SUPPLEMENT.

I.

SECOND AD INTERIM REPORT ON THE CENSUS OF HALLUCINATIONS,

Up to July 11th, 1890.

In England the total number of answers received up to this date is :

	"No."	"Yes."	Totals.
From men	2646	218	2864
From women	3108	509	3617
	5754	727	6481

Percentage of affirmative answers, 11·1.

Of the persons answering "Yes" 121 have as yet sent no particulars.

The number of persons who have had more than one experience, either the same repeated more than once or different experiences, is 217. Of these, 90 have had only auditory or tactile experiences, generally of a trivial kind. When a percipient has had more than one experience, but has not described them singly, his experiences are counted together as one case in the following tables.

The experiences recorded have been classified as follows :

A.—Experiences Affecting More Than One Sense.

I.—Coincidental.

	Representing			Totals.
	A Living Person.	A Dead Person.	An Inanimate Object.	
Visual and Auditory	8	1	2	11
Visual and Tactile	2			2
Auditory and Tactile.....	1			1
Visual, Auditory, and Tactile	2			2
	13	1	2	16

II.—Non-Coincidental.

	Representing						Totals.
	A Living Person.	A Dead Person.	An Unrecognised Person.	Part of Human Figure other than Head.	An Animal.	An Inanimate Object.	
Visual and Auditory	6	15	9	2	1	3	36
Visual and Tactile	3	4	2	1	1	1	12
Auditory and Tactile	3	1	2			1	7
Visual, Auditory, and Tactile	2		1				3
	14	20	14	3	2	5	58

It is by no means certain that the affection of *both* senses was in all cases hallucinatory—rustling, footsteps, &c., may sometimes have been real sounds, and touches real muscular sensations.

Of the coincidental visual and auditory cases, 2, viz., those representing an inanimate object, are said to have been collective. Of the non-coincidental visual and auditory cases, 5, viz., 1 of an unrecognised person, 1 of an animal, 2 of an inanimate object, and 1 of a recognised living person, are also said to have been collective. In the last case the experience of two out of the three percipients was visual only.

B.—Experiences Affecting One Sense Only.

I.—Visual.

1. Coincidental—				
a. Human apparitions:				
α. Of living people	31	37		
β. Unrecognised	6			
b. Non-human apparitions:				43
α. Of animals (symbolic)	2	6		
β. Of inanimate objects	4			
2. Non-coincidental—				
a. Human apparitions:				
α. Of living people	87	317		
β. Of dead people	51			
γ. Unrecognised	171			
δ. Any part of figure other than head	8			365
b. Non-human apparitions:				
α. Of animals	11	48		
β. Of inanimate objects	37			
Total				408

Of these, 52 (6 coincidental and 46 non-coincidental cases) are said to have been collective experiences. The coincidental collective cases consist of

3 apparitions of a living person, 1 unrecognised, and 2 of inanimate objects; and the non-coincidental collective cases consist of 6 apparitions of a living person, 2 of a dead person, and 29 unrecognised, 1 of an animal, and 8 of inanimate objects.

II.—Auditory (Human Voices).

1. Coincidental—				
a. Recognised living:				
Name called...	11			
Words other than percipient's name	12	25		
Crying or sobbing	2			33
b. Unrecognised:				
Name called...	2			
Words other than percipient's name	6	8		
2. Non-coincidental—				
a. Recognised. Of living persons:				
Name called on one occasion...	26			
Words other than percipient's name	6			
Voices heard (once or more)	5			39
Song	1			
Screams	1			
b. Recognised. Of dead persons:				
Name called on one occasion	10			
Words other than percipient's name	6			20
Voices heard (once or more)	4			
c. Name called on more than one occasion, voice either recognised or not				63
d. Unrecognised:				
Name called on one occasion	20			
Words other than percipient's name	21			
Voices heard (once or more)	14			
"Crooning" a tune	1			58
Music and faint voices	1			
Shriek	1			
Total				213

Of these, 19 (4 coincidental and 15 non-coincidental) are said to have been collective experiences. The 4 coincidental collective cases consist of 2 cases of calls, 1 of words in a recognised voice, and 1 of a call in an unrecognised voice. The non-coincidental collective cases are 4 cases of calls, 2 of words, and 1 of a song in the voice of a living person, 1 of words in the voice of a dead person, 1 of the voice of a dead person, 1 of calls occurring on three occasions to the same two percipients, and 5 unrecognised cases (3 of words, 1 of voices, and 1 of "crooning" a tune).

