible character.* But the most interesting of all the cases in point are those where one type of hallucination assails one side of the body and another the other.† They confirm what was said above—that the mere fact of a hallucination being unilateral, or peculiar to one side of the body, though suggesting a defect in the external organ, is by no means a proof of it.‡ The double sensory experience follows with exactness the course of the delusions. The patient first suffers from melancholy and discouragement; this develops into a belief that he is surrounded

* Griesinger's *Ment. Path. and Ther.*, p. 89. The bearing of this fact on the theory of central origin has been noted by Mr. Sully, *Illusions*, p. 119.
† See Dr. Magnan's account in the *Archives de Neurologie*, Vol. VI., p. 336.
by enemies; and he then hears insulting voices on the right side. To this unhappy stage succeeds in due course one of exaltation and self-esteem; the patient believes himself to be the Son of God. And now encouraging and eulogistic voices present themselves on the left side. "The good and the evil genii form a sort of Manicheism which governs him." Here the imagination, as its operations became more complex, and established an opposition of character between its creatures, took advantage (so to speak) of the fact that the body has two opposite sides; it located friends and foes just as they might be located in a picture or play which represented an impending contest. It cannot surely be maintained that by accident the right ear began to be locally affected, just at the time when the development of the plot necessitated the entrance of the friendly power upon the scene. Another case involves the sense of touch. A man, after praying for a year that his actions might be divinely guided, heard a voice say, "I will save thy soul"; and from that time forward he felt his left or his right ear touched by an invisible attendant, according as he was doing right or wrong.* Did the auditory hallucination conicide by chance with the commencement of local irritation in the pinna? Dr. Magnan adds three examples of alcoholism, where abuse and threats were heard on one side, praise and consolation on the other. In these cases there were crises of fury, in which hallucinations of all the senses took place, involving both sides alike, and masking the more ordinary condition. On the decline of these crises, the opposed auditory hallucinations recommenced. It seems impossible to resist Dr. Magnan's view, that the poison, distributed through the whole brain, provokes at times a general crisis; but that when this subsides, it localises its action at the weakest spot. Should this happen to be the auditory centre on one side, a single unilateral hallucination would be the result; but if both centres remain affected, the projection may assume the complex two-sided form.

But the strongest cases of all in favour of a purely central initiation yet remain—the cases of hallucination voluntarily originated. Wigan's instance has often been quoted, of the painter who, after carefully studying a sitter's appearance, could project it visibly into space, and paint the portrait not from the original but from the phantasm. He ended by confounding the phantasmal figures with real ones, and became insane. Baillarger reports another painter, Martin, as having similarly projected pictures, which so interested him that he requested anyone who took up a position in front of them to move.† A still more

† One of the seers of "Faces in the Dark" reported that he could produce the vision of the spangles and sheep at will. His case differs, however, from those given in the text. For, in the first place, his vision was one of old standing; and, in the second place, his retina must have been pretty constantly in the abnormal
interesting case, recently reported by Dr. V. Parant, is that of an asylum patient who, when thwarted or annoyed, would go to special spots to consult imaginary advisers; the replies she received—it need hardly be said—always corresponded with her own desires and prejudices. Another insane woman used to play "odd and even" with an imaginary prefect of police, whose guesses were always wrong.* M. Binet will surely not maintain that in these cases the person first establishes, by an effort of will, some sort of peripheral excitation, and that this then re-acts by provoking the hallucination. Such a circuitous route might with equal reason be imagined for any simple act of representation or memory.†

The only other group of phenomena that we need notice is one that all writers since Baillarger seem to have agreed to treat as a quite unique type. It is a class of which frequent examples have been observed among religious mystics and persons who believe themselves to be in direct communication with spiritual guides. Such persons describe a voice which is yet soundless, which utters the "language of the soul" inside them, and which they hear by means of "a sixth sense," and without any apparent participation of the ear. Owing to the absence of a definable sensory quality, Baillarger distinguished this class as psychic hallucinations, in opposition to psychic-sensorial; and M. Binet himself is inclined to treat them as exceptional, and to grant them an origin from within. As one who holds that that is equally the origin of a large number of the undoubted state. I should thus ascribe the phenomenon to a concentration of attention on actual visual sensations, which fell by habit into the familiar lines. It would be interesting to know whether, after the spangles had appeared, it was possible to check their development into sheep.

* Annales Médico-psyeh., 6th series, Vol. VII., p 379; Ball, Maladies Mentales, p. 98. See also the cases described by Michéa, in the Ann. Medico-psyeh. for 1856, p. 389, and M. Sandras's own experience in the same journal for 1855, p. 542. It is odd to find involuntariness not infrequently taken as the distinctive abnormality in hallucinations (Fairot, Des Maladies Mentales, p. 281, Buchez and De Castelnau in the French debates of 1855-6); and the odder, inasmuch as not only may hallucinations be voluntary, but the mental pictures and memories, from which they are to be distinguished, are, of course, often involuntary.

† I should have been tempted to regard these voluntary cases as conclusive had I not found Prof. Ball (Maladies Mentales, p. 122) explicitly claiming them as hallucinations provoked by an "abnormal sensation." He does not tell us what the abnormal sensation is, or what causes it. He contents himself with pointing out that hallucinations are very like dreams; that some dreams are (and therefore, apparently, all dreams must be) provoked by external stimulation—say a knock at the door; and that we can sometimes direct the course of a dream at will: ergo, it is easy to see how some people may start a hallucination at will. It would be more to the purpose if he would introduce us to a dreamer who can designedly start a pre-arranged dream by knocking at his own door.
Hallucinations.

psycho-sensorial hallucinations, I cannot recognise this exception; and to me the class in question is of interest, not as distinguished from the psycho-sensorial family, but as a true species of that genus presenting the sensorial element reduced to its very lowest terms. These “psychic” hallucinations appear to me as the first stage of a graduated series—the embryonic instance of the investiture of an image or representation with a sensory or presentative character. In proportion as the sensorial element in hallucination is attenuated and dim, or full and distinct, will the perception appear internal or external; and these cases are simply the most internal sort, between which and the most external sort there exist many degrees of partial externalisation.* This view has surely everything to recommend it. We can but take the patient's own account—that he has a distinct impression of words; and that this impression has an actuality which clearly separates it from the mere image or memory of words. How can this separation be conceived, except by recognising the presence of a genuine, though faint, sensorial element? Of what exactly this element may consist, is another question. Dr. Max Simon (in the L2on Medical, Vol. XXXV., pp. 435, 486) has made the very plausible suggestion that what is felt is a muscular impulse to form the words, rather than the sound of them—an impulse exhibited in its extreme form in the irresistible continuous vociferation of mania. On this account Dr. Simon even refuses to regard the experience as hallucination at all. Here, however, I cannot follow him. For, however much a motor-current or impulsion towards speech be involved, the patient’s sensation is of something other and more than this. For him, the words are not suggested or initiated, but actually and completely produced; in his description of the product we do not encounter terms of impulse or movement, any more than terms of sound. Here we surely trace the characteristic delusive element: what a normal person would recognise as purely subjective experience has assumed an objective reality. In what then does the experience fall short of hallucination? If we adopt Dr. Simon's view, so far as to regard it as hallucination of the muscular sense, it becomes of interest to note that it does not admit of any parallel of a visual sort; for no order of visible objects can at all rival language in the closeness and directness of its association with a particular set of muscular

* Our friend, the Rev. P. H. Newnham, of Maker Vicarage, Devonport, has described to us some auditory impressions of his own, which are interesting as exemplifying the stage just above that of the so-called “psychic” hallucinations. He has occasionally had experience of these “psychic” hallucinations, as of words which “seem to be formed and spoken within the chest.” But he has also experienced a soundless voice which yet seems to speak into his right ear (he is deaf of the left ear)—and which thus produces the sense of externality, though not of actual sound.
movements. And this very fact—this absence of any *sightless* hallucinations to compare with these *soundless* ones—is perhaps the reason why the latter have passed as an isolated non-sensory class, with a separate mode of origin. I am concerned to substitute my own view of them; for to admit a genuine sensory element in the most "internal" species of hallucination—which all agree to be centrally initiated—will practically be to admit a similar initiation for *other* psycho-sensorial hallucinations.

