


PHANTASMS
OF
THE LIVING

BOSTON
MEDICAL LIBRARY
8 THE FENWAY

PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Open Knowledge Commons and Harvard Medical School

PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING

BY

EDMUND GURNEY, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

AND

FRANK PODMORE, M.A.

VOLUME II.

LONDON :

ROOMS OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH,

14, DEAN'S YARD, S.W.

TRÜBNER AND CO., LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

1886.

d

19. N. 29.

FURTHER ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page vi, line 13. For 247 read 248. Line 18. For "nearly a trillion of trillions of trillions" read "about a thousand billion trillion trillion trillions."

Page 16, line 23. If only cases are reckoned where the auditory phantasm was recorded or described before the news of the death arrived, the odds will be reduced to about a million to 1.

Page 17, line 29. If only cases are reckoned where the visual phantasm was recorded or described before the news of the death arrived, the odds will be reduced to about a hundred billion trillions to 1.

Page 21, end of § 8. In the numerical estimates, I have throughout confined the reasoning to *sensory* experiences, and have not attempted to extend it to the ideal and emotional impressions which were considered in the 6th and 7th chapters. This is because a trustworthy census of strong but purely subjective impressions of these commoner and often vaguer kinds would have been impossible to obtain. There is, however, one important point which concerns the non-sensory experiences as well as the sensory, and which ought not to be omitted from the argument; the occurrence, namely, at various times, to a single percipient, of *several* "veridical" impressions, sometimes similar, sometimes different in type. (See p. 77, note.) It is clear how enormously this multiplication of the coincidences in one person's history multiplies the already enormous odds against chance as their cause.

Page 24, line 3 of note. For 40 read 39

Page 26, line 8 of note. For 32 read 31. This correction will slightly, but not appreciably, affect the subsequent estimate.

Page 50, case 233. The narrator mentioned in conversation that she woke her sister at the time of her experience, and also described it to her family at breakfast, before the news of the death arrived. Her sister—who probably supposed it to be a dream, and fell asleep again at once—had no recollection of it when it was referred to some years ago.

Page 52, case 235. The narrator's first initial is G. We have applied to the gentleman to whom the earlier account was sent; but he forwarded it to some one else, and cannot now recollect to whom. The friend with whom Colonel Swiney was staying has long since left Norfolk, and we have not been able to trace him.

Page 68, line 23. For 296 read 246.

Pages 139-41, case 296. Further knowledge and a more critical study of this case suggest doubts as to whether it should have been included. It will be seen that three important points—the impression of seeing the handle turn, the getting out of bed to search, and Mr. Phillips's statement as to his wife's having imagined herself to be in the narrator's house—are not mentioned in the diary, but only in the account written more than 3½ years afterwards. Moreover, it appears probable from an inspection of the diary that the entry for Oct. 23 was not written on that day, but after the news of the death had arrived on the following day; and it is, therefore, not unlikely that the description, "steps as of a female walking aimlessly," was to some extent suggested by the news.

Page 346, line 5. For *maladie* read *malade*. With this account should be compared the apparent instance of thought-transference in a case of hysterical catalepsy, recorded by Dr. Bristowe in the *British Medical Journal* for Feb. 8, 1879.

Page 390, line 1. For Kirkbright read Shuckburgh.

Page 393, case 419. A first-hand account from Mr. John A. Orr, F.R.C.S.I., of Fleetwood, shows that the dream on which the mother acted had conveyed no more than the idea of her son's serious illness, and, moreover, had been dreamt some nights before the accident, as she arrived on the morning of its occurrence. The case should, therefore, be omitted.

Page 397, case 424. The narrator mentioned in conversation that the experience was a very vivid impression on waking, rather than an actual dream. The impression was sufficiently disquieting to keep her awake for several hours.

Page 398, case 425. In conversation, Mrs. Tandy, a daughter of the narrator's, who has heard the percipient describe her vision, expressed a distinct opinion that she spoke of it as a *waking* experience.

Page 404, case 432. The narrator mentioned in conversation that her dreams are rarely painful or distressing, and that she has never on any other occasion taken action on a dream.

Page 461, first line of case 499. For 1877 read 1867.

Page 469, case 505. The narrator not only told her sister of her experience on the morning (Tuesday) after it occurred, but wrote the same day to England, expressing her uneasiness about her nephew, and asking if anything was wrong with him; and Mrs. Wilkinson, (of 63, Harcourt Terrace, Redcliffe Square, S.W.,) the boy's mother, remembers receiving this letter on the Wednesday evening, while she was herself in the act of writing to tell Miss Wilkinson of the accident. (Miss Wilkinson was therefore mistaken in saying that her sister-in-law wrote on the day after the accident.) Mrs. Wilkinson further mentioned in conversation that on the Monday, while lying in a semi-conscious state, the boy constantly asked whether his aunt had been told of the accident. He was much attached to her, and had been nursed by her through a serious illness.

Page 474, case 509. We have procured an official certificate from New South Wales, which corroborates the narrator's statement that her mother died on June 17, 1868.

Page 513, case 556. The name of the percipient has been privately communicated.

Page 515, case 558. We have now received a written account of this incident from another daughter of the percipient, who was present at the time. It was inferred that the dying man spoke of the little grandson of whose sudden illness and death he had been kept in ignorance, from the fact of his turning to the child's mother and addressing her in the way described (the second account substitutes "Don't fret" for "Never mind"); but it ought to be added that he had lost a son of the same name 24 years before.

Page 524, end of case 569. The name of the percipient has now been privately communicated.

Page 566, line 4 from bottom. The narrator explains (Dec. 22, 1886) that her father was "an amateur doctor" only; he had been a solicitor by profession, but had studied medicine.

Page 584, line 29, and page 585, line 4. For Heaton read Seaton.

SYNOPSIS OF VOLUME II.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS XXI-XXVII

CHAPTER XIII.

THE THEORY OF CHANCE-COINCIDENCE.

§ 1. Assuming the substantial correctness of much of the evidence for phantasms which have markedly coincided with an event at a distance, how can it be known that these coincidences are not due to *chance* alone? In examining this question, we must be careful to distinguish *waking* cases from *dreams*—in which latter class (as we have seen) the scope for chance-coincidences is indefinitely large 1-4

§ 2. The answer to this question depends on *two* points—the frequency of phantasms which *have* markedly coincided with real events, and the frequency of phantasms which have *not*. If the latter class turned out to be extremely large—*e.g.*, if we each of us once a week saw some friend's figure in a place which was really empty—it is certain that occasionally such a subjective delusion would fall on the day that the friend happened to die. The matter is one on which there have been many guesses, and many assertions, but hitherto no statistics 4-6

§ 3. To ascertain what proportion of the population have had experience of purely subjective hallucinations, a definite question must be asked of a group large and varied enough to serve as a fair sample of the whole. The difficulty of taking such a census has been much increased by a wide misunderstanding of its purpose 6-8

§ 4. But answers have been received from a specimen group of 5,680 persons; and there is every reason to suppose this number sufficient 8-10

§ 5. It may be objected that persons may have wrongly denied such experiences (1) through forgetfulness—but the experiences of real importance for the end in view are too striking to be readily forgotten; (2) by way of a joke or a hoax—but this would lead rather to false confessions than false denials; (3) in self-defence—but such error as may

have been produced by this motive has probably been more than counter-balanced in other ways 10-12

§ 6. First as to *auditory* hallucinations, representing *recognised* voices—in the last 12 years such an experience has, according to the census, befallen 1 adult in every 90; but it would have had to befall 7 in every 10, to justify the assumption that the cases recorded in this work on first-hand testimony, of the coincidence of the experience in question with the death of the person represented, were due to chance. The odds against the accidental occurrence of the said coincidences are more than a trillion to 1 12-16

§ 7. Next as to *visual* hallucinations, representing a recognised face or form—in the last 12 years such an experience has, according to the census, befallen 1 adult in every 247; but it would have had to befall *every* adult *once*, and *most* adults *twice*, to justify the assumption that the cases recorded in the present work on first-hand testimony, of the coincidence of the experience in question with the death of the person represented, were due to chance. The odds against the accidental occurrence of the said coincidences are nearly a trillion of trillions of trillions to 1 16-18

§ 8. The *extreme closeness* of some of the coincidences affords the basis for another form of estimate, which shows the improbability of their accidental occurrence to be almost immeasurably great 18-20

And a number of further cases and further considerations remain, by which even this huge total of improbability would be again swelled. The conclusion, therefore, after all allowances, that at any rate a large number of the coincidences here adduced have had some other cause than chance seems irresistible 20-21

§ 9. An argument of a quite different sort may be drawn from *certain peculiarities* which the group of coincidental hallucinations present, when compared, as a whole, with the general mass of transient hallucinations of the sane. The chief of these peculiarities are (1) the decided preponderance of *visual* cases over *auditory*, and (2) the immense preponderance of cases where the figure or voice was *recognised* as representing some one known to the percipient: whereas among clearly subjective hallucinations there is a very great preponderance of auditory cases, and almost an equality between recognised and unrecognised phantasms, the preponderance being slightly with the latter 22-25

Another striking point—the preponderance of cases in which the distant event with which the phantasm coincides is *death*, or one of the crises that come nearest to death—again marks out the coincidental phantasms as a distinct group of natural phenomena 25-28

CHAPTER XIV.

FURTHER VISUAL CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT.

§ 1. Visual hallucinations may present various degrees of apparent externalisation, beginning with what is scarcely more than a picture in the mind's eye, and ending with a percept which seems quite on a par with all surrounding objects. Examples of these varieties in telepathic phantasms 29-37

§ 2. Examples of completely externalised phantasms. In connection with one case (No. 225) it is shown that a slight liability to subjective hallucinations (which a few telepathic percipients have exhibited) need not seriously affect the probability that a particular experience was telepathic. Another case (No. 242) is remarkable in that the actual percipient had no direct connection with the agent, but was in the vicinity of a person intimately connected with him 38-62

§ 3. Cases where the hypothesis of *illusion* or *mistaken identity* has to be taken into account. This hypothesis would not exclude a telepathic origin, as telepathic *illusions* are quite conceivable phenomena. But more probably these cases were hallucinations; and if so, their telepathic origin would hardly be doubtful. One of them (No. 243) exhibits the point of a *previous compact* between the agent and percipient, that whichever died first should endeavour to make the other sensible of his presence. Such a compact, latent in either mind, may quite conceivably have some conditioning efficacy 62-73

§ 4. Cases of a *rudimentary* type—perhaps of *arrested development*—not representative of a human form; they might be compared to a *motor* effect which is limited to a single start or twitch. The class is too small to carry any conviction on its own account, but its type is not so improbable as might at first appear 73-76

§ 5. Certain cases involving no coincidence with any ostensibly abnormal condition of the agent. (1) Instances where *several* percipients, at different times, have had hallucinations representing the *same* person, in whom a specific faculty for producing telepathic impressions may therefore be surmised 77-90

§ 6. And (2) instances where a presumption that a hallucination was not purely subjective is afforded by peculiarities of dress or aspect in the figure presented 90-96

§ 7. And (3) instances where the phantasm appears at a time when the

person whom it represents is, unknown to the percipient, actually approaching him, with thoughts more or less consciously turned in his direction. The last two examples (Nos. 265 and 266) are auditory . . . 96-100

CHAPTER XV.

FURTHER AUDITORY CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT.

§ 1. Cases where the phantasm has been of a *recognised* voice—the words heard having been, certainly in some cases and possibly in others, those which the distant agent was uttering. One case (No. 269) illustrates the feature of *repetition* after a short interval . . . 101-108

§ 2. Cases where what was heard was the percipient's own name—which is a very common form of purely subjective hallucination.

In most of these cases there may probably have been a certain occupation of the agent's thoughts with the percipient . . . 108-114

§ 3. Cases where the phantasm has been of an *unrecognised* voice. In one instance, (No. 279) *several* experiences of the sort, in close coincidence with the deaths of relatives, have occurred to the same percipient . . . 114-118

§ 4. Cases where the impression was of a complete sentence, conveying either a piece of information or a direction, projected by the percipient as a message from without . . . 118-124

§ 5. An example where the sound heard was vocal, but not recognised and articulate . . . 124-125

§ 6. Phantasms of non-vocal noises or shocks. These are parallel to the rudimentary visual hallucinations; but need a more jealous scrutiny, since odd noises are often due to undiscovered physical causes in the vicinity. Still, some impressions of the sort are pretty clearly hallucinatory; and the form is one which telepathic hallucinations seem occasionally to take. The final case (No. 291) suggests the possibility of *family* susceptibility to telepathic influences . . . 125-132

CHAPTER XVI.

TACTILE CASES, AND CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES.

§ 1. Purely subjective impressions of touch, of at all a distinct kind, are rare; and when they occur, may often be accounted for as illusions due

to an involuntary muscular twitch. It is not surprising, therefore, that telepathic hallucinations of this type should be rare . . . 133-134

The most conclusive examples are those where an affection of touch is combined with one of sight or hearing. Examples . . . 135-139

§ 2. Combined affections of the senses of sight and hearing : one case (No. 299) is peculiar in that the person who was probably the agent was in the percipient's company at the time . . . 139-149

§ 3. A case where the impressions of sight and hearing were separated by some hours . . . 149-152

CHAPTER XVII.

RECIPROCAL CASES.

§ 1. It occasionally happens that at the time when A telepathically influences B, A on his side has an impression which strongly suggests that B has reciprocally influenced *him*. The best proof of this is where A expresses in words some piece of knowledge as to B's condition. Other more doubtful cases (of which a few are quoted) may be provisionally referred to the same type ; but unless A's description includes something which he could not have known or guessed in a normal manner, his alleged percipience of B cannot be assumed to have been more than mere subjective dream or vision . . . 153-158

§ 2. Examples of apparently reciprocal action. They may be regarded as special cases of "telepathic clairvoyance" ; A's percipience of B being apparently active rather than passive, and due to some extension of his own faculties, connected with the abnormality of condition that occasions his agency, and not to any special abnormality in B's condition . . . 158-166

The cases which, on the evidence, would be clearly reciprocal, are so few in number as to justify a doubt whether they represent a genuine type. Supposing them to be genuine, however, their rarity is not hard to account for ; and it may be hoped that time will bring us more well-attested specimens . . . 167

CHAPTER XVIII.

COLLECTIVE CASES.

§ 1. Phantasms which have affected the senses of more than one percipient, are a specially perplexing class. On the face of them, they suggest a real objective presence of the person seen or heard. But such "objectivity" (unless conceived as some illusive form of *matter*) can hardly be defined except just as a temporary existence in more minds than one: it does not explain, but merely repeats, the fact that the experience is collective 168-170

In the absence of evidence (worthy of the name) that a telepathic phantasm has ever given a test of *physical* reality—*e.g.*, by opening a door or a window—we are led to inquire how far the phenomena of collective hallucination can be covered by a theory of purely *psychical* impressions. *Two* views (which will subsequently prove capable of amalgamation) present themselves:—(1) that A, at a distance, produces *simultaneous telepathic impressions* on the minds of B and C, who happen to be together; (2) that B's impression, however originated, passes on to C by a process of *thought-transference*—the hallucination itself being, so to speak, infectious 170-171

§ 2. The *first* of these hypotheses presents great difficulties. For our review of telepathic hallucinations, so far, has shown that they may take very various forms, and may be projected at various intervals of time (within a range of a few hours) from the crisis or event to which we trace them; so that, supposing several persons to have been the joint recipients of a telepathic impression, it seems most improbable that they should independently invest it at the *same* moment with the *same* sensory form. Nor, again, should we expect to find, among those jointly affected, any person who was a *stranger* to the distant agent; nevertheless, cases occur where such a person has shared in the collective percipience. And yet again, on this theory of independent affection of several persons, there seems no special reason why they should be *in one another's company* at the time, since the agent may presumably exercise his influence equally in any direction; nevertheless, cases where the percipients have been apart are, in fact, extremely rare 171-172

A few examples of the sort are given; but in several even of these, the percipients, though not together, were very near one another, and had been to some extent sharing the same life 173-183

§ 3. As to the *second* of the proposed hypotheses—that one percipient catches the hallucination from another by a process of thought-trans-

ference—the question at once suggests itself whether such communicability is ever found in cases where no distant agent is concerned—cases of *purely subjective* hallucination. Such an idea would, no doubt, be as new to scientific psychology as every other form of thought-transference; but transient hallucinations of the sane have been so little studied or collected that it is not surprising if the evidence for collective experiences of the sort has escaped attention—though collective *illusions* have sometimes been described as hallucinations 183–184

It is in collective cases that the importance of distinguishing illusions from hallucinations becomes plain. In illusions, the persons affected receive an actual sensory impression from a real object, the error being simply in their way of *interpreting* it; and in the interpretation they are often greatly at the mercy of one another's suggestions. Many historical incidents—such as visions of signs in the heavens and of phantom champions—might be thus explained 184–186

In other alleged instances of “collective hallucination” there is no proof that the impression was really more than a vivid mental picture, evoked under excitement. And even where the image probably has been externalised in space—as, *e.g.*, in religious epidemics, or in experimentation with hypnotised subjects—most cases may be at once explained, without any resort to thought-transference, as due to a common idea or expectancy. (Apart, however, from special excitement or from hypnotism, the power of mere verbal suggestion to produce delusions of the senses may easily be exaggerated) 186–188

It is only when these various conditions are absent—when the joint percept is clearly *hallucination*, and is also projected by the several percipients *without emotional preparation or suggestion*—that the hypothesis of thought-transference from one percipient to another can reasonably be entertained 189–190

§ 4. The examples to be adduced, of collective hallucinations, not apparently originating in the condition of any absent living person, include cases which may be regarded by some as indicating *post-mortem* agency. It is not necessary to enter into the vexed question as to whether the power of exercising psychical energy can or cannot continue after physical death. Whatever answer that question received, these cases would still, in the writer's opinion, (for reasons set forth in § 2,) bear witness to a quite mundane transference between the minds of the living percipients 190–192

§ 5. *Visual* examples. Hallucinations of light 192–194
 Various out-of-door experiences, not easy to explain as illusions 194–198
 Examples of the simultaneous appearance of an *unrecognised* figure to

two percipients, who in most instances were in each other's company at the time. The two impressions received in several cases were not precisely similar, and in one (No. 322) were markedly different 198-207

Similar appearances of *recognised* phantasms; one of which (case 333) represented the form of one of the percipients 208-218

The *auditory* class requires special care, owing to the liability of real sounds (whose source is often uncertain) to be misinterpreted. Examples of *voices* 218-221

And of *musical* hallucinations 221-223

The examples may at all events show that a purely psychical account of these joint experiences is possible. It is not, indeed, obvious *why* hallucinations of the senses should be a form of experience liable to transmission from mind to mind; but as regards the cases which are telepathically originated, some explanation may perhaps be found in the fact that they at any rate involve a disturbance of a very peculiar kind 224-225

§ 6. Collective hallucinations of telepathic origin. Auditory examples, representing *vocal* sounds 226-230

And *non-vocal* sounds 230-235

Visual examples. In two of these (Nos. 345 and 346) the experiences of the several percipients were not precisely similar. Another case (No. 349) affords an opportunity for estimating the probability of a collective mistake of identity 235-264

§ 7. The fact that in most of the examples the two percipients, B and C, were *together* suggests that mere community of scene, or of immediate mental occupation, may establish a *rapport* favourable to "psychical" transferences 264-266

And this conception may lead us, in cases where a distant agent, A, is concerned, to an amalgamation of the two hypotheses (see § 1) which have hitherto been treated separately. C's experience, *quod* hallucination, that is to say in its *sensory* character, may be derived from B's; but, for all that, A may be telepathically affecting C. It may be A's joint influence on B and C that has conditioned the transference of sensation between them; or, in cases where C holds no intimate relation to A, a *rapport* may be established, *ad hoc*, between A and C by the *rapport* of both of them with B—who thus serves, so to speak, as a *channel* for C's percipience; and this would even help to explain the cases where B is not himself consciously percipient 266-268

The conception of *rapport* through community of mental occupation might explain the various cases where the telepathic influence seems to have been *locally* conditioned, by the presence of the percipient in a place that was interesting to the agent. And the idea may receive a still

further extension in cases where there is reason to suppose a reciprocal telepathic clairvoyance of the scene on the agent's part 268-269

Conjectures of this sort concerning the more outlying telepathic phenomena have an air of rashness; but the mere fact that "psychical" transferences are possible, when once admitted, opens up a scheme of Idealism within whose bounds (if bounds there be) the potential unity between individual minds is at any rate likely to realise itself in surprising ways 270

CONCLUSION.

§ 1. The case for spontaneous telepathy, being essentially a cumulative one, hardly admits of being recapitulated in a brief and attractive form. Nothing but a detailed study of the evidence—dull as that study is—can justify definite conclusions concerning it. After all, the dulness is perhaps not greater than attaches to the mastery of details in other departments of knowledge; and it cannot be too clearly realised that what the research requires is not sensational incidents, but verified dates 271-272

§ 2. The present instalment of evidence, with all its defects, may yet, by making the idea of telepathy better understood, facilitate collection in the future; and already various difficulties and prejudices show signs of giving way 273

§ 3. But though a fair field is sure, in time, to be allowed to the work, its advance must depend on very wide co-operation; and the more so as the several items of proof tend to lose their effect as they recede into the past. The experimental investigations must be greatly extended, the spontaneous phenomena must be far more intelligently watched for and recorded, before the place of telepathy in scientific psychology can be absolutely assured 273-274

NOTE (BY MR. MYERS) ON A SUGGESTED MODE OF PSYCHICAL INTERACTION.

§ 1. The hypotheses contained in this note are tentatively advanced, but may at least direct observation 277

§ 2. The theory which represents a veridical phantasm as the externalisation of a telepathic impression encounters a difficulty in the fact that when two (or more) persons are together the phantasm is usually, though not always, perceived by *both* 277-278

§ 3. This complex fact seems in the first place inconsistent with the popular theory of a material ghost, or "meta-organism,"—a theory on other grounds objectionable; 278-279

§ 4. Nor can we always assume a separate telepathic impulse from A to B and from A to C. Mr. Gurney therefore supposes a fresh telepathic communication from B to C: 279

§ 5. But no such cases of communication of hallucinations are recorded by alienists who have treated of "folie à deux"; 279-280

§ 6. And in morbid hallucinations of the sane, no degree of duration or intensity seems to effect this communication of the hallucination to bystanders 280-282

§ 7. Moreover, in Mr. Gurney's collection of *casual* hallucinations of the sane, there are no collective cases which are indisputably *falsidical*; 282-284

§ 8. Alleged phantasms of the *dead*, for instance, cannot all be classed with certainty as merely illusory in the present state of our knowledge 284

§ 9. It may be better, then, to fall back on observation of the experimental cases, and to note that in them the *percipient* exercises a species of supernormal activity 284-286

§ 10. Such activity, if pushed further, might become first telepathic clairvoyance, then independent clairvoyance 286-287

§ 11. Clairvoyant perception seems to be exercised in inverse ratio to activity of normal faculties, and to be stimulated by influence from another mind 287

§ 12. If this be so, we have an analogy which throws light on cases in this book where a dreaming, or even a waking, percipient becomes conscious of a distant scene; 287-289

§ 13. And, furthermore, our cases suggest that correspondently with clairvoyant perception there may be phantasmogenetic efficacy: 289

§ 14. So that all the persons present together may be equally likely to discern the phantasmal correlate of the dying man's clairvoyant perception; and *collective* cases will no longer present a unique difficulty 289-290

§ 15. And this will hold good whatever view we take of the relation

to *space* or *matter*, either of the clairvoyant percipience or of its phantasmal correlate 290-291

§ 16. This view suggests test-experiments. Points to be noticed in a collective hallucination ; 291-292

§ 17. And in a hallucination induced by hypnotic suggestion 292-293

§ 18. But if the dying man's conception of himself is thus presented as a quasi-percept to a group of persons collectively, then some cases where there is one percipient only may be similarly explained 293-294

§ 19. If we consider the indications of origin in one or the other mind given by the *dress* of phantoms, we find no clear case where such origin must be referred to the percipient's mind ; 294-297

§ 20. And the *symbolism* of phantoms also is generally such as may have been common to both minds 297-298

§ 21. On the other hand there are cases where the dying man's actual dress at the moment, though an improbable one, is reproduced by the phantom, which thus is clothed according to the dying man's conception of himself, and probably not according to the percipient's antecedent conception of him ; 298

§ 22. And the symbolism of the figure sometimes conveys true information, or is in other ways probably referable to the dying man 299-300

§ 23. And the cases of imperfect or deferred recognition seem similarly to indicate that the aspect of the apparition has not been determined by the percipient himself 300-301

§ 24. Moreover, the attraction which determines the phantasmal presence seems sometimes to be *local* rather than *personal* ; as if the percipient merely saw an apparition which was generated by causes independent of himself 301-302

§ 25. It may be said that on this view the mass of our cases should be *reciprocal*. But in order to prove a case reciprocal it is necessary that clairvoyant percipience should be *recollected*, which is a rare thing 302-303

§ 26. Still further, the agent's *death* often prevents his recounting such percipience as he may have enjoyed. His last words sometimes indicate that there has been such percipience. Dr. Ormsby's case 303-306

§ 27. In our few cases of *voluntary self-projection* the experience seems rarely to have persisted into waking memory ; 306-307

- § 28. And after clairvoyant dreams the fact of the clairvoyant *invasion* may be forgotten till revived by accidental presence in the scene thus discerned 307
- § 29. Invasion, however, is sometimes remembered; faintly and brokenly by an agent *waking* at the time; 307-308
- § 30. More often and more distinctly by an agent *sleeping* at the time 308
- § 31. Such reciprocity seems further facilitated by a state of *trance* or *delirium*. 309-310
- § 32. Stages by which, in this view, veridical phantasms gradually approach a reciprocal type 310-311
- § 33. Power of the death or crisis of one person to evoke the clairvoyant percipience, and invite the supernormal invasion, of another. Parallel with clairvoyance mesmerically induced 311-312
- § 34. A true classification must depend on the condition and crises of the unconscious rather than of the conscious self 312-314
- § 35. In the meantime reciprocal percipience may be taken as the type of a fully-developed veridical hallucination; its relation to space and matter being as yet unknown 314
- § 36. Suggested analogy of telepathic with vital or organic communication 314-316

SUPPLEMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The supplementary evidence for telepathy, like that in the main body of the work, consists of *experimental* cases (Chap. I.) and of *spontaneous* cases (Chaps. II.-IX.) 321

§ 2. The spontaneous cases, in the aggregate, have less force than those which have preceded—the chances of error in many of them being very appreciable, and some of them being second-hand. Still, the evidence is for the most part of a character which allows us to suppose that the *essential*

point has been truly retained, even though details may have been altered or added 321-322

§ 3. And since this evidence, which might not *prove* the reality of spontaneous telepathy, is sufficient, even alone, to establish a very strong presumption for it, it lends an important support to the cumulative argument already presented 322-323

CHAPTER I.

FURTHER EXAMPLES OF THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE, PRINCIPALLY IN HYPNOTIC CASES.

§ 1. Experiments in the transference of *tastes* and *pains* 324-329
Occasionally the transference seems to be from the "subject" to the operator 330-331

§ 2. Examples of the power of the *will* in producing the hypnotic condition, or in evoking particular actions 331-334

§ 3 Transferences of ideas unconnected with movement. One remarkable record (No. 366) exemplifies a very long-continued susceptibility on the percipient's part. Several of the cases, here treated as telepathic, have been attributed without sufficient grounds to independent clairvoyance 334-348

CHAPTER II.

IDEAL, EMOTIONAL, AND MOTOR CASES.

§ 1. Examples of spontaneous thought-transference of a tolerably literal kind, several of which suggest a fugitive faculty of percipience developed by illness 349-362

§ 2. Examples of an apparently abnormal intuition of the *approach* or *proximity* of certain persons 363-365

§ 3. Cases where the "agency" is difficult or impossible to assign, and which recall the Greek notion of *φῆμη* 365-370

§ 4. Emotional impressions (involving in one case—No. 391—distinct physical discomfort) which the percipients connected at the moment with particular individuals 370-374

§ 5. Emotional impressions not so connected	374-376
§ 6. Examples of <i>motor</i> effects	376-379

CHAPTER III.

DREAMS.

§ 1. Examples of simultaneous dreams corresponding in content	380-383
§ 2. Examples of dreams which have seemed to represent some <i>thought or mental picture</i> in the mind of a waking agent	383-393
§ 3. Examples of dreams which have directly corresponded with a <i>real event</i> (usually death) that befell the agent	393-401
§ 4. Examples of <i>pictorial</i> dreams with a similar correspondence; in many of which the dreamer has invested the idea with original (symbolic or fantastic) imagery	401-428
§ 5. Examples of dreams that may be described as telepathically <i>clairvoyant</i> , in several of which (Nos. 481-4) the object prominently presented has been a <i>letter</i>	428-448

CHAPTER IV.