III.—Tactile.

1. Coincidental—			
a. Recognised touch of a living person	2		
b. Unrecognised	4	6	

2. Non-coincidental—

a. Recognised touch of a living person :				
α. Single touch	1	2		
β. Recurring touches	1			
b. Recognised touch of a dead person :				
α. Single touch	1	4	50	
β. Recurring touches	3			
c. Unrecognised :				
α. Single touch, &c.	25	44		
β. Frequent touches	19			
Total				56

One case of a single unrecognised touch is said to have been collective, one percipient seeing a form when the other felt a touch.

I must make the same reserves as to possibilities of error, and, in a few cases, morbid conditions in the percipients, as in my last report.

The inquiry is also proceeding in America, France, Germany, and Italy, but we have not received any detailed reports from these countries.

I may again remind my readers that a report on the Census is to be made to the International Congress of Experimental Psychology in 1892, and that we should like by that time to have 50,000 answers. Further assistance in collecting is urgently needed, and I shall be glad to correspond with anyone willing to help in the work. Letters should be addressed, Professor Sidgwick, Cambridge.

HENRY SIDGWICK.

P.S.—In America the collection is being carried on by Professor William James, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., who may be applied to for the necessary forms, and in France by Mons. Léon Marillier, 7, Rue Michelet, Paris.

II.

REVIEW OF A. AKSAKOF'S ANIMISMUS AND SPIRITISMUS.

By F. W. H. Myers.

Animism and Spiritism; an Attempt at a Critical Investigation of Mediumistic Phenomena, with special reference to the Hypotheses of Hallucination and of the Unconscious; an Answer to Dr. E. von Hartmann's work, "Der Spiritismus." By Alexander N. Aksakof. Pp. xli., 768, in two volumes octavo. Oswald Mutze, Leipsic, 1890.

This work calls for serious notice, alike on account of the position and character of its author, and of the original thought and independent research to which the book itself bears witness. There are few men living who have pursued these inquiries with such persistent energy as M. Aksakof. His personal investigations must have involved journeys of several thousands of miles; and he has for many years published at Leipsic the monthly journal, *Psychische Studien*, which is honourably distinguished by absence of fanaticism or *parti pris*; its sub-editor, Herr Wittig, being no Spiritualist, but explaining all supernormal phenomena by the action of telepathy and of the unconscious Self.

Through the medium of his journal, or by direct communication, M. Aksakof has supplied our own Society with some very important pieces of evidence; and in the verification and corroboration of these cases he has spared no pains.

The primary object of his present work is of a controversial nature. In 1888 Dr. von Hartmann, the distinguished author of *Phenomenology* and *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, published a short work on Spiritualism, which was translated by Mr. C. C. Massey for English readers in 1885, in *Light*, from the office of which paper it can be obtained in pamphlet form.

In this work Dr. von Hartmann provisionally accepted the bulk of Spiritualistic phenomena as reported, but endeavoured to explain them without admitting the agency of any minds except those of the medium and sitters. His principal assumptions, as summarised by M. Aksakof (Vol. I., p. xxiv.), are as follows:—

1. A nervous force, which can produce mechanical and plastic effects outside the human body.

2. Hallucinations [often collective], supported by this same nervous force, and sometimes producing physical and plastic effects.

3. A hidden, unrealised, somnambulic consciousness (*unbewusstes Bewusstsein*) existing throughout the subject's normal life, which perceives the whole present and past life of another man, through telepathic insight into his intellectual content.

4. Finally, Dr. von Hartmann assumes that this same consciousness sometimes becomes possessed of a clairvoyant power; brings the subject

into relation with the absolute, and consequently bestows upon him a knowledge of everything which is or which has been.

To this M. Aksakof replies by accepting the facts as assumed by Dr. von Hartmann, and by urging that that philosopher's theories (with which, so far as they go, M. Aksakof in the main concurs) do not explain or cover the whole of the assumed facts; some of which facts need the hypothesis of an intervening intelligence outside the intelligences of the living persons concerned. I may say at once that *on the data as assumed* I think that M. Aksakof has the better of his opponent. But the value of this victory is diminished by the looseness of the premises on which the arguments on each side are founded. Dr. von Hartmann was by no means bound, I think, to admit so much as he has admitted. Many of the incidents to which both he and M. Aksakof appeal seem to me to rest on very insufficient proof. And M. Aksakof's book would consequently have been to us of more value had its aim been of a more evidential and a less controversial character.