And this leads me to a concluding word of criticism on M. Binet's hypothesis. We have seen that it is violent; may we not add that it is gratuitous? He has himself most rightly insisted on the fact that images and sensations are not separated by an impassable gulf, but merge into one another; and he will allow that in many hallucinations, the image—however evoked—gets charged with the whole fulness and vividness of sensation. But then how can it be treated *simply* as an image, superposed on a quite different sensation? To recur once more to Delboeuf's experiment, or to the brown butterfly and the black mice, M. Binet will admit that *somewhere* in the brain activities corresponding to green, to brown, to black, are going on: he is not the writer to make "the imagination" bob in among physical facts like *a deus ex machina*. By what right, then, are these activities to be confined to *ideational* tracts, and excluded from all access to a true *sensory* centre? What temptation is there to strain facts and theories in order to make out that the central initiation of sensation is impossible? The hypnotic "subject" will smack his lips over the sweetness of sugar when there is nothing in his mouth—will sniff with delight at a piece of wood when told it is a rose: may not the brain do for sight and hearing what it does for taste and smell? M. Binet seems really to have been led off the track by his own brilliant experiments with prisms and mirrors. Even in those cases, as he admits, the whole work of creation is done by the brain. Even for him the gist of the experience is not the atrophied external "sensation," but the hypertrophied, brain-imposed "image." We do but ask him to concede that the "image," which can here do so much, can elsewhere do a very little more, and, while charging itself with full sensation from within, can dispense with the atrophied contribution from outside. Why should it not? There is nothing to lead one to suppose that images would assume the unwonted vividness of sensations specially at moments when the external organs of sense are occupied with *other* sensations; rather the reverse. Is not the sort of day-dream which comes nearest to hallucination favoured by *repose* of the sense-organs? When we want to call up the vivid image of a scene, to make it *as real—as sensorial—as possible*, do we not close our eyes? And what are the seasons of life in which genuine hallucinations are
commonest? Are they not seasons of sleep? Are not dreams by far the most familiar instances of the projection by the mind of images that are mistaken for realities? It is just because they are so familiar, and waking-hallucinations comparatively so rare, that we are in danger of overlooking the essential similarity of the phenomena, and the light which the former class can throw on the latter. Indeed, if waking-hallucinations are to be taken as the pathological form of any normal function, much might be said for taking them as the pathological form of dreaming; and we might present the waking-dreams of haschisch-poisoning as a sort of intermediate link. The normal dream disappears when sleep departs; having been able to impose its images as realities only because in sleep our sensory faculties are to a great extent benumbed, and images cannot therefore be compared with actual presentations. Thus the normal dream cannot survive the corrective which the contact of the waking-senses with the external world supplies; it fades like a candle at sunrise; and its images, if they survive, survive as images and nothing more, emptied of all robust sensory quality. The hallucination, or pathological dream, on the other hand, does not require to be thus guarded from comparison with real presentations; its "hypertrophied images" are able to resist the normal corrective, for they are often as fully charged with sensory quality as the external realities which compete with them. But though we may thus regard hallucinations as a pathological form of dream, what is here more in point is the converse view—that dreams are a healthy form of hallucination. For it cannot but appear less likely that excitation of the external organs is a necessary basis for hallucinations, if hallucinations turn out to be most common at precisely those times when the external organs are least excited.

6. The question of Cerebral Localisation.

We may now proceed to an altogether different question—namely, at what part or parts of the brain the creative process takes place, and in what it can be conceived to consist. The distinction that has so long occupied us, between central and peripheral initiation, may henceforth be dismissed; for wherever initiated, hallucinations are assuredly created by the brain from its own resources. An initiating stimulus may probably come from any point on the line from the external organ to the central terminus, along which a nervous current passes in our normal perception of objects. But that stimulus will clearly not determine what the imaginary object shall be, or invest it with any of its qualities: it will merely set the creative machinery in motion; and the same stimulus—the same inflammation of the eye or ear—may set the machinery in motion a hundred times, and each time evoke a
different hallucination. Where, then, and what, is this creative machinery? It would be out of place here to attempt any minute account of the various theories, which have for the most part rested on anatomical observations; and the more so, that their details are still sub judice. But in a more general way the problem can be stated, and even I think to some extent determined.

If we begin at the beginning, we find agreement among the authorities up to a certain point. All are agreed in recognising some part or parts of the brain in which the nerves passing from the various sense-organs terminate, and where the impressions conveyed by the nerves produce the changes which are the physical basis of sensation, or—in the ordinary crude but convenient language—where "impressions are transformed into sensations." As to the locality and extent of these parts, there is a conflict of views, which may be to some extent reconciled if we regard the process as taking place in several stages. Some (Luys, Ritti, Fournié) believe the principal scene of action to be the large central masses called the optic thalami; others (Schröder van der Kolk, Meynert, Kandinsky) would place the centres lower down—that of vision, for instance, in the corpora quadrigemina; others again (Hitzig, Ferrier, Tamburini) locate them higher up, in the cortex itself; and Goltz assigns them so diffused an area that the word centre becomes scarcely appropriate. But all are agreed, I imagine, that they are distinct from the tracts associated with the most highly-developed phenomena of consciousness—complete perception, ideation, memory, and volition; and even if the idea of local separation should come to be modified in the direction indicated by Goltz, the distinctions would be re-interpreted as differences of less and more complex activities. The authorities agree further in connecting the "sensory centres" in a special way with hallucinations. It could not, indeed, be otherwise when once the full sensory character of the phenomena is recognised; for that character can only be the psychical expression of changes at the sensory centres. Any particular activity of these centres which reaches a certain intensity will affect us as a particular sensation; whether excited (1) normally, from the sense-organ; or (2) pathologically, by local irritation of the sense-organ of along the line of nerve from it to the centre; or (3) pathologically, but spontaneously, in the centre itself. In the first case the sensation will be a true one, i.e., will correspond with a real external object; in the second and third cases it will not; but as sensation, it will be the same in all three.

Now for one view of the creation of hallucinations, these data are sufficient. We have only to suppose that, in cases (2) and (3), the agitation at the sensory centre falls readily into certain lines and combinations, so as not only to produce a large
variety of sensations—colours, if it be the visual centre, sounds, if it be the auditory one—but to arrange these elements in various definite groups. Everything will now proceed precisely as if these effects had been due to the presence of a real object. The excitation will pursue its ordinary upward course to the highest parts of the brain, and will lead to intelligent perception of the sensory group as an object; while by a yet further process (which will probably take place only in the most complete or "external" form of hallucinations), a reflucent current will pass downwards to the external organ, and the perception will be referred to the eye or ear, just as though its object were really acting on those organs from outside.* There then is the full-fledged hallucination; and its creative machinery, according to this view, lies wholly in the sensory centre.