"BORDERLAND" CASES.

§ 1. First-hand cases of rather remote date: Visual cases	449-459
Auditory cases	459-461
§ 2. First-hand and more recent cases: Visual cases	461-470
Auditory cases	470-474
§ 3. A group of first-hand cases taken from printed sources	474-477
§ 4. Second-hand cases from informants who were nearly related to the original witnesses	477-496
§ 5. And from informants who were not so related	496-508

CHAPTER V.

VISUAL CASES.

- § 1. First-hand death-cases 509-523
- § 2. First-hand cases where the conditioning event on the agent's side was something other than death 523-532
- § 3. Second-hand cases from informants who were nearly related to the original witnesses. In connection with one of these cases (No. 583) some remarks are made on the Scotch "second sight"; another case (No. 586) illustrates the difference between the right and the wrong sort of transmitted evidence 532-542
- § 4. Second-hand cases from informants who were not nearly related to the original witnesses 543-558
- § 5. Ancient cases, which, by rare exception, were recorded in such a way as to have permanent value 558-560

CHAPTER VI.

AUDITORY AND TACTILE CASES.

- § 1. Cases where the impression was of distinct words 561-568
- § 2. Cases where the impression apparently represented what was actually in the agent's ears at the time 568-570
- § 3. Non-vocal cases 570-574
- § 4. Tactile cases 574-576
- A case suggesting a peculiar sympathy of physical condition 576-577

CHAPTER VII.

- CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES 578-589

CHAPTER VIII.

- RECIPROCAL CASES 590-599
- VOL. II. b 2

CHAPTER IX.

COLLECTIVE CASES.

§ 1. Three outlying cases	600-603
§ 2. Visual cases, apparently connected with the condition of a distant agent, occurring to percipients who were apart	603-607
§ 3. And to percipients who were together	607-623
§ 4. Visual cases where it is doubtful whether there was any "agency" on the part of the person whom the phantasm represented	623-630
§ 5. Auditory cases, where the impression was of a recognised voice	631-634
§ 6. And where the impression was of inarticulate or non-vocal sounds	634-641

 ADDITIONAL CHAPTER

OF CASES RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR INSERTION IN THEIR PROPER PLACES.

§ 1. Experimental cases—	
Reproduction of diagrams	642-653
Transference of ideas of numbers, words, and objects	653-666
Transference of tastes	666-669
Transference of ideas below the threshold of consciousness	669-671
§ 2. Transitional cases—	
Production of visual phantasms at a distance	671-676
Hypnotic effects at a distance	676-687
§ 3. Spontaneous cases of various types. The last two (Nos. 701 and 702) afford a specially good illustration of the psychological identity of dreams and hallucinations	687-705

TABLE OF NUMBERED CASES	707-722
ANALYSIS OF THE TABLE	723
INDEX	725-733

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

VOLUME II.

Page 13, line 13 from bottom. "One in every 90 of the population." The probability that the ratio $\frac{1}{90}$, observed in the specimen-group, may be fairly assumed as correct for the whole population, admits of precise determination. A general idea of its degree of correctness may be obtained from the following analogue, which I owe to Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth. Suppose 5680 balls to be drawn from a bag containing immense numbers of black and white balls, mixed in a certain ratio. If the real ratio of black balls to the total be $\frac{1}{90}$, the odds against our drawing so small a proportion of black balls as $\frac{1}{90}$ —*i.e.*, the odds against the ratio *appearing* to be $\frac{1}{90}$ —are about 10 to 1. If the real ratio be $\frac{1}{60}$, the odds against its appearing to be so small as $\frac{1}{90}$ are about 500 to 1. If the real ratio be $\frac{1}{45}$, the odds against its appearing to be so small as $\frac{1}{90}$ are more than 100,000 to 1. It will become obvious, I think, as we proceed, that even in this last contingency—on the violently improbable assumption that the true ratio of *hallucinés* in the population is *double* that observed in the specimen group—my general conclusion would remain safe, even for the auditory cases; and *à fortiori* for the visual cases, where a far smaller ratio is substituted for $\frac{1}{90}$. But it is enough to notice that practically, as the ratio for the population is as likely to be *less* than the specimen-ratio as *greater*, and as it cannot differ from it very materially on either side, the specimen-ratio may safely be used.

Page 24, line 1. For 13 read 12, and for 6 read 7. Lines 17-22. Among the "recognised" visual cases, I include three where the figure seen did not represent the person who was probably the agent. I do not reckon on either side two cases of mis-recognition, which might equally well be described as partial recognition; nor three cases where the recognition was retrospective; nor four "collective" cases where one of the percipients recognised the agent, but the other was a stranger to him. I reckon in the unrecognised class three cases where the percipient was a stranger to the agent, but described his appearance correctly. Among the "recognised" auditory cases, I include two where the voice heard was not that of the supposed agent. I do not reckon on either side case 279; nor case 507 where the recognition was retrospective; nor the case of mis-recognition, No. 570.

Page 25, note. The slight difference from the numbers given in Vol. I., pp. 392 and 498, is due to cases received since those pages were printed off.

Page 26, lines 12 and 13. For 399 read 401, and for 303 read 304.

Page 27. "The only way of meeting this argument," &c. In more technical language, the point stands thus. The determination of the *à posteriori* probability that certain events took place by chance depends not only on the "objective" probability of the occurrence of such events under a *régime* of chance, but on *à priori* probabilities depending (except in imaginary problems about bags and balls) on what Professor A. Marshall has felicitously called "that abstract and essence of past experience which is on the one side science, and on the other practical instinct." And as Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth remarks, in writing to me on this topic, "Scratches or ordering boots might be as unique experiences as death, or at any rate not materially more frequent; yet all would agree that the *à priori* probability of a causal connection between a phantasm and ordering boots is *nil*; while as to death, many would think differently." Now in applying this remark, it must be remembered that that which alone could make a number of the coincidences—whether between phantasms and orderings of boots, or between phantasms and deaths—explicable as accidental occurrences, would be the universal though unknown and unnoticed prevalence of spectral illusions. This is itself a huge improbability, determined as such by the relation of the statistical results of my census to complex *à priori* probabilities concerning facts of human memory and testimony. And what I have implied in the text is simply that it is an improbability *so* huge as to outweigh the *à priori* improbability of a causal connection between phantasms and deaths, though not perhaps the *à priori* improbability of a causal connection between phantasms and orderings of boots.

Page 37, first note. Since this note was printed, I have met with an interesting case of the peculiar sensation described, in connection with purely subjective hallucinations. Mr. J. Russell Lowell tells me that in past years he had frequent hallucinations of vision, of both the recognised and the unrecognised sort, which greatly interested him; and that the experience was ushered in (he believes invariably) by a feeling of *marked chill*, which seemed to ascend from the feet to the head.

Page 37, second note. Mr. Lowell also tells me that though the figures he saw were sometimes quite natural-looking, at other times they were of the semi-transparent sort here described, allowing the wall or furniture to be seen through them. He spoke of these as looking as if composed of "blue film"—a description which is of great interest, when taken in connection with some of the telepathic cases, *e.g.*, Nos. 210, 311, 315, 485, 555.

Page 39, line 2 from bottom. For *Act* read *Acte*.

Page 42, case 226. In conversation, General H. informed Mr. Podmore that the native who was with him at the time of his experience was not facing the figure, but still would probably have been aware of the presence of a real person who occupied the spot where the figure was seen.

Page 66 note. For case 197 read cases 197 and 509.

Page 67, case 245. The narrator has added, in conversation, that he was in Huddersfield for the day only, and that his sudden resolve necessitated his telegraphing to the friends with whom he was staying. For the moment he does not know the address of these friends; but he hopes to procure us their recollections as to the receipt of this telegram and his subsequent explanation of it.

Page 71, case 249. The following corroboration is supplied by Mr. and Mrs. Coates, of 156, Waperton Road, Bradford, who were with Mr. Carr at the time :—

“June 23, 1886.

“We shall only be able to confirm the statement of Mr. T. Carr. So far as we can remember, while we were sitting in the room, T. C. came from his chair to the window; and, while looking out of the window, he made the remark, ‘Ah, there is [X.] coming to see us,’ and stepped back from the window, waiting to hear a knock at the door, which however did not come. T. C. remarked that he must have gone up the yard, and looked at the clock to see what time it was. We afterwards heard that at the time we thought [X.] was in the yard, he was just about dying.

“CHARLES COATES.

“ANNIE COATES.”

In conversation, Mr. Coates gave the time as about 4 p.m.; and spoke of Mr. Carr’s consulting his *watch*.

Page 72, case 250. In conversation I have learnt from Mr. Schofield that he had been absent from home for some days—which explains his having heard nothing of the illness. The deceased had a warm affection for his mother.

Page 85, case 257. Since this case was printed, a hallucination representing the same person has been seen by a fourth percipient. Mrs. Glanville writes from Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport, on Aug. 23, 1886 :—

“After breakfast this morning, I was outside the breakfast-room window, looking about, when I saw Mrs. Stone walking up one of the paths by the side of the lawn. I followed her. The path is long and winds round. I saw her turn the corner into a path that led through the orchard, but when I came there I could not see her. I wondered at her walking so quickly as to go out of sight, and strolled on, following the path, which led me back to the house. Here I saw Mrs. Stone talking to the gardener. She was surprised when I asked her how I could have missed her, and said she had not been walking at all, had not left her plants. Well, I saw her, her black dress, her white cap, her walk, Mrs. Stone certainly, but whether out of herself, or by an impression on my brain, I cannot tell—but I never saw anything more distinctly.” [A plan of the paths was enclosed.]

Mrs. Stone writes, Aug. 25, 1886 :—

“You wish me to give an account of my proceedings when Mrs. Glan-

ville saw my double. About 10 on the morning of Monday, August 23rd, I had gone direct from the house to water some flowers in a greenhouse marked in Mrs. Glanville's plan. My mind was rather disturbed at not hearing from my son. I was watering in a rather dazed, mechanical way, but did not lose consciousness. Walking from the place I met Mrs. Glanville, who said, 'How could you get here without my seeing you?' I had not been near the spot where she saw me."

The percipient in this case has had one other visual hallucination representing a living person, which was very likely telepathic. She thus describes it:—

"I remember one experience of the same sort happening when I was a girl. I certainly *did* see an old gentleman in the street who was then on his death-bed, but nobody would believe it. He was standing outside his shop-door; there were two other men with him. I can see him now in my mind's eye—a tall thin man; I knew his face quite well. When I said at dinner that Mr. Worth was better, for I had seen him in the street, my father told me he had just called, and Mr. Worth was very ill, in fact dying, and I *must* be mistaken."

Page 112, case 277. The narrator has explained to me that her mother was taken ill on the Saturday night, and lay all that night and the next day on the sofa, muttering to herself, but not thought to be dying.

Page 116, case 281. We have procured, from the Acting Registrar-General at Fiji, a certificate which shows that the death took place on Sept. 8, 1875. But we learn from the Astronomer-Royal that, until recently, the nomenclature of days of the month at Fiji followed the rule of Australia. Sept. 8, 1875, therefore, began there nearly 12 hours before it began here; so that unless the deceased was bathing late in the evening, the narrator's experience must have followed the death by more than 12 hours. This, of course, is on the supposition that the experience was really on the night of the 8th, and not of the 7th; in which latter case the coincidence might have been exact. The narrator is sure that the 8th was the date—not, however, from any independent recollection of the number 8, but on the ground that she referred to her diary after she heard of the death, and verified the coincidence, which she then mentioned to one or two persons. But it will be seen from her account that, for aught she knew, the death might have occurred on the 7th; and therefore the days would have seemed to her to have very probably coincided if the day which she found noted in her diary was also the 7th. Should the diary ever be found, the point may be cleared up.

Page 123, case 287. Since this case was printed, I have learnt from Dr. Joseph Smith that he was seeing Mrs. Gandy nearly every day. He nevertheless feels pretty confident that his experience was not due to anything that he had heard or observed—arguing that that explanation of it, if it had been the true one, would have occurred to him at the time. But extremely slight and transient impressions may, for aught we know, serve as the germ of subsequent hallucinations, just as they may serve as the

germ of subsequent dreams; and the case ought not, I think, to have received an evidential number.

Page 199, case 319. Both witnesses are positive that the case was not one of mere illusion; though it was dusk, there was enough light for the clergyman to observe that the figure outside was rather badly dressed, besides differing from Dr. Cant in being considerably stouter and wearing a beard. They discussed the matter the same evening, at about 11 p.m. In the interval, something had occurred by which Dr. Cant tells us that he was a good deal impressed. At about 8 p.m. he was called to visit a stranger, who was dying, and who had expressly desired his attendance; and he was startled by the close (though not exact) resemblance of this man to the hallucinatory figure.

Page 209, case 326. Mrs. R.'s sister, Miss Norman, of Stone, Stafford, has sent the following independent testimony, dated June 21, 1886:—

“After the lapse of so many years, the statement I now write is all that I can remember of seeing my father and mother walking together, in the year 1843, in the village where we then resided. At the time, my father was from home, very ill; and my mother, to the best of my remembrance, was out on that day. I have a very vivid recollection of the vision, which I think remarkable. My parents were walking together by the churchyard wall, close to the parsonage. This happened in September, 1843.”

Mrs. R. writes that she is confident that neither she nor the manservant saw her mother's figure:—“He saw just what I saw—my father entering the church by the vestry door.” After so long an interval, it is likely enough that the sisters' accounts might differ, even if their experiences had been identical. But it seems quite possible, on the analogy of several other cases, that the simultaneous hallucinations were not exactly identical.

Page 237, line 24. After Mr. R. Hodgson insert “and later the present writer.”

Page 247, lines 4, 5. The testimony in question has now been obtained, and is as follows:—

“Lakeside Cottages, Newby Bridge.

“June, 1886.

“It was one evening, about 4 years ago, that I sat in the kitchen, at Lindale Parsonage, at supper, and looking at the window I saw, at the side of the blind, which was not hanging quite straight, a very pale face looking at me. It was turned sideways when I first saw it, and thinking it was one of the young men from the village come up to make game of us, I made a face at it; then it turned full face towards me, and I saw that it was the face of Mrs. John Robinson, my present husband's first wife. It looked very pale. I watched it with the other servants for about 3 minutes perhaps, and then it dropped down and disappeared. I could see all round it,¹ so that I

¹ Compare cases 553 and 572.

could see that it was not a real face, and it was too close to the window for that. It looked as if resting on the sill.

"I have never on any other occasion seen anything which was not really there. "HELEN ROBINSON."

Page 297, line 14. Before p. 546 insert Vol. I.

Page 336, case 366. The phenomena of mesmeric *rapport* described in this case strongly suggest a specific influence exercised by the operator, of a sort not as yet recognised in the various scientific theories of hypnotism ; but a more decisive proof of such an influence is of course afforded if the same operator has produced kindred effects on more than one "subject." After the case in the text was printed, I heard from Mrs. Pinhey of another occurrence which, from this point of view, is of the greatest interest, besides supplying a parallel to the examples of the telepathic production of hypnotic sleep given in Vol. I., p. 88, and below, pp. 679-87. During the period when the events described in case 366 were proceeding, Mrs. Pinhey was staying with some friends at Pakenham, and was requested by Sir Walter Trevelyan, one of the party, to try to induce mesmeric sleep in another guest, Miss Lofft. Mrs. Pinhey was rather unwilling, but at last consented.

"The experiment was quite successful as far as it went. Miss L. soon went off into the sleep and was laid upon a bed in that state. I believe she did not wake for some hours. The Trevelyans and Miss Lofft were to leave the next day, and before they did so Sir Walter startled me by making the following request: 'Would I, as an experiment and to oblige him, undertake to retire at a certain hour, which he fixed, that evening, and make the usual passes with an intention of again mesmerising Miss Lofft, who would by that time be with him and his wife at a hotel at Lincoln or Leicester, or some town which he named but which I have now forgotten?' Again I hesitated. * * However, curiosity, and a comfortable assurance that there could be nothing in it, gradually conquered my repugnance, and I promised to make the attempt, heartily hoping that it might not succeed. The Trevelyans and Miss Lofft all left at about noon for the railway station, and travelled by train to their destination. The day passed as usual, and I began to feel more confidence and could almost laugh at my former fears. When the appointed time came, I retired quietly to my own room, and, imagining Miss Lofft before me, I made the usual passes¹ just as I had done the evening before, and for about the same length of time. It appeared very absurd and I could not help laughing at the situation; but I kept my own counsel and said nothing to anyone.

"A day or two later, when I had returned home, a letter came for me from Sir Walter Trevelyan. It informed me in a few words that at the preconcerted hour Miss Lofft was sitting at table after tea or supper, that she suddenly began to feel very drowsy, said her sensations were the same as when she was being mesmerised, and that at last she slept much as she had done the evening before, though, I think, less deeply and for a shorter time. I confess that I was so astonished at this news, and found it so disagreeable and bewildering, that I destroyed the letter, an act I have

¹ Possibly effective indirectly, as aiding concentration of attention.

often since regretted, and said as little as possible about the matter to anyone. I instinctively felt that it would be commonly regarded as so incredible that I had better say nothing about it, lest it should throw discredit upon the other experiments. Nevertheless, the main facts are perfectly true, though I will not undertake to answer for every detail. For instance, it is certainly true that Miss Lofft was affected in the way I have described, but I cannot remember to what exact extent."

[A niece of Miss Lofft tells us that she remembers Mrs. Pinhey mesmerising her aunt at Pakenham; but she was not told of the subsequent experiment.]

Of course if this occurrence stood alone, the most natural hypothesis would be that Sir Walter Trevelyan had in some way betrayed what was being attempted, and that the trance was caused by suggestion and expectancy. But in view of other cases of the same sort, and especially of the recent French records, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was sufficiently on his guard not to mar his own carefully-planned experiment, and that the incident was genuinely telepathic.

Page 413, case 445. We find from the Register of Deaths that the lady's death took place on March 2, 1843. The narrator tells me that there was no immediate apprehension of it—that, for aught he knew, "she might have lived for 20 years." He thinks, but cannot be sure, that his eyes were open.

Page 422, lines 4 and 16. For Harley read Holles. The note to this case (within brackets) is not quite correct, as a sailing-vessel bound for Melbourne might have 6 weeks' start, and still be outstripped by a steamer. But even with this correction, the time of the second dream cannot be brought into correspondence with any customary hour for a London funeral.

Page 460, second note. For 568 read 569; for 639 read 638; for 654 read 653.

Page 485, case 522. A sister of the narrator's, who had also heard of the experience from her father's lips, confirms the account given.

Page 511, case 552. In conversation, Mrs. Rooke mentioned that she saw the figure as she was coming out after prayers, *all the students being behind her*. This is important, as telling against the hypothesis of mistaken identity. She regards that hypothesis as out of the question, the recognition of the face being complete. The dress was a grey suit with black-barred pattern, and cap to match, such as the young man had been used to wear at the college. Mrs. Rooke did not mention her experience to her husband, not liking to appear superstitious; but both he and she agree that she mentioned it as soon as the news of the death arrived, which was about 6 weeks later; the words "many months" in her account seem therefore to be a slip.

Page 612, note. Omit 659, and add cases 30, 190, 198, 495, 530, 537, 591.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE THEORY OF CHANCE-COINCIDENCE.

§ 1. AN issue has now to be seriously considered which I have several times referred to as a fundamental one, but which could not be treated without a preliminary study of the subject of sensory hallucinations. *That*, as I have tried to show, is the order of natural phenomena to which “phantasms of the living” in general belong; they are to be regarded as projections of the percipient’s brain by which his senses are deceived. We have further found that in a certain number of cases—which may be taken as representing the still larger number to be cited in the following chapters—a phantasm of this kind is alleged to have coincided very closely in time with the death, or some serious crisis in the life, of the person whose presence it suggested. The question for us now is whether these coincidences can, or cannot, be explained as accidental. If they *can*, then the theory of telepathy—so far as applied to apparitions—falls to the ground. If they *cannot*, then the existence of telepathy as a fact in Nature is proved on the evidence; and the proof could only be resisted by the assumption that the evidence, or a very large part of it, is in its main features untrustworthy. It is very necessary to distinguish these two questions—whether the evidence may be trusted; and if trusted, what it proves. It is the latter question that is now before us. The character of the evidence was discussed at some length in the fourth chapter, and is to be judged of by the narratives quoted throughout the book. In the present chapter it is assumed that these narratives are in the main trustworthy; that in a large proportion of them the essential features of the case—*i.e.*, two marked experiences and a time-relation between them—are correctly recorded.

Here, then, is the issue. A certain number of coincidences of a particular sort have occurred: did they or did they not occur by

chance? Now there are doubtless some who do not perceive that this question demands a reasoned examination at all. They settle it *à priori*. "One is constantly coming across very startling coincidences," they observe, "which no one thinks of ascribing to anything but chance; why should not these, which are no more startling than many others, be of the number?" This idea need hardly detain us: the point in our cases is, of course, not that the coincidence is *startling*¹—that alone would be insignificant—but that the *same sort* of startling coincidence is again and again repeated. That is clearly a fact which demands treatment by a particular method, often vaguely appealed to as "the doctrine of chances." The actual application of that doctrine, however, even to simple cases, seems to require more care than is always bestowed upon it.

Especially is care required in the simple preliminary matter of deciding, before one begins to calculate, what the subject-matter of the calculation is to be—what precise class of phenomena it is to which the doctrine of chances is to be applied. I need only recall Lord Brougham's treatment of his own case (Vol. I., pp. 396-7). His attempted explanation, as we saw, entirely depended on his miscalling his experience, and referring it to the class of dreams—a class numerous enough, as he rightly perceived, to afford scope for numbers of startling coincidences. And his remarks illustrate what is really a very common outside view of psychical research. Dreams, and hallucinations, and impressions, and warnings, and presentiments—it is held—are the "psychical" stock-in-trade; and these phenomena are all much on a par, and may all be shown by the same arguments to be undeserving of serious attention. There has been the more excuse for this view, in that those who have claimed objective validity for what others dismiss as purely subjective experiences have often themselves been equally indiscriminating. Even this book might

¹ It is, however, something to get even the startling character of the coincidence admitted. For there are writers of repute who seem to think that the whole occurrence receives a sufficient rationalistic explanation when some plausible subjective cause for the hallucination has been suggested. The Abbé de St. Pierre, after telling the well-known story of Desfontaines' appearance to his friend Bezuel, at the time of the former's death by drowning, and while the latter was apparently in a swoon, opines that the swoon was the cause of the apparition; and Ferriar, who agrees with the Abbé in this, and adds, "I know from my own experience that the approach of syncope is sometimes attended with a spectral appearance," agrees with him also in leaving the little detail of the drowning wholly out of account. So with respect to the story told by Baronius, of the appearance of Ficino, at the time of his death, to Michael Mercato, who was studying philosophy. Ferriar (instead of making inquiry into the evidence of dates, which would show the story to be spurious) explains that Mercato's study of philosophy may have revived the idea of his friend in a vivid manner. It would certainly be a very vivid manner that could kill the friend at a distance.

lead a critic who confined his perusal to the headings of the chapters to imagine that dreams form a corner-stone of the argument; and in admitting that topic at all, we have so far laid ourselves open to misunderstanding. Thus a distinguished foreign critic of our efforts thought the subjective nature of what we regard as telepathic incidents sufficiently proved by the suggestion that "any physician will consider it quite within the bounds of probability that one per cent. of the population of the country are subject to remarkably vivid *dreams, illusions, visions, &c.*," and that each of these persons is "subject to a *dream or vision* once a week."¹ It is obvious enough that in circles whose members have "spectral illusions" of their friends as often as once a week, the approximate coincidence of one of these experiences with the death of the corresponding person will be an insignificant accident. But we have not ourselves met with any specimen of this class; and the present collection comprises first-hand accounts of recognised apparitions, closely coinciding with the death of the original, from 109 percipients, of whom only a small minority can recall having experienced even a single other visual hallucination than the apparition in question.² Once again, then, let me repeat that, though this work connects the sleeping and the waking phenomena in their *theoretic and psychological* aspects, it carefully and expressly separates them in their *demonstrational* aspect. The extent to which either class demonstrates the reality of telepathy can only be known through the application of the doctrine of chances; but the application

¹ Another trap lies in the word *hallucination* (see Vol. i., pp. 458-9); which in this book is strictly limited to *sensory* affections, but which common usage often applies to purely mental errors. But for this *équivoque*, an eminent physiologist would perhaps hardly have thought he made a point against us in the remark—a rather rash one from any point of view—that our evidence is manifestly derived for the most part "from a class of persons given to hallucination, especially clergymen and women, who are naturally inclined to believe marvels." (*Deutsche Rundschau* for January, 1886, p. 45.) Among 509 informants from whom I have received accounts of apparently subjective hallucinations of sight and hearing, I find the proportion of females to males almost exactly 3 to 2, and clergymen most sparsely represented. Of the 527 percipients concerned in the hallucinations of sight and hearing which are included as telepathic evidence in these volumes, 241, or more than 46 per cent., are males; 286, or less than 54 per cent., are females; and 28, or between 5 and 6 per cent., are ministers of religion. The slight preponderance of female informants may probably be due to their having, as a rule, more leisure than men for writing on matters unconnected with business.

² Explicit denials have been given by 73 out of the 109. From 22 others no answer has been obtained on the point, either through our own failure at first to realise its importance, or owing to death or some unavoidable cause; but of these 22, the majority have pretty clearly implied that what they describe was a unique experience. Of the 14 who can recall some further instance or instances, 4 have had a single apparently subjective hallucination under exceptional conditions of bad health or mental strain; 3 have had one such experience when in a normal state; and 7 have had several such experiences—some of which, however, differed from the telepathic cases in not representing a living figure, while others were themselves either probably or possibly of telepathic origin. I may add that in a large number of other cases, not given in the actual words of the percipient, there is very good reason to believe the experiences to have been unique.

must be made to them separately, not together; we must not, like Lord Brougham, argue to one class from the data of the other. I have already applied the doctrine to a particular class of dreams, with results which, though numerically striking, left room for doubt, owing to the peculiar untrustworthiness of memory in dream-matters. It remains to apply it to the waking phantasms; and here I think that the results may fairly be held to be decisive.

§ 2. It is clear that the points to be settled are two:—the frequency of the phantasms which have markedly corresponded with real events; and the frequency of phantasms which have had no such correspondence, and have been obviously and wholly subjective in character. These points are absolutely essential to any conclusion on the question before us; and if not settled in any other way, they must be settled by guesses or tacit assumptions. The theory of chance-coincidence, as opposed to that of telepathy, has so far depended on two such assumptions. The first is that the coincidences themselves are *extremely rare*. They can then be accounted for as accidental. For we know that there are such things as hallucinations representing human forms, which do not correspond with any objective fact whatever outside the organism of the percipient; and it would be rash to deny that the death of the person represented may now and then, in the world's history, have fallen on the same day as the hallucination. The second assumption is that these purely subjective apparitions of forms are *extremely common*. It can then be argued that even a considerable number of them might fall on the same day as the death of the corresponding human being. Supposing that we could each of us recall the occasional experience of gazing at friends or relatives in places which were really empty, then—since people are perpetually dying who are the friends and relatives of some of us—every year might yield a certain crop of the coincidences.

But as soon as we make these assumptions explicit and look at them, we see how baseless and arbitrary they are. Why should either of them be admitted without challenge? The second one especially seems opposed to what we may call the common-sense view of ordinary intelligent men. The question whether or not a very large proportion of the population have had experience of morbid or purely subjective hallucinations is one, I submit, where the opponents of the chance-theory might fairly take their stand

on the ordinary observation of educated persons, and have thrown on others the *onus* of proving them wrong. On this point a broad view, based on one's general knowledge of oneself and one's fellows, does exist; and according to it, "spectral illusions"—distinct hallucinations of the sense of vision—are very far from the everyday occurrences which they would have to be if we are to suppose that, whenever they coincide in time with the death of the person seen, they do so by accident. Nay, if we take even one of our critics, and bring him fairly face to face with the question, "If *you* all at once saw in your room a brother whom you had believed to be a hundred miles away; if he disappeared without the door opening; and if an hour later you received a telegram announcing his sudden death—how should you explain the occurrence"? he does not as a rule reply, "*His* day and hour for dying happened also to be *my* day and hour for a spectral illusion, which is natural enough, considering how common the latter experience is." The line that he takes is, "The supposition is absurd; there are no really authentic cases of that sort." Under the immediate pressure of the supposed facts, he instinctively feels that the argument of chance-coincidence would not seem effective.