But while thus premising that there must be much more evidential work done before any controversy of this kind can be considered as finally settled, we may gladly allow that in the hands of these two very capable logicians the controversy has been made the occasion of presenting many psychological problems under a far more reasonable, a far more *soluble*, aspect than they have been wont to wear in Spiritualistic manuals. M. Aksakof has written with adequate knowledge of what experimental psychology has done within the last few years in France and England to throw light on human automatism, and the workings of the subconscious Self; and his own temper of mind is free from haste or fanaticism. One or two passages from his preface will best indicate his attitude:—

"Since I first interested myself, in the year 1855, in the Spiritualistic movement, I have never ceased to study it in all its details,—in all parts of the world, and in all literatures. At first I learnt the facts from the testimony of others: it was not until the year 1870 that I attended my first séance in an intimate circle of friends selected by myself. I was not surprised to find that the phenomena were such as others had asserted them to be; and I formed the deep conviction that these facts, veritably existing in Nature, must form a firm basis for the gradual upbuilding of a new science, which might hold the promise, perhaps, of solving in the remote future the main riddle of human life. I did what I could to make these facts known, and to draw upon them the attention of open-minded men.

"Meanwhile, however, a change was taking place in my own inward attitude. I suppose that every intelligent observer, on his first acquaintance with these phenomena, is struck with two indubitable facts: firstly, the obviously *automatic* character of so-called Spiritualistic manifestations, and, secondly, the frequent *falsity*—shameless and conspicuous—of their intellectual content. The illustrious names with which these communications are usually signed are the best proof that the messages are at any rate *not that* which they pretend to be. And similarly with the simpler physical phenomena it is evident, on the one hand, that they occur without the slightest conscious co-operation on the medium's part,—while yet, on the other hand, there is at first sight nothing to justify their ascription to the

agency of 'spirits.' It is only gradually—when certain phenomena of an intellectual type have compelled us to recognise an intelligent power outside the medium—that one forgets one's first impression and learns to look with more respect on the Spiritualistic hypothesis. And thus, while the materials which I had collected by reading and experience seemed abundant, their explanation was hard to find. And on the other hand, as years went on, the weak side of Spiritualism became increasingly conspicuous. The vulgarity of the messages, the barrenness of their intellectual content, the mystifications and falsehoods involved in the majority of the manifestations, the unsuitability of the physical phenomena for systematic experiment, the credulity, infatuation, fanaticism of Spiritists and Spiritualists, and, finally, the fraud which made its entrance into the inquiry along with dark séances and materialisations, a fraud whose prevalence was brought home to me, not only by the writings of others, but by my own personal experiences in the course of investigation with the most renowned professional mediums;—in a word, a whole mass of new doubts, objections, and perplexities intensified the original difficulty of the problem before me. . . . Under the influence of such impressions, I often bethought myself of the great illusions through which mankind have passed in the course of their intellectual development, and asked myself whether of these illusions Spiritualism might not be the last.

"I first saw light breaking in upon me, when a critical study of the facts had forced me to the conclusion that every type of mediumistic phenomenon is capable of being produced by the unconscious action of living men; that consequently the unconscious psychical activity of our being is neither *purely* psychical in character, nor is confined within the periphery of our bodily frames; but that it can overstep the bounds of the body, and can exert, either within or without the body, activities of a physical, nay even of a plastic kind. It is to this wide field of phenomena,—wider perhaps than the field of Spiritualism proper,—that I have given the name of Animism.

"It is highly important to recognise and study the working of the unconscious element in our nature—most of all in those its most complex and extreme manifestations which Animism reveals to us. From this standpoint alone can we judge aright of Spiritualism itself. For if aught within us survives the body, *that* must be this unconscious element, or say this inner consciousness, which, although at present hidden from us, yet constitutes the original principle of each individuality.