But there is another view. We have noted three ways in which the machinery may be set in motion; but there is a fourth possible way. The excitation may come downwards from the higher part of the brain—from the seats of ideation and memory. And clearly this sort of excitation will have a dominance of its own. It will have its own psychical counterpart—an idea or a memory; and when it sets the sensory machinery in motion, that machinery will not now produce or combine a group of sensations determined by its own activity; but will merely embody, or as we might say execute, the idea or memory imposed on it. Here, then, the only machinery which is in any sense creative is situated in the higher ideational tracts. And if we wish

* Krafft-Ebing, Die Sinnesdelirien, p. 11; Despine, Etude Scientifique sur le Somnambulisme, p. 329; Tamburini in the Revue Scientifique, 1881, p. 139. The mere subjective fact of this reference to the external organ would not prove (as Tamburini seems to assume) that the organ had been actually excited by the reflucent current. But, in the case of vision, we have at any rate a fair amount of proof. First, there is the fact already noted, that pressure on the side of one eyeball doubles the phantom. It seems difficult to refer this result to association—the doubling of ordinary objects by such pressure being an infrequent and little noticed experience. Secondly, we have a case of hemiopic hallucination recorded by Dr. Pick, of Prague, where only the upper halves of imaginary figures were seen; and where it was ascertained that the upper half of the retina (to which of course the lower half of the figure would have corresponded) was anopic. Further, it has been noted by H. Meyer of "hypnagogic illusions," and by Gruithuisen of hallucinations which consist in the surviving of dream-images into waking moments, that they can give rise to after-images; this, however, might perhaps not imply more than the brief continuance of excitation at the central cells.

Wundt (Phys. Psych., Vol. II., p. 338) seems to think that this centrifugal retinal stimulation is excluded in the cases where the phantom does not move with the movement of the eye. But, there being a physical process corresponding to the idea of a stationary phantom, why may not that process extend to the whole carrying out of the idea, so as to include the turning on or off of the retinal stimulation according as the phantom is looked at or away from?
to identify the exact starting-point of the hallucination, as such, we must fix it at the point of contact between the ideational and the sensory activities. As long as the nervous activity is confined to the ideational tracts, though there is creation, there is no hallucination; that word is never used to describe the mere image or memory of an object. It is only when the activity escapes downwards, with such force as strongly to stimulate the cells at the lower centre, that sensation floods the image, and we get the delusive percept or hallucination. The force of this downward current may exhibit all degrees. It is probable that even for the barest idea or memory of an object there is some slight downward escape, with a corresponding slight reverberation of the sensory centre; and where, as in rare morbid cases, the escape is wholly barred, all power of calling up visual images is lost. With every increase in the force of the escape, there will be a rise of sensory quality, and a nearer approach to absolute hallucination; and every stage will thus be accounted for, from the picture “in the mind’s eye” to the phantom completely externalised in space. But whatever the degree of the delusion, its local origin is the place where the current, so to speak, bursts the sluice-gates which physically represent the distinction between ideas and percepts.

Here, then, are the two possibilities: (1) that hallucinations are produced by an independent activity of the specific sensory cells—the sensations which arise there being perceived as objects when the nervous current passes on centripetally to the higher parts of the brain; (2) that the part played by the specific sensory cells is only a response to what may be called ideational excitation, propagated centrifugally from the higher tracts where the image has been formed.

In attempting to decide between these possibilities, we shall get little assistance from direct pathological and physiological observations. These have been mainly directed to an end rather the converse of ours—to utilising the facts of hallucination for fixing the locality of the centres, by inspection of the brains of persons who have been in life markedly hallucinated. But cerebral pathology, as Ball trenchantly remarks, has a way of lending itself to the demonstration of whatever one wants. Lesions rarely confine themselves neatly to specific areas. We find M. Luys, the chief advocate of the

* See the case quoted in the Archives de Neurologie, Vol. VI., p. 352. “Je rêve seulement paroles, tandis que je possédais auparavant dans mes rêves la perception visuelle.” The Progrès Médical, July, 1883, has another interesting case.

† I eschew here the expression “sensory centres,” merely to avoid confusion with the higher “centres” to which the words “centripetal” and “centrifugal” refer.
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optic thalami as the primary seat of hallucinations, admitting the constant spread of lesions from the thalami to the cortex;* and Dr. W. J. Micklet† considers—as the result of a number of very careful necropsies—that in cases of hallucination "thalamic disease plays a less important part than cortical." But on the other hand, he did not find that the lesions were definitely associated with the spots in the cortex which Ferrier and the advocates of restricted cortical localisation mark out as the visual and the auditory centres; while lesions at these spots—the angular gyrus and the first temporo-sphenoidal convolution—seem to be found in cases where no hallucination has been observed.‡ This want of correspondence will seem less surprising if we remember the vast number of casual hallucinations where nothing that could be called a lesion exists; and also that the more persistent hallucinations of the insane belong, as a rule, to the earlier period of irritation, rather than to the later one when marked lesion has supervened, and dementia is creeping on.§ Even if we take subsequent cortical lesion as a sign that the weak spot existed from the first in the highest part of the brain, this would be no proof that the specific sensory centre is cortical. If lesions are not bound to be locally restricted, much less are irritations; and there is nothing to refute the supposition above made, that, when the hallucination occurs, a current has passed downwards to the lower centre—the mischief in the cortex having been primarily an excitant of ideational activities only, and the hallucination being due (as Dr. Mickle well expresses it) to "a tumultuous disorderly reaction of disturbed ideational centres upon sensorial." The same may be said of the artificial irritation of the "cortical centres" during life. Ferrier regards the movements which result when an electrical stimulus is applied to these areas, as an indication that visual or auditory sensations (i.e., hallucinations) have been evoked. We may quite accept this interpretation, but still suppose that the primary seat of the sensation was not the spot where the stimulus was applied, but a lower centre on the path along which the irritation passed.¶

* Gazette des Hôpitaux, Dec., 1880, p. 46.
† Journal of Mental Science, Oct., 1881, p. 382.
‡ Journal of Mental Science, Oct., 1881, p. 381, and Jan., 1882, p. 29.
¶ It may be remarked, by the way, that what has been here said as to the relation of hallucinations to cerebral localisation will apply, mutatis mutandis, to blindness. We may suppose the action of lower centres to be inhibited, as well as abnormally excited, by stimulation from above. Thus the fact that blindness follows certain cortical lesions does not by any means establish the location of the principal sensory centres in the cortex. And as it happens, some of the facts of blindness seem absolutely adverse to that location—I mean the...
We are thus thrown back on less direct arguments, derived from the nature of the hallucinations themselves. And I think the mistake has again been in imagining that one or other of two alternatives must be exclusively adopted—that either the lower or the higher origin of hallucinations is the universal one. All, I think, that can be fairly said, is that, while the first mode of origin is a probable one for some cases, the second mode is a certain one for others. Hallucinations produced at the will of the percipient must first take shape above the sensory centres. For it is indisputable that the idea of the object to be projected—the picture, face, sentence, or whatever it may be—must precede its sensory embodiment as a thing actually seen or heard; and the idea, as well as the volition, is an affair of the higher tracts; MM. Luys and Ritti will certainly not locate either of them in the optic thalami. But if the advocates of the first mode have thus ignored an important class of cases, the advocates of the second have erred by adopting a quasi-metaphysical standpoint. Thus Dr. Despine, who has given an extremely clear account of the centrifugal process (Annales Médico-psychologiques, 6th series, Vol.VI., p. 371), argues that for a hallucination to arise, we first need an idea—"an object which does not exist"; and if in a way it is endowed with existence, this, as a purely constructive act, can only emanate from the seat of the highest psychical activities. There is some originality in extracting a physiological conclusion from the relation of the mind to the non-existent. But at this rate the image of the sun's disc on the wall would originate in a constructive act of the mind: it is as much "an object that does not exist" as the most elaborate phantasm. The non-existence of an object outside the organism is quite irrelevant to the course of nervous events inside; and whether we regard a psychic act, for any given case, as constructive or receptive, depends simply on whether the nervous excitation is spon-