Still, "common-sense"—though it would support what I say—is not here the true court of appeal. And, moreover, it is not unanimous. On the second point, as on the first, I have received the most divergent replies from persons whom I have casually asked to give a guess on the subject; and some have guessed the frequency of the purely subjective hallucinations as very much *below* what it actually is. The moral—that we cannot advance a step without statistics—seems pretty obvious, though the student of the subject may read every word that has ever been published on both sides of the argument without encountering a hint of the need. There is plenty of assertion, but no figures; and a single instance, one way or the other, seems often to be thought decisive. To A, who has himself seen a friend's form at the time of his death at a distance, the connection between the two facts seems obvious; B, having heard of a phantasm of a living person which raised apprehensions as to his safety, but which "came to nothing," is at once sure that A's case was "a chance." I have even seen this view expanded, and a leading review gravely urging that the coincidences must be regarded as accidental, if against every hallucination which *has* markedly corresponded with a real event we can set another which has *not*.

This is certainly a statistical argument—of a sort—and might be represented as follows:—At the end of an hour's rifle-practice at a long-distance range, the record shows that for every shot that has hit the bull's-eye another has missed the target: therefore the shots that hit the bull's-eye did so by accident.

§ 3. Perhaps the neglect of statistics has in part been due to an apparent hopelessness of attaining a sufficient quantity of reliable facts on which to found an argument—to an idea that any census on which a conclusion could be founded would have to be carried out on a scale so vast as to be practically impossible. “Do you intend,” I have been sometimes asked, “to ask every man and woman in England whether he or she has experienced any subjective hallucination during, say, the last twenty years, and also to get a complete record of all the alleged coincidences within the same period, and then to compare the two lists?” Happily nothing at all approaching this is required. We shall find that approximately accurate figures are necessary only on one point—the frequency of the subjective hallucinations; and this can be ascertained by making inquiries of any fraction of the population which is large and varied enough to serve as a fair sample of the whole. Even this smaller task, however, is a very tedious one, consisting, as it does for the most part, in carefully registering *negative* information. The believer in telepathy may feel that he is doing much more to advance his belief by narrating a striking positive instance at a dinner party than by ascertaining, for instance, from twenty of his acquaintance the dull fact that they have never experienced a distinct visual hallucination. Just in the same way a scientific lecturer may win more regard at the moment by a sensational experiment with pretty colours and loud explosions than by laborious quantitative work in his laboratory. But it must be persistently impressed on the friends of “psychical research” that the laborious quantitative work has to be done; and it is some satisfaction to think that the facts themselves may stand as material for others to deal with, even if the conclusions here drawn from them are incorrect.

Nor has the dulness of the work been by any means the only difficulty: its purpose has been widely misconceived, and its scope has thereby been much curtailed. The proposal for a numerical estimate was introduced in a circular letter, every word of which might have been penned by a zealous sceptic, anxious above all things to prove that, in cases where the phantasm of a distant person has appeared

simultaneously with the person's death, the coincidence has been an accidental one. Not a syllable was used implying that the authors of the letter had themselves any opinion as to whether phantasms to which no real event corresponds *are* or are *not* common things; it was simply pointed out that it is necessary to have some idea *how* common they are, before deciding whether phantasms to which real events *do* correspond are or are not to be fairly accounted for by chance. And since sensory hallucinations, whatever their frequency, are at any rate phenomena as completely admitted as measles or colour-blindness, it did not occur to us that the following question could possibly be misunderstood:—

*Since January 1, 1874, have you—when in good health, free from anxiety, and completely awake—had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a human being, or of hearing a voice or sound which suggested a human presence, when no one was there? Yes or no?*¹

Clearly, the more *yeses* are received to this question—*i.e.*, the *commoner* the purely subjective hallucinations prove to be—the stronger is the argument for *chance* as an adequate explanation of the instances of coincidence; the more *noes*—the *rarer* the purely subjective hallucinations prove to be—the stronger the argument that the death or other crisis which *coincides* with the apparition is in some way the *cause* of the apparition. We should have expected, if any injustice was to be done us, that it would have taken the form of attributing to us an inordinate desire for *noes*. To our amazement we found that we were supposed to be aiming exclusively at *yeses*—and not only at *yeses*, but at *yeses* expanded into orthodox “ghost-stories”—to be anxious, in fact, that every one in and out of Bedlam who had ever imagined something that was not there, or mistaken one object for another, should tell us his experience, with a view that we might immediately interpret it as due to the intervention of a bogey. A more singular instance of the power of *expectancy*—of the power of gathering from words any

¹ This comprehensive question has been actually asked in several parts. As first put, for example, it contained no limitation as to date—as I was anxious to obtain accounts of as many hallucinations of the sane as possible; and the fact that any experience recorded had or had not fallen within the specified period of 12 years was ascertained by subsequent correspondence. The details of the experience were also a matter of subsequent inquiry.

I need hardly warn the reader not to confound the group of hallucinations belonging to the limited number of persons who were expressly asked the above question, with the large collection of similar experiences which has been frequently mentioned in some of the preceding chapters. That large collection includes the smaller group, and also census-cases which fell outside the 12 years' limit; but it includes also a far larger number of cases which were received quite irrespectively of the census.

meaning that a critic comes predisposed to find there—can hardly be conceived. A statistical question on a perfectly well-recognised point in the natural history of the senses was treated, in scientific and unscientific quarters alike, as a manifesto of faith in “supernatural” agencies; and we found ourselves solemnly rebuked for ignoring the morbid and subjective character of many hallucinations—that is to say, for ignoring the fact which we had set forth as the very basis of our appeal, and from which its whole and sole point was derived.

§ 4. If I have dwelt thus on difficulties and misconceptions, it is not that I may boast of having altogether triumphed over them. On the contrary, they have made it impossible to attain more than a fraction of what I once hoped. I began with the idea that the census might be extended to 50,000 persons; the group actually included numbers only 5705. Still, though this is certainly not a showy number, any one who is familiar with work in averages will, I think, admit that it is adequate for the purpose; and the friends who have assisted in the collection of the answers (to whom I take this opportunity of offering my grateful thanks) need certainly not feel that their labour has been in vain. It is possible for a *small* group to be quite fairly *representative*. Thus, if 50 males were taken at random from the inhabitants of London, if the heights of their respective owners were measured, and added together, and if the total were divided by 50, the result might be taken as representing, within extremely small limits of error, the average height of adult male Londoners; we should not get a much more correct result by taking the mean of 500, or 500,000 heights. This is the simplest sort of case. When it is a question of what proportion of the population have had a certain experience which many of them have *not* had, we must take a larger specimen-number, adjusting it to some extent by our rough previous knowledge. For instance, if we want to know what proportion of the inhabitants of London have had typhoid fever, it would not be safe to take 50 of them at random, and then, if we found that 10 of these had had the illness, to argue that one-fifth of the inhabitants of London had had it. Our rough knowledge is that a great many have not had it, and that a good many have; and in such circumstances we should probably get a very appreciably more certain result by enlarging our representative group to 500.¹ If, again, the

¹ In the recently issued Supplement to the Registrar-General's Reports for 1870-80, he bases his conclusions as to the proportionate deadliness of different diseases in the various occupations on batches of 500-1000 deaths.

experience was of extraordinary rarity, such as leprosy, the number of our specimen-group would have to be again increased; even if we took as many as 500,000 people at random, that is about one-ninth of the population, and ascertained that one of them was a leper, it would not be safe to conclude that there were nine lepers in London. Now our rough knowledge as to hallucinations would place them in this regard very much more on a par with typhoid fever than with leprosy. We realise that a great many people have not had experience of them; but we realise also that they are in no way marvellous or prodigious events. And if a group of 5705 persons seems a somewhat arbitrary number by which to test their frequency, the view that it is *too small* and that 50,000 would be greatly preferable, is one that can at any rate hardly be held with consistency by advocates of the theory of chance-coincidence. For the main prop of that theory, as we have seen, is the assumption that purely subjective hallucinations are *tolerably common* experiences; whereas it is only of *decidedly rare* experiences that the frequency, in relation to the whole population, would be much more correctly estimated from the proportion of *fifty* thousand people that have had them than from the proportion of *five* thousand people that have had them. However, the adequacy of the latter number approves itself most clearly in the course of the census itself. We find as we go on that hallucinations are sufficiently uncommon to force us to take our specimen-group of persons in thousands, not in hundreds, but not so uncommon as to force us to take very many thousands: after the first thousand is reached the proportion of "yesses" to "noes" keeps pretty uniformly steady—as would, no doubt, be the case if the question asked related not to hallucinations but to typhoid fever.

As regards the sort of persons from whom the answers have been collected—if there have been any answers from persons whose deficiencies of education or intelligence rendered them unfit subjects for a simple inquiry bearing on their personal experience, they form, I may confidently say, an inappreciable fraction of the whole. Perhaps a fourth of the persons canvassed have been in the position of shopkeepers and artisans or *employés* of various sorts; but the large majority have belonged to what would be known as the educated class, being relatives and friends of the various collectors. It is, no doubt, safest to assume that a certain degree of education is a pre-requisite to even the simplest form of participation in scientific

work ; and this condition, it will be observed, in no way detracts from the *representative* character of the group. A few thousand educated persons, taken at random, present an abundantly sufficient variety of types ; and, indeed, for the purpose in view, the group is the more truly representative for belonging mainly to the educated class, inasmuch as it is from that class that the majority of the cases which are presented in this work as probably telepathic are also drawn.

§ 5. To say, however, that the answers came in the main from an educated class, is not, of course, a guarantee of the accuracy of the census ; and before giving the actual results it may be well to forestall some possible objections.

It may be said, to begin with, that people may have had the experience inquired about, but may have forgotten the fact. This is the objection which was considered above in respect of dreams of death, and which there seemed to have decided force. In respect of waking hallucinations of the senses, its force is very much less. No doubt hallucinations may exhibit all degrees of vagueness ; and it is very possible that extremely slight and momentary specimens may make little impression, and may rapidly be forgotten ; but for the purposes of the census it would not in the least matter that persons whose experience had been of this slight and momentary kind should answer *no* instead of *yes*. It would have been unwise to complicate the question asked by an attempt to define the extent of vividness that the hallucination must have reached, to be reckoned as an item in our census ; but clearly the only subjective hallucinations of which it really concerns us to ascertain the frequency are those which are in themselves *as distinct and impressive* as the hallucinations that we represent as telepathic ; and any that fall below this point of distinctness and impressiveness have no bearing on the argument. And, *per contra*, it will be seen that by not limiting the wording of the question to distinct and impressive hallucinations, the collector exposes himself to receiving the answer "yes" from persons whose hallucination actually was very vague and momentary, but who do, as it happens, remember its occurrence. In point of fact, this has occurred a good many times ; and the swelling of the list of *yesses* by this means probably outweighs any losses of what should have been genuine *yesses* through failure of memory. For consider what such failure of memory would imply. A fact of sight, hearing, or touch, as clear and unequivocal as most of the sensory impressions which we adduce as evidence for telepathy, must be very clear and

unequivocal indeed. And the absence of the normal external cause of such an impression, when recognised, can hardly fail to give rise to genuine surprise—the surprise that follows a novel and unaccountable experience: this has been the result of almost all the “telepathic” phantasms, quite independently of the news which afterwards seemed to connect them with reality. Now, can it be a common thing for an experience as unusual and surprising as this to be, within a dozen years or any shorter period, so utterly obliterated from a person’s mind that his memory remains a blank, even when he is pointedly asked to try and recall whether he has had such an experience or not?

A second objection is this. It has been suggested that untrue answers may be given by persons wishing to amuse themselves at our expense. Now I cannot deny that persons may exist who would be glad to thwart us, and amuse themselves, even at the cost of untruth. But when the question is put, “Do you remember having ever distinctly seen the face or form of a person known to you, when that person was not really there?” it is not at once obvious whether the *amusing* untruth would be “Yes” or “No.” In neither case would the joke seem to be of a very exhilarating quality; but, on the whole, I should say that “Yes” would be the favourite, as at any rate representing the rarer and less commonplace experience. “Yes” is, moreover, the answer which (as I have explained) it has been very generally thought that we ourselves preferred; so that to give it might produce a piquant sense of fooling us to the top of our bent. But the reader has seen that, so far as the census might be thus affected, it would be affected in a direction *adverse* to the telepathic argument; for the commoner the purely casual hallucinations are reckoned to be, the stronger is the argument that the visions which correspond with real events do so *by chance*. And if the number of these coincident visions makes the chance-argument untenable, even when the basis of estimation is affected in the way supposed, *à fortiori* would this be the case if the *yeses* were reduced to their true number.

Yet another objection is that persons who have had hallucinations may sometimes be disinclined to admit the fact, and may say “No” instead of “Yes” in self-defence. This source of error must be frankly admitted; but I feel tolerably confident that it has not affected the results to a really detrimental extent. Any reluctance to give the true answer is, as a rule, observable at the moment; and

in most cases it disappears when the purpose of the census is explained, and careful suppression of names is guaranteed. And against this tendency to swell the *noes* may be set several reasons why, quite apart from untruth, a census like this is sure to produce an unfair number of *yeses*. Quite apart from any wish to deceive, the very general impression that *yeses* were what was specially wanted could not but affect some of the answers given, at any rate to the extent of causing indistinct impressions to be represented as vivid sensory experiences;¹ and it has also led some of those who have aided in the collection to put the questions to persons of whom it was *known beforehand* that their answer would be *yes*. Moreover, when question-forms to be filled up are distributed on a large scale, it is impossible to bring it home to the minds of many of the persons whose answer would be "No" that there is *any use* in recording that answer. They probably have a vague idea that they have heard "negative evidence" disparaged, and fail to see that every percentage in the world involves it—that we cannot know that one man in 100 is six feet high without evidence that 99 men in 100 are *not* six feet high. This difficulty has been encountered again and again; and on the whole I have no doubt that the proportion of *yeses* is decidedly larger than it ought to be. Fortunately, incorrectness on this side need not trouble us—its only effect being that the telepathic argument, if it prevail, will prevail though based on distinctly unfavourable assumptions.

§ 6. And now to proceed to the actual results of the census, and to the calculations based thereon. I will begin with auditory cases. Of the 5705 persons who have been asked the question, it appears that 96 have, within the last 12 years, when awake,² experienced an auditory hallucination of a voice. The voice is alleged to have been unrecognised in 48 cases, and recognised in 44, in 13 of which latter cases the person whose voice seemed to be heard was known to have been dead for some time. In the remaining 4 cases it has been

¹ For instance, a lady who answers that she has had an auditory hallucination, and is written to with the view of finding out in what it had consisted, then states that "it was *not* an auditory experience, but merely a feeling that something had happened." Here the answer could be rectified; but even the many hundreds of letters that have been written on the subject have not served to eliminate all doubtful cases.

² I have not made a separate calculation for "borderland" cases; as the attempt to obtain separate statistics under that head would have complicated the census, and the only chance of carrying it through successfully was to keep it as simple as possible. The question as to hallucinations specially included the condition of *being awake*; but naturally some of the experiences recorded had taken place when the hallucinated person was *in bed* (Vol. i., p. 393). I reckon these cases among the *yeses*; and I include similar experiences in the group of *coincidental hallucinations* which appears later in the calculation.

impossible to discover whether the voice was recognised or not; the numbers being so even, I shall perhaps be justified in assigning 2 of these to one class, and 2 to the other. The computation will be clearer if we consider only the cases in which the voice was recognised, and the person whom it suggested was living; these, then may be taken as 33. But, out of the 33 persons, 10¹ profess to have had the experience more than once. Such cases of repetition, or at any rate most of them, might fairly have been disregarded; for since the large majority of the persons who have had one of the coincidental hallucinations, which appear later in the calculation, can recall no other hallucination besides that one, I might in the same proportion confine the present list, which consists wholly of non-coincidental or purely subjective hallucinations, to similarly *unique* experiences, and leave out of account those occurring to people who seem rather more pre-disposed to such affections. However, in order to make ample allowance for the possibility that the witnesses in the coincidental cases may have had subjective hallucinations which they have forgotten, let us take the repetitions into account; and let us suppose each of the 10 persons just mentioned to have had 4 experiences of the sort within the specified 12 years. The most convenient way of making this allowance will be to add 30 to the former total of 33—*i.e.*, to take the number of persons who have had the experience under the given conditions as 63. This amounts to 1 in every 90 of the group of 5705 persons named, or (if that group be accepted as fairly representative of the population of this country) 1 in every 90 of the population.

Let us now see what the proportion of the population who have had such an experience ought to be, on the hypothesis that the similar impressions of recognised voices presented in this book as telepathic were really chance-coincidences. As before in the case of dreams (Vol. I., pp. 303-7), I take cases where the coincidence of the hallucination was with *death*—the reasons for this selection being (1) that death is the prominent event in our telepathic cases; and (2) that for the purpose of an accurate numerical estimate it is important to select an event of a very definite and unmistakable kind, such as only happens once to each individual. Again also, in accordance with the official returns which give $\frac{22}{1000}$ as the annual death-rate, the proportion of anyone's relatives and acquaintances

¹ Some of these cases were quite clearly "after-images" (see Vol. i., p. 502). One informant describes the impressions as very faint, and another experienced them only when over-tired.

who die in the course of 12 years is taken as $\frac{264}{1000}$; and as we have seen (Vol. I., pp. 305-6), it will make no appreciable difference to the calculation whether a person's circle of relatives and acquaintances, the voice of any one of whom his hallucination may represent, is large or small. The probability, then, that a person hallucinated in the way supposed will, by accident, have his hallucination within 12 hours on either side of the death of the relative or acquaintance whose voice it represents, is 1 in $\frac{12 \times 365 \times 1000}{264}$, or $\frac{1}{16,591}$. That is to say, each coincidental hallucination of the sort in question implies 16,590 purely subjective cases of the same type. Now our collection may be reckoned to include 13 first-hand and well-attested coincidental cases of this kind, which have occurred in this country within the specified time.¹ On the hypothesis, therefore, that these cases were accidental, the circle of persons from whom they are drawn ought to supply altogether, in the specified 12 years, 215,670 examples.

The next point to decide is the size of the circle from which our coincidental cases are drawn. The number here is not one that it is possible to estimate accurately: what must be done, therefore, is to make sure that our margin is on the side adverse to the telepathic argument, *i.e.*, to take a number clearly in excess of the true one. Our chief means of obtaining information has been by occasional requests in newspapers. A million-and-a-half would probably be an outside estimate of the circulation of the papers which have contained our appeals; but it by no means follows that every paragraph in a paper is studied by every person, or by a tenth of the persons, whom the paper reaches. However, I will make the extreme assumption that as many as a quarter of a million of people have by this means become aware of the kind of evidence that was being sought—an assumption which probably arrogates to us who sought it many times as much fame as we really possess; and I will allow another 50,000 for those who have become aware of the object of our work through private channels. This would raise the number of the circle from whom our evidence is drawn to 300,000, or about $\frac{1}{30}$ of the adult population.² No one, I think,

¹ Nos. 33, 158, 184, 190, 197, 272, 273, 278, 298, 300, 310, 340, 702. In one of these cases, No. 197, it is possible, on the facts stated, that the 12 hours' limit was slightly exceeded. I have not included case 613, as, though there were only a very few people by whom the percipient could have been addressed as "Pa.,"—which was the word he heard—and one of these died at the time at a distance, the father did not identify the voice with the particular son who died.

² In the "adult population" I mean to include all persons above 15 years of age. In the Supplement to the 45th Annual Report of the Registrar-General, p. xix., the proportion of such persons is given as $\frac{1}{64}$ of the whole; which would make their number about 24,000,000.

will maintain on reflection, that I am taking too low an estimate. Would anyone, for instance, suppose that if he canvassed the first 1000 adults whom he met in the streets of any large town, he would find that 12 or 13 of them had, within the last three years, been aware of what we wanted, and of the address to which information might be sent? and for rural districts such a supposition would be even more violent. But I am further supposing that this area of 300,000 persons has been drained dry—again an extravagant concession; for though it is easily assumed that anyone who has ever had a “psychical” experience is desirous to publish it abroad, as a matter of fact people do not usually take the trouble to write a letter about family and personal matters to perfect strangers, on the ground of a newspaper appeal; and I have already mentioned that we ourselves know of much evidence which the reluctance or indifference of the parties concerned has made unavailable for our collection; we cannot, therefore, doubt that much more remains unelicited even among those whom our appeal has reached. A further strong argument for the existence of these unelicited facts is the very large proportion of our actual cases that has been drawn from a circle of our own, unconnected with “psychical” inquiry—from the friends, or the friends’ friends, of a group of some half-dozen persons who have had no such experiences themselves, and who have no reason to suppose their friends or their friends’ friends better supplied with them than anybody else’s.¹

Here, then, is the conclusion to which we shall be driven, if our coincidental cases were really purely subjective hallucinations, and the coincidence was an accident:—that in a circle of 300,000, within 12 years, 215,670 subjective hallucinations of the type in question have taken place; that is that, on an average, 7 persons in every 10 have had such an experience within the time. But the result of the census above described showed the proportion to be 1 person in every 90 only. Thus the theory of chance-coincidence, as applied to this

¹ An approximation to an estimate of the actual circle whom we have effectively reached may perhaps be made as follows:—Of the 24 coincidental dreams of death, mentioned in Vol. i., p. 307, 4 were derived from a canvassed group of 5360 persons; of the 13 coincidental auditory hallucinations mentioned above, none were derived from the canvassed group of 5705 persons; and of 27 coincidental visual hallucinations (of a definite type to be explained immediately), 1 was derived from a canvassed group of 5705 persons. Thus of 64 coincidental experiences of specified sorts, 5, or about one-thirteenth, were obtained by canvassing a body which (to take a mean) we may call 5535: we may surmise, then, that the circle from whom the whole number were drawn amounts to about 13 times 5535, or 71,955. This is no doubt a very rough calculation; the number of coincidental (or, as we should say, telepathic) experiences yielded by a random group of 5535 persons being too small for us to be confident that it represents the average proportion in other groups of the same size. But the estimate is probably not so inexact but that it may safely be taken as showing the assumption of 300,000, made in the text, to be extravagantly unfair to the telepathic argument.

class of cases, would require that the proportion of those who have not had, to those who have had, a subjective hallucination of a recognised voice should be 63 times as large as it has been shown to be; that is, would require either that the subjective hallucinations should be 63 times as numerous as they actually are, or else that the circle from whom our coincidental cases are drawn should amount to 63 times the assumed size—in other words, that our existence and objects should have been prominently before the minds of more than three-fourths of the adult population of the country!

Another form of the estimate is as follows. The probability that a person, taken at random, will, in the course of 12 years, have the form of hallucination in question is $\frac{1}{30}$; the probability that any assigned member of the general population, and therefore any particular person whose phantasmal voice is heard, will die within 12 hours of an assigned point of time is $\frac{1}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$; hence the probability that, in the course of 12 years, a hallucination of this form *and* the death of the person whose voice seems to be heard will fall within 12 hours of one another is $\frac{1}{30} \times \frac{1}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$, or almost exactly 1 in 1,500,000. And the circle from which our coincidental cases are drawn is assumed to be 300,000. From these data it may be calculated that the odds against the occurrence, by accident, of as many coincidences of the type in question as that circle produced, are *more than a trillion to 1*.

§ 7. But the *reductio ad absurdum* becomes far more striking when we apply the doctrine of chances to *visual* cases. Out of the 5705 persons taken at random, of whom the above question was asked, only 21 could recall having, in the conditions named and within the specified 12 years, experienced a visual hallucination representing a living person known to them. But two of the 21 had had 2 experiences of the sort; so let us take the total as 23.¹ That is, the experience has fallen to the lot of one 248th of the group of persons asked, or, if that group be fairly representative, to 1 person in every 248 of the population.² Now, just as before, each coincidental

¹ This is a liberal allowance; for it includes several cases where there was such an amount of anxiety or expectancy on the part of the hallucinated person as would prevent us, if it were present in a *coincidental* case, from including such a case in our telepathic evidence. In 7 of the cases, the form seen was an "after-image" of what had been, for some time previously, part of the perceiver's daily visual experience.

² It will be seen that 1 in 248, though a small proportion, is yet quite large enough to make it likely that most of us should casually have heard of a case or two of the kind. For there are probably more than 248 persons whom we are each of us sufficiently near to make it natural that an unusual experience—such as a distinct "spectral illusion"—befalling one of them, should directly or indirectly reach our ears. This is worth noting, because one sometimes hears the statement, "Why I heard the other day of a person

hallucination of the sort in question, supposing it to have been purely subjective and the coincidence to have been accidental, should stand for 16,590 purely subjective hallucinations. But our collection includes 31 first-hand¹ and well-attested coincidental cases of this type, which have occurred in this country within the specified time;² and the circle of persons from whom they were drawn—liberally supposed, as before, to number 300,000—ought, therefore, to supply altogether, in the specified 12 years, 514,290 examples. That is to say, it ought to have happened on an average to everybody once, and to most people twice, within the given time, distinctly to see an absent relation or acquaintance in a part of space that was actually vacant. But the census has shown that, within the given time, only about 1 in every 248 persons has had such an experience even once. Thus the group of visual coincidental cases now in question, if ascribed to accident, would require either that the subjective hallucinations should be more than 396 times as numerous as they actually are; or else that the circle from whom our coincidental cases are drawn should amount to more than 396 times the assumed size—in other words, that our existence and objects should have been prominently before the minds of every adult member of a population 5 times as large as the existing one.

The second form of estimate in the last section, applied to visual cases, will give as the probability that the hallucination and the death will fall within 12 hours of one another, $\frac{1}{248} \times \frac{22}{1000} \times \frac{1}{365}$, or 1 in 4,114,545. And the circle from which our coincidental cases are drawn is assumed to be 300,000. From these data it may be calculated that the odds against the occurrence, by accident, of as many coincidences of the type in question as the 31 which that circle produced, are about *a thousand billion trillion trillion trillions to 1*. Or, to put it in yet another way—the theory of chances, which gives 1 as the most probable number of coincidences of the type in question for every 4,114,545 of the population to yield, will give 6 as the most

who had been disturbed by seeing an apparition of a friend, and nothing came of it," made as though it amounted to a proof that such experiences were common enough to afford scope for any number of marked coincidences.

¹ In 3 of the cases the evidence is not first-hand from the percipient, but is of the nature described in Vol. i., p. 148.

² Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175, 182, 184, 195, 197, 199, 201, 202, 214, 231, 236, 237, 238, 240, 249, 298, 300, 350, 355, 695, 697, 702, and the case described in Vol. i., p. 130, note. As regards recognition, Nos. 170 and 355 do not stand on quite the same ground as the other cases. I am not reckoning case 241, where the recognition, such as it was, was retrospective; nor case 500, where it seems at any rate as likely as not that the 12 hours' limit was somewhat exceeded. In 3 cases, Nos. 197, 201, 231, it is possible, on the facts stated, that the limit was exceeded; but in the two latter cases this is very improbable, and the coincidence may have been exact.

probable number for the whole adult population to yield, within the given period. Yet we draw more than 5 times that number from a fraction of the adult population which can only by an extravagantly liberal estimate be assumed to amount to an 80th part of the whole, and which has been very inadequately canvassed.