"And thus for the due comprehension of mediumistic phenomena we have not one hypothesis only, but three hypotheses: each of them possessing full right to be invoked for the explanation of a certain series of facts; the facts themselves being thus reducible under three main categories, which we may designate by the following names:—

"I. *Personismus* (or change of personality) may stand for those unconscious psychical phenomena which are produced within the limits of the medium's own body; those *intra-mediumistic* phenomena, whose distinguishing characteristic is the assumption of a personality strange to that of the medium. Of this class are the elementary phenomena of mediumship,—the conversations through table-tilting, writing mediumship, and unconscious utterance. We have here the first and simplest manifestation of the duplica-

tion of consciousness,—that fundamental phenomenon of mediumship. The facts under this heading reveal to us the duality of our psychical being,—the non-identity of the individual, inner, unconscious Self with the personal, outer, conscious Self. They show us that the centre of gravity of the psychical being does not lie in the personal Ego; that this last is but the phenomenal manifestation of the noumenal individuality; and that consequently the (necessarily personal) elements of this phenomenal self may assume a manifold character,—normal, abnormal, or fictive,—according to the condition of the organism, in sleep, somnambulism, or mediumistic activity.

"II. Under the name of Animism, we include unconscious psychical phenomena, which show themselves outside the limits of the medium's body,—*extra-mediumistic* operations, as thought-transference, telepathy, telekinesis (*Fernwirkung*), or movements of objects without contact, and finally materialisation. We have here the highest manifestation of the psychical duplication; the elements of the personality overstep the limits of this body, and manifest themselves at a distance not only in psychical, but also in physical, and even plastic operation, up to the point of complete externalisation or objectification. Thus it is proved that a psychical element may be not merely a simple phenomenon of consciousness, but an actual centre of force, which thinks and organises;—which can sometimes organise a visible or invisible duplicate of a given organ of the body, and which thus acts upon the physical world.

"III. Under the name of *Spiritism* we include phenomena, resembling both Personalisation and Animism, but which we must ascribe to some extra-mediumistic and extra-terrene cause. We have here the earthly manifestation of the individuality through the help of those elements of personality which have been able to cling round the centre of individuality after its severance from the body, and which can manifest themselves through mediumship,—that is to say, through association with the corporate psychical elements of some living being. The phenomena of Spiritism must therefore resemble in their general form those of Personalisation and of Animism, and differ only in their intellectual content, which affords evidence of an independent personality." (Vol. I., pp. xxv.-xxxii.)

From the point of view of a believer in all these phenomena, this classification has great merit. It forms a marked advance on the merely empirical arrangements, with all phenomena alike referred to the action of "spirits," with which the propounders of these tenets have too often rested content. A few remarks on the terms which M. Aksakof employs may be useful here.

In the first place it is important to keep the term Spiritism (or Spiritualism) for phenomena where the intervention of spirits is meant to be asserted.

At present much confusion exists, owing partly to the fact that various movements of human limbs, not due to the conscious agency of the owner of the limb, and therefore called automatic, were first observed or described by men who attributed them to the agency of the departed. Thus automatic writing,—which happens to be now mainly discussed by French doctors in anything but a mystical spirit,—is still indiscriminately called in some quarters a "Spiritualistic phenomenon," although it ought not to be so designated

unless the speaker means distinctly to assert that a spirit is prompting the message.

Moreover, the word "Spiritualism" is itself ambiguous. It had already been appropriated in France to the school of philosophy opposed to materialism, before it was used for the belief in manifestations of the departed.

It seems, therefore, better to give the term "Spiritism" to this special belief. At present "Spiritism and Spiritualism" are sometimes opposed to each other with a kind of sectarian connotation,—Spiritism involving a belief in re-incarnation on this planet, which Spiritualism denies. But this difference of speculative view can easily be expressed in a more direct way. And if these phenomena are to be dispassionately studied, it is most desirable that they should bear no question-begging or sectarian titles.

For the alleged movements without contact, which form an important branch of "so-called Spiritualistic phenomena," M. Aksakof's new word "telekinetic" seems to me the best attainable. It need not, of course, imply an actual *actio in distans*, without any intervening medium, but rather an action exercised upon a body so situated with regard to the assumed agent that no exercise of any known force would have originated the body's movement. Again, M. Aksakof uses the term "telesomatic" for the phenomena of so-called "materialisation,"—the formation of "spirit-hands" and the like. Elsewhere he calls these phenomena "plastic." Inasmuch as other material objects are asserted to be thus supernormally formed, besides quasi-human bodies, it would be better, I think, to give the name *teleplastic* to all this class of alleged phenomena.