phenomena of so-called "psychical blindness," where cortical lesion has produced loss of memory and of the higher functions of perception, while sensation (according to Munk's view) remains intact, and may gradually give rise to new perceptions and new memories. The observations of Munk and Goltz as to the survival of vision, though not of intelligent vision, after extensive cortical injury, seem distinctly favourable to the theory of the lower position of the specific sensory centres. Nor need that theory conflict with the most extreme view as to the absence of circumscribed areas in the cortex. Goltz himself would not deny that some place or places on the paths of the optic and the auditory nerve are specially connected with the fact that the stimulation of the one corresponds with sight, and of the other with sound. It cannot be maintained that this psychical distinction has no local representative; for such a contention would logically lead to denying, e.g., that the corpora quadrigemina in the lower animals have any particular relation to vision. Thus, whatever be the final issue of the vexed question of cortical areas of perception, a local distinction of genuine centres of sensation somewhere in the brain seems as certain as the distinction of the external organs themselves.
taneous, or is received from below. Now this may be applied, as we
have seen, to the lower centres of sensation as reasonably as to the
higher tracts of perceptive ideation; the former may construct as truly
as the latter; that is to say, the configurations and activities of their
cells may produce definite groupings of the sensory elements.

And for simple and recurrent forms of hallucination, much may be
said in favour of this lower origin. It is in accordance with all that
we know or conjecture as to nerve-tissue, that certain configurations
and modifications of cells would be rendered easy by exercise; and thus
the changes to which any morbid excitement gives rise might naturally
be the same as have often before been brought about by normal stimulation
from the retina or the ear. The elements would fall readily, so to
speak, into the accustomed pattern. An object which has been
frequently or recently before the eyes—a word or phrase that has been
perpetually in the ear—these may certainly be held capable of leaving
organic traces of their presence, and so of establishing a sort of
lower memory. That this lower memory should act automatically,
and independently of the will, seems natural enough when
we remember how large a part even of the higher memory
is also automatic: an unsought word, suddenly reverberating in
the sensorium, is on a par with the images that emerge into
consciousness without our being able to connect them with our previous
train of ideas. Now it is remarkable how large a number of hallucina-
tions are of this primitive type. I mentioned above that, among the
sane, the commonest of all cases is to hear the name called; and even
with the insane, the vocabulary of the imaginary voices often consists
of only a few threatening or abusive words.* So of optical hallucinations.
With the sane, a large number consist in the casual vision—an after-
image, as we might say—of a near relative or familiar associate. More
persistent cases are still frequently of a single object. I have mentioned
the doctor and the black cow; similarly a lady, when in bad health,
always saw a cat on the staircase.† And among the insane, a single
imaginary attendant is equally common: our friend “Guiteau” above
was an instance. Wherever such simple cases are not connected with
any special délire, or any fixed set of ideas, they may, I think, be fairly
(though of course not certainly) attributed to an activity following the
lines of certain established tracts in the sensorium. We might compare
this locality to a kaleidoscope, which when shaken is capable of turning
out a certain limited number of combinations.‡

* On this subject, see Dr. V. Parant in the Ann. Médico-psych., 6th series,
Vol. VII., p. 384. These embryonic hallucinations often develop into more com-
plex form; see Ball, Maladies Mentales, p. 67.
† Blandford, Insanity and its Treatment, p. 155.
‡ Charcot (Le Progrès Médical, 1878, p. 38) has noted a curious form of
But, on the other hand, the astonishing variety and complexity of other cases—whether visual appearances or verbal sequences—seem absolutely to drive us to a higher seat of manufacture; for they demand a countless store of elements, and limitless powers of ideal combination. The patient listens to long discourses, or holds conversations with his invisible friends; and what is heard is no echo of former phrases, but is in every way a piece of new experience. So, too, the number and variety of visual hallucinations which may occur to a single person, sometimes even within the space of a few minutes, is astonishing. The shapes and features of Dr. Bostock's apparitions were always completely new to him; the seers of "Faces in the Dark" who had in the course of their lives seen many thousand phantasmal faces, had never seen one that they recognised; Nicolai, who was never otherwise than perfectly sane and who eventually recovered, continually saw troops of phantoms, most of them of an aspect quite new to him; and in insanity such a phenomenon is common enough. Even in the casual hallucinations of the sane, what is seen is less commonly a mere revival of an object which the eyes have previously encountered than an unrecognised person. Here, then, we have an immense amount of high creative work—of what in psychical terms we should call *par excellence* the work of the imagination; and this is work which we have good grounds for supposing that the highest cortical tracts, and they alone, are capable of performing. From our experience of the number and mobility of the ideas and images that the mind in a normal state can summon up and combine, we know that the cells of the highest cerebral areas are practically unlimited in their powers of configuration and association; but we have no right to assume the same inexhaustible possibilities as existing independently in any specific sensory centre—we might almost as well expect a kaleidoscope to present us with an ever-fresh series of elaborate landscapes. And over and above all this, we can point to the constant connection between the delusions, the *conceptions délirantes* of the insane and their sensory hallucinations,* which makes it almost im-

unilateral hallucination, which occurs sometimes to hysterical patients on the side on which they are hemianesthetie—animals, passing rapidly in a row from behind forwards, which usually disappear when the eyes are turned directly to them. Examined by the ophthalmoscope, the eyes of these patients appear absolutely normal. Charcot attributes amblyopy and achromatopsy, occurring in the same persons (as well as in non-hysterical cases of hemianesthesia), to lesion at a point which he calls the *carrefour sensitif* in the hinder part of the internal capsule; and I assume that he would refer the hallucination to the same point. If so, he may be quoted as an authority for the infra-cortical initiation of simple and recurrent forms of hallucination.

possible not to regard the latter as a particular effect of the more widely diffused cerebral disturbance. The conclusion seems to be that for many hallucinations the mode of origin can be no other than what I have called the centrifugal.

I have throughout tried to express what I have called the centrifugal theory in such terms that it might be accepted even by those who locate the sensory centres themselves not below, but in, the cortex. According to these physiologists, the whole double transformation of physical impressions into visual or auditory sensations, and of these sensations into complete perceptions and mnemonic images, would be practically referred to one place. It must be admitted that this view seems at times connected with the want of a due psychological distinction between sensation and perception. But even supposing a specific centre of sensation to be thus equally the seat of psychic functions higher than sensation, it would still be none the less liable to be stimulated by parts of the cortex external to itself; and the nature of many hallucinations would still indicate that they depend on this stimulation, and not on a mere spontaneous quickening of morbid activity in the centre itself. For instance, a girl is violently distressed by seeing her home in flames, and for days afterwards sees fire wherever she looks.* One must surely trace the hallucination to the distress, and so to an "escape of current" from the seat of ideas and images other than visual ones. Again, in the cases described above where the hallucinations faithfully reflect the changes of the whole moral and intellectual bias, the local excitement in the sensory centre would still be traceable to an abnormally strong irradiation from the regions where the highest co-ordinations take place—these regions being themselves, ex hypothesi, already in a state of pathological activity. The other hypothesis would be that the mere hyper-excitability at the centre itself made it impossible for images to arise without getting hurried on, so to speak, into sensations by the violence of the nervous vibrations. This seems to be what Wundt has in view when he speaks of hallucinations as originating, not in an actual irritation, but in a heightened irritability, of the sensory centres. But then, what should cause images belonging to one particular order of ideas—the diseased order—to be picked out for this fate in preference to any others? The hyper-excitable centre in itself, as an arena of images, could have no ground for such a partial selection among the crowd of them which emerge during every hour of waking life. Among the endless and multiform vibrations involved, why should

* Griesinger, Op. cit., p. 97, For an auditory case, cf. the account, in the Lyon Medical, Vol. XXXV., p. 437, of a young Frenchman who was rendered insane by the German invasion, and who was then haunted by the sound of guns firing.
the excessive amplitude that corresponds to sensation be confined to a particular set? A reason must exist. The unique agreement between the sensory hallucinations and the more general moral and intellectual disorder must have its particular physical counterpart; and for this "a strong downward escape of current" is at any rate a sufficiently comprehensible metaphor.*

7.—Veridical Hallucinations.