§ 8. In the above estimates, I have allowed to the so-called coincidence the rather wide limit of 12 hours. But in most of the actual cases it has been much closer than this; and it will be worth while to show how a single case of very close coincidence may legitimately strengthen the argument. First, it must be unreservedly admitted that a single case, if it stood alone and no similar one had ever been heard of, would have no cogency whatever as evidence of the operation of anything beyond chance. The most extraordinary coincidence, as above remarked, may yet be totally insignificant. The *à priori* improbability that the tallest man of the century will be born during a transit of Venus is enormous; but such a conjunction of events, if it happened, might be at once and with moral certainty ascribed to accident; and with equal certainty might it be predicted that such a conjunction would never recur. And without resorting to imaginary examples, we often encounter conjunctions and coincidences which would have appeared, before they happened, to be extremely improbable, but the happening of which is none the less clearly accidental. The odds are very great against two of the foremost men in a century being born on the same day; yet this happened in the case of Darwin and Lincoln, and no one imagines that one birth depended on the other. "Extraordinary coincidences" are, in fact, quite ordinary things; and only when previous experience has given us ground for suspecting (however faintly) that the conjunction in time or special combination is due to some positive causal link, can we connect the *à priori* improbability of a new case with an *à posteriori* argument that cases of that type are not due to chance.¹ Now the result of § 7 may be

¹ In a general way, coincidences where previous experience affords some ground for suspecting (however faintly) a cause other than chance are distinguished from coincidences where no such ground exists by this fact—that the latter sort of cases, if *à priori* highly improbable, are not mentioned or described until *after* they have happened. From the mere fact that they do not belong to any known or surmised type, they do not enter into anyone's head: no one suggests, without any sort of grounds, that a particular thing will happen to some one at a particular time, or predicts any particular highly improbable coincidence, and then afterwards finds this thing or this coincidence actually occurring. Now it will scarcely be contended that the coincidence of an apparition with the death of the person seen is a combination of events which has never entered anyone's head; for it has entered the heads even of those who deny that it has ever occurred, or who ascribe its occurrence to accident. But the idea has of course had much more than this negative sort of existence; there has been a

summarised as follows. The census leads us to infer that, during the years 1874-85, out of 300,000 inhabitants of this country taken at random, $\frac{23 \times 300,000}{5705}$ or 1209 have had a recognised visual hallucination, representing a living person, which did not coincide with the death of that person. And during the same period, out of the same number of persons (supposing our inquiries really to have extended to so wide a circle,) at least 31 have had a recognised visual hallucination which did coincide—in the sense of falling withing 12 hours of—the death of the person seen. That is, out of $1209 + 31$ or 1240 hallucinations, 31, or 1 in 40, have fallen within 12 hours of the death of the person seen. Now let us apply this conclusion to case 28 (Vol. I., p. 210). When Mr. S. had his visual hallucination representing his friend, he would have been justified in regarding the probability that his friend would prove to have died within 12 hours of the vision as 1 in 40; whereas, if there was no ground at all for surmising that a causal connection may exist between deaths and apparitions, he would only have been justified in regarding the probability of his friend's dying on that day as about 1 in 20,440—estimated from the death-rate which tables of mortality give for men of his friend's age (48 years). But it will be observed that the death and the apparition, for aught we know, were absolutely simultaneous, and at any rate were within a quarter of an hour of one another. Since, however, the death may have occurred 12 minutes before or 12 minutes after the apparition, we must take into account the double period; or, to allow for difference of clocks, let us say half-an-hour. Now, on the supposition that telepathy is a reality in the world, closeness of coincidence rather increases than otherwise the probability that the death and the apparition in any particular case are causally connected; whereas the probability of a death accidentally falling in a particular half-hour is, of course, 48 times less than that of its falling on a particular day. Thus the *à priori* probability that the death, if unconnected with the apparition, would fall in the particular half-hour in which the apparition fell, was 1 in 981,120; and in considering the question of connection, it is this extremely small degree of probability which has to be contrasted with the 1 in 40 which we have taken as

good deal of positive belief that such combinations occur, and that their occurrence implies a causal connection between the death and the apparition. And though this belief may have been rash and premature before the necessary statistics had been obtained, I have tried in the last two sections to show that it may now be justified by precise calculation.

about the true *à priori* probability that this particular half-hour would prove to be that of the death.

But the significance of extreme closeness of coincidence may be yet more strikingly suggested, if we consider the probability of the joint event before either part of it has occurred. My census gives $\frac{1}{243}$ as the probability that a particular individual would within 12 years have a visual hallucination of a friend not known to be dead. Mr. S. has, say, x friends, of whom about a fourth would naturally die in this period; and the period comprises 210,240 half-hours. Thus the probability of Mr. S.'s hitting off by chance such a coincidence as he did hit off was $\frac{1}{243} \times \frac{1}{x} \times \frac{x}{4} \times \frac{1}{210,240}$, or about 1 in 208 millions.¹ It might, I think, be safely said that, in the world's history, no one has ever contemplated the possible participation of himself, or of any other specified person, in an event of this degree of unlikelihood, and has afterwards found his idea realised. But apart from this, the points to be specially weighed are (1) that Mr. S.'s case was drawn from a very inconsiderable fraction of the population—a fraction liberally estimated at $\frac{1}{10}$; and (2) that this fraction of the population has supplied many other parallel instances of great closeness of coincidence. Taking only the "borderland" and waking phantasms recorded on first-hand testimony in the main body of this work, I find that 66 of them are represented as having occurred within an hour of the event on the agent's side—which event in 41 of the 66 cases was death; 15 more, according to the facts stated, were within two hours of the event, which in 10 of the 15 cases was death; and in nearly all these cases, as well as in several others, it is quite possible that the coincidence was absolutely exact. I do not forget, what I have expressly pointed out in Chapter IV., that exaggeration of the closeness of the coincidence is a likely form for exaggeration in such matters to take;² but in a considerable

¹ The denominator of the third of the four fractions which are multiplied together will diminish or increase according as the period considered is longer or shorter than 12 years. Otherwise the length of the period is not material; since the first fraction may be assumed to vary inversely with the last.

The death, it will be observed, might happen in *any* half-hour; and therefore the *total* of half-hours must be reckoned, without deduction of those in which a waking hallucination would be impossible—as in sleep; or of those in which it would be specially improbable—as during conversation or active exercise. The case is like that of drawing two tickets simultaneously from two bags, one of which contains the numbers from 1 to 100, and the other the numbers from 1 to 1000. The probability that the two tickets drawn will bear the same number is not $\frac{1}{1000}$ but $\frac{1}{10000}$. I neglect the remote chance that several friends might die in one half-hour—which, however, can be shown not to affect the result.

² Thus it would be quite unjustifiable to add to the list a number of cases in the Supplement where the coincidence is stated to have been exact. Still the Supplement contains several accounts—*e.g.*, Nos. 508, 510, 569, 584, 599—which may fairly be assumed to be correct in this particular.

number of the cases mentioned, good reason is shown for believing it to have been as close as is stated.

But the huge total of improbability is nothing like complete. Nothing has been said of the aggregate strength of the cases where the phantasm was unrecognised. Nothing has been said of the large array of cases where the coincident event was not death, but some other form of crisis—a class which does not lend itself easily to a precise numerical estimate, but whose collective force, even if it stood alone, would be very great. Once more, each of the two classes of cases—the “reciprocal” and the “collective”—which still await discussion, includes specimens of visual and auditory phantasms; and some of these afford an immensely higher probability for a cause other than chance, than the more ordinary cases where only one person is impressed. For the improbability of one sort of coincidence, that between B's unusual hallucination and A's condition—has now to be multiplied by the improbability of another sort of coincidence, that between B's hallucination and a second unusual impression (whether a hallucination or of some other form) on the part of A or C. Nor even so will the argument for telepathic phantasms be nearly exhausted. For it will have been observed that throughout I have been taking into account nothing beyond the bare facts of the death and the hallucination, and altogether neglecting the correspondences of detail which in some cases add indefinitely, and almost infinitely, to the improbability of the chance occurrence.

It would be very easy to amplify this reasoning, and to extend and vary the computations themselves; but the specimens given are perhaps sufficient. They cannot possibly be made interesting; but they are indispensable if the question is ever to be set at rest, and the appeal to the doctrine of chances to be anything better than empty words. Figures, one is sometimes told, can be made to prove anything; but I confess that I should be curious to see the figures by which the theory of chance-coincidence could here be proved adequate to the facts. Whatever group of phenomena be selected, and whatever method of reckoning be adopted, the estimates founded on that theory are hopelessly and even ludicrously overpassed. With so enormous a margin to draw on, there is no particular temptation to exaggerate the extent to which the evidence for the phenomena is to be relied on. In some cases it is possibly erroneous; in many it is undoubtedly incomplete; narratives may have been admitted which a more sagacious criticism would have excluded. But after

all allowances and deductions, the conclusion that our collection comprises a large number of coincidences which have had some other cause than chance will still, I believe, be amply justified.¹

§ 9. But I have not yet done. There are considerations of a quite different kind which still further strengthen the argument for telepathy as against chance. At the close of the last chapter, I briefly referred to certain points of *contrast* between the telepathic and the purely subjective class of hallucinations. I have now to take up this thread and to show that, though the hallucinations which may be regarded as telepathic or veridical include many cases which may differ from purely subjective hallucinations of the sane only in the fact of being veridical, yet the *group*, as a whole, presents some well-marked peculiarities.

The first of these peculiarities is the great *preponderance of visual cases*. Among hallucinations of the insane, the proportion of auditory to visual cases is often given as about 3 to 1; this estimate, however, seems to have been merely copied by one writer from another since the days of Esquirol; and I am not aware that any statistics, on a large scale, have been obtained or published. Dr. Savage, however, tells me that he thinks that this is about the usual proportion at Bethlem Hospital; and Dr. Lockhart Robertson writes to me, "Esquirol has put the proportion lower than I should do. I should say 5 to 1 at least; auditory hallucinations are very frequent, visual rare." With respect to the transient hallucinations of the sane, so far as the results of my census are accepted, there is no doubt on the matter. We have seen that, out of 5705 persons taken at random, 46 proved to have had, within the last 12 years, an auditory hallucination of the "recognised" type, of whom 10 had had the experience more than once; and only 21 a visual one, of whom 2 had had the experience more than once. It becomes, then, at once a very remarkable fact that of the hallucinations which, within the same period, have coincided with real events, 31 should be visual, and only 13 auditory—or 26 and 8, if we omit 5 which affected both senses; while the whole collection of numbered cases in this work includes 271 phantasms which were visual without any auditory element, and 85 only which were auditory without any visual element. This

¹ I have given no separate estimate of the coincidental cases which happened before Jan. 1, 1874; as to do so would have been simply to reproduce the reasonings of §§ 6 and 7 with rather less striking results. Nor have I taken account of the experiences of foreigners, as these could not be brought into relation to statistics on subjective hallucinations belonging to this one country. But these further cases have a true force of their own, in indicating the general diffusion of the phenomena.

difference would alone be a serious objection to explaining the coincidences as accidental. Nor could the advocates of the chance-theory fairly evade the objection by attributing the inversion of the ordinary proportion to faults of evidence. For why should evidence be faulty in this partial and one-sided way? Why should people's memories deceive them more as to the fact of having *seen* something on a particular day than as to the fact of having *heard* something? On the telepathic theory, on the other hand, the peculiarity seems to admit of explanation. The majority of the auditory cases, in transient hallucinations of the sane, are of hearing the name called, or of hearing some short familiar phrase; and of such cases, as we saw above (Vol. I., pp. 489-90), the most natural physiological explanation is that they are not produced by a downward stimulation from the higher tracts of the brain, but are due to a sudden reverberation at the sensory centre itself, which is readily excited to vibrations of a familiar type. The telepathic hallucinations, on the other hand, were traced (as far as their development in the percipient is concerned) to a stimulation passing downwards to the sensory centres from the higher or ideational tracts of the brain. There is, then, no difficulty in supposing that the auditory centre is more prone than the visual to spontaneous recrudescence of vibrations; but that the downward excitation, which hurries ideas and images on into delusive sensory percepts, finds a readier passage to the visual centre than to the auditory—or at any rate that, where the idea of a particular individual is to be abnormally embodied in a sensory form, it is more natural and direct to *visualise* it, in a shape that conveys his permanent personal attributes, than to *verbalise* it in some imagined or remembered phrase.

A subordinate point, but one which is still worth noting, is that the proportion of cases where more senses than one have been concerned is considerably larger in the telepathic than in the purely subjective class of hallucinations—which seems to imply what may be called a higher average intensity in the former class. Out of 590 subjective cases, I find that 49, that is, a trifle over 8 per cent. of the whole number, are alleged to have concerned more senses than one; of which 24 were visual and auditory, 8 visual and tactile, 13 auditory and tactile, and 4 concerned all three senses. Taking the telepathic evidence, I find that, out of 423 cases where a sensory hallucination seems to have been distinctly externalised, 80, or 19 per cent. of the whole number, are alleged to have concerned more senses than one;

of which 53 were visual and auditory, 13 visual and tactile, 6 auditory and tactile, and 8 concerned all three senses. I may add that the proportion of 19 per cent. remains exactly the same if only the first-hand cases included in the body of the work be taken into account, and cannot therefore be attributed to exaggeration of the facts in those narratives in the Supplement which are given at second-hand.¹

The next distinguishing mark of the class of phantasms which have coincided with real events is the enormous proportion of them in which the figure or the voice was *recognised*. In the purely subjective class of transient hallucinations of the sane, the recognised and unrecognised phantasms seem to be about equal in number. Thus, if we confine ourselves to cases where a human presence was suggested, of the canvassed group of 5705 persons, 17 had seen unrecognised figures, to 21 who had seen recognised ones; and 50 had heard unrecognised voices, to 46 who had heard recognised ones. Of the visible phantasms described in this work as probably telepathic, which represented human forms or faces without any sound of a voice, 237 have been recognised, and only 13 unrecognised. Of the phantasms described in this work as probably telepathic, which consisted simply of voices uttering words, 36 have been of a recognised and 21 of an unrecognised voice; but among these 21 I include 6 cases where the words heard were as closely associated with the agent as if the tone had been his, since they actually named him; and a seventh where a place specially connected with him was named. Out of 38 cases which included both a form and a voice, the phantasm was unrecognised in only 2. It may be said that the fact of recognition is the very fact which has led us to refer the phantasm to the telepathic class, and that therefore it is no wonder if the recognised phantasms preponderate in our evidence. But this is not what has happened. Important as the recognition is, and greatly as the lack of it detracts from the evidential force of a case, it is the *coincidence*, not the *recognition*, that we have throughout regarded as the main point; and cases have never been suppressed for lack of recognition alone, provided the coincidence was close—non-recognition being easily explicable on the view of telepathic hallucinations above propounded

¹ If only the subjective cases received from the canvassed group of 5705 persons be considered, those which concerned more than one sense amount to less than 4 per cent.; while of the 40 special coincidental cases enumerated in p. 14, first note, and p. 17, second note, 8, that is 20 per cent., concerned more than one sense—or 17½ per cent. if we exclude one case, No. 199, where it is not quite certain that what was heard was not a real sound.

(Vol. I., pp. 539-40). The fact is simply that we have received comparatively few cases of unrecognised phantasms of human figures or voices which have closely coincided, and afterwards been associated, with some marked event closely affecting the percipient; and those which we *have* received, on trustworthy authority, have been included in our collection. And if it be further suggested that the persons concerned are themselves little likely to remark the coincidence, if the phantasmal form or voice was not recognised, my reply is (1) that this seems a very sweeping assumption; and (2) that so far as it is valid as an argument, it implies the existence of a large number of unnoted cases, over and above those which it is possible to collect, of those very coincidences whose perpetual repetition is already such a mountainous obstacle to the theory that they occur by chance.¹

Further knowledge may possibly bring to light other points in which the hallucinations that have corresponded with real events—taken in their immediate aspect as phenomena and quite apart from this correspondence—may be distinguished from the general body of transient hallucinations of the sane. And while the resemblances, brought out in the two preceding chapters, between the coincidental and the non-coincidental or purely subjective experiences, were sufficient, I think, to show that the coincidental cases are truly hallucinations of the percipient's senses, clearly every feature which can be named as distinguishing these hallucinations,—every feature which tends to separate them off as a restricted group—thereby increases the difficulty of attributing the correspondences to chance.

The last point to which I must call attention, as conflicting with

¹ It may still be thought that the visual and the recognised phantasms are at any rate *more interesting* than the auditory and the unrecognised, and that that is a reason for their preponderating among the telepathic cases that we have received. I would admit this to some extent. That some difference in the record is made by the superior interest of visual and of recognised phantasms, may be argued from the numbers in my total collection of hallucinations, putting aside those presented as telepathic evidence. Thus, in spite of the visual hallucinations being shown, by the canvassing of a limited group of persons, to be the rarer phenomena, I have a total of 311 visual cases to only 187 auditory—a fact, by the way, which may suggest how Krafft-Ebing (*Die Sinnesdelirien*, p. 32), Griesinger (*Die Pathologie und Therapie der Psychischen Krankheiten*, p. 100) and Wundt (*Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie*, Vol. ii., p. 353) have been led into asserting that the visual class is the more numerous. Again, among cases where a human presence was suggested, in spite of the recognised and unrecognised classes being shown, by the canvassing of a limited group of persons, to be about equal, I have 172 visual examples of the recognised sort to only 116 of the unrecognised, and 82 auditory examples of the recognised sort to only 64 of the unrecognised. Still, remembering that the vitally interesting point in the coincidental cases is, after all, the coincidence, and not the mere form of the phantasm, the allowance which may thus be fairly made cannot, I think, suffice to explain the proportions given in the text.

the theory of chance-coincidence, is a characteristic not of the telepathic phantasms themselves, but of the distant events with which they and other telepathic impressions coincide; but it none the less serves to distinguish these coincidences as due to a definite and peculiar cause. It is the very large proportion of cases in which the distant event is *death*.¹ It is in this profoundest shock which human life encounters that these phenomena seem to be oftenest engendered; and, where not in death itself, at least in one of those special moments, whether of strong mental excitement or of bodily collapse, which of all living experiences come nearest to the great crisis of dissolution. Thus among the 668 cases of spontaneous telepathy in this book, 399, (or among 423 examples of the sensory externalised class, 303,) are death-cases, in the sense that the percipient's experience either coincided with or very shortly followed the agent's death; while in 25 more cases the agent's condition, at the time of the percipient's experience, was one of serious illness which in a few hours or a few days terminated in death. Nor, in this connection, can I avoid once more referring to the large number of cases in which the event that befell the agent has been death (or a very near approach to it) by *drowning or suffocation*. Out of the 399 death-cases just mentioned, there are 35, or nearly 9 per cent., where the death was by drowning,—clearly a very much higher proportion than deaths of this particular form bear to all deaths, for even of accidental deaths among the male population, only 5 per cent. are due to drowning—and in 6 other cases the agent's escape

¹ The point is one to which I have adverted in connection with dreams (Vol. i., pp. 308-10). But there we saw a certain force in the objection that the coincident dream of death might get remembered just by virtue of the coincidence, while other equally vivid dreams of death might be forgotten. Let us see what would be implied if a similar supposition were made in the case of the waking-hallucinations. Taking the number of adults in the country as 24 millions, then, even on the extravagant assumption which I made as to the size of the area from which our cases are drawn, the probable number of coincidental phantasms for the United Kingdom, during the last 12 years, amounts to as many as 32×80 , or 2560. Now the census gives $\frac{24,000,000}{248}$, or 96,744, as the number of persons in the United Kingdom who, on being asked, would remember having had a purely subjective visual hallucination of this type. Therefore, if these were all the hallucinations that had occurred, 1 in every 38 of them would correspond with the death of the person whose figure appeared; that is to say, for each hallucination, the probability that it would coincide with the death would be 1 in 38. Now for each of the *remembered* hallucinations we found the probability of the accidental occurrence of the coincidence to be $\frac{1}{103.571}$. We thus arrive at the total which the purely subjective hallucinations, remembered and unremembered, will have to reach in order to bring the probability of an accidental coincidence up to $\frac{1}{38}$: they will have to be altogether $\frac{103.571}{38}$ or 436 times as numerous as the remembered cases. But as 1 person in 248 remembers a case, this will mean either that nearly every sane and healthy adult in the country, while awake, has seen a phantasm representing a living acquaintance twice within the last 12 years, or that a very large proportion of them have seen such a phantasm more than twice; and that 435 out of every 436 of these startling experiences have been totally forgotten by the persons affected.

from such a death was a narrow one.¹ And if we do not insist on the form of death, but only on its suddenness, the above proportion still remains a very striking fact; since deaths by accident, even among males, are only a little over 4 per cent. of the total of deaths.

We do not know why the conditions of death generally, or of sudden death, or of any particular form of death,² or of excitement or collapse, should be effective; but we at all events know that the conditions are themselves *unusual*. Similarly in most cases of experimental thought-transference, the agent's mind is *unusually* occupied by its concentrated fixation on a single object; and whether it be in the curiosities of an afternoon or in the crises of a lifetime that telepathy finds its occasion, the peculiarity of the agent's state has at any rate that degree of explanatory power which succeeds in connecting the rare effect with the rare cause. In neither case can we trace out the actual process whereby the percipient is influenced; but we have the same sort of ground for refusing to attribute to chance the oft-repeated apparitions at the time of death, as the oft-repeated successes in guessing cards and reproducing diagrams.

The only way of meeting this argument would be to show that similar coincidences have been frequently met with in connection with definite events which produced *no* unusual physical or mental state in the person to whom they occurred. For instance, if B at a distance has a vision of A on the day that A scratches his finger or orders a new pair of boots, it would seem wholly irrational to connect the two facts. Accordingly, if many, or even several, such coincidences were on record, I should have to admit that the operations of chance altogether overpass my estimate, and that the data on which the previous argument rested must, therefore, be somehow defective. Or, to take a case where some emotional disturbance *is*, as a rule, involved, if it proved to be not extremely uncommon to have a vision of an absent friend on the morning of his marriage, I should feel that my argument was so far weakened; for it would be difficult to suppose that the emotions connected with that one

¹ Nos. 48, 59, 60, 105, 138, 159, 165, 188, 236, 281, 282, 297, 341, 349, 416, 487, 513, 525, 528, 529, 535, 536, 537, 540, 541, 559, 570, 581, 582, 583, 596, 600, 603, 608, 636, 648, 659, 662, 664, 674, 675. I have explained (Vol. i., pp. 335-6) that cases are not admitted as evidence where the percipient's experience might be attributed to his own state of apprehension as to the agent's fate.

² At the same time, with respect to drowning, one cannot but recall the peculiar vividness and concentration of psychical life which (from the accounts of many persons who have been ultimately rescued) seem to characterise the earlier stages of that form of death.

morning stood distinctly apart from those of other seasons dedicated to happiness and the affections.¹ But in point of fact we do *not* find that coincidences of these types prevail. The coincidental phantasms seem limited to seasons of exceptional crisis or excitement on the agent's part; and this limitation, in once more marking out these phantasms as a distinct group of natural phenomena, strongly confirms the substantial accuracy of the statistical results.

I am not forgetting, in these final remarks, what I have expressly stated before (Vol. I., p. 97), that the action of telepathy must not be dogmatically confined to those examples of striking coincidence which are suitable to be quoted in demonstration of it; and even in respect of such extreme affections as hallucinations of the senses, I should hesitate to assert that they *cannot* be due to an absent agent whose condition is not markedly abnormal.² I regard it, however, as so unlikely that this is often their source—I regard the probability as so enormous that a phantasm seen or heard by A only, and representing B who is at the time living a piece of ordinary life, is of purely subjective origin—that the above argument remains in my view a fair one; and it is at any rate fairly addressed to those (whom of course I have had chiefly in view throughout the present chapter) who have not hitherto admitted or considered the case for telepathy even as based on the markedly coincidental examples.

¹ In accordance with this view, and in the absence of very special details, we should feel bound to exclude from our evidence, as an "ambiguous case," any stray coincidence of the sort that we encountered. The following is an instance:

Miss Keith Bremner, daughter of Captain Bremner, the chief constable of Fifeshire, was sitting at the window of the dining-room in the forenoon (precise hour forgotten) of the 18th June, 1884, when looking out of the window she saw, in a flower-bed about 20 feet distant, what seemed to her the face of Mary D., growing out of a yellow pansy. The face was quite distinct and life-like, and seemed to be laughing as it looked at her. Miss Bremner is quite certain that what she saw was not merely a fancied resemblance in one of the flowers to Miss D.'s face. The face was too clearly and distinctly seen for that. Moreover, it seemed to be of the size of life. There could have been no mistake about it. Miss Bremner did not look long. She turned away, and the face was gone when she looked again. Later in the day she told her mother what she had seen, and Mrs. Bremner remarked, "I wonder when Mary D. will be married; it should be about this time." They heard afterwards that Miss D. had actually been married on that day, and at about the time when Miss Bremner saw the apparition of her. Miss Bremner has never had any other hallucination of the senses.

This account was written down by Mr. Podmore after an interview with Miss Bremner, and submitted to her. She writes:—

"The above account correctly describes what I saw.—KEITH BREMNER."

Mrs. Bremner wrote from Sandilands, Cupar, Fife, on September 22nd, 1884:—

"Mrs. Bremner begs to inform Mr. Podmore that her daughter told her immediately she saw the face in the pansy. Mr. Podmore's written statement is quite correct. The wedding took place on Wednesday, the 18th of June."

² See, for example, the cases in Chap. xiv., § 7.

CHAPTER XIV.

FURTHER VISUAL CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT.

§ 1. IN Chapter XII., a good many specimens of telepathic phantasms were quoted, in illustration of certain special points; and particularly as showing what part in the phenomena we may attribute to the obscure action of the agent's and of the percipient's mind respectively, and how the original impulse may become modified *in transitu*. A still larger number of cases remain, of which only a few present specially noticeable characteristics of dress, or development, or phantasmal imagery; but which have their share with the others in the cumulative proof of telepathy, and include moreover several fresh features and types. The present chapter will be devoted to visual examples.

In the "General Sketch of Hallucinations" (Vol. I., pp. 480-3 and 488), I mentioned the various degrees of externalisation that the phenomena may present; beginning with the ideal picture which is not a sensory hallucination at all—which is realised as a purely internal impression, as seen by the "mind's eye"; and ending with the actual percept, which, though equally the product of the percipient's mind, seems to take its place in the external world on a par with all the other objects within his range of vision. Now between these first and last stages there seems a wide gap; and if our review of telepathic incidents had to pass at one step from the vivid pictures flashed from mind to mind, to the phantasmal figure "out in the room," there might be a certain difficulty in conceiving two such different-seeming phenomena as having a similar origin. It is satisfactory, then, to be able to point to several intermediate stages. That such stages are found in the telepathic, as well as in the purely subjective or pathological, class of phantasms, is only a fresh indication that telepathic phantasms, in spite of their peculiar origin, are worked (so to speak) by the ordinary mechanism of hallucination.

I may first quote a case which shows how the percipient may himself be doubtful as to the degree of externality that the phantasmal appearance had. In the summer of 1884, Mr. Henry H. Howorth, M.P., of Eccles, Manchester, filled up a question-form with the information that one morning, in 1857, he had a visual hallucination representing a great-uncle ; and added :—

(218) “ My great uncle died at the very time ; and someone came to bring me home from school, where I then was. I don't think I was at all excitable or impressionable. My uncle was a very unlikely person for me to have thought about. He had been for years troubled with gout of a chronic type, but was otherwise hearty and well, and to a boy had the appearance of robust health. He was much attached to my mother and her children.

“ HENRY H. HOWORTH.”

Recounting the same incident on December 2nd, 1885, Mr. Howorth wrote :—

“ I was a young boy about 12 years old, and at school at Whalley, when I felt an overpowering sense that something very serious had happened to my great-uncle, who had been a foster-father to my mother, and was much attached to me. The same day someone came to fetch me home, as he had died. When you look across a gap of 30 years, memory is blunted as to details, and I cannot pretend to fill in the story. I never remember having a similar visitation.”

On my pointing out that the second account differed from the first in making no mention of any *visual* experience, Mr. Howorth wrote :—

“ I could not say at this distance of time whether the experience I had was visual or mental merely, for the distinction in the case of a boy would perhaps not be marked in the memory. I can only say the impression was a very vivid and sharp one.”

I should regard this indistinctness of memory as a tolerably sure sign that the impression was not of the truly sensory (that is, of the most unique and startling) sort, but rather a vivid mental picture of the type noticed in Vol. I., p. 209, and further exemplified in the 6th chapter. In the stage next above this, the observer may still find it hard to say whether what impresses him is purely ideal, or whether his sense-organs are partly concerned—there being a sense of externality, but not exactly a projection into the surrounding world. Case 66 (Vol I., p. 267) was really an example in point—the scene having apparently been something more than a vivid mental picture but not confounded with the objective world, or located in the actual place where the percipient was at the time. Very similar is an experience which befell a master at a large public school, in the

summer of 1874 or 1875. Having been detained at home while a party of boys, accompanied by some masters and ladies, made a steamer excursion, he was, he says,

(219) "Standing vacantly at the door of his house, doubtless thinking of the absentees and conjecturing how they were then employed. Suddenly he seemed to see a boy slip, when crossing the landing stage from the quay to the vessel, and fall into the water, wounding his mouth as he fell. There the vision ended. Mr. A. [the narrator] returned to his work, in which he was absorbed, until the return of Mrs. A. ; but so vivid was the impression on his mind of the reality of the occurrence that he had looked at his watch and noted the time exactly.

"On his wife's return Mr. A. at once said to her, 'Did you get that boy out of the water?'

"'Oh, yes; there was no harm done beyond the fright. But how should you know anything about it? I am the first to arrive; *they* are walking. *I* drove.'

"'Well, how about his lip? Was it badly cut?'

"'It was not hurt at all; you know X. has a harelip.'

"'Mr. A. has no explanation to offer: these are the facts.'

[Mr. A. was under the impression that the coincidence was precise. But the time of the vision was about 7 p.m.; and we learn from the wife of the head-master, who was present, that the accident occurred before luncheon; therefore, if telepathic, the case was one of the deferred class. This lady remembers that some of the party were afraid that the boy had cut his face, till the fact of the harelip was recalled. If we suppose the agent to have been Mrs. A., then the impression of the scene (as in the somewhat similar dream-case, No. 101) would seem to have been transferred, so to speak, ready-made—and to have received no development from the percipient.]