To many of my readers this may seem to be an elaborate bestowal of specific names upon some fine specimens of the genus *Chimæra*. But if these alleged phenomena are to be discussed at all, we must have names to call them by; and M. Aksakof's effort to avoid the confused and misleading terminology at present in vogue should, I think, be warmly encouraged by disputants on either side.

M. Aksakof still, however, retains one word which seems to me the most barbarous and the most question-begging of all, viz., the word *medium*, with its intolerable derivatives *mediumism* and *mediumistic*;—as though one were to say *magnumism* for magnitude, or *parvumistic* for small.

But the main objection is to the implied assumption that the "medium" is acting as an intermediary between the spirit-world and our own. This is just the question in dispute; and it is surely better to keep to the word "automatist," understanding this to mean that the person who is producing the phenomena is not producing them by any conscious means.

But apart from these details, it is plain that from the standpoint at which many of our own readers have arrived M. Aksakof's heading of *Animismus* will be seen to include phenomena which to us are situated on the two sides of a formidable gulf. To telepathy we are in these *Proceedings* fully accustomed; but the movement of objects, the interference with the ponderable world,—which M. Aksakof sets down as merely one among the effects of telergic activity,—this alleged *physical* action has hitherto seemed to most of us to be far less conclusively demonstrated. If it is to be included among the supernormal powers of the human organism, we should

assuredly desire to see more cases where it has been exercised under definite conditions, and with no possibility of fraud. M. Aksakof touches, I think, the centre of the problem when he suggests that *hypnotic suggestion* ought,—if this power truly exist—to enable us to evoke its action experimentally in a suitable subject. Thus, where we already have (as in Mr. Cleave's often quoted case) an *appearance* of the hypnotised subject to the distant person on whom his thoughts are fixed, we should have some physical effect also, coincident with that appearance, and indicating that the entranced person was modifying the material world in what M. Aksakof terms a *telekinetic* manner.

"Just as hypnotism has in our days become an instrument through which certain phenomena of psychical automatism, or disintegration of consciousness, can be summoned at will and subjected to experiment, even so we allow ourselves to hope that through the instrumentality of hypnotism nearly all the phenomena of Animism may before long be subjected to the control of definite experiment. We hope that *hypnotic suggestion* will succeed in carrying this psychical disintegration beyond the limits of the body, in producing at will an action upon the physical world. That will be the first step towards a similarly voluntary origination of *plastic* action as well, so that the phenomenon known as 'materialisation' may receive scientific acceptance.

"And when Personality is thus analysed, psychological experiment will strike down to human individuality; that transcendental core of indissoluble forces, round which the complex and separable elements of Personality are grouped and cling." (Vol. I., p. xxxvi.)

M. Aksakof, however, while fully recognising the desirability of experiment of the above kind, is nevertheless convinced that ample proof already exists of many classes of physical phenomena; and, moreover, that some of these classes (as "spirit-photography") demonstrate the influence of an intelligent agency outside the mind of any person present. Into his review of physical phenomena I must not here follow him in detail. A committee of the Society for Psychical Research (as my readers may perhaps remember) is engaged on this same inquiry, and what has to be said on the matter will be better said elsewhere. Yet I may just suggest that in the event of the translation of M. Aksakof's book into French or English the list of cases which he quotes might well undergo revision. I observe the names of certain mediums whose marvels would need a great deal of testimony to establish them, and of certain witnesses whose testimony would go but small way towards establishing any marvels whatever. And some other cases are at that perplexing point where the evidence for them is just too strong to ignore, but just too weak to rely on. There are, however, certain other cases which—however isolated and startling—are yet so well evidenced that attention should certainly be drawn to them as often as possible, in the hope that other observers may attempt to obtain similar results. Such are the transcendental photographs taken by Mr. Beattie and (especially) by Prof. Wagner; hard to explain either by fraud or by accident, yet not hitherto sufficiently supported by careful experiments of like kind to compel conviction.

But I pass on to the second volume, which consists mainly of an analysis

of the contents of communications supernormally received, with a view to deciding whether anything in those communications compels us to look beyond the medium's mind for its source and derivation.