There is one topic which I cannot altogether pass over here, as it has a distinct bearing on the centrifugal origin of hallucinations. There is a class of phenomena, not yet recognised by science, and for which the evidence has never yet been presented with anything like convincing fulness; but which—I do not think it rash to say—will be accepted as genuine by a large number of persons who quite realise the strength of the a priori presumption against it, whenever the quantity and quality of the evidence shall be adequately realised; and which is accepted already by a considerable number of such persons as, at any rate, having a strong prima facie claim to attention. Readers of these Proceedings will hardly need to be told that I refer to the telepathic class—hallucinations of sight, sound or touch, which suggest the presence of an absent person, and which occur simultaneously with some exceptional crisis in that person's life or, most frequently of all, with his death. Visual and auditory phantasms occurring at such moments may be conveniently termed veridical hallucinations; for while they are completely delusive as far as the percipient's senses are concerned—while they completely conform to our definition, "sensory percepts which lack the objective basis which

* Kandinsky (in the Archiv für Psychiatrie, 1881), agreeing with Meynert, denies this centrifugal influence, and regards the contribution of the higher (front) part of the cortex to hallucinations as something quite different—i.e., the remission of an inhibitory function normally exercised by this part on the specific sensory regions. But he fails to make out even a plausible case. His argument that the higher part cannot initiate hallucinations rests on no better ground than his own inability, when suffering from hallucinations, to transform mental pictures into hallucinations at will; and on the further experience—which was decidedly exceptional—that his hallucinations did not correspond in any marked way with his more general mental delusions. Again, if one asks in what the effect of the supposed inhibitory function would normally be shown, it must surely be in preventing ordinary mental images from taking on the more vivid characters of hallucinations. Now Kandinsky himself admits that in normal acts of imagination the cortical sensory region is stimulated from the higher part of the cortex; hence he seems involved in the difficulty of conceiving stimulation and inhibition to proceed at the same moment from the same quarter. Nor, again, does he make any attempt to show why the supposed inhibitory function, if it is normally operative, does not equally inhibit the normal stimulation derived from the periphery, i.e., normal perception of objects.
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they suggest"—they nevertheless have a definite correspondence with certain objective facts, namely, the exceptional condition of the absent person. Such cases, if genuine, militate very strongly against M. Binet's theory that excitation from the external sensory apparatus is a *sine qua non* of hallucinations. For here the occurrence of the hallucination depends on the distant event; *that* is what fixes it to take place at a particular time; and an occurrence thus conditioned cannot be supposed to be conditioned *also* by the accidental presence of real phenomena capable of supplying *points de repère*, or by an accidental morbid disturbance of the organ or the nerve. And if the brain be admitted to be the primary physical seat of the phenomena, there are, further, good reasons for supposing that its highest tracts are those first affected, and so that the hallucination is centrifugal. The chief reasons are two. (1) The phantasm is often bodied forth with elements of a more or less fanciful kind—dream-imagery, so to speak, embroidered on a groundwork of fact; and these elements seem clearly to be the percipient's own contribution, and not part of what he receives. (2) Cases occur where actual intercourse between the two persons concerned has long ceased; and where the supersensuous communication can only be supposed to be initiated by the quickening of long-buried memories and of dim tracts of emotional association. The hallucination in these cases would therefore be a complete example of the projection of an idea from within outwards; the sensorium reverberates to a tremor which must start in the inmost *penetralia* of cerebral process.

[Note.—I would specially point out that the argument in the last paragraph does not extend beyond the limits of the percipient's organism. It involves no physical expression of the fact of the *transmission*. If A is dying at a distance, and B sees his form, it is rarely that one can suppose any psychical event in A's mind to be identical with any psychical event provocative of the hallucination in B's mind. That being so, there will be no simple and immediate concordance of nervous vibration in the two brains; and that being so, there is no very obvious means of translating into physical terms the causal connection between A's experience and B's. The case thus differs from "thought-transference" of the ordinary experimental type, where the image actually present in the one mind is reproduced in the other; where, therefore, a physical concordance does exist, and something of the nature of a "brain-wave" can be conceived. This was quite rightly pointed out in the notice of the *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* which appeared in *MIND* XXXVI. But it had also been pointed out by Mr. F. W. H. Myers and myself in the "Theory of Apparitions" there criticised. In our *rapprochement* of veridical hallucinations to experimental thought-transference, we are confining ourselves to the psychical aspect; we connect the phenomena as being in both cases affections of one mind by another occurring otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense. The objector may urge that if we have not, we ought to have, a *physical* theory which will embrace all...
the phenomena—that we ought not to talk about a *rapport* between A’s mind and B’s unless we can establish a *bridge* between their two brains. This seems rather to assume that the standing puzzle of the relation between cerebral and psychical events *in the individual*, B, can only be stated in one crude form—viz., that the former are prior and *produce* the latter. For ordinary purposes such an expression is convenient; but the convenience has its dangers. Still, as the converse proposition would be equally dangerous, a *crux* remains which we cannot evade. Since we cannot doubt that B’s unwonted experience has its appropriate cerebral correlate, we have to admit that the energy of B’s brain is directed in a way in which it would not be directed but for something that has happened to A. In this physical effect it is impossible to assume that an external physical antecedent is not involved; and the relation of the antecedent to the effect is, as I have pointed out, very hard to conceive, when the neural tremors in A’s brain are so unlike the neural tremors in B’s brain as they must be when A’s mind is occupied with his immediate surroundings or with the idea of death, and B’s mind is occupied with a sudden and unaccountable impression or vision of A. I can only suggest that the action of brain on brain is not bound to conform to the simplest type of two tuning-forks; and that a considerable community of experience (especially in emotional relations) between two persons may involve nervous records sufficiently similar to retain for one another some sort of revivable affinity, even when the experience has lost its vividness for conscious memory. But, however that may be on the physical plane, the facts of which we have presented and shall continue to present evidence are purely *psychical* facts; and on the psychical plane, we can give to a heterogeneous array of them a certain orderly coherence, and present them as a graduated series of natural phenomena. Will it be asserted that this treatment is illegitimate unless a concurrent physical theory can also be put forward? It is surely allowable to do one thing at a time. There is an unsolved mystery in the background; that we grant and remember; but it need not perpetually oppress us. After all, is there not that standing mystery of the cerebral and mental correlation in the individual—a mystery equally unsolved and perhaps more definitely and radically insoluble—at the background of every fact and doctrine of the recognised psychology? The psychologists work on as if it did not exist, or rather as if it were the most natural thing in the world, and no one complains of them. May we not claim a similar freedom?
THE CALCULUS OF PROBABILITIES APPLIED TO PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

By F. Y. Edgeworth.