The following case, though undoubtedly sensory, seems still to belong to a somewhat indescribable stage of visualisation. If interpreted as telepathic, it is further of interest as illustrating that rarer type where the phantasm is not merely representative of the agent, but visibly reproduces some actual percept or idea which is prominently present at the time to the agent's consciousness (see Chap. XII., beginning of § 5). The account is from Mr. F. Gottschalk, of 20, Adamson Road, Belsize Park, N.W., and is dated Feb. 12, 1886.

(220) Mr. Gottschalk begins by describing a friendship which he formed with Mr. Courtenay Thorpe, at the rooms of Dr. Sylvain Mayer, on the evening of February 20th, 1885. On February 24th, being anxious to hear a particular recitation which Mr. Thorpe was shortly going to give, Mr. Gottschalk wrote to him, at the Prince's Theatre, to ask what the hour of the recitation was to be. "In the evening I was going out to see some friends, when on the road there seemed suddenly to develop itself before me a disc of light, which appeared to be on a different plane to everything else in view. It was not possible for me to fix the distance at

which it seemed to be from me.¹ Examining the illumined space, I found that two hands were visible. They were engaged in drawing a letter from an envelope which I instinctively felt to be mine and, in consequence, thought immediately that the hands were those of Mr. Thorpe. I had not previously been thinking of him, but at the moment the conviction came to me with such intensity that it was irresistible. Not being in any way awe-struck by the extraordinary nature and novelty of this incident, but in a perfectly calm frame of mind, I examined the picture, and found that the hands were very white, and bared up to some distance above the wrist. Each forearm terminated in a ruffle; beyond that nothing was to be seen. The vision lasted about a minute. After its disappearance I determined to find out what connection it may have had with Mr. Thorpe's actual pursuit at the moment, and went to the nearest lamp-post and noted the time.

"By the first post the next morning, I received an answer from Mr. Thorpe, which began in the following way: 'Tell me, pray tell me, why did I, when I saw your letter in the rack at the Prince's Theatre, know that it was from you?' [We have seen this letter, which is dated "Tuesday night"; and February 24th, 1885, fell on a Tuesday.] Mr. Thorpe had no expectation of receiving a letter from me, nor had he ever seen my writing. Even had he seen it, his knowledge of it would not affect the issue of the question, as he assured me that the impression arrived the moment he saw there was a letter under the 'T clip,' before any writing was visible. [Mr. Gottschalk explains that from the construction of the rack, which he has examined, the address on the envelope would be invisible.]

"On the evening of February 27th, by arrangement, I again met him at the rooms of Dr. Mayer, and there put questions to him with a view to eliciting some explanation. As near as possible, I give them as they were put at the time, and add the answers. It is necessary for me here to state that he and the Doctor were in complete ignorance of what had happened to me. Having first impressed upon him the necessity of answering in a categorical manner and with the greatest possible accuracy, I commenced:—

"'When did you get my Tuesday's letter?' 'At 7 in the evening, when I arrived at the theatre.' 'Then what happened?' 'I read it, but, being very late, in such a hurry that when I had finished I was as ignorant of its contents as if I had never seen it.' 'Then?' 'I dressed, went on the stage, played my part, and came off.' 'What was the time then?' 'About 20 minutes past 8.' 'What happened then?' 'I talked for a time with some of the company in my dressing-room.' 'For how long?' 'Twenty minutes.' 'What did you then do?' 'They having left me, my first thought was to find your letter. I looked everywhere for it, in vain. I turned out the pockets of my ordinary clothes, and searched among the many things that encumbered my dressing-table. I was annoyed at not finding it immediately, especially as I was anxious to know what it was

¹ Cf. a remark in M. Marillier's account of his interesting subjective experiences, referred to in Vol. i., p. 521:—"Je ne pourrais indiquer ni la place de l'image que j'ai objectivée, ni la distance à laquelle elle se trouve." The *indescrivableness* of a certain sort of externalisation is well brought out in the same writer's description of his vision of parts of his body which could never actually be seen by him—*e.g.*, the back of his head.

about. Strangely enough I discovered it eventually in the coat which I had just worn in the piece "School for Scandal." I immediately read it again, was delighted to receive it, and decided to answer at once.' 'Now be very exact. What was the time when you read it on the second occasion?' 'As nearly as I can say 10 minutes to 9.'

"Thereupon I drew from my pocket a little pocket-diary in which I had noted the time of my vision, and asked Dr. Mayer to read what was written under the date 24th February.

"'Eight minutes to 9.'

[Mr. Gottschalk has kindly allowed us to inspect his diary, which confirms all the dates given.]

"Having established in this way, without any assistance, the coincidence of time between his actually opening the envelope and my seeing him do so, I was satisfied as to the principal part, and proceeded to analyse the incident in detail. The whiteness of the hands was accounted for by the fact that actors invariably whiten their hands when playing a part like the one Mr. Thorpe was engaged in—'Snake' in the 'School for Scandal.' The ruffles also formed part of the dress in this piece. They were attached to the short sleeves of the shirt which Mr. Thorpe was actually wearing when he opened my letter.

"This is the first hallucination I ever had. I have had one since of a similar nature, which I will recount separately.

"FERDINAND GOTTSCHALK."

Dr. Mayer, of 42, Somerset Street, Portman Square, W., corroborates as follows :—

"March 1, 1886.

"I well remember having read something [*i.e.*, in Mr. Gottschalk's diary]—the exact words memory will not allow me to give—which tallied almost exactly with the story told by Courtenay Thorpe; and can bear positive testimony of the above conversation having taken place.

"SYLVAIN MAYER."

[We cannot lay any stress on Mr. Thorpe's impression as to the letter and its writer, since that may easily have been accidental. But it is a point to be noticed that he read the letter with very decided pleasure, after a considerable hunt for it—in other words, that the reading of the letter stood out rather distinctly from the general run of such experiences. Though the incident is trivial, the close correspondence of time and detail is strongly suggestive of telepathic clairvoyance. In the second case mentioned, an illuminated disc was again seen, which "seemed not to belong to the surroundings"; but the details were not quite as distinctive as in the above instance.]

The fragmentary nature of the hallucination in this case has parallels, as we have seen, in the purely subjective class.¹ The "disc of light" is also to be noticed. (See Chap. XII., § 7, and compare the

¹ Vol. i. p. 504. The case in the *Phrenological Journal*, referred to below (p. 38, note), included visions of parts of figures, faces, half-faces, and limbs. There are many degrees of incompleteness. Thus, one of my correspondents, when out of doors, was startled by the sight of a man whose bearded face was clearly distinguished, but whose form stopped short at the knees; another, on waking, saw "a shadow" bending over her, but with a face that was distinct. A very interesting case is that of the quarter-length Mr.

“bright oval” in Vol. I., p. 503, the “large flickering oval,” p. 176, and the face “in the centre of a bright, opaque, white mass,” in case 184. The exact description—a “disc of light”—recurs in the dream-case No. 464.)

In the next stage of visualisation the percipient sees a face or figure projected or depicted, as it were, on some convenient surface—the image being thus truly externalised, but in an unreal and unsubstantial fashion, and in a bizarre relation to the real objects among which it appears. In this respect it might be compared to the “after-image” of the sun, or of some object that has been intently scrutinised through a microscope, which we involuntarily import into our views of the surrounding scene. The following example is taken from the *Memoirs of Georgiana, Lady Chatterton*, by E. H. Dering (1878), pp. 100-102. It exemplifies again the peculiarity observed in the last case—the *blood* being a feature in the vision which we may confidently refer to the agent’s mind. Lady Chatterton narrates:—

(221) “My mother [the wife of the Rev. Tremonger Lascelles, Prebendary of Winchester,] had not been very well, but there was nothing alarming in her state. I was suffering from a bad cold, and went early to bed one night, after leaving her in the drawing-room in excellent spirits, and tolerably well. I slept unusually well, and when I awoke, the moon was shining through the old casement brightly into the room. The white curtains of my bed were drawn to protect me from the draught that came through the large window; and on this curtain, as if depicted there, I saw the figure of my mother, the face deadly pale, with blood¹ flowing on the bed-clothes. For a moment I lay horror-stricken and unable to move or cry out, till, thinking it might be a dream or a delusion, I raised myself up in bed, and touched the curtain. Still the appearance remained (although the curtain on which it was depicted moved to and fro when I touched it) as if reflected by a magic-lantern. In great terror I got up, and throwing on a cloak, I rushed off through some rooms and a long passage to my mother’s room. To my surprise, I saw from the further end of the passage that her door was open, and a strong light coming from it across the passage. As she invariably locked her door when she went to bed, my fears were increased by the sight, and I ran on more quickly still, and entered her room. There she lay, just as I had seen her on the curtain, pale as death, and the sheet covered with blood, and two doctors standing by the bedside. She saw me at once and seemed delighted to see me, though too weak to speak or hold out her hand. ‘She has been very ill,’ said the doctor, ‘but she would not allow you to be called, lest your cold should be made worse. But I trust all danger is over now. . . . The sight of you has decidedly done her

Gabage, cited by M. Ribot, *Maladies de la Personnalité*, p. 111; with which compare case 301 below. For further telepathic examples, see cases 161, 240, 350 (in “Additions and Corrections”), 553, 572.

¹ Compare the dream-cases Nos. 432, 463, 466, 467.

much good.' So she had been in danger, and would not disturb me! Oh! how thankful I felt to the vision or fancy, or whatever it may have been."

Mrs. Ferrers, of Baddesley Clinton, Knowle, a niece of Lady Chatterton's, wrote to us on October 24th, 1883, "This account is taken from a diary of my aunt's." She adds later:—

"I have often and often heard my aunt relate that vision, but it was not, so far as I know, recorded in any contemporary diary.

"Lady C. related the story to Lockhart and his daughter about 1843, and then wrote it down in her diary. The entry is not dated; the date before it is May, 1843, that which follows, 1842, but it was evidently written down between 1839 and 1848. The book is very badly arranged as to chronology. I can't fix the date of Lady C.'s mother's death from it except that it was prior to 1836. "R. H. FERRERS."

Here the picture, though not producing the impression of a solid and independent object, was clearly no mere illusion, no mere momentary translation of the folds or pattern of the drapery into a human face; it was accurate and persistent enough to resist a touch which shook the curtain on which it was shown. It is a point of interest that (besides a second veridical case given in Chap. XII. § 7.) Lady Chatterton mentions having experienced another hallucination which, like the one just quoted, appeared *on a flat surface*.¹ On the theory of telepathic phantasms explained in Chap. XII., § 5, it is of course quite natural that a veridical and a non-veridical vision, or that several veridical visions, occurring to the same person, should present this amount of likeness, as, *e.g.*, in Mr. Gottschalk's experience. But the point is one that we can rarely observe, as few of our telepathic percipients have had any second hallucination of the senses at all.

But yet further stages remain, on the path to the final one of natural solid-looking externality. In the following case the image appeared with somewhat more of apparent relief than in Lady Chatterton's, but certainly not yet as co-ordinate in any natural fashion with the real objects in view. The account is from Mr. Richard Searle, barrister, of Home Lodge, Herne Hill, who tells us that he has had no other experience of a hallucination.

"November 2nd, 1883.

(222) "One afternoon, a few years ago, I was sitting in my chambers in the Temple, working at some papers. My desk is between the fireplace and one of the windows, the window being two or three yards on the left side of my chair, and looking out into the Temple. Suddenly I became aware that I was looking at the bottom window-pane, which was about on a level

¹ She records—apparently in her journal—that, when sleeping as a child in a "haunted room," she woke in the middle of the night, and saw a brilliant light on the wall, and figures of men passing over it, as in a panorama, fighting. She inferred from the words and gestures of her nurse, who was apparently sitting up in her sleep with fixed and open eyes, that she saw the same scene; and the nurse may possibly have been the "agent" of the child's impression (see Chap. xviii. § 5).

with my eyes, and there I saw the figure of the head and face of my wife, in a reclining position, with the eyes closed and the face quite white and bloodless, as if she were dead.

"I pulled myself together, and got up and looked out of the window, where I saw nothing but the houses opposite, and I came to the conclusion that I had been drowsy and had fallen asleep, and, after taking a few turns about the room to rouse myself, I sat down again to my work and thought no more of the matter.

"I went home at my usual time that evening, and whilst my wife and I were at dinner, she told me that she had lunched with a friend who lived in Gloucester Gardens, and that she had taken with her a little child, one of her nieces, who was staying with us; but during lunch, or just after it, the child had a fall and slightly cut her face so that the blood came. After telling the story, my wife added that she was so alarmed when she saw the blood on the child's face that she had fainted. What I had seen in the window then occurred to my mind, and I asked her what time it was when this happened. She said, as far as she remembered, it must have been a few minutes after 2 o'clock. This was the time, as nearly as I could calculate, not having looked at my watch, when I saw the figure in the window-pane.

"I have only to add that this is the only occasion on which I have known my wife to have had a fainting-fit. She was in bad health at the time, and I did not mention to her what I had seen until a few days afterwards, when she had become stronger. I mentioned the occurrence to several of my friends at the time.

"R. S."

Mr. Paul Pierrard, of 27, Gloucester Gardens, W., writes as follows:—

"4th December, 1883.

"It may be interesting for special observers to have a record of an extraordinary occurrence which happened about four years ago at my residence, 27, Gloucester Gardens, W.

"At an afternoon party of ladies and children, among whom were Mrs. Searle, of Home Lodge, Herne Hill, and her little niece, Louise, there was a rather noisy, bustling, and amusing game round a table, when little Louise fell from her chair and hurt herself slightly. The fear of a grave accident caused Mrs. Searle to be very excited, and she fainted.

"The day after, we met Mr. Searle, who stated that in the afternoon of the preceding day he had been reading important cases in his chambers, No. 6, Pump Court, Temple, when a peculiar feeling overcame him, and he distinctly saw, as it were in a looking-glass, the very image of his wife leaning back in a swoon, which seemed very strange at the moment.

"By comparing the time, it was found that this extraordinary vision was produced at the very same instant as the related incident.

"We often spoke of the case together, and could not find any explanation to completely satisfy our minds; but we registered this rare fact for which a name is wanted.

"PAUL PIERRARD."

Here there was more than the mere representation of the agent; she was represented apparently in the aspect which she actually wore, but in which the percipient had never seen her, and in which

she would hardly be consciously picturing herself. We are scarcely driven, however, in this case, to the difficult conception of "telepathic clairvoyance" set forth in Chapter XII., § 8; for it is possible to suppose that the *idea* of fainting, impressed on Mr. Searle's mind, worked itself out into perception in an appropriate fashion.

The stage of visualisation in the next case is particularly interesting. The narrator is Mrs. Taunton, of Brook Vale, Witton, Birmingham.

"January 15th, 1884.

(223) "On Thursday evening, 14th November, 1867, I was sitting in the Birmingham Town Hall with my husband at a concert, when there came over me the icy chill which usually accompanies these occurrences.¹ Almost immediately, I saw with perfect distinctness, between myself and the orchestra, my uncle, Mr. W., lying in bed with an appealing look on his face, like one dying. I had not heard anything of him for several months, and had no reason to think he was ill. The appearance was not transparent or filmy, but perfectly solid-looking; *and yet I could somehow see the orchestra, not through, but behind it.* I did not try turning my eyes to see whether the figure moved with them, but looked at it with a fascinated expression that made my husband ask if I was ill. I asked him not to speak to me for a minute or two; the vision gradually disappeared, and I told my husband, after the concert was over, what I had seen. A letter came shortly after telling of my uncle's death. He died at exactly the time when I saw the vision.

"E. F. TAUNTON."

The signature of Mrs. Taunton's husband is also appended.

"RICH. H. TAUNTON."

We find from an obituary notice in the *Belfast News-Letter* that Mr. W. died on November 14th, 1867.

The phantasm here was perfectly external, and is described as "perfectly solid-looking"; yet it certainly did not hold to the real objects around the same relation as a figure of flesh and blood would have held; it was in a peculiar way transparent. This feature is noticeable, as it is one which occasionally occurs also in hallucinations of the purely subjective class.² It may thus be taken as one of the numerous minor indications of the hallucinatory character of telepathic phantasms (see Chapter XII., § 10).

¹ This refers to a few other experiences of a different character, one of which, however, involved a hallucination of sight. The cold sensation described was a feature in cases 28 and 149; and appears again in case 286, where the percipient describes a sensation as of "cold water poured on the nape of the neck"; in case 302, where what is described is a sense of physical chill, without any flutter of the nerves; and in cases 313 and 352. Compare also cases 211 and 263, where however, (as perhaps in some of the other instances) the feelings may not have been due to anything more specific than momentary shock or alarm.

² Of many subjective hallucinations, it has been specially noticed that they hid what-

§ 2. In the remaining cases the illusion seems to have been practically complete. They constitute what may be called the normal type of these abnormal phenomena. The hallucination goes through no gradual process of formation, and is externalised as fully and naturally as a real object; the agent contributes to it little, if any, of the actual detail of his condition; the percipient contributes to it no special imagery or setting of his own.

The following narrative is from M. Gaston Fournier, of 21, Rue de Berlin, Paris, an intimate friend of our esteemed collaborator, M. Ch. Richet. He has antedated the occurrence by about 18 months.

“16, Octobre, 1885.

(224) “Le 21 février, 1879, j'étais invité à dîner chez mes amis, M. et Mme. B—. En arrivant dans le salon, je constate l'absence d'un commensal ordinaire de la maison, M. d'E—, que je recontrais presque toujours à leur table. J'en fais la remarque, et Mme. B— me répond que d'E—, employé dans une importante maison de banque, était sans doute fort occupé en ce moment, car on ne l'avait pas vu depuis deux jours. A partir de ce moment, *il ne fut plus plus question de d'E—*. Le repas s'achève fort gaiement, et sans que Mme. B— donne la moindre marque visible de préoccupation. Pendant le dîner, nous avons formé le projet d'aller achever notre soirée au théâtre. Au dessert Mme. B— se lève pour aller s'habiller dans sa chambre, dont la porte, restée entr'ouverte, donne dans la salle-à-manger. B— et moi étions restée à table, fumant notre cigare, quand, après quelques minutes à peine, nous entendons un cri terrible. Croyant à un accident, nous nous précipitons dans la chambre, et nous trouvons Mme. B— assise, prête à se trouver mal. Nous nous empressons autour d'elle; elle se remet peu à peu, et nous fait alors le récit suivant.

“Après vous avoir quittés, je m'habillais pour sortir, et j'étais en train

ever was behind the place which they appeared to occupy; and the rule seems to be that when the percept is completely externalised, it is solid-looking. But exceptions are not infrequent. Whittish transparent figures were a feature in a pathological case first published in the *Phrenological Journal and Miscellany* (Edinburgh), No vi., p. 290, &c., and described in the well-known article on “Spectral Illusions” in *Chambers' Miscellany*. Wundt (*Op. cit.*, Vol. ii., p. 357,) records the experience of an overseer of forests, who saw heaps of wood all round him in his house, but also saw the furniture and carpet just as usual. (*Cf.* case 193.) Miss Morse, of Vermont, a careful observer, who has had hallucinations at rare intervals during a good many years, tells me, that at first “they seemed to be pictured just *within* instead of before my eyes.” Lately, however, “they have usually been projected into space; but however real the apparitions at first appear, a close inspection reveals that they have no solidity—that objects can be seen through them.” Another of my informants, who on waking had a hallucination of a tall female figure, noticed that he could see a towel through her; and similarly in one of my cases of persistent dream-images, Professor Goodwin reports that with him they “retain an appearance of solidity for some seconds after waking, the furniture of the room being distinctly recognised through these figures, like a dissolving view.” Another correspondent describes such images as seen “as it were with one eye asleep, the other awake.” In one of Paterson's cases (*Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* for Jan., 1843), the phantasm appeared as though seen through gauze. I may also refer to the telepathic phantasms which gave the impression of being formed from mist (Chap xii., § 3, cases 315, 518, and Mrs. Deane's experience, p. 237). I have mentioned that the *disappearance* is occasionally through a stage of increased tenuity and transparency.

de nouer les brides de mon chapeau devant ma glace, quand tout-à-coup j'ai vu dans cette glace d'E—— entrer par la porte.¹ Il avait son chapeau sur la tête ; il était pâle et triste ; sans me retourner je lui adresse la parole, "Tiens, d'E——, vous voilà ; asseyez-vous donc" ; et comme il ne répondait pas, je me suis alors retourné et je n'ai plus rien vu ; prise alors de peur, j'ai poussé le cri que vous avez entendu.'

"B——, pour rassurer sa femme, se met à la plaisanter, traitant l'apparition d'hallucination nerveuse, et lui disant que d'E—— serait très flatté d'apprendre à quel point il occupait sa pensée ; puis, comme Mme. B—— restait toute tremblante, pour couper court à son émotion, nous lui proposons de partir tout de suite, alléguant que nous allions manquer le lever du rideau. 'Je n'ai pas pensé un seul instant à d'E——,' nous dit Mme. B——, 'depuis que M. F—— m'a demandé la cause de son absence. Je ne suis pas nerveuse, et je n'ai jamais eu d'hallucination ; je vous assure qu'il y a là quelque chose d'extraordinaire, et quant à moi, je ne sortirai pas avant d'avoir des nouvelles de d'E——. Je vous supplie d'aller chez lui, c'est le seul moyen de me rassurer.' Je conseille à B—— de céder au désir de sa femme, et nous partons tous les deux chez d'E——, qui demeurait à très peu de distance. Tout en marchant nous plaisantions beaucoup sur les frayeurs de Mme. B——.

"En arrivant chez d'E——, nous demandons au concierge, 'D'E——, est-il chez lui ?' 'Oui, messieurs, il n'est pas descendu de la journée.' D'E—— habitait un petit appartement de garçon ; il n'avait pas de domestiques. Nous montons chez lui, et nous sonnons à plusieurs reprises sans avoir de réponse. Nous sonnons plus fort, puis nous frappons à tour de bras, sans plus de succès. B——, émotionné malgré lui, me dit, 'C'est absurde, le concierge se sera trompé ; il est sorti ; descendons.' Mais le concierge nous affirme que d'E—— n'est pas sorti, qu'il en est absolument sûr. Véritablement effrayés, nous remontons avec lui, et nous tentons de nouveau de nous faire ouvrir ; puis n'entendant rien bouger dans l'appartement, nous envoyons chercher un serrurier. On force la porte, et nous trouvons le corps de d'E——, *encore chaud*, couché sur son lit, et troué de deux coups de revolver.

"Le médecin, que nous faisons venir aussitôt, constate que d'E—— avait d'abord tenté de se suicider en avalant un flacon de laudanum, et qu' ensuite, trouvant sans doute que le poison n' agissait pas assez vite, il s'était tiré deux coups de revolver à la place du cœur. D'après la constatation médicale, la mort remontait à une heure environ. Sans que je puisse préciser l'heure exacte, c'était cependant une coïncidence presque absolue avec la soi-disant hallucination de Mme. B——. Sur la cheminée il y avait une lettre de d'E——, annonçant à M. et Mme. B—— sa résolution, lettre particulièrement affectueuse pour Mme. B——.

"GASTON FOURNIER."

In conversation with Mr. Myers, M. Fournier expressed himself uncertain as to the correctness of his date. We have procured a copy of the *Act de Décès*, which records that the date of d'E——'s death was October 7, 1880 ; also that it took place at 10 a.m. If this was so, it

¹ The vision in the glass is, of course, itself the hallucination in this case (*cf.* Vol. i., p. 444, note), and does not imply either actual reflection, or even a corresponding phantasm to be seen in the room, had Mme. B. turned her head. That such a phantasm might have appeared is, however, shown by the case in Vol. i., p. 469, note.

would still be quite possible that the body, which was clothed, should be found warm in the evening. Probably the hour could not be stated with anything like precision; and it is as likely that the official record fixed it too early as that M. Fournier's medical authority (supposing him to be correctly quoted) fixed it too late. But we clearly cannot assume the coincidence to have been nearly as exact as M. Fournier imagined.

Mme. B. is dead. M. B. is unfortunately in South America; and though we hope to obtain his account of the occurrence, it has not arrived in time for insertion.

Mrs. Leonard Thrupp, of 67, Kensington Gardens Square, W., narrates:—

“November, 1883.

(225) “In the month of October, 1850, I was staying in the house of Mr. D., an East Indian merchant, No. 1, Southwick Crescent, Hyde Park.

“One evening, a Mr. B., with three daughters, came to dine—the youngest a blooming rosy girl of 17. Mr. B. had lately bought a house in Devonshire, which was being added to and furnished. He made our host promise to go down to the house-warming at Christmas.

“A few weeks afterwards, that gentleman was out one night, and his sister, Mrs. R., and I sat by the fire in a large double drawing-room. She was knitting, and from her position could see into the smaller room which was *not* lighted. I had my back to that room, and was reading aloud one of Charles Dickens' serial stories. All of a sudden she dropped her work, exclaiming faintly, ‘Good God!’ ‘What is the matter?’ I cried. She pointed into the semi-darkness, and whispered (as if awe-struck), ‘There's Louisa B.’ I rose, looked, but saw nothing. She said, ‘Are you afraid to go in?’ ‘Not at all,’ I replied, and went, and passed my arm round to prove it was mere fancy on her part. However, the result showed *that* was youthful presumption on my part.

“The next morning, Mr. D. heard the story from his sister in her own apartment, where she breakfasted. He said to me in the breakfast-room, ‘Did not *you* see anything last night, Miss Hill?’ ‘Nothing whatever,’ I replied. ‘Well,’ said he, ‘I suppose you think us Scotch very superstitious, but an aunt of ours and two of my sisters have the gift of second-sight.’

“That day passed, but the following day at noon, Mr. D. met me at the bottom of the stairs with an open letter and said, ‘That was no fancy of Mrs. R.'s; poor Louisa B. died at 9 o'clock that evening, of brain fever, after measles.’

“ANNE ELIZABETH THRUPP.”

Since giving this account, Mrs. Thrupp has referred to old letters, and has come to the opinion that the date must have been towards the end of 1847. We find, however, from the obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine* that a death, which is almost certainly that of the Miss Louisa B. of the narrative, took place on July 8, 1847. This suggests that the detail of sitting *by the fire* is inaccurate—the temperature at 9 p.m. on that day, as we learn from the Greenwich Observatory, having been 60°; but Mrs. Thrupp is quite certain that her memory is right on this point. She further tells us that there were reasons why Miss B. should have wished to see Mr. D., who was an old friend of the family, but that she knew little of Mrs. R. Mrs. R. has been dead some years; and Mrs. Durward, a lady who was her companion at the

time, and who—as Mrs. Thrupp recollects—assisted Mrs. R. to bed, remembers no more of the matter than that Mrs. R. was excited. She mentions, however, that Mrs. R. was “subject to a kind of seizure,” in which she would become quite rigid, and point with her finger to where she imagined her husband to be, exclaiming, “There he is.” These fits occurred perhaps half a dozen times in a year, and were brought on by any news of him that distressed her. Mrs. Durward never knew her to have apparitions of anyone except her husband.

This case is an example of an appearance to a person only slightly connected with the agent; and it cannot but suggest the question, would Mr. D. have seen the figure had he been present? I shall recur to the point in connection with “collective” hallucinations (Chap. XVIII., § 7). As to Mrs. R.’s pathological visions, I may point out that the extent to which they weaken the evidence for telepathy afforded by the present incident may easily be exaggerated. People seem sometimes to regard any real or supposed tendency to subjective hallucination on the part of the percipient as at once fatal to an alleged telepathic case. Now let us grant for the moment that Mrs. R.’s visions of her husband prove a tendency to similar subjective visions of other persons known to her; and let us make the extreme supposition that, unknown to her intimate attendant who never knew her to have any such experience, she actually had 50 in the course of her adult life—or on an average one in every 292 days, if we reckon her adult life as 40 years. Then the probability of her having a vision of the sort on the particular day on which Miss B. died would be $\frac{1}{292}$. But the probability that that particular vision would represent Miss B., with whom she had only a slight acquaintance, would clearly be very small; let us be liberal, and call it $\frac{1}{30}$. Thus the probability of her hitting off the above coincidence by accident would be at most $\frac{1}{14100}$, even if we took only the identity of *day* into account; and very much less if we relied on the alleged identity of *hour*. It would surely be irrational to exclude from the cumulative telepathic evidence a case where the probability of accidental occurrence remains as minute as this.

The next case is from General H., who, unfortunately, will not permit the publication of his name. The account was procured through the kindness of Miss A. A. Leith, of 8, Dorset Square, N.W.

“November 11th, 1884.