And here the greater number of the points which our author suggests are capable of being directly tested by experiments which have nothing mystical or unscientific about them. For they are, as I have said, mainly questions as to the *content of automatic messages.*

Now we may fairly claim that automatic writing and cognate forms of "message" are now accepted as genuine and important phenomena, throwing light upon the workings of subconscious strata of the mind. What the psychology of ten years ago ignored as mere fraud or fancy, the experimental psychologist of to-day recognises as a necessary aid to diagnosis.

And on the other hand, any Spiritualist who, like M. Aksakof, writes with knowledge and moderation, admits that the mere fact of automatic writing does not necessarily prove the intervention of an intelligence other than that of the automatist himself, or of some other living person, whose knowledge may be transmitted to the automatist by a telepathic undercurrent from mind to mind.

With these admissions on both sides the points to observe in experiments in automatism are sufficiently clear, however much opinions may differ as to the reliance to be placed on the accuracy of any given observer.

I regard some of the cases which M. Aksakof cites as being too remote and too loosely described to carry much weight. But the headings or rubrics under which they are grouped seem soundly chosen, and there is no reason why further experiments should not be made in almost every class, if pains are taken to select suitable automatists.

1. As a first step among the proofs of an external agency in the messages, M. Aksakof takes those cases where the message is given against the automatist's desire, or contains advice, injunctions, &c., contrary to his conscious will.

Cases of this sort are not uncommon ; and it is interesting to trace the differences of character, &c., between the two personalities. But we infer from the classical case of Léonie I., II., III., and from other cases, that the subconscious self may set itself in opposition to the conscious self ; nor can we limit the extent to which this war of wills may be carried.

2. Somewhat similar are the cases where the substance of the message contravenes the automatist's speculative or religious ideas. The case of "M.A. (Oxon.)," given in his work, *Spirit Teachings*, is a striking instance of this kind. In that case the automatist was converted from ordinary Anglican orthodoxy to a much broader view of spiritual evolution. In another case, privately printed under the title of *Strange Tracts*, a few years ago, the automatist was a Unitarian, and was converted by his own automatic writings to Trinitarian views. I have known other instances of this kind. But, of course, we can have no rigorous proof that these effective arguments did not proceed from the writer's own brain.

3 and 4. Similar remarks apply to the cases where the communications appear to be either *below or above* the writer's level of character and intelligence. Startling although they often are, these manifestations of something within us either more debased or more exalted than we had supposed

can hardly be pressed as rigorous proofs of an external influence. In some of the cases cited (in the *Edwin Drood* case, for instance) our author, I think, much overrates the intrinsic value of the messages given.

5. It has occasionally been stated that infants or very young children have written, &c., automatically. Could this be proved (and I do not think M. Aksakof's cases adequate to prove it), we should still have an alternative view. Such a manifestation might possibly show an inward development of the unconscious self in advance of that of the conscious self, rather than any influence from external intelligences.

6. The next heading is a very important one. It is asserted that messages have frequently been given by automatic speech or writing in a tongue unknown to the automatist. Up to this date this thesis has mainly rested on some strong testimony given by Judge Edmonds, an upright and sagacious man,—but one who unhappily was content to set down his experiences without the details and corroborations which would now add so much value to the record. In every case where this utterance in an unknown tongue is asserted the actual words used should be given, in order to assure the reader that they are more than such trivial phrases as the unconscious self may easily have noted and retained, as in the case given *Proceedings*, Vol. II., p. 26.

This subject has been repeatedly alluded to in our *Proceedings*, and fresh observations are much to be desired.

7. Of a somewhat similar type are the anomalous cases under M. Aksakof's next heading. One of these is especially noteworthy, but cannot be reproduced without the use of the Russian alphabet. In a message written by the late Madame Aksakof (apparently in a state of trance) Russian letters were used to represent English letters, which they resembled in form, while totally different in phonetic value. The case is a complex one, and (excluding the supposition of external agency) would imply an elaborate mystification, conducted by Madame Aksakof's unconscious self, by the aid of knowledge telepathically drawn from her husband's mind. Absurd as such a hypothesis may sound, we have only to refer to our often-cited case of Mr. and Mrs. Newnham (where the messages themselves expressly claimed to originate in Mrs. Newnham's mind), to show that it must be taken into account as a quite possible explanation.

8. The next heading is the important one of "Communications of facts unknown to the medium and sitters."

In some of these cases the medium or automatist appears to have indicated the position of objects in darkness, or to have read concealed words, &c.