"Nous sommes si éloignés de connaître tous les agents de la nature qu'il serait peu philosophique de nier l'existence de phénomènes, uniquement parce qu'ils sont inexplicables dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances. Seulement nous devons les examiner avec une attention d'autant plus scrupuleuse, qu'il paraît plus difficile de les admettre ; et c'est ici que l'analyse des probabilités devient indispensable, pour déterminer jusqu'à quel point il faut multiplier les observations ou les expériences, pour avoir, en faveur de l'existence des agents qu'elles semblent indiquer, une probabilité supérieure à toutes les raisons que l'on peut avoir d'ailleurs, de la rejeter."—LAPLACE.

It is proposed here to appreciate by means of the calculus of probabilities the evidence in favour of some extraordinary agency which is afforded by experiences of the following type: One person chooses a suit of cards, or a letter of the alphabet. Another person makes a guess as to what the choice has been. This experiment—a choice by one party, a guess by another—is performed $N$ times. The number of successful guesses exceeds the number which is the most probable on the supposition of mere chance, viz., $m$, where $m=Nu$ (in the above-mentioned cases respectively $\frac{1}{4}N$ and $\frac{1}{4}N$), by a considerable number $n$, where $n=Nv$. There follow a second and a third similar series of trials in which the number of successes exceeds the number most probable on the hypothesis of mere chance, viz., $N'u'$, $N''u''$, by $n'$, $n''$ respectively. As the number of these series is increased, there occur some in which the number of successes falls below the most probable number. What probability in favour of the existence of some agency other than chance is afforded by (1) a single series such as the first, in which the successes are in excess; (2) a set of series such as the first two or three, in all of which the successes are in excess; (3) a chequered set of series in some of which the successes are in excess, in others in defect?

These problems may, for our purpose, be replaced by the following: Out of an urn known to contain an infinite number of white and black balls in the proportion $u: 1-u$ have been drawn $N$ balls whereof $N$ $(u + v)$ are white; and again $N'$ balls whereof $N'$ $(u + v')$ are white; and so on. $v$ is sometimes negative. What is the probability in favour of agency other than chance deducible (1) from the first series; (2) from a set of series in which $v$ is positive; (3) from a chequered set of series?
operations which may be distinguished in analysis, though implicated in practice. The first (I.) is to determine what function the required probability is of two sets of variables; namely, à priori probabilities not given by (or deducible from) direct statistical experience, and “objective” probabilities (to use the phrase of Cournot), which are derived from statistical experience. The second operation (II.) is the treatment of the à priori probabilities; the discovery, assumption, or ignorance of those unknown quantities. The third operation (III.) is the evaluation of the objective probabilities. These three operations are taken as the principle of division for this study; as a principle of subdivision, the three problems above stated.

I. There is apt to appear something arbitrary in the form of the function expressing an à posteriori probability. When Donkin, for example, constructs a scheme expressing the probability that chessmen, found standing on a board in a certain position, or that neighbouring stars, have not been so arranged by mere chance, one does not feel very confident that the formula, not merely a formula, is assigned by him. It should be observed, however, first that an identical value may be reached in different ways; very much as a multiple integral may be expressed in different forms. Secondly, and more importantly, there is a characteristic defect† of the calculus of probability, which leads us to expect a real discrepancy in the methods of performing our first operation. I allude to the fact that we are often unable to utilise all our datum, to calculate the relative probabilities (in favour of mere chance or some additional agency) for the particular event observed, but only for a class to which that event belongs. And there is something arbitrary in the selection of this class. An example‡ of this peculiarity will presently appear.

(1) For the solution of our first problem two schemata present themselves, each recommended by high authority; the first perhaps more frequently employed in problems of the general sort to which ours belongs, the second, I think, more appropriate to our particular problem. According to the (a) first solution we regard the observed event—the drawing of \( N (u+v) \) white balls—as having resulted from some real constitution or proportion of the balls in the urn, some “possibility,” in the phrase of Laplace. By inverse probability, upon the principle of Bayes, we determine the probability that this constitution, or possibility, or cause of the observed event, was some ratio higher than \( u \). Let \( q(x) \) be the à priori probability that the sought ratio should have been the particular ratio \( \frac{x}{N} \). Let \( f(x) \) be the objective probability that, if \( x : (N-x) \) were the real distribution of the balls, then exactly
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$m+n$ white balls would be drawn in $N$ trials. Then the probability that the observed event has resulted from some possibility above $u$, is expressed by $\sum \phi (x) \cdot f(x)$, summed from $m$ to $N$, divided by the same expression summed from $o$ to $N$.

This, as I understand, is the method pursued by Laplace in investigating the probability that the difference in the ratio of male to female births, as observed in Paris and in London (respectively $\frac{3}{8}$ and $\frac{5}{8}$), is due to a real difference between the two localities. ("Theor. Analytique des Prob.," Book II., Art. 29); mutatis mutandis, that is, it being observed first that Laplace’s $m$ is derived only from a finite set of observations (say at London), whereas ours is derived deductively from an infinite set of observations, the experience of games of chance and even more* widely diffused experiences, from the beginning of time. And secondly, in comparing our formula with Laplace’s method, we must allow for his characteristic neglect of à priori probabilities. Laplace’s reasoning is abridged by Mr. Todhunter, in his “History of Probabilities,” Arts. 902, 1018. Laplace is followed by Demorgan, in the treatise on Probabilities published in the “Encyclopædia. Metrop.,” at section 145, which the author entitles, “Determination of the Presumption that Increased Frequency of an event Has a Particular Cause.” The same method is employed by Cournot in his masterly discussion of à posteriori Probabilities (in the eighth chapter of “Exposition de la Théorie des Chances”). The reader who may wish to see the identical (or as nearly as possible the same) problem which we have in hand, discussed by a first-rate authority, is referred to Cournot, section 99; where it is to be observed that our case is that noted by Cournot when his $m^1$ (our $N$) is “très petit par rapport à $m$” (his $m$ corresponding to our infinite set of observations afforded by games of chance, &c.).

But however well established the preceding formula as an organon of statistics (b), the following schema, savouring more of Bernouilli than of Bayes, is perhaps more appropriate to the particular problem in hand. Let $a$ be the à priori probability that chance alone should have been the régime under which the observed event occurred. Let $p$ be the objective probability that, chance being the régime, a deviation from $u$ in the direction of success at least as great as $v$ should occur. Let $\beta$ be the à priori probability that there should have been some additional agency. Let $\gamma$ be the (not in general objective) probability that, such additional agency existing, the observed event should occur. Then the required à posteriori probability in favour of the additional agency is $\frac{\beta \gamma}{\beta \gamma + ap}$; where $a=1-\beta$.

* I have dwelt upon this sort of experience elsewhere: Mind, April, 1884. Hermathena, 1884.
Such, as I understand, is the method pursued by Laplace in his investigation ("Theor. Analyt.," Book II., Art. 25) whether the difference between barometrical observation at different hours of the day is due to cause or chance alone. Laplace is followed by Demorgan in his section 139 entitled "On the Question whether Observed Discrepancies are Consequences of a General Law, or Accidental Fluctuations." Such also is the method employed by Herschel (Essay on Quetelet) in determining the probability that the difference between the numbers of male and female births is not accidental, and that the connection between the binary stars is physical.

It may be objected, perhaps, to both these methods that they do not utilise all our knowledge; for that, as regards the second method, we are given the particular deviation from \( u \), namely, \( v \), while we take account only of the fact that the deviation belongs to the class extending from \( v \) to \( 1 - u \). In the first method, indeed, we take our stand upon the particular event, the deviation of exactly \( v \). But, on the other hand, we do not take account of our exact knowledge of \( u \). The answer would have been the same if we had been given only that this fraction was somewhere between zero and what we now know to be its exact value.