(226) “In 1856 I was engaged on duty at a place called Roha, some 40 miles south of Bombay, and moving about in the districts (as it is termed in India). My only shelter was a tent, in which I lived for several months in the year. My parents, and only sister, about 22 years

of age, were living at K., from which place letters used to take a week reaching me. My sister and I were regular correspondents, and the post generally arrived about 6 a.m., as I was starting to my work. It was on the 18th April of that year (a day never to be forgotten) that I received a letter from my mother, stating that my sister was not feeling well, but hoped to write to me the next day. There was nothing in the letter to make me feel particularly anxious. After my usual out-door work, I returned to my tent, and in due course set to my ordinary daily work. At 2 o'clock my clerk was with me, reading some native documents that required my attention, and I was in no way thinking of my sister, when all of a sudden I was startled by seeing my sister (as it appeared) walk in front of me from one door of the tent to the other, dressed in her night-dress.¹ The apparition had such an effect upon me that I felt persuaded that my sister had died at that time. I wrote at once to my father, stating what I had seen, and in due time I also heard from him that my sister had died at that time.

“J. C. H.”

An obituary notice in *Allen's Indian Mail* shows that General H.'s sister died on April 18th, 1856.

In answer to inquiries, General H. writes :

“By the context of the narrative you will see it was 2 p.m., broad daylight. My vision corresponded with the exact time of death.

“I have never seen any other apparition.

“You must excuse my sanctioning my name being appended to the account, though I am as certain of it as I am of my own existence.”

[General H. further informs us that his parents are dead, and that there is no friend living who may have seen his letter.]

The next case—a recent one—is of a very unusual type as regards the effect on the percipient, and, perhaps, on that very account suggests the telepathic explanation rather more strongly than the facts warrant. But as regards the facts themselves, there can be little doubt. The evidence, though it does not come from the percipient, is of the sort which is as good as first-hand; and this is the more fortunate, in that, as it happens, there never was a moment at which the first-hand evidence could have been given. The account is in the words of Mr. H. King, of the Royal Military College, York Town, Farnborough, Hants.

“March, 1885.

(227) “On Thursday night, October 30th [1884], H. M. and I went to dine at Broadmoor. We stayed till 10 p.m. or so, and on leaving the house were talking of different things, M. being quite as usual; when, after five minutes' walk, M suddenly stopped, and said, ‘Look, look! oh, look!’ We thought nothing of it at first, but he still kept pointing with his finger at some imaginary thing in the darkness. The spot we were in was very dark, with a wood on our right and a field on our left,

¹ For this feature, compare the dream-case, No. 118.

separated from us by a railing. Thinking M. saw somebody hiding behind a bush I went forward, but saw nothing. M. now, still saying 'Look at her, look at her,' fell back against the railing and lay motionless with his back against it. We ran to him, asking him what was the matter, but he only moaned. After a while he seemed better. We wanted him to come on, but he said, 'Where is my stick?'—which he had dropped. 'Oh, never mind your stick,' I said, for I was afraid of not being at the college before the shutting of the doors; but he would look for his stick, which he found by lighting a match. We walked on together, M., notwithstanding all my efforts to get him into conversation, not saying a word. After walking for about a quarter of a mile, he suddenly said, 'Where were they carrying her to? I tell you they were carrying her; didn't you see them carrying her?' I tried to quiet him, but he kept on saying, 'I tell you they were carrying her.' In a short time he was pacified and walked quietly on for half a mile or so, when he said, looking round in surprise, 'Hullo! we must have come a short cut. I know this house.' I said we hadn't; but he said, 'We must have run then. It seems only a minute ago since we left the house.' He several times expressed his surprise at the quickness we had done the last half-mile in. He was all right from this to the college.

"On Sunday morning he told me that something very bad happened on Thursday night. An old lady who was very fond of him, but whom he hadn't seen for a long time, had died suddenly of heart disease. She had been out somewhere and had come home, when, as she was receiving some friends, she fell dead, and, to use his words, she was carried out. I immediately asked him at what hour did she die? He said at between 10 and 11. (It was a little after 10 when he saw his vision.) I could not get the exact hour of the lady's death, as he didn't like the subject. When he told me this, he knew nothing of what occurred on the walk home. When he was told of it, he didn't remember a thing about the vision; but said if he hadn't known that he hadn't drunk anything (which was true), he would have said he had been drunk. He seemed to have been in a sort of stupor all the time. I think I ought to mention that he told me long before this that he had seen a vision of a girl who had been drowned.¹ This is a true account of what happened.

(Signed) "H. KING (the writer of the above).

"A. HAMILTON-JONES."

Mr. H. King adds, "My friend [Mr. Jones] remembers perfectly M.'s not being surprised at the news [of the death], and his saying it seemed to have happened before."

[Mr. R. A. King, of 36, Grove Lane, Denmark Hill, uncle of the narrator, through whose kindness we obtained this account, says: "M. has such a horror of the whole affair that my nephew does not let me write to ask him about the old lady's death." We are thus unable to verify the date of the death independently. M.'s name is known to me. He has left the Military College.]

The next case is from the Rev. F. Barker, late Rector of Cottenham, Cambridge.

¹ This other vision followed closely on an accident which had much distressed the percipient.

“ July 2nd, 1884.

(228) “ At about 11 o'clock on the night of December 6th, 1873, I had just got into bed, and had certainly not fallen asleep, or even into a doze, when I suddenly startled my wife by a deep groan, and when she asked the reason, I said, ‘ I have just seen my aunt. She came and stood beside me, and smiled with her old kind smile, and disappeared.’ A much-loved aunt, my mother's sister, was at that time in Madeira, for her health, accompanied by my cousin, her niece. I had no reason to think that she was critically ill at this time, but the impression made upon me was so great that the next day I told her family (my mother among them) what I had seen. Within a week afterwards we heard that she had died on that very night, and, making all allowance for longitude, at about that very time.

“ When my cousin, who was with her to the last, heard what I had seen, she said, ‘ I am not at all surprised, for she was calling out for you all the time she was dying.’

“ This is the only time I have experienced anything of this nature. I think, perhaps, this story first-hand may interest you. I can only say that the vivid impression I received that night has never left me.

“ FREDERICK BARKER.”

We find the date of death confirmed in the *Times* obituary.

Mrs. Barker's account is as follows :—

“ I recollect the circumstances well, upon which my husband wrote to you. It must have been somewhere about 11 o'clock. He was not asleep (for he had only just spoken), when he groaned deeply. I asked what was the matter, and he said his aunt, who was then in Madeira, had appeared to him, smiling at him with her own kind smile, and then vanished. He said she had ‘ something black, it might have been lace, thrown over her head.’ The next day he told many relations of the occurrence, and it turned out she died that very night. Her niece, Miss Garnett, told me she was not at all astonished that he should have seen her aunt, for that while she was dying she was calling out for him. He had been to her almost like a son.

“ P. S. BARKER.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Barker says, “ My recollection is of some lace-like head-gear, as of a black lace veil thrown round the head.”

The following statement is from Miss Garnett, who was with Mr. Barker's aunt at the time of her death :—

“ Wyreside, near Lancaster.

“ October, 1885.

“ I beg to certify that I was with my aunt, Miss ——, at the time of her death in Madeira, December 6th, 1873. On hearing that my cousin, the Rev. F. Barker, now living in Stanley Place, Chester, had had some kind of a vision of my aunt at a time almost exactly corresponding with that of her death, I told my uncle, from whom I heard of the occurrence, that I was not surprised, since my aunt had so frequently expressed a wish to see Mr. Barker during the last few days of her life

“ LOUISA GARNETT.”

The following case was first published in *Burma, Past and Present*, by Lieut.-Gen. Albert Fytche, C.S.I., Vol. I, pp. 177-8.

(229) "A remarkable incident occurred to me at Maulmain, which made a deep impression upon my imagination. I saw a ghost¹ with my own eyes in broad daylight, of which I could make an affidavit. I had an old schoolfellow, who was afterwards a college friend, with whom I had lived in the closest intimacy. Years, however, passed without our seeing each other. One morning I had just got out of bed, and was dressing myself, when suddenly my old friend entered the room. I greeted him warmly; told him to call for a cup of tea in the verandah, and promised to be with him immediately. I dressed myself in all haste, and went out into the verandah, but found no one there. I could not believe my eyes. I called to the sentry who was posted at the front of the house, but he had seen no strange gentleman that morning; the servants also declared that no such person had entered the house. I was certain I had seen my friend. I was not thinking about him at the time, yet I was not taken by surprise, as steamers and other vessels were frequently arriving at Maulmain. A fortnight afterwards news arrived that he had died 600 miles off, about the very time I had seen him at Maulmain."

General Fytche writes to Professor Sidgwick as follows:—

"Durling Dean, West Cliff, Bournemouth,"

"December 22nd, 1883."

"A paper containing answers to your list of questions is enclosed. I don't think I have anything further to add, except to reiterate my conviction that my friend's εἶδωλον did appear to me as stated. My friend's death was a sudden one; I had never heard of his previous illness, nor had I been thinking about him in any way. In animistic philosophy, savage or civilised, I believe it is admitted that an apparition of the kind bears the likeness of its fleshly body.

"Answers to questions as to the apparition at Maulmain:—

(1) "The printed narrative was written from memory. I kept no diary after my papers were burnt at Bassein (see p. 24 of book). There are no letters extant which I am aware of which were written at the time of the occurrence.

(2) "The news of my friend's death was conveyed by the public newspapers, which arrived at Maulmain by the mail steamer about a fortnight after the incident in question. They stated that the death of my friend occurred in the early morning of the day his spirit appeared to me.

(3) "When the apparition was addressed by me, it did not respond by word or sign, at least so far as I observed. I was not thinking of an apparition. I took it for my friend in the flesh.

(4) "The event occurred some 26 years ago, and the persons who resided near me at the time, and whom I visited on the morning of the occurrence, are dead. The year following I visited England, and mentioned the circumstance to several members of my family, and amongst others, I think, my cousin, Louis Tennyson d'Eyncourt, one of the London magistrates, but it was not a matter that I ever talked much about.

(5) "I have had no similar experience. I have had no hallucination of

¹ See p. 48, note.

sight or hearing, and have always been considered as a person of the strongest nerve.

“A. FYTCHE (General).”

Mr. d'Eyncourt writes from 31, Cornwall Gardens, S.W., on Dec. 21, 1885:—

“General Fytche paid me a visit at Hadley a year or two¹ before he published his book—I should say from 15 to 18 years since, and told me the story as narrated afterwards in his book; and it made a great impression on me and my family. I cannot remember what year he told me, but certainly not 25 years since; perhaps 20 would be nearer the mark.”

[General Fytche is under a promise not to disclose his friend's name; which prevents us from ascertaining the exact date of the incident.]

The next case is from Mr. Evans, of Byron Cottage, Chalford, near Stroud.

“April 17th, 1884.

(230) “In the fall of 1867, I took a trip to Canada; and one evening, the early part of October, the same year, I was sitting with a merchant of Toronto, in the dress-circle of the theatre; and during the evening my attention was attracted towards a portion of the pit, which was, through shadow, slightly obscured, by a face looking up at me in an intent, weird, and agonising manner, that caused a feeling of awe to overpower me, as I recognised in the features my twin brother,² who at that time was in China. The figure, although in shadow, appeared lighted up supernaturally, and revealed itself plainly, so that I could not be mistaken about the face. I instantly exclaimed to my friend, ‘Good God! there is my brother,’ pointing at the same time to the figure. He said, ‘I cannot see anyone looking up here.’ However, I was so excited I rushed down to the pit where he stood, but could not see anyone resembling him in features whatever. I am not superstitious or a Spiritualist, but could not get over the startling circumstances for some time.

“On my return home to England, shortly afterwards, much to my grief and sorrow, I found my brother had died at the French Hospital, Shanghai, on the 6th October, 1867. The incident in the theatre flashed into my thoughts, and impressed me I had seen his apparition, and I took the trouble to ascertain date of performance, and found it corresponded. I could not be mistaken, as it occurred the first week I was in Toronto, and the patronage of the military placed the performance precisely on the 6th October, 1867.

“I am prepared to make an affidavit that such are the facts.

“J. EVANS.”

We find from a certified copy of the Register of Deaths kept at the British Consulate, at Shanghai, that the death took place on October 6th, 1868 (not 1867), at the General Hospital.

I wrote to Mr. Evans, explaining that it would be the evening, (10.37 p.m.) not of October 6th, but of October 5th, at Toronto, that would correspond with October 6th, midday, at Shanghai. As I anticipated, it

¹ The interval must have been longer than this, as the book was published in 1878.

² Other cases where the agent was a twin brother are Nos. 76, 77, 78, and 134.

turned out that he had *assumed* that October 6th in one place would be October 6th in another, and had simply asked which opera was performed on October 6th. He says:—

“I wrote to my friend in Toronto, asking him if the ‘Grand Duchess’ were performed on October 6th, and he replied in the affirmative; but at the same time it was performed on the 5th, I am sure, as well as on the 6th. The company was performing *opera bouffe* during the entire week.

“I have never had any hallucinations before or since.”

We have procured from Toronto a copy of the *Daily Globe*, which shows that the “Grand Duchess” was performed on both nights.

[Mr. Evans has had no recent communication with his companion of the evening, who was only an acquaintance; and corroboration cannot be obtained. The uncertainty as to the day of the apparition seems irremovable. If it was the 5th, the coincidence may have been quite exact; if it was the 6th, the 12 hours’ limit must have been exceeded, unless the death took place in the hour or two preceding midnight.]

Here we have to notice once more the *luminous* appearance of the phantasm (Chap. XII., § 7).

The following narrative appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*, in October, 1881. Unfortunately we have been unable to obtain corroboration or further details, as we have failed to discover the writer’s present address. We learn from the War Office that he resigned his militia commission in August, 1880.

“West Brompton.

“October 25th, 1881.

(231) “SIR,—Of many comrades who gave up their lives for Queen and country in Zululand and Natal, for none have I, or those who knew him, felt a keener pang of regret than for Rudolph Gough. In November, 1878, Gough, having retired from the Coldstream Guards, proceeded as a volunteer to Natal, where on arrival he was given a company in Commandant Nettleton’s battalion of the Natal Native Contingent, with which regiment he served in the first advance into Zululand. The Etshowe relief column commenced its advance on March 29th, and reached the Inyone River on the evening of that day. To all our astonishment, Gough, who had risen from a sick bed in Durban, accompanied by Lieutenant George Davis of his own regiment, arrived in camp at dusk, having ridden through from Durban, a distance of 82 miles, in little over a day. Gough, who had suffered badly *en route*, was again severely attacked by that curse of South African Armies—dysentery—and was ordered to one of the ambulances, where he remained until the morning of the action of Gingihlovo. The moment the alarm sounded, the poor fellow staggered out and took command of his company, and afterwards actually led his men over the shelter trench, when the cheer was started and the charge sounded. The excitement and exertion proved too much for my poor friend’s enfeebled frame, and utter collapse followed.

“On April 17th, just before ‘tattoo,’ I was sitting in the gipsy-looking edifice that the officers of the King’s Royal Rifle Corps had rigged up,

which we dubbed the 'mess house' or 'banqueting hall,' finishing a letter to a newspaper for which I acted as correspondent, when the brigade bugler rang out 'last post.' I walked to the door, outside of which I saw standing the man who, two days ago, I had been told was dying on the other side of the Tugela. I could not describe on paper the extraordinary sensation that Gough's unexpected appearance gave me.

"Some few days after I returned to Fort Pearson to re-assume command of the Natal Native Pioneers. After reporting my arrival, I made my way to the post-office, where I was much shocked at being told of my friend's death. The postmaster handed me a telegram, which had been suffered to remain in a pigeon-hole for some days, instead of being sent on to the front. It was from the civil surgeon, who helped to soothe the last moments of my friend, and ran as follows: 'Captain the Hon. H. R. Gough is dying. He has been asking for you all day. Come down here if possible.' On subsequent inquiries at the hospital, I found that he had died at exactly the hour I fancied I had seen him outside the mess house at Gingihlovo. Prior to the occurrence I have narrated, I never had the faintest belief in the actuality of supernatural¹ phenomena of any nature.

"STUART STEPHENS.

"(Late Lieutenant 4th Battalion Royal Dublin Fusiliers.)"

Miss I. F. Galwey writes to us from 5, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin:—

"May 18th, 1885.

"I met two of young Gough's cousins on Saturday; and they assure me that the account given by Mr. Stephens is a perfectly authentic one, and is fully believed by all the family; but they know nothing of Mr. Stephens, except that he was a comrade of poor Rudolph's, and that just before his death he had expressed an earnest desire to see him."

[The *London Gazette* for July 22nd, 1879, gives the date of the death of Captain Gough as April 19th. It seems very probable that the "17th" in Mr. Stephens' account is a misprint. For if he inquired at the hospital and learnt the identity of *hour*, it is not likely that he made so grave a mistake as to the *day*. But from the *South African Campaign of 1879*, by J. R. Mackinnon, we learn that Captain Gough had been desperately ill for some days before his death; so that even if the vision did precede the death by two days, it might still be connected with his condition. It is clear, too, from the words of the telegram that his thoughts had been directed to the percipient for some little time before his death.]

It might perhaps seem that this case ought to have been disallowed, on the principle that, when the percipient is in anxiety about the person whose phantasm appears, there is an appreciable chance that the appearance is the purely subjective creation of his own brain (Vol. I., pp. 508-9). But it would, perhaps, be a trifle pedantic to apply this principle to cases which occur in the thick of a war, where the idea of death is constant and familiar. In such circumstances, the

¹ I must once again disclaim all responsibility for this and similar expressions on the part of informants.

mental attitude caused by the knowledge that a comrade is in peril seems scarcely parallel to that which similar knowledge might produce among those who are sitting brooding at home. At any rate, if anxiety for the fate of absent comrades be a natural and known source of hallucinations during campaigns, it is odd that, among several hundreds of cases of subjective hallucination, I find no second instance of the phenomenon.

The following account is from a lady, Miss H., whose name and address may be given to private inquirers, and who would gladly have allowed its publication had friends not been unwilling. Having stated that on Thursday, November 16th, 1854, about 10 o'clock at night, she had a vision of an intimate friend, who died that evening at 7, she was asked to furnish particulars, and replied:—

“November, 1885.

(232) “I had had 16 hours' travelling in the interior of a diligence, crossing the Apennines from Bologna to Florence. I was perfectly well, but unusually tired. I was in the Hotel Europa, in Florence, and was quite wide awake, not having had the necessary moments in which to compose myself to sleep. My sister had just fallen asleep. My friend stood at the side of the bed nearest to me, near the foot, and looked at me fixedly. She was in white, and looked exactly as she did in life. She was an old lady, and had been almost bedridden for long. She had taken very keen interest in our Italian tour. I lost my presence of mind, and woke my sister. I also called out to my father, who was in the adjoining room, not yet asleep, but too tired to do more than answer, though he remembered the circumstance of my calling to him the next morning. Directly this alarm was shown, the vision disappeared. It was both vivid, and produced a *supernatural* sensation which I never before or since experienced to anything like the same extent.

“E. H. H.”

We find from the *Times* obituary that the death took place on Thursday, November 16th, 1854. Inquiries have been made at the hotel in Florence, in order to obtain confirmation of the date of Miss H.'s stay there; but the hotel changed hands a few years later, and the information cannot be got.

Miss H. has experienced only one other hallucination, and that was “in the height of a severe illness,” when she fancied her maid was at the bedside. In answer to inquiries, she writes that the sister who was with her cannot recall the occurrence; and adds:—

“The fact is she only woke for an instant, and as she is 9 years younger than myself, and I saw she *believed* I had only been dreaming this, I spared her. I had not fallen asleep. I did not argue the point with her, or refer to it again for some long time after. It was the same with my father. I called out Mrs. W.'s name, and he referred to it as a dream in the morning. But I *confided* in a sister, then recently married to a Norfolk clergyman, who was very near my own age. I was the more led to do this as the lady who stood near me was her husband's mother. The account goes on to say how exceptionally

interested the lady had been in the route and experience of the travellers; and concludes thus: "In those days such things were subjects of ridicule and unbelief more than they now are, and I am surprised how lightly I took what yet I felt positive was no dream."

The sister to whom Miss H. mentioned her experience writes to her as follows, on December 4th, 1885:—

"MY DEAR ELISE,—I fully remember your naming the vision of Mrs. W. which you had on the very evening on which she died. We compared notes faithfully at the time; and it was most remarkable because she had not been visibly worse, and died at the last suddenly. She had thought a great deal about you being in a Roman Catholic country at the time of some great council, and had named in two or three letters that she should be glad when you got home; so you were on her mind. I believe you named it in a letter, but I can't find it. But I am as *sure* of the *fact* of your *telling* me (on your return home, and coming here on the way) *all particulars* as if it was yesterday—the rooms *en suite*, and our father hearing you call out to Memie, who had fallen asleep before you; and you naming 'Mrs. W.' to father, and he, supposing it was a dream, trying to soothe you. And you, though feeling *sure* you were awake, yet tried to *think* it was a sort of dream 'as when one awaketh.' The first news you received from England was the account of the peaceful and rather sudden death of one who was renowned for energy of spirit all her life, and who was full of imagination and great love for you. This is my statement. The dates were *carefully* compared, that I am sure of. My husband is as certain as I am of all I say.—Your affectionate sister,
"M. A. W."

The next case, like the last, seems fairly to fall among waking rather than "borderland" impressions, since a special reason is remembered for wakefulness. It is, however, still more remote, and depends on a single memory. The Rev. H. E. Noyes, of Christ Church Vicarage, Kingstown, a nephew of Mrs. G., the narrator, (formerly of the Parsonage, Kingstown,) vouches for the strength of the impression made on her.

"1883.

(233) "On February 26, 1850, I was awake, for I was to go to my sister-in-law, at Kingstown, and visiting was then an event to me. About 2 o'clock in the morning my brother walked into our room (my sister's) and stood beside my bed. I called to her, 'There is ——.' He was at the time quartered at Paisley, and a mail car from Belfast passed, about that hour, not more than about half a mile from our village. When he could get a short leave, he liked to come in upon us and give us a delightful surprise. I even recollect its crossing my mind what there was in the house ready that we could give him to eat. He looked down most lovingly and kindly, and waved his hand and he was gone. I recollect it all as if it were only last night it all occurred, and my feeling of astonishment, not at his coming in to the room at all, but at where he could have gone. At that hour he died."

We have confirmed the date of death in the *Army List*, and find from a newspaper notice that the death took place in the early morning, and was extremely sudden.

The next account was given to us by Mrs. Swithinbank, of Ormleigh, Mowbray Road, Upper Norwood. The incident occurred about 1867.

“1882.

(234) “When my son H. was a boy, I one day saw him off to school, watching him down the Grove, and then went into the library to sit, a room I rarely used at that time of the day. Shortly after, he appeared, walking over the wall opposite the window. The wall was about 13 feet distant from the window and low, so that when my son stood on it his face was on a level with mine, and close to me. I hastily threw up the sash, and called to ask why he had returned from school, and why he was there; he did not answer, but looked full at me with a frightened expression, and dropped down the other side of the wall and disappeared. Never doubting but that it was some boyish trick, I called a servant to tell him to come to me, but not a trace of him was to be found, though there was no screen or place of concealment. I myself searched with the same result.

“As I sat still wondering where and how he had so suddenly disappeared a cab drove up with H. in an almost unconscious state, brought home by a friend and schoolfellow, who said that during a dictation-lesson he had suddenly fallen backward over his seat, calling out in a shrill voice, ‘Mamma will know,’ and became insensible. He was ill that day, prostrate the next; but our doctor could not account for the attack, nor did anything follow to throw any light on his appearance to me. That the time of his attack exactly corresponded with that at which I saw his figure was proved both by his master and class-mates.”

The Rev. H. Swithinbank, eldest son of the writer of the above, explains that the point at which the figure was seen was in a direct line between the house (situated at Summerhill Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne) and the school, but that “no animal but a bird could come direct that way,” and that the walking distance between the two places was nearly a mile. He describes his brother as of a nervous temperament, but his mother as just the opposite, a calm person, who has never in her life had any other similar experience.

The next account is from Colonel Swiney, of the Duke of Cornwall’s Regiment. Possibly, in this as in some other cases, publication may lead to our obtaining corroborative evidence from persons to whom we have as yet been unable to apply for it.

“Richmond Barracks, Dublin, July 14th, 1885.

(235) “It was some time in the latter end of September, 1864, when quartered at Shorncliffe Camp, I thought I saw my eldest brother (whom at the time I believed to be in India, where he was serving in the Royal Engineers) walking towards me, and before I could recover from my astonishment, the figure had disappeared. I perfectly well remember mentioning the fact to some of my brother officers, and saying how curious it was, but never thought much about it until I received news of his death, which had occurred about (as near as I can recollect, without having made any note) the time I had imagined I had seen him—viz., September 24th, 1864—at Nagpore, East Indies, and but for the fact of his death, I should never probably have recalled the circumstance. I do

not attach much importance to this; it might have been a coincidence, remarkable certainly, but nothing more. I am afraid it will not be of much use to you in your inquiries, as half its value is gone by my not being able to bring corroborative evidence to prove that I had mentioned the fact prior to hearing of his death, although in my own mind I am perfectly certain I did so. Richard Edgcumbe was quartered at Shorncliffe at the very time this occurred.

“S. C. SWINEY.”

[It was from Mr. R. Edgcumbe that we first heard of this incident. He did not himself hear of it until some years after its occurrence.]

In answer to inquiries Colonel Swiney adds:—

(1) “Years afterwards, in 1871, at the Cape of Good Hope, I wrote a long account of it to a Yorkshire gentleman who was collecting data on the subject of hallucination.

(2) “I have had a personal interview with Colonel Schwabe, who was a subaltern with me in the Carabineers, and he cannot recall the circumstances at all, indeed has no recollection whatever about it. This may be accounted for by the fact of his having gone abroad very shortly afterwards, and we did not meet for some months after I had heard of my brother’s death. At the time I heard of his death I was stopping with Charles Gurney, shooting, near Norwich, some time the latter end of October, if not the beginning of November. When I received the letter I knew what was in it; and if I only knew Charles Gurney’s address, I should like to have asked him if he ever remembers the morning I received the bad news before I left for London, saying ‘How curious; I thought I saw him coming towards me at Shorncliffe a few weeks ago.’

(3) “The 24th of September, 1864, was a Sunday. I cannot say whether that was the day I mentioned it. My brother died some time, as far as I can recollect, after the family with whom he was stopping had returned from church; for I remember the letter saying: ‘He was so much better, and asleep, that we thought it safe to leave him for an hour or so. On our return,’ it went on to say, ‘we found he was very feverish, and he died that afternoon.’ Now the time I saw the hallucination could not have been later than 2 p.m. Allowing for the five hours difference of longitude, that would be about 9 a.m., and would not tally.”

[Colonel Swiney seems to have reckoned the difference the wrong way, At any moment the time of day in India is four or five hours *later* than the time of day in England; and thus, if the days were the same, the death and the vision may have coincided exactly.]

The *Army List* for December, 1864, and *Allen’s Indian Mail* for October 20th, 1864, give the date of Lieut. John D. Swiney’s death as September 25th; and it was the 25th, not the 24th, that fell on a Sunday. When Colonel Swiney heard of the death he was clearly under the impression that his experience had occurred on a Sunday—which is a marked day; and his subsequent mistake as to the day of the month seems therefore unimportant.

The next case is from Miss Bale, of Church Farm, Gorleston.

“September 17th, 1885.

(236) “In the June of 1880, I went to a situation as governess. On the first day of my going there, after retiring for the night, I heard a noise which

was like the ticking of a watch. I took no particular notice of it, but I noticed that every time I was alone I heard it, more especially at night. I even went so far as to search, thinking there must be a watch concealed somewhere in the room. This continued until I grew quite accustomed to it. It was on the 12th of July, when I was coming from the dining-room with a tray of glasses that I saw what appeared to me to be a dark figure standing just outside the door, with outstretched arms. It startled me, and when I turned to look again it was gone.

“On the 23rd September I received news that my brother was drowned on the 12th of July. I heard the ticking up to the time I had the letter, but never once afterwards.

“F. A. BALE.”

Writing again, Miss Bale says :—

“I enclose the letter informing us of my brother’s death, also one from the captain of the ship, for your perusal.

“I made no entry in my diary of the apparition I saw on the 12th of July, but I distinctly remember the time. I sat down a little while to recover my fright, and then I looked at the time ; it was 20 minutes past 6. I enclose the address of a friend who I am sure remembers it as well as I do. You will see by enclosed where my brother was when he met with his death.