For this there is much old, and some recent evidence; but "Clairvoyance" of this kind resembles rather an extension of the automatist's own perceptivity than the effect of an external influence.

In other cases (as the *Cardoso* case, given in the *Society for Psychical Research Journal*, January, 1887, and June, 1889), and some of "M.A. (Oxon.)'s" experiences, the facts given consist in the reproduction of words from a book; and even admitting that those words have never fallen within the automatist's visual field, we may still think it more probable that his unconscious self has obtained clairvoyant access (so to say) to the words in

question, rather than that an external intelligence has communicated so unmeaning a message.

Perhaps the strongest case under this heading is the *Ducanel* case, already published by us, in fuller detail, through M. Aksakof's kind permission, in *Proceedings* XVI.

9. The previously-unknown fact is of course of special interest when it concerns a deceased person never before heard of by any of those present.

The few well-attested cases of this kind,—one of which, the Péréliguine case, was contributed by M. Aksakof to our *Proceedings* XVI.,—are of the greatest possible interest, and need further discussion than can here be given.

But I must protest, in passing, against M. Aksakof's citation of messages from the "Message Department" of the *Banner of Light*. I have analysed many of those messages, and have usually found them to consist of a mere reproduction of announcements of deaths which have already appeared in newspapers, or to present other suspicious circumstances.

10. The next heading is one which, even if better attested, could hardly exclude a telepathic explanation. "The carrying of messages for great distances,"—transference from one group of observers to another of some definite communication not previously agreed upon,—has been very rarely recorded. Professor Hare,—the American chemist well known in the early days of Spiritualism,—records a case of this kind in his own experience, but he seems never to have been able to repeat the experiment. It must be added that few serious endeavours would seem to have been made by anyone to procure this phenomenon.

And, indeed, with regard to this whole series of possible experiments the same criticism holds good. M. Aksakof's painstaking collection of evidence incidentally brings out a fact which he has by no means aimed at proving,—a fact which some less judicious partisans of his ideas might even refuse to admit,—but which forms in reality the strongest argument for careful and persistent investigation into the whole range of these phenomena. That fact is the scantiness, the desultoriness, the superficiality, of such investigation as they have yet received. If a series of incidents so profoundly interesting as some of those which M. Aksakof quotes have already rewarded such casual, amateurish inquiries as most (I do not say all) of those which he describes,—then what may we not expect when careful and persevering attention shall be given to these long-tabooed topics by the scientific world! For myself personally I may say that, although I make large deductions from M. Aksakof's mass of evidence, yet it seems to me that his review of the history of the subject has plainly shown that in no other direction whatever have results so striking already rewarded so small an expenditure of serious or systematic toil.

The inquiry, so to say, has been passing through the *nomadic* stage, but has not yet reached the *agricultural*. The scattered observers have wandered among spontaneous phenomena, and have cropped enough for their own spiritual food. They have not yet settled down to steady labour, nor worked the ground with the plough of experiment, nor built the barns of systematic record to which posterity may commit an ever ampler store.

And I am not speaking only of the obvious deficiency in specially trained

observers of the calibre of Mr. Crookes. I rather wish to point out how few men there have been like the author of these volumes himself;—men who, without pretending to exceptional scientific attainments, have expended on these problems the persevering sagacity, the lifelong devotion, by which in common life, as in exact inquiries, all great results must needs be won. More such men there well might be; and in M. Aksakof they have assuredly an example to follow. I will conclude this review with a few words in which our author resumes the labour of his life.

"One last word! In the decline of life I ask myself sometimes, 'Have I in truth done well, to have devoted so much time and toil and money to the study and the publication of facts in this domain? Have I not struck into a blind road? followed an illusive hope? Have I not wasted my existence, with no result to justify all my pains?' Yet always I seem to hear the same reply: 'A life on earth can have no higher aspiration than to demonstrate the transcendental nature of man's being,—to prove him called to a destiny loftier than the phenomenal existence which alone he knows.' I cannot, then, regret that I have devoted my whole life to the pursuance of this aim; although it be by methods which Science shuns or spurns,—methods which I hold far trustier than any other which Science has to show. And if it be in the end my lot to have laid one stone of that temple of the Spirit, upbuilt from century to century by men true of heart,—this will be the highest and the only recompense which ever I strove to gain." (Vol. I., pp. xl., xli.)

F. W. H. M.