This difficulty may be partially cleared up by the following illustration (borrowed from Laplace). Suppose we know that there are a thousand tickets in a certain lottery, whereof a hundred are red and the rest white, and that each has a certain number inscribed. If a red ball is drawn, though it has a particular number inscribed on it, yet we cannot utilise that knowledge in the absence of any knowledge whether the agency, other than chance, would prefer one number to another. We may have to put down the (objective) probability that chance alone existing the red ball would have been drawn as \( \frac{1}{100} \). But now let it be known that the particular number was prophesied, or is, and might have been found out to be, the prize-bearing ticket; then, indeed, we obtain a hold whereby to bring to bear our knowledge of the differential change, that is \( \frac{1}{99} \). In our problem, with reference, for example, to the second method above exhibited, we can assign certainly the differential probability that the exact deviation \( v \) should result from chance alone. But we cannot similarly differentiate our vague knowledge about the other agency. We may assign, certainly, the form of such an argument, but when we come to our second operation we shall find that it is an empty form. This foredoomed form might be \( \frac{\beta y^1}{\beta y^1 + \alpha p^1} \) where, corresponding to the notation above employed, \( p^1 \) is the (very small) probability that the particular deviation \( v \) should occur under the régime of chance; \( y^1 \) is the probability (presumably of the same order of magnitude) that, an additional agency existing, the exact deviation \( v \) should have occurred; \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are as before.
The only interpretation which I can put on Professor Lodge's reasoning upon the problem now in hand (in the Proceedings of the S.P.R., Part VII.), is that it is an attempt in some way to evade the difficulty here noticed. But the originality of his reasoning renders it difficult for the book-taught student to understand it.

(2) Still under the heading devoted to the first operation, we come now to our second problem. It seems a sufficient (though for reasons already intimated it is an imperfect) statement to posit the same formula as in the second method of the preceding problem (viz., \( \frac{\beta y}{\beta y + \alpha p} \)), substituting for the \( p \) of that formula the continued product \( p' p'' \), &c., expressing the probability that under the régime of chance all the observed results \( m + n, m + n', \) &c., would have diverged in the same direction from the most probable result, \( m \) by \( n \) \( n' \), &c. (Had the datum been that the observed results had diverged on one side or the other, it would have been proper to take each \( p \) as expressing that degree of divergence on one side or the other.) The import of \( y \) is analogously modified.

It will be noticed that this formula differs from that offered by Mr. Gurney in Part VII. of these Proceedings. But, as above intimated, it does not follow that, because two formulæ are different, both cannot be right. They may be equally serviceable and equally imperfect. In the present case Mr. Gurney's formula appears to be quite as accurate as ours,* but not, as will presently be pointed out, substantially more serviceable.

(3) The third problem may be reduced to the second (or first), by grouping the given series so as to constitute a set, in all of which the successes are in excess. This method, doubtless, does not utilise all our information. But it is convenient; and it might be difficult to frame a more useful formula without special knowledge of the subject-matter. Much would turn upon the probability that the agency other than chance, if existing, would have been attended by the observed chequered result. If it were known or suspected to be a fitful agency, not much presumption against it would be created by defective series.

II. For the methods appropriate to the second operation the reader is referred to the paper on à priori probabilities in the Philosophical Magazine, September, 1884, and to the authorities therein cited. It is pointed out in the article referred to that an accurate knowledge of the values under consideration can often be dispensed with, and that an inaccurate knowledge is often derivable from experience; partly by a copious simple induction, and partly by inference from the success which has attended the hypothetical values which have been usually assigned.

* Poisson (Recherches, Art. 64) indicates the difference between these two procedures, without expressing a preference.
to these quantities. To apply these principles to the problems in hand.

1) For the first problem and the \( (a) \) first method the \( \text{a priori} \) facility function \( f(x) \) can, to a large extent, be ignored, when \( N \) is large; as Cournot has well exhibited in the eighth chapter of the work already referred to. I would further contend that there is some empirical ground for treating the function as a constant (as is usual in inverse reasoning founded on Bayes' theorem and the cognate theory of errors of observation). Accordingly the sought \( \text{a posteriori} \) probability reduces to the objective probability \( \sum f(x) \) between proper limits, divided by the same, summed between extreme limits.

As to the second formula offered above under \( (b) \) \( \frac{\beta \gamma}{\beta \gamma + ap} \) for additional agency, it is consonant, I submit, to experience to put \( f \) both for \( a \) and \( \beta \). To put that same value for \( \gamma \), appears, while not contradicted by, yet less agreeable to, experience. In fact, we know of some kinds of agencies which, if they exist, are extremely likely to make themselves felt (e.g., imposture). Accordingly Mill, discussing a similar problem ("Logic," Book III., chap. xviii., section 6), says: "The law of nature, if real, would certainly produce the series of coincidences." And so Poisson, in a passage above referred to, supposes "une cause capable de le [the observed event] produire nécessairement." But it really is not very important what particular value we assign to one of these \( \text{a priori} \) constants, provided that we are careful not to build upon any particularity which does not rest upon our rough though solid ground of experience. In the present case all that we really know about \( \gamma \) is that it is substantial, not in general indefinitely small. But we must not build any conclusion on its fractional character, seeing that it may very well be in the neighbourhood of unity. The importance of this remark will appear when we come to the second problem. In the present case, since neither \( a \) nor \( \beta \) nor \( \gamma \) is very small, if \( p \) is very small the above written expression for the \( \text{a posteriori} \) probability in favour of additional agency reduces by Taylor's theorem to \( 1 - \frac{a}{\beta \gamma} \times p \).

Thus the objective probability \( p \) may be taken as a rough measure of the sought \( \text{a posteriori} \) probability in favour of mere chance. This reasoning is authorised by Donkin and even by Boole, who is so mightily scrupulous about the undetermined constants of probabilities (see the authorities cited in the paper on \( \text{a priori} \) Probabilities in Philosophical Magazine). The conclusion is agreeable to the summary practice of Laplace and Herschel. They have not thought it worth while to construct a scaffolding of unknown constants which would have to be taken down again.

The third formula \( \frac{\beta \gamma^l}{\beta \gamma^l + ap^l} \) attempts to utilise our knowledge of the particular deviation \( n \), and the particular, most probable value from
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which it is a deviation, viz., \( m, p' \), is the objective probability that this particular deviation should occur in the régime of chance. \( p' \) we know; but what is \( \gamma \)? It is a magnitude presumably of the same order as \( p' \). Accordingly the above expression is thoroughly indeterminate. It will be remembered that this formula is here criticised not as being identical with the rule given by Professor Lodge, but as that to which the principle he employs might seem to lead. His rule, however obtained, is so far a good rule as (in common with an indefinite number of rules that might be constructed) it always varies in the same direction as the rule sanctioned by Laplace, Demorgan, Herschel, and the other masters of the science of probabilities. What is here termed \( p \) always increases with the increase, and decreases with the decrease of Professor Lodge's \( \frac{p}{q} \) (Proceedings, Part VII., p. 261, top). But it happens that Professor Lodge's rule does less than justice to the argument in favour of agency other than chance.