“The apparition did remind me of my brother, as I last saw him in a long dark ulster, and it was about his height, but that was all I could discover, for when I looked a second time it was gone. What made me mention the ticking was the peculiarity of its following me *everywhere*, providing I was *alone*.”

The enclosed letter, written by the Rev. W. A. Purey-Cust on board the Ship “Melbourne,” announced that Mr. William Bale’s death occurred at 6 p.m., on July 12th, 1880, about 150 miles south of Tristan d’Acunha, longitude 12 deg. 30” W. Mr. Purey-Cust has since told us that on that day—and on that day only—the position of the ship had to be found by dead reckoning, the sun not being visible. The error in time arising in this way could not, however, have amounted to more than a minute or two, and Mr. Purey-Cust gives particulars which make it almost impossible that he can be mistaken in stating that the accident occurred at 6 p.m., by the ship’s clock.

Mrs. Hart, of Baker Street, Gorleston, writes to us :—

“September 28th, 1885.

“On the night of the 12th of July, 1880, Miss Bale came to my house to supper, and she told me that she was coming from the drawing-room and she saw a dark figure standing just outside the door ; she appeared very nervous. She said it reminded her of her brother, and remarked to me then that she knew something must have happened to him. I asked her if she noticed the time she saw it, and she told me that the apparition had startled her very much, and she had sat down a little time to recover the fright it gave her, and then she looked at the time ; it was 6.20. She had previously told me of a ticking she heard everywhere she went, so long as she was alone, but directly anyone joined her it ceased ; and she told me she heard it up to the day she received the news of her brother’s death, but not afterwards.

“H. HART.”

Miss Bale adds :—

“September 24th, 1885.

“There was one incident I did not tell you, thinking it too trivial, as I did not notice the date or hour, but I know it was shortly before I heard the news of my brother’s death. I had been in bed a short time, and I heard a tremendous crash like the smashing of a lot of china. I felt too nervous to go and see what it was, but nothing was broken or disturbed in the morning, and for three nights in succession I heard the same. I am not inclined to think that it was in any way corresponding with my brother’s death. I certainly have never heard imaginary voices nor seen imaginary figures except the apparition I saw the day my brother was drowned.”

[There seems to be no reason for connecting the ticking sound with Mr. Bale’s death, any more than the crash of china; and it is probable that it was due to a merely physical affection, to which the shock of receiving the news perhaps put an end. It seemed right, however, to mention it; since, if it was a hallucination, it would tend to show that Miss Bale was for some time in a condition favourable to purely subjective hallucinations—which would slightly weaken the force of the coincidence of the visual hallucination with her brother’s death. It will be noticed that, allowing for longitude, the death occurred—according to the statements made—about half-an-hour after the apparition. But as the difference is so small, it seems more probable that it is due to error in Miss Bale’s observation or memory, or in the time of her clock, than that so close a coincidence was purely accidental.]

The next few cases, though depending in the first instance on witnesses in a humbler station, are, as far as I can judge, faithfully reported. The narrator of the first of them is Ellen M. Greany, a trusted and valued servant in the family of Miss Porter, at 16, Russell Square, W.C.

“May 20th, 1884.

(237) “I sat one evening reading, when on looking up from my book, I distinctly saw a school-friend of mine, to whom I was very much attached, standing near the door. I was about to exclaim at the strangeness of her visit, when, to my horror, there were no signs of any one in the room but my mother. I related what I had seen to her, knowing she could not have seen, as she was sitting with her back towards the door, nor did she hear anything unusual, and was greatly amused at my scare, suggesting I had read too much or been dreaming.

“A day or so after this strange event, I had news to say my friend was no more. The strange part was I did not even know she was ill, much less in danger, so could not have felt anxious at the time on her account, but may have been thinking of her; that I cannot testify. Her illness was short, and death very unexpected. Her mother told me she spoke of me not long before she died, and wondered I had not been to see her, thinking, of course, I had some knowledge of her illness, which was not the case. It may be as well to mention she left a small box she prized rather, to be given to me in remembrance of her. She died the same evening and about the same time that I saw her vision, which was the end of October, 1874.

“ELLEN M. GREANY.”

In answer to an inquiry, Ellen Greany adds that this hallucination is the only one she has ever experienced. She tells Miss Porter that she went to see her dead friend before the funeral, which accords with her statement that she heard the news of the death very soon after it occurred; and there is no reason to doubt that, at the time when she heard the news, she was able correctly to identify the day of her vision.

Her mother corroborates as follows:—

“Acton, July, 1884.

“I can well remember the instance my daughter speaks of. I know she was not anxious at the time, not knowing her friend was ill. I took no notice of it at the time, as I do not believe in ghosts, but thought it strange the next day, when we heard she was dead, and died about the same time that my daughter saw her.

“MARGARET GREANY.”

[I have seen Ellen Greany, who is a superior and intelligent person. She went over her story without prompting, giving an entirely clear and consistent account, and standing cross-examination perfectly. But the favourable effect of such an interview on one's own mind cannot, of course, be conveyed to others.]

The following account was first published in *The Englishman*, on May 13th, 1876.

(238) “A labourer named Duck, employed by Mr. Dixon, of Mildenhall Warren Farm, near Marlborough, was in charge of a horse and water-cart on the farm, when the animal took fright and knocked him down. The wheel went over his chest, and he died shortly afterwards. Immediately after the accident, Mr. Dixon despatched a woman to Ramsbury, where Duck lived, to make known the fact to his wife. On arriving at her home the messenger found her out gathering wood, but shortly after a girl, who was her companion, arrived, and without being told of what had occurred, volunteered the statement that Ria (Mrs. Duck) was unable to do much that morning, that she had been very much frightened, having seen her husband in the wood. Shortly afterwards Mrs. Duck returned without any wood, and being informed by a neighbour that a woman from Mildenhall Woodlands wished to see her, ejaculated ‘My David's dead then.’ Inquiry has since been made by Mr. Dixon of the woman, and she positively asserts that she saw her husband in the wood, and said, ‘Hallo, David, what wind blows you here?’ and that he made no answer. Mr. Dixon inquired what time this occurred, and she replied about 10 o'clock, the time at which the fatal accident occurred.”

On the appearance of this account, our friend, Mr. F. W. Percival, of 36, Bryanston Street, W., wrote to Mr. Dixon to inquire into the facts, and received from him the following confirmation:—

“May 25th, 1876.

“As soon as it happened (Duck's death), I sent one of my female servants to inform his wife of the sad occurrence, to a place called Ramsbury, about four miles from where it occurred. But when she got

there, his wife was gone to get wood at a distant wood, the woman stopping for her return at an adjoining cottage. But Maria returned without any wood, saying she had seen her husband, and asked him how he came there—telling the woman that she knew her business, that she was come to inform her of her husband's death, and that she had seen him as plain as ever she did in her life, and said to him, 'Hallo, David, what wind blew you here?' but as she saw him no more, she became much frightened, and left the wood."

"June 1st, 1876.

"The woman I sent told me, when she got to Ramsbury to Duck's house, her neighbour told her that she was gone to get wood and her (the neighbour's) little girl was gone with her. The girl soon returned saying Maria Duck was much frightened in the wood, and had seen her husband and spoken to him, but as he made no reply she became faint, and told the girl to go home, as she knew something had happened to David. That was before she knew the woman was sent. When she got home and found the woman waiting for her return she said she knew her errand, and asked her if her husband was not dead, and seemed much frightened, the woman telling her he was very ill, and thought he would not be living to see her again. When she got to Warren, she found him dead, and told us the time she saw him, which was exactly the time he lost his life; therefore I think the public is bound to believe it, although it seems to us quite a mystery. Duck's wife is now in Hungerford Union, her home broken up by his death. The woman I sent is Mary Holick, has been living with me some time, and her word is to be relied on.

"BENJAMIN DIXON."

Mrs. Duck has since died; but Mrs. Holick dictated and signed the following account:—

"January 26th, 1886.

"I well remember about poor old David Duck. I am never likely to forget it. The cart-wheel passed over his chest and killed him, and I was sent down by Mr. Dixon to tell his wife at Ramsbury. She was not at home; she was out gathering wood with the little girl of a neighbour; so I went to this neighbour's house to wait. Presently the little girl came in, and said that Mrs. Duck was in a great way because she had seen her husband in the wood, and when she spoke to him and said, 'What wind blows you here, Davie?' he disappeared away, and she fell back on the bank half fainting with fright; and the little girl ran down and found her like it. So she had gathered very little wood. If the little girl had not told me first, I never could have really believed that she had seen him. But when she came back, about half-an-hour after the little girl (who had come on in front, full of what Mrs. Duck had seen), it was all true. I shall never forget her; she came in with her hands stretched out, and said, looking at me, 'She has come to tell me that my Davie is killed. I knew he was; I have seen his ghost. I didn't need anyone to tell me.' And then she told us, afterwards, how she had suddenly seen him in front of her, in his usual clothes; and how she spoke to him, and he vanished. She lived about half a mile from the woman I was waiting with; and we sent another woman to her house to tell her, when she came home, that a person from Mr. Dixon's wanted to see her. So directly she told her,

she said, 'She has come to tell me my poor Davie is killed ; but I didn't want anyone to tell me, for I *know* ; I have just seen his ghost.' And the woman said, 'Don't give way now, but come with me, there's a good woman.' And they came ; and I shall never forget her as she came stumbling up the steps, and looked at me and said, 'For God's sake tell me ; my Davie is dead.' She had seen him just as natural as life, every bit ; but the little girl never saw anything, only she knew Mrs. Duck had, when she helped her off the bank, where she fell when he disappeared. She was a very good woman, I think, and her husband was a very quiet man ; and she was as strong as any man, and worked hard from early morning."

We find from the Register of Deaths that David Duck died on March 31, 1874.

[Mrs. Holick's account fairly comes into the class of evidence reckoned as on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148) ; as, though she did not actually receive a description of the apparition from Mrs. Duck's own lips before Mrs. Duck heard the fatal news, she saw her in the state of agitation, and heard her express the conviction, which the apparition had produced. Mrs. Holick is quite clear that she herself was the first to communicate the news.]

In the next example accident has made the evidence for the facts very fairly strong ; but the case is to some extent weakened by the percipient's knowledge that the person whose phantasm he saw was ill. The case was first described to us by a clergyman as follows :—

"March 5th, 1885.

(239) "Some 18 or 19 years ago, I remember calling on a working maltster, whose employer was living at Lincoln. His employer was ill at the time, and I asked the man if he had heard from him lately. 'No,' he said, 'but I am afraid he is dead.' And on my inquiring why he thought so, he replied that on going out that morning early, he had seen his employer standing on the top of the steps that lead up to the kiln door, as plainly as he ever had seen him in his life.

It was as he expected : the first news that came reported his employer's death.

"I have no doubt the man I speak of either saw this appearance, or *believed* he saw it."

In answer to inquiries, this informant says :—

"March 12th, 1885.

"Since receiving your letter, I have had the curiosity to look over my old diaries, thinking I might have made a note of the occurrence, and under the date of Thursday, the 22nd of October, 1863, I find the following :—

'Report of Mr. W.'s death. M. saw his "wraith" on Tuesday morning about 5 o'clock.'

"This differs somewhat from what I told you in my last letter, for I said that the man had seen the appearance that same morning in which I spoke with him. Here it seems it was two days before. But still he had

Mrs. H's acc
is more

late note
lined by
percipient
note
behind
man's
memo
10/19
ago
224.2

told me *before* it was known for a certainty that Mr. W. was dead. For you observe the word 'dead' put in over the **A**. This I know from my own habit was put in afterwards. There is no communication between this place and Lincoln, except on the market day, Friday. At that time of year, moreover, the carriers who go to Lincoln would not get back before night, and consequently I should most probably not have learned the certainty of the report until some time on Saturday. Then, instead of making a new note of it, I simply put in the word 'dead' to show that the report was true when I first heard it. Moreover, I used the Scotch word 'wraith' instead of 'ghost' or 'spirit,' as I had an idea that the former word was applied to appearances before death.

"I observe that the man said 'about 5 o'clock.' Of course, this would be a vague expression for any time up to 5.30, or thereabouts, when the morning would not be very clear perhaps, but sufficiently so to enable one to see an object some 10 or 12 yards off, and I am not sure it was quite so much.

"I cannot say that Mr. W. was dead at the time M. saw the appearance, but he was certainly dead at the time he told me of it, otherwise I should not have inserted the word 'dead' where I did.

I may add that Mr. W. had formerly lived in this village, and I had known him well. He had gone to live in Lincoln only a short time before his death. His malt kiln was his only means of providing for his wife and family—five or six young children—and he had been in the habit of coming over to see how things went on, twice a week. There is nothing more natural than that his thoughts (and they must have been very anxious thoughts) should have been fixed on that one place."

The following is the percipient's own account:—

"Ridley's Yard, North Gate, Newark, Notts., March 16th, 1885.

"I have received your letter asking me to forward you what I said about my dear Mr. Wright, for he was a very good master. I said I saw him standing on the steps, with one hand on the handrail; my light went out, and I saw no more, and he died, and I hope he is at rest. That was at 4 o'clock in the morning, before he departed from us. "J. MERRILL."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Merrill adds, on April 6, 1885:—

"I am very sorry to let you know that I do not remember the date that dear Mr. Wright died, but I think it was the latter end of 1863. I looked my old books over, but, with the trade being carried on in the same way, I have nothing to go by. I saw him as plain as in the middle of the day, for he stood just the same as he did when he came at noon, looking on to the house for me to go to him. I never saw anything before, to my mind." [The last sentence is in answer to the question whether the above was his only experience of a hallucination.]

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Wright died on October 22, 1863, of "gastric fever." The apparition therefore took place two days before the death, but no doubt at a time of critical illness. In conversation, Mr. Merrill's wife stated that she remembered laughing at her husband's account of his strange experience when he returned home. Neither of them seems to have then connected the apparition with the idea of death.

The following case was written down by our valued helper, Miss

Porter, from the account of Mrs. Banister, of Eversley, mother of the percipient, Mrs. Ellis, of Portesbery Road, Camberley, who has signed it as correct.

“August 5th.

(240) “In September, 1878, I, then residing in York Town, Surrey, three times during the day distinctly saw the face of an old friend, Mr. James Stephenson, who I afterwards heard died that day in Eversley, five miles off. I saw it first about half-past 10 in the morning; the last time it was nearly 6 o'clock. I knew him to be ill.

(Signed) “MARY ELLIS.”

A memorial card shows that Mr. Stephenson died on Sept. 19, 1878.

Mr. Stephenson had not been on friendly terms with Mrs. Banister or her daughter; but Mrs. Banister, by his desire, went to see him just before his death.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Ellis says:—

“I told my husband, and a young man, whose name is Swiney, at the tea-table the same afternoon, and after leaving the table to go into another room I saw it again—which was the last time. I did not hear of Mr. Stephenson's death until the next day, nor did I know that he was so near death. My husband remembers it well, but the children were then too young to notice such a thing. I have never seen anything like it before or since, and I hope I never shall again.

“MARY ELLIS.”

Mr. Ellis writes:—

“I quite well remember my wife speaking of the figure that she had seen during the day. The next day we heard of Mr. Stephenson's death.

“E. J. ELLIS.”

Mr. Herbert Swiney, writing on September 29th, 1885, from Tregarthen House, Romford Road, Forest Gate, says that he only faintly recollects the matter.

If correctly reported, this case presents two of the rarer features which are common to telepathic and to purely subjective hallucinations; the *fragmentary* nature of the percept—a face only,—and the *repetition* after an interval of some hours.¹

The next case must be reckoned as one of non-recognition, as the resemblance between the phantasm and the person who died was not remarked until the fact of death was known. The narrator, Mr. S. J. Masters, of 87, Clifford Crescent, Southampton, will hardly be accused of excessive sentimentality.

“December 14th, 1882.

(241) “Last Easter Sunday, I was retiring to bed, just after 11 o'clock, and had stepped off the stairs on the landing that led to my room (my parents' bedroom door being in front of me, about 10 or 12ft., and my door

¹ As to the first point see above, p. 33, note; as to the second, see Vol. i., p. 445, an below p. 237, note.

being about 2ft. to the right, so that I had to pass it to get to my room). I saw their bedroom door was open, and I was rivetted to the spot by seeing standing in the room doorway in front of me, a figure of a female ; although I could not distinguish the dress, I could plainly see the features, and especially the eyes. I must have stood there at least 20 seconds, for my mother, hearing me stop suddenly before reaching my room, at last opened the door (below) and asked what was the matter. I then came downstairs and stopped with them till we all retired together. The figure collapsed when my mother called upstairs, and the light I held in my hand shone through the doorway to the opposite wall, which had been obscured by the figure, as if it had had a tangible body.

“It was not till the following Wednesday that my mother, on reading the mid-weekly local paper, saw the death of a young lady with whom I had once kept company for a short time. On inquiry, I found she died about the same time as I saw the apparition. I feel convinced it was her, for the eyes had the same expression, although I could not recognise her at the time ; not having seen the girl for quite six months, I had almost forgotten her existence. She died in decline, which accounts for her not being about the town before her death.

“S. J. MASTERS.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on March 5, 1882. This was a Sunday, but not Easter Sunday. The mention of the *Wednesday* paper seems also to be a mistake ; as the death does not appear in the Wednesday issue of either of the two bi-weekly Southampton papers, though it appears in the Saturday issue of one of them, on March 11th. These mistakes are not important. For even apart from Mr. Masters' observation of the coincidence at the time, Easter Sunday seems a very unlikely day to have been named, if the experience had really fallen on a week-day ; and if it fell on a Sunday, there is no reason to doubt that it fell on the Sunday before the announcement of the death—*i.e.*, on the day of the death.

The narrator's mother corroborates as follows :—

“I remember, perfectly well, the circumstance, and the effect it produced on my son at the time. He is not of a nervous disposition, nor a believer in anything at all approaching Spiritualism, as we all belong to the Church. His father and I thought it might betoken the death of some near friend or relative, having heard of such things, but never had seen so direct an appearance ourselves.

“ELIZABETH MASTERS.”

[Mr. Masters has reason to think that the young lady's attachment to him had continued. He reports that on more exact inquiry, he finds the death to have occurred within a quarter-of-an-hour of the apparition—probably after rather than before it. Asked if he had ever experienced any other hallucinations, he replied in the negative.]

The next case is one of the most singular in our collection. It is from Mrs. Clerke, of Clifton Lodge, Farquhar Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.

“October 30th, 1885.

(242) “In the month of August, 1864, about 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, I was sitting reading in the verandah of our house in Barbadoes. My black nurse was driving my little girl, about 18 months or so old, in her perambulator in the garden. I got up after some time to go into the house, not having noticed anything at all—when this black woman said to me, ‘Missis, who was that gentleman that was talking to you just now?’ ‘There was no one talking to me,’ I said. ‘Oh, yes, dere was, Missis—a very pale gentleman, very tall, and he talked to you, and you was very rude, for you never answered him.’ I repeated there was no one, and got rather cross with the woman, and she begged me to write down the day, for she knew she had seen someone. I did, and in a few days I heard of the death of my brother in Tobago. Now, the curious part is this, that I did not see him, but she—a stranger to him—did; and she said that he seemed very anxious for me to notice him.

“MAY CLERKE.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Clerke says :—

“(1) The day of death was the same, for I wrote it down. I think it was the 3rd of August, but I know it was the same.

“(2) The description, ‘very tall and pale,’ was accurate.

“(3) I had no idea that he was ill. He was only a few days ill.

“(4) The woman had never seen him. She had been with me for about 18 months, and I considered her truthful. She had *no object* in telling me.”

In conversation, I learned that Mrs. Clerke had immediately mentioned what the servant said, and the fact that she had written down the date, to her husband, Colonel Clerke, who corroborates as follows :—

“I well remember that on the day on which Mr. John Beresford, my wife's brother, died in Tobago—after a short illness of which we were not aware—our black nurse declared she saw, at as nearly as possible the time of his death, a gentleman, exactly answering to Mr. Beresford's description, leaning over the back of Mrs. Clerke's easy-chair in the open verandah. The figure was not seen by any one else.

“SHADWELL H. CLERKE.”

We find it stated in Burke's *Peerage* that Mr. J. H. de la Poer Beresford, Secretary for the Island of Tobago, died on August 3, 1863 (not 1864).

If this incident is to be interpreted telepathically, it is scarcely possible to suppose that Mrs. Clerke's own presence did not play a part in the phenomenon. The case would then be comparable to some of the “collective” cases (to be cited in Chap. XVIII.), where one of the percipients is a stranger to the agent; the difference being that here the person who should (so to speak) have been the principal percipient was as unconscious of the impression which she received

as we have found the percipient to be in some of the experimental cases.¹ Another instance of the same kind is No. 355 (p. 256, and see p. 267).

§ 3. I will now give a group of cases in respect of which the hypothesis of *mistaken identity* has to be taken into account. The apparition in all of them was seen out-of-doors, and in several of them in the street—which is the place where such mistakes are most liable to occur. Now, with respect to mistakes of identity, made at the time when the person who seems to be seen is really dying at a distance, one general remark has to be made—namely, that cases in which they have occurred are not thereby at once put out of court, for the purpose of my argument. For if telepathic hallucinations are facts in nature, the possibility of *telepathic illusions* cannot reasonably be excluded. Illusions, as I have remarked, (Vol. I., p. 460,)

¹ As one more example of the psychological identity of hallucinations and dreams (Chap. xii., § 5), I may quote an account of a dream which is an exact parallel to the above waking case.

In the last week of February, 1885, Miss Harris, of 9, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, W.C., wrote to us as follows:—

“On Thursday night, the 19th of February, 1885, I dreamed the following dream. A servant, a Lincolnshire woman, has lived in our house for two years; and of her, whom I never see in the day, I dreamt, as portentously as if her troubles were my own. There is nothing remarkable in this young woman’s character or experience. She is but an ordinary rather rough specimen of a village girl, quiet and respectable.

“In my dream a long country lane was before me; in this I walked with the Lincolnshire cook, without speaking; yet I knew that my companion was going with me as a sort of escort to some errand of my own. Then a face appeared over the hedge, a solemn, silent face, exactly resembling that of the one who noiselessly moved beside me; the sternest suffering was impressed upon the plain hard-lined countenance. From beside me the country servant instantly departed to follow the warning voiceless form through the hedge, into a little house. Only a long minute passed, and the servant rushed from the hedge, absolutely wringing her hands, crouching to the ground in dumb agony. ‘Tis my sister called me, she beckoned me in; but she will not speak: she will not have me with her.’ As she spoke the vision returned. It looked over the low hedge, with the same indescribable expression of sadness unspeakable—of a terrible woe impossible of utterance. It flung back its sleeve, and lifting one arm, pointed to a single white spot in the centre of a finger. And as suddenly as I had fallen on this dream, so suddenly I awoke. I tried to cast off the shadow the dream had cast on me. But the same evening came the news that the country cook’s sister was very ill, and had prematurely been confined with a child born dead.

“EMILY MARION HARRIS.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Harris adds:—

“Certainly I repeated my dream even before I left my room. I asked the housemaid whether she knew of any reason her fellow-servant might have to fear, or to hear bad news. She said, ‘No,’ and after that I told my sister. Nothing was said about the dream during Friday. On Saturday morning, when I returned from a class—having dismissed the occurrence from my mind for the time—my sister immediately told me that the coincidence of dream and fact were marvellously similar. The poor woman whom I saw with such dumb appeal on her countenance, was alone, unable to speak, meeting her trouble alone, her husband, who is a policeman, being on night duty. She thought it was impossible to be heard, till she found a stick of his, and contrived to knock on the floor.”

Miss Harris’s sister corroborates as follows:—

“March 16th, 1885.
“It was directly I came out of my room, before I went down stairs, that my sister told me the dream she wrote to you about, and which she had dreamed between night and morning.

“CLARA DE H. HARRIS.”

are merely the sprinkling of fragments of genuine hallucination on a background of true perception; and it is surely not more difficult to suppose that a mind which is telepathically affected can project its sensory delusion on some real figure which bears a general resemblance to the agent, than that it can project it in vacancy. But of course the coincidence with A's death of an *illusion* in which the perceiver mistook B for A would have far less force as evidence for telepathy than the coincidence with A's death of a *hallucination* representing him, simply because purely subjective mistakes as to identity are far commoner things than purely subjective hallucinations. To find the probability that a person will by accident make a particular mistake of identity on a particular day of his life, we must multiply the fraction $\frac{1}{\text{number of days of his life}}$ by the number of similar mistakes, in similar circumstances of light, distance, &c., that he makes altogether; and we must divide the result by the number of acquaintances any one of whom, if chance alone acted, is as likely as the one who died on the particular day to be the one wrongly identified on that day. This process may reduce the probability of a telepathic explanation of the coincidence from odds of millions to 1 (as found in the case of hallucinations, pp. 18-20) to odds of thousands to 1; but in a cumulative argument, odds of that magnitude are clearly not to be neglected. However, with regard to the following specimens, or most of them, such considerations are hardly needed. They seem pretty certainly to be cases of hallucination, and stand, for instance, on different ground from the incidents mentioned above (Vol. I., pp. 123-4), where the hypothesis of mistaken identity seemed fairly plausible.

The first account is from the Chevalier Sebastiano Fenzi, of the Palazzo Fenzi, Florence, a corresponding member of the S.P.R. The peculiar melancholy described as preceding the vision may possibly exemplify the *gradual* emergence of telepathic impressions into consciousness, which was exemplified in Chap. XII., § 3.

“November 13th, 1883.

(243) “Some months before his demise, my brother (Senator Carlo Fenzi) one day, as we were driving to town together from our villa of St. Andrea, told me that if he should be summoned first, he would endeavour to prove to me that life continued beyond the chasm of the grave, and that I was to promise him the same in case I went first; ‘*but,*’ said he, ‘I am sure to go first, and, mind you, I feel quite sure that before the year is out—nay, in three months—I shall be no more.’ This was said in June and he died on the 2nd of September, the same year, 1881.

“Now, on that fatal morning (the 2nd of September), I was some 70 miles away from Florence, namely, at Fortullino, a villa of ours on a rock on the sea, 10 miles south-east of Leghorn. Well, at about half-past 10 in the morning, I was seized with a fit of deep melancholy—a thing very unusual with me, who enjoy great serenity of mind. I had, however, no reason for being alarmed about my brother, who was then in Florence—as, although he had not been very well, the latest news of him was very good, as my nephew had written to say, ‘*Uncle is doing very comfortably, and it cannot even be said that he has really been ill*’—so that I could not account for this sudden gloomy impression; yet the tears stood in my eyes, and in order not to burst out crying like a baby before our family party, I rushed out of the house without my hat on, although it was blowing a hurricane, and the rain fell in torrents, accompanied by permanent flashes of lightning, and the loud and unceasing roar of the sea and of thunder.

“I ran and ran, and only stopped when I had reached the end of a spacious lawn, from whence are seen, close on the other side of a small stream (the Fortulla), the huge stones or rocks heaped on one another, and stretching for a good half mile along the sea coast. I there gazed to try and see a youth, a cousin of mine, who, having been born among the Zulus, retained enough of love for savage life to have yielded to the wish of going out in that terrible weather, ‘to enjoy,’ he said, ‘the fury of the elements.’ Judge of my surprise and astonishment when, instead of Giovanni (such is my cousin’s name), I saw my brother, with a top hat and his big white moustachios, stepping leisurely along from one rock to another, as if the weather were fair and calm! I could not believe my eyes; and yet, there he was—he, unmistakably! I thought of rushing back to the house to call every one out to give him a hearty welcome, but then preferred waiting for him, and meanwhile waved my hand to him and called out his name as loud as I possibly could, although with the awful noise of wind, and sea, and thunder combined, nothing could naturally be heard. He meanwhile continued to advance, until, having reached a rock larger than the rest, he slipped behind it. The distance between myself and the rock was, as nearly as I can judge, not more than 60 paces. I waited for him to reappear on the other side—but to no purpose, and I only saw Giovanni, who was just then emerging from a wood, and stepping on to the rocks. Giovanni, tall and slight, with a broad-brimmed hat and dark beard, was altogether a very different type, and I thought that my having seen Charles, my brother, must have been a freak of my sense of vision, and felt rather annoyed, and almost blushed at the idea that I could have been so deceived by a sort of phantom of my own fancy; yet could not help telling Giovanni, ‘There must be some family likeness, for I must positively have taken you for Charles, although I cannot make out how you could have gone from behind the huge rock into the wood without my seeing you cross over.’ ‘*I never was behind the rock,*’ he said, ‘*for when you saw me, I had but just put my foot on the rocks.*’

“Meanwhile we went home, put on fresh clothes, and then joined the rest to breakfast. My melancholy had left me, and I conversed merrily with all the young people. After breakfast a telegram came, telling me and my daughter Christina to hasten home, as Carlo had suddenly been taken very

ill. We made preparations to at once depart, and meanwhile another telegram came, urging us to make all possible haste, as the illness was making rapid strides, but although we caught the nearest train, we only arrived in Florence at night; where we found, to our horror, that my brother had died just at the time when in the morning I had seen him on the rocks, when, feeling that his moments were numbered, he had been continually asking for me, regretting not to see me appear.