(2) We come now to the second problem, concerning which, under the heading of the second operation, there need hardly be added anything. As under (1) we see (or will see presently) that \( p \) is the effective measure of the probability—the à posteriori probability—of mere chance, so under (2) the real grip of proof consists in \( p \times p' \times, \&c. \) If we replace \( \frac{1}{x} \) which Mr. Gurney assigns as "the probability of obtaining at least that degree of success—if chance +\( \theta \)" act, by our \( \gamma \), his "final value" will become

\[
x \frac{1}{\gamma} \times q_1 q_2 \ldots q_n (1-x)
\]

So far as there is reason to think (with Mill) that "the law of nature, if real, would certainly produce the series of coincidences," Mr. Gurney seems to underrate the probability in favour of a cause other than chance, by assigning to \( \frac{1}{\gamma} \) a value (2) which, being raised to the \( n \)th power, unduly swells the denominator. If each \( p \) or the average—the geometric mean—of the \( p' \)'s were \( \frac{1}{2} \), Mr. Gurney's formula would be void of any probative content. But this is contrary to common sense. It is contrary to this elementary principle of statistics: that, if an event may indifferently happen one way or another, be either plus or minus, and it repeatedly happens one way, then there must be a cause other than chance for that repetition.* According to this new rule it is no

* It is evidently owing to a mere lapsus plume on the part of Mr. Gurney that this consequence can be fastened upon him. For at p. 256 he implies the principle for which we are here contending. It may be as well to repeat that my contention is not against Mr. Gurney's reasoning, which is excellent; but against his assumption of the premiss: that, "if chance +\( \theta \)" act, the probability
argument in favour of causation * that all the planets move in the same direction. It would be no proof of asymmetry in a coin that it ever so often turned up in succession heads. Doubtless you never could prove by repeated throws the existence of such a peculiar kind of asymmetry, such a wabbling load, that it would be (for each throw) "as likely to bring the degree of success up to that point" which is observed, that is to give heads, as "not to do so," that is to give tails. Pure chance would always be as probable an hypothesis as that. In a word, Mr. Gurney's solution underrates the evidence in the case where the divergence from the most probable value is small or not known to be large, but is repeatedly in the same direction. In the general case where $p$ is very small his solution does not differ substantially from ours. His $2p$ is as good as our $\frac{1}{\gamma}p$, may be regarded as of the same order of magnitude.

It should be observed that this criticism relates to the second, not the first operation, as performed by Mr. Gurney. His scaffolding is more elaborate, if not more serviceable, than ours. But in the building he uses some materials which, though solid enough for ordinary purposes, yet will not bear certain strains. It is to be observed, also, that Mr. Gurney's "at least that degree of success" has here been interpreted as at least that degree of divergence from the most probable point in an assigned, say the plus, direction. If we interpret (violently) his $q$ as probability of obtaining that degree of divergence in either direction, we shall be involved in still greater difficulties.

(3) As to our third problem, it has been already resolved into the other two.

III. We come now to the third, the calculative portion of our work. (1) As an example of the application of first principles without the intervention of approximative formulæ, let us take the experiment cited by Mr. Gurney at p. 251 of Part VII. of these Proceedings, where the "name thought of" was DOREMOND, and the "letters

of a certain degree of success being attained may be put down as $\frac{1}{4}$. The ground of my contention is that we are not entirely ignorant of the probability in question. For we have the datum that it is greater than the probability that chance alone would attain the certain degree of success. For it is absurd to suppose that chance + a favouring cause is less likely to obtain a certain degree of success than chance alone. Accordingly it might be legitimate to put $\gamma = p + \frac{1-p}{2}$; or rather to regard $\gamma$ as an independent variable in $P$, the expression for the a posteriori probability in favour of a cause, and to integrate $P$ with regard to $\gamma$ between limits $p$ and 1; agreeably to the practice recommended by Donkin in his masterly discussion of a priori probabilities (Phil. Mag., 1831). It is clear that, when $p$ is in the neighbourhood of $\frac{1}{4}$, Mr. Gurney's assumption sacrifices much of the cumulative force which properly belongs to $P$.

* Cf. Laplace, Essai Philosophique.
produced" were EPJYEIOD. Here, out of eight guesses, there are four successes; if success consist in guessing either the very letter thought of, or either of its nearest alphabetical neighbours, in short any one of an assigned consecutive triplet. The probability that a letter taken at random should fall within any assigned triplet is \( \frac{1}{8} \). Accordingly (on the supposition that chance is the only agency), the probabilities of obtaining in the course of eight trials no successes, one success, two successes, &c., are given by the first, second, third, &c., terms respectively of the binomial \( \left( \frac{7}{8} + \frac{1}{8} \right)^8 \). The probability of obtaining at least four successes is equal to the sum of the fifth, and remaining terms; that is

\[
70 \left( \frac{7}{8} \right)^4 \left( \frac{1}{8} \right)^4 + 56 \left( \frac{7}{8} \right)^3 \left( \frac{1}{8} \right)^5 + 28 \left( \frac{7}{8} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{8} \right)^6 + 8 \left( \frac{7}{8} \right) \left( \frac{1}{8} \right)^7 + \left( \frac{1}{8} \right)^8,
\]

or \(0.011\). The probability, then, in favour of an agency other than chance is about \(0.99\).

When larger numbers are involved, approximative formulæ become necessary. According to principles familiar to those who have studied the calculus of probabilities, the objective probability involved in either formula \((a)\) or \((b)\) is approximately*

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - 2 \int_0^T e^{-t^2} \, dt \right], \text{ where } T = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2u(1-u)}}
\]

The approximation requires that \(n^2\) should not exceed \(N\), and that \(N\) should be large. This then, according to the reasoning employed in our second part, is the measure of the \(\text{à posteriori}\) probability in favour of chance alone.

For example, in the first instance given by Mr. Gurney, at p. 241 of the December number of this Journal, \(N\) is 2927, \(u\) is \(\frac{1}{4}\), and \(v\) is \(\frac{1}{2927}\). As the condition required for the validity of the approximation is just or very nearly fulfilled, the answer is, if I do the sum correctly, about \(0.93\) as the probability of an agency other than chance; no very crushing probability, as statistical evidence goes. In Mr. Gurney's next instance, \(N\) is 1833, \(u\) still \(\frac{1}{4}\), \(v\) is \(\frac{1}{1833}\). Whence in favour of additional agency a very respectable probability, \(0.997\).

\((2)\) and \((3)\). As an illustration of the second problem (including the

Omitting a certain term outside the sign of integration (see Todhunter, sec. 997) as here practically, if not in general theoretically, negligible. It will be observed that in \(\text{halving} the quantity within the brackets we assume that an excess greater than \(n\) is equally probable as a defect greater than the same quantity. This is exactly true only when \(u = \frac{1}{4}\). In our case the factor \(\frac{1}{4}\) is too large. The argument becomes a \(\text{a fortiori}\).
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third), let us suppose that the series just instanced breaks up into four series, each presenting an excess of successes, with about the same \( v \)—an arrangement to which the experiments of M. Richet (described at p. 622-628 of the December number of *Revue Philosophique*) seem to lend themselves without violence. Then for one of the fractional series we have \( N = \frac{18^{33}}{458} = 158 \), \( u \) and \( v \) as before. Whence \( p \) is found about \( 0.08 \). Whence \( p^4 \) about \( 0.00004 \). And \( 1 - p^4 \), the measure of the sought probability, \( = 0.99996 \), which may fairly be regarded as physical certainty. It should be observed that if, as would usually happen, the \( v \) for all the partial series should not be the same, then *ceteris paribus* the above estimate would be below the mark. On the other hand, if the partial \( N \)'s were unequal, *ceteris paribus* our estimate would be above the mark. As both inequalities, but especially the former, are likely to make themselves felt, the conclusion may be regarded as safe.

Such is the evidence which the calculus of probabilities affords as to the existence of an agency other than mere chance. The calculus is silent as to the nature of that agency—whether it is more likely to be vulgar illusion or extraordinary law. That is a question to be decided, not by formulæ and figures, but by general philosophy and common sense.