"In kissing his cold forehead with intense sorrow, as we had lived together, and loved one another during our whole lives, I thought, '*Poor, dear Charlie; he kept his word!*'"

"SEBASTIANO FENZI."

In answer to inquiries, Chevalier Fenzi tells us that his "eyesight is excellent, especially at moderate distances." He has had one other experience of visual hallucination—representing an unrecognised figure—which was probably subjective.

The "Giovanni" of the narrative corroborates as follows:—

"Athens, (English address, 131, Tavistock Street, Bedford).

"May 3rd, 1884.

"My cousin, Sebastiano Fenzi, of Florence, has sent me your letter of 13th March last, with a request that I would give you my recollections of the strange circumstance attending the death of his brother, Carlo Fenzi, in September, 1881, a circumstance which made (and has left) a deep impression on my mind. I will endeavour to recall the whole circumstance. Nearly three years, it is true, have since passed, but my recollection of the event, on account of its strangeness, remains clear.

"Passing through Italy in the autumn of 1881, I profited by the occasion to visit my relatives. At Milan I learnt that the major portion were at Fortullino, my cousin's seaside villa. Thither I accordingly went, arriving the last days of August. Fortullino is a charming villa, situated on the top of a cliff on the sea, and surrounded by deep growths of trees and shrubs. The weather, during the beginning of my stay, was very bad, rain, thunder, strong winds, and heavy sea. I remember that on the morning of my cousin's death—none then dreamed the end was near—indulging in a favourite weakness (?).—I started off alone for an escapade along the shore. Descending by the hillside to the beach, I passed on, leaping from boulder to boulder, climbing over, or passing round them when too huge, past a bend, which hid me from a view of the villa, for some distance along the shore.

"Returning for breakfast, I found the rain (driven into my face by the wind) blinding, and, fearing an accident, entered the wood. The undergrowth of the shrubs, and the wet state of the ground, urged me to try the open again. This I did, emerging just inside the bend, in full sight of the house. To my surprise I saw my cousin standing on the edge of the cliff. When I approached him he remarked that there must be a strange family likeness, as he had mistaken me for his brother Carlo, being on the rocks, but wondered how I had managed to enter the wood unseen by him, and then suddenly leave it again. I replied that he had not seen me on the rocks before leaving the wood (for I was out of sight). The matter shortly afterwards dropped. Scarcely was breakfast over than a wire arrived, summoning him and his daughter Christina to Florence,—Carlo was very ill. They left at once, I staying, at their request, with

the younger members at Fortullino. Our next news was that Carlo Fenzi had died—about the very time that Sebastiano had fancied to have mistaken me for his brother.

“JOHN DOUGLAS DE FENZI.”

[Even apart from the evidence that “Giovanni” was not in sight when the figure was seen, it would be difficult to regard this as a case of mistaken identity. For Chevalier Fenzi, being specially on the look out for “Giovanni,” would be specially unlikely to mistake him for someone else.]

Here we encounter a feature of which there are altogether nine examples in the present collection¹—a previous compact between the parties that the one who died first should endeavour to make the other sensible of his presence. Considering what an extremely small number of persons make such a compact, compared with those who do not, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that its existence has a certain efficacy. The cause of this might be sought in some quickening of the agent’s thought, in relation to the percipient, as the time for fulfilment approached. But considering how often spontaneous telepathy acts without any conscious set of the distant mind towards the person impressed, it is safer to refer the phenomenon to the same sort of blind movements as seem sometimes, at supreme crises, to evoke a response out of memories and affinities that have long lapsed from consciousness (see Chap. XII., § 9); on which view, the efficacy of the compact may quite as readily be conceived to depend on its latent place in the percipient’s mind as in the agent’s.

In the next case—from Major Owen, of 4, Grove Road, Eastbourne—the tie between the two parties was, we learn, one rather of blood than of affection.

“November 17th, 1883.

(244) “In the year 1870, I went one morning from my then home, in Clifton, to order various eatables for the day. On my way, I saw coming towards me, on the same side of the street, J. E. H., a male cousin. To avoid meeting him, I went across to the other side, and walked into a fishmonger’s shop, and watched him pass on. I remained in the same place, looking into the street, and I saw him (or it) pass back again. I felt so annoyed at the idea of J. E. H. being in Clifton that I hurried home to tell my wife that I had seen J. E. H., and that he was evidently making inquiries as to our residence, and would certainly be here directly. I stayed at home all that morning, but J. E. H. never appeared.

“The next day, or day after, I received a letter from a son of J. E. H., telling me his father had died the very day I had seen the apparition.

“H. M. ARTHUR OWEN.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Owen says:—

¹ See cases 146, 165, 169, 194, 355, 514, 526, 537; also Mr. Cooper’s “ambiguous” case, Vol. i., p. 507. In case 210 there had been a request, but not a compact; and in case 197 a promise on the side of the person who died.

“I have ascertained from the widow of J. E. H. that he died Tuesday, November 2nd, 1869, not as I wrote to you, 1870, between 2 and 3 p.m. I saw, as I believe to this moment, J. E. H. certainly before noon on that day. My wife can testify to the fact of my having seen J. E. H. before I heard of his death, as I went back to my house to tell her J. E. H. was in Clifton, and she must expect to see him any moment.”

Mrs. Owen corroborates as follows :—

“I perfectly recognise the circumstance detailed to you by my husband of his having, as he thought, seen J. E. H. walking in the streets of Clifton ; indeed, he came home on purpose to prepare me for his coming to our house, and the whole day we were expecting he would appear.

“M. OWEN.”

[Major Owen has had no other hallucination, and his sight is excellent. In conversation, Mrs. Owen described J. E. H.'s figure to Mr. Podmore as unmistakable ; very tall and thin, with small black eyes and a very small head.]

The next case is from the Rev. W. E. Dutton, of Lothersdale Rectory, Cononley, Leeds. It will be seen that the impression may possibly have been *reciprocal*.

“January, 30th, 1885.

(245) “I am not quite clear as to the exact date, but about the middle of June, in the year 1863, I was walking up the High Street of Huddersfield, in broad daylight, when I saw approaching me, at a distance of a few yards, a dear friend who I had every reason to believe was lying dangerously ill at his home in Staffordshire. A few days before, I had heard this from his friends. As the figure drew nearer, I had every opportunity of observing it ; and, although it flashed across my mind that his recovery had been sudden, I never thought of doubting that it was really my friend. As we met he looked into my eyes with a sad longing expression, and, to my astonishment, never appeared to notice my outstretched hand, or respond to my greeting, but quietly passed on. I was so taken by surprise as to be unable to speak or move for a few seconds, and could never be quite certain whether there was uttered by him any audible sound, but a clear impression was left on my mind, ‘I have wanted to see you so much, and you would not come.’ Recovering from my astonishment, I turned to look after the retreating figure, but it was gone. My first impulse was to go to the station and wire a message ; my next, which was acted upon, was to start off immediately to see whether my friend was really alive or dead, scarcely doubting that the latter was the case. When I arrived next day I found him living, but in a state of semi-consciousness. He had been repeatedly asking for me, his mind apparently dwelling on the thought that I would not come to see him. As far as I could make out, at the time I saw him on the previous day he was apparently sleeping. He told me afterwards that he fancied he saw me, but had no clear idea how or where. I have no means of accounting for the apparition, which was that of my friend clothed, and not as he must have been at the time.¹ My mind was at the moment fully occupied with other matters, and I was not thinking of him.

¹ On the view of telepathic hallucinations which has been here advanced, this point of course presents no difficulty ; see Chap. xii. §§ 5 and 6.

"I may add that he rallied afterwards, and lived for several months. At the time of his death I was far from home, but there was no repetition of the mysterious experience. "W. E. DUTTON."

In answer to the question whether this was his only experience of a hallucination of the senses, Mr. Dutton replies:—

"I have never had, so far as I can remember, any other experience of the nature described in my narrative, and do not think I am a subject for such impressions. This makes the solitary experience all the more mysterious to me."

Asked as to his eyesight, he adds:—"I am not and never have been shortsighted, but just the contrary. Nor do I remember to have made a mistake of identity except on one occasion, and that in the case of a person I had seen only once."

[Here the behaviour of the phantasm is very unlike that of a stranger who found himself mistaken for someone else. The case is of course weakened by Mr. Dutton's knowledge of his friend's serious illness, which makes it more likely than it would otherwise be that the hallucination was purely subjective (Vol. I., p. 509). But the fact of his friend's mind having been distinctly occupied with him (possibly even telepathically clairvoyant of him) is a point on the other side.]

Mr. Arthur Ireland, of the School House, South Witham, near Grantham, wrote to us on January 5, 1884:—

(296) "About 14 years ago, about 3 o'clock one summer's afternoon, I was passing in front of Trinity Church, Upper King Street, Leicester, when I saw on the opposite side of the street a very old playmate, whom, having left the town to learn some business, I had for some time lost sight of. I thought it odd he took no notice of me; and while following him with my eyes, deliberating whether I should accost him or not, I called after him by name, and was somewhat surprised at not being able to follow him any further, or to say into which house he had gone, for I felt persuaded he had gone into one. The next week I was informed of his somewhat sudden death at Burton-on-Trent, at about the time I felt certain he was passing in front of me. What struck me most at the time was that he should take no notice of me, and that he should go along so noiselessly¹ and disappear so suddenly, but that it was E. P. I had seen I never for one moment doubted. I have always looked upon this as a hallucination, but why it should have occurred at that particular time, and to me, I could never make out. "ARTHUR IRELAND."

To inquiries, Mr. Ireland replies:—

(1) "I have never on any other occasion had any hallucination of the senses at all.

(2) "I mentioned the incident of having met E. P. to my mother, and remarked on the seeming slight of his not acknowledging me. Of course, when the news of his death came, mother remarked that I was mistaken,

¹ This feature recurs in Dr. Leslie's narrative, p. 252. Visual hallucinations, as we have seen, often involve further the *sounds* that a real person would have made; but the absence of this complete development (*cf.* case 252) is only on a par with the common occurrence of hallucinations of voices close at hand, where no *visible* phantasm appears.

and although not feeling convinced, I had to assent to such a seemingly apparent truism. My mother has since died, or we might have had this added testimony.

(3) "I am thankful to say that my eyesight is good, and I remember no instance of mistaking one person for another. Of course I could not swear that there was no mistake; but I do assert that I, without knowing he had left the town, and with nothing to make me think of him, was suddenly certain that E. P. was coming towards me on the opposite side of the street; that I watched him attentively for any sign of recognition; that I called after him, and could never explain his disappearance, or account for the unnatural noiselessness of his movements or the suddenness of his appearance.

"I conclude by assuring you that so far I have been of a very realistic turn of mind, and am not aware that I am in the least superstitious or even imaginative. That which I have written is the truth, according to my experience, placed at your disposal to help, if of any service, in the unravelling of that for which at present there seems no adequate explanation."

Mr. Ireland was in doubt as to the exact date. We learn through a sister of Mr. E. P.'s—and have confirmed her statement by the Register—that the death occurred on January 9th, 1869. Mr. Ireland was therefore mistaken in referring it to the summer. But he is quite certain that he "received the information of it within a week after it took place," and remarked to his mother on the exactitude of the coincidence.

[Here the words "without knowing he had left the town" somewhat weaken the case. But the mode of appearance and disappearance strongly suggests that the figure seen was not a stranger mistaken for E. P. but a hallucination; and if so, there is the strongest probability that it was telepathic.]

The next case is taken from a book called *John Leifchild, D.D., his Public Ministry; founded upon an Autobiography*, by J. R. Leifchild, his son (published by Jackson, Walford and Hodder, 1863). The account is in the words of Dr. Leifchild himself, not of his son.

(247) "I give an account of an occurrence which soon after befell my aunt, for the truth of which, as an event, I can vouch, but of which I can offer no solution. She was standing in a little shop fronting the street while a customer was being served. On a sudden, her absent son passed in the street before her, and, as he passed, gave her a look of recognition, which so surprised and overjoyed her that, forgetting everything else, she rushed into the street after him. When there, she could not see him, and concluded that he was gone to the alley, which led to the abbey, and meant to hide himself away. We went, as soon as we could assemble, in search of him, but could not discover any trace of the son. My aunt then concluded that she had seen his spirit, and fell seriously ill. I noticed the circumstances in writing at the time, and pondered over them.

"A few weeks afterwards my father came to see us, and my aunt truly divined his errand. He had received a letter from the captain of the ship in which her son was sailing, stating that the unfortunate lad had fallen from the mast, and fractured his skull. While lying on his

death-bed he directed the captain to write to my father, whose address he named. The dates of this misfortune and the hallucination corresponded precisely."

[This certainly cannot be proved not to have been a case of mistaken identity; for the "look of recognition" cannot be pressed, that being just the sort of detail that might creep in afterwards, and the evidence for it being second-hand. At the same time, the sense of reality seems to have been of a kind which excluded this hypothesis in the percipient's mind: people do not as a rule "fall seriously ill" as a consequence of mistaking one person for another in the street.]

The next case was thus narrated by Mr. Andrew Lang, in an article on "Apparitions," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. II., p. 207.

(248) "The writer once met, as he believed, a well-known and learned member of an English University [Professor Conington], who was really dying at a place more than 100 miles distant from that in which he was seen. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the writer did not mistake some other individual for the extremely noticeable person whom he seemed to see, the coincidence between the subjective impression and the death of the learned professor is, to say the least, curious."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Lang wrote, on January 30th, 1886:—

"Savile Club.

"It was when I was living in St. Giles that I saw the real or sham J. C. I was under the lamp in Oriel Lane, about 9 at night, in winter, and I certainly had a *very good view of him*. I believe this to have been on a Thursday, but it may have been a Friday. I think it was on the Saturday that Scott Holland did not come to a breakfast party, and sent a note that Conington was dangerously ill. I said, 'He can't have been very ill on Thursday (or yesterday, I can't be sure which), for I met him near Corpus.'

"I am constantly failing to recognise people. Conington, however, was not easily mistaken, and I know no one in Oxford who was at all like him. Whoever he was, he was in cap and gown.

"A. LANG."

Mr. Lang tells us that he has never had a hallucination on any other occasion.

The notice of the death in the *Times* shows that it took place on Saturday, October 23, 1869; but information received from Canon Scott Holland, who heard from Professor Conington four times in the course of the week, leaves no doubt that he knew himself to be dying on the Thursday night. The experience narrated therefore coincided with a time of critical illness, though not with the death.

[This is, no doubt, an experience which might have been without difficulty accounted for as a mistake of identity, had the person who seemed to be seen been in a normal state at the time. But in any such case the *coincidence* is an inexpugnable fact or factor, the probability of which, as the result of accident, cannot reasonably be estimated save in relation to numbers of similar and more striking examples; and its force, as I pointed out above (pp. 62-3), is by no means entirely dependent on the supposition that the experience was a hallucination and not an illusion.]

The next case is from Mr. T. H. Carr, of 1, The Terrace, Carlton Hill, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds.

“February 18th, 1886.

(249) “I cannot make you fully understand the case unless you are acquainted with the Friends’ Meeting House premises. In passing through the front gate, the Meeting House is on the left, and my house, the first of 5 terrace houses, up a few steps on the right hand; but they stand back a few feet at the end of a high wall. And on account of the height of this wall we could only just see the top part of the head and hat of any gentleman coming.

“It was when I was standing at my front window on Christmas Day, 1884, that I saw the head of a gentleman walking up the yard which I thought was Daniel Pickard coming up, but on getting nearer I saw that the hair was whiter than Daniel’s; and on looking again, I thought it was the head and hat of Mr. X. But to see him right, I thought he would think me rude to be standing close to the window and watching him turn the corner, so I walked backwards a couple of paces, expecting to see him pass close to the terrace. But, to my surprise, he vanished in a moment, and I saw no more. I was struck with the affair, and took out my watch, and it was just 4 o’clock.

“A couple of hours after, B. Geddard, the caretaker, came down the yard, and said, ‘Hast thou heard that Mr. X. is dead?’ I said, ‘No; when has he died?’ He replied, ‘To-day at 4 o’clock.’

“THOMAS H. CARR.”

We find from a newspaper obituary that Mr. X. died on December 25th, 1884, after an illness of less than a week.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Carr adds that for distant objects his eyesight is excellent; that he has never on any other occasion experienced any sort of hallucination of the senses; and that, though he knew Mr. X. to be ill, he had no idea that the illness was serious.

It was impossible to judge of this case without an actual observation on the spot. Mr. Carr’s house stands in an enclosure which is divided from the street by open railings; and nobody would be walking along the line which the figure appeared to be taking, unless he were coming to the small row of houses of which Mr. Carr’s is the first—in which case his whole figure would be visible in a very few seconds after the upper part of it came into view. To disappear as it did, the figure would have had to retire by the way that it came, *but closer to the wall*. Mr. Carr was perfectly familiar with the aspect of Mr. X., who used frequently to come to see him, and whose head and tall hat were quite sufficient to distinguish him from other people known to enter this private enclosure. The broad brim of the hat was peculiar; and Mr. X. also walked with a peculiar droop of the head. Moreover, the fact that at the first moment Mr. Carr took the person he saw for some one else, and then corrected his judgment, shows at any rate that his recognition of Mr. X. was not that of a mere hasty glance. He was extremely startled by the sudden disappearance of his friend, and at once hurried out to see what could have become of him, but no one the least resembling him was in view. The incident perplexed and disturbed him at the moment far more than the words “I was struck with the affair” might seem to imply.

The final case of this group (procured for us by the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, of Rhyl,) is from Mr. Schofield, of 350, Belgrade Terrace, Manchester, a manufacturing chemist, and an office-bearer in the Collyhurst Wesleyan Church.

(250) "About the year 1857, while I was apprenticed at Bacup, I came home to Newchurch, in Rossendale, one Wednesday evening. On arriving at the gate of the garden fronting my father's house, I saw Martha Mills, a young woman with whom we were well acquainted, at the gate as if coming from the house. I spoke to her, but she made no answer, and I passed on into the house. When I got into the house I remarked to my mother that I had met Martha Mills at the gate, and that she did not answer me when I spoke to her. My mother [since dead] said, 'You could not have seen her, for she is either dead or dying.' I had not heard of her illness; but she died about the same time that I had seen her.

"RICHARD SCHOFIELD."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Schofield tells us that he has never had any other visual hallucination. He adds:—

"It was in the winter, and the light would not be sufficient to enable me to distinguish a living person at the distance at which Martha Mills appeared to me; yet I saw her very distinctly, and at the time had no doubt that it was she. I was not astonished at the time at the vividness with which I had seen her features; for I did not until afterwards reflect upon the distance of the street lamp, and general darkness of the night."

The Register of Deaths confirms Mr. Schofield's recollection that the occurrence fell on a *Wednesday*, and in the *winter*, but shows that it is rather more remote than he supposed—the date of Martha Mills's death being December 15, 1852. The coincidence of time between the vision and the death was, as far as he can remember, exact. Martha Mills was just a neighbour, who would be in and out at the Schofields' without ceremony.

Here Mr. Schofield asserts that he saw the face distinctly; but afterwards adds that the light was insufficient to admit of such distinct perception, had the figure been a real person. Now, taken together, these statements might seem to tell in favour of the abnormal—the hallucinatory—nature of the vision:¹ at the same time it would be an equally reasonable inference that perhaps he did not really see the face as distinctly as he afterwards supposed. When persons whom

¹ See Vol. i., p. 462, note, and Chap. xii., § 7. A case of subjective hallucination experienced by the Rev. P. H. Newnham further illustrates the point. He distinctly saw in church the figure of a parishioner of marked appearance, who, it turned out, had not been there, and whose place had not been occupied by anyone else. "When I became convinced it was a hallucination, it then occurred to me that the clearness with which I had noted the eyes and the careworn look proved it; for my eyesight is now unable to distinguish such details of features at the distance of the pew in question." It is interesting in this connection to remark that Mr. Newnham, for the larger part of his life, enjoyed particularly good sight; while another correspondent, who occasionally sees subjective phantoms, and who has been short-sighted from birth, says, "I experience the same difficulty in discerning the unreal that I do when viewing real objects; unless the persons come near, I cannot clearly distinguish their features."

one knows are seen in places where it is very natural that they should be, one often accepts a very slight and general glance as a sufficient ground of recognition; and it is easy afterwards to mistake the inference that one drew from this glance for actual ocular observation. But, on the other hand, Mr. Schofield spoke to the figure, and it did not answer him; which would at any rate be unlikely conduct on the part of a real person.

§ 4. The next type that presents itself is different from any that has yet been mentioned. We have encountered several cases, which there seemed strong grounds for considering telepathic, where the phantasmal form was not recognised; and we have seen that on the theory that the telepathic impulse may take place on various levels, or even below any level, of consciousness, and may be projected into sensory form by the percipient with various degrees of distinctness, this lack of recognition is not surprising. But all the visual cases so far examined have presented a *human* appearance: the hallucination has been developed at any rate up to that point. It will be remembered, however, that there have been instances where the human appearances developed out of something of a formless kind, which gradually assumed outline and detail (Chap. XII., § 3); and this might naturally lead us to expect that other cases might occur of a more rudimentary type—hallucinations, as we might say, of arrested development, and not suggestive or but faintly suggestive of any human likeness. Instances of the undeveloped type are met with among the purely subjective hallucinations of the sane; but they are very rare in comparison with the hallucinations which represent a definite figure;¹ it need not, therefore, surprise us to find that the analogous group, which there are grounds for regarding as very possibly telepathic, is a small one. Physiologically, we might compare these undeveloped flashes of hallucination to a *motor* effect

¹ In my collection of purely subjective hallucinations of the sane, the only visual examples that I find of a quite rudimentary type are a star, and two or three appearances of shapeless cloudy masses; to which I might add a few of the "collective" cases in Chap. xviii., § 5. But since this chapter was written, M. Marillier's paper, above cited, has supplied me with a case eminently in point. After describing some most distinct and complete hallucinations from which he suffered at one period of his life, he continues:—"Depuis lors, je n'ai plus eu d'hallucinations très nettes; parfois encore je vois des lueurs, j'entends des craquements, des bruissements, je sens en moi ce sentiment d'attente anxieuse qui précède d'ordinaire l'apparition d'une hallucination; mais rien ne paraît: l'hallucination est réduite avant même qu'elle ait eu le temps de se produire." This seems exactly to illustrate "arrested development." See also case 311 below, where a hallucination of light develops into a human form; a converse case, No. 553, where a developed hallucination passes into a mere impression of light; case 332 where it seems probable that what appeared to one percipient as a complete and recognised figure appeared to another as a formless luminous cloud; and case 346 where what appeared to one percipient as a complete figure, which touched him, appeared to another as a misty shadow.

which, instead of taking the complex form of automatic writing, is limited to a single start or twitch. The experiments in Chap. II., § 13, seemed to indicate that the sequel of a telepathic impulse might be a single tremor or vibration, sent down to the motor centre from the higher tracts of the brain; just so may we suppose the speech-centre to have been stimulated in the case of Mrs. K.'s cry (Vol. I., p. 398); and in the rudimentary hallucinations the stimulation of the sensory centre may be conceived as of the same simple and explosive sort.

The following case stands in an intermediate position, as there was a suggestion, but not exactly a representation, of human form. The account is from a witness whom we believe to have stated the facts correctly. She is the wife of an Inspector on the G.N. Railway, and resides at 4, Taylor's Cottages, London Road, Nottingham.

“April 23rd, 1883.

(251) “We received a letter a few days since, asking me to give you the account of our dear little girl's death, which took place on the 17th of May, 1879. I beg to state it is as fresh on my mind as if it only occurred a few days ago. The morning was very bright, and I think the sun shone more bright than I had ever seen it before. The child was four years and five months old, and a very fine girl. A few minutes after 11 she came running into the kitchen and said to me, ‘Mother, may I go and play?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ She then went out. Soon after I spoke to her, I went and fetched a pail of water from the bedroom. As I was walking across the yard, the child came in front of me like a bright shadow,¹ and I stopped quite still and looked at her, and turned my head to the right, and saw her pass away. I emptied my water, and was coming in. My husband's brother, who was staying with us, called to me, and said, ‘Fanny have got runned over.’ I then came through the house and went just across the road, and found her. She was knocked down by the horse's feet, and the wheel of a baker's cart had broken the brain at the back of her neck. She only breathed a few minutes in my arms.

“This is just as the sad accident occurred. I have been looking for the piece of paper with it in, but I cannot find it. “ANNE E. WRIGHT.”

The accident occurred at Derby. The *Derby and Chesterfield Reporter* gives a full account of it, which completely corresponds with the above.

[In a conversation with Mr. and Mrs. H. Sidgwick on December 16th, 1883, Mrs. Wright explained that the apparition was “like a flash of lightning in the form of a child's shadow.” It could not have been a real child; it was “not the least like one,” nor did she recognise in it the image of any particular child; but it gave her a kind of shock and made her think, “I wonder where those children are.” It lasted long enough for her to gaze steadily at it—“about half a minute”—and “moved away to the right, with her eyes upon it,” and so dis-

¹ Cf. Case 491, where a “shadowy light” seems to have developed into more definite form.

appeared. Not more than a quarter or three-quarters of a minute passed before her brother-in-law called to her. It must have been 5 or 7 minutes since the child had gone to play, when the accident happened. Mrs. Wright afterwards learnt from an eye-witness what the child had been doing out in the road for some minutes previously to the accident. While holding the dying child in her arms, she said to the people standing by, "This is her death-blow. I saw her shadow in the yard." She has had no hallucination of vision on any other occasion.]

It is open to doubt, of course, whether the experience here was of a sufficiently marked kind to have remained in the percipient's mind, had no accident occurred. But the description of the phantasm appears at any rate to point to something more than a mere illusion caused by the sunlight; nor is it of a sort that seems specially likely to have been unconsciously invented or exaggerated after the event.

The next two cases are of a much more rudimentary type. The narrator of the first is the Rev. James Went, M.A., of Southlea, Knighton, Leicester, Headmaster of the Leicester Grammar School.

"December 21st, 1885.

(252) "In the year 1870, I held an assistant-mastership in a large grammar school in the Midland counties. At the beginning of one of the school terms a boy had come to the town to reside with his uncle, for the sake of attending the school. He was a quiet, thoughtful-looking boy, and he and I were, I think, attracted to each other. A short time after he had come to the school, he was taken ill during school hours. Seeing that he was in pain I suggested that he should go home, and he did so. He was absent for perhaps three or four days, and, I think, meantime I made inquiries of his cousin, who also attended the school, and got the impression that he was not seriously ill. At all events, I had no idea that he was in any danger, nor, indeed, as I ascertained afterwards, had his friends. One evening I was sitting in my drawing-room reading, my wife being in the dining room behind, when I became aware of a vague presence within a few feet of me. It assumed no shape, and was nothing more than an indefinable dark appearance as of massed and disordered drapery, though there was no rustling. Slight as it was, however, I was quite conscious of it, and I can recall it at this distance of time. It made me feel a little uncomfortable, and I put down my book and joined my wife in the next room. The discomfort passed away at once, and I thought no more of it. In the course of an hour, however, I received a note which informed me that my pupil had died at about the same time, so far as I could make out, that I had been conscious of this appearance. I was, of course, at once reminded of it, and took some little trouble to ascertain the time. When I received the note informing me of his death I mentioned the incident to my wife, and she at the present time remembers my doing so.

"I give the narrative for what it is worth. It is very vague, but I have endeavoured not to overstate the incident. "JAMES WENT."

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Went says:—"I have never on any other occasion had any hallucination of the senses."

Mrs. Went writes as follows on Dec. 29, 1885 :—

“I remember well my husband mentioning to me, directly after he heard of the boy’s death, a queer sensation that he had experienced an hour previously that evening, and his belief that he had seen something which he could not describe.
“FRANCES J. WENT.”

The stage of development here seems just on a par with that out of which the appearances in cases 193, 194, and 315 took definite shape.

The next case is from the late Rev. Stephen H. Saxby, of Mount Elton, Clevedon, who was present when the incident occurred.

“1883.

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

[The exact date of death cannot be traced, the name being a common one.]

It is superfluous to remark that such an incident as this would deserve no attention if it stood alone; for therein it only resembles almost any example of coincidence that can be adduced. But in the case of the rudimentary visual phantasms, the evidential weakness extends to the whole class, which is far too small to carry any conviction, or to be even worth presenting on its own account; and to many, I am aware, the very mention of it will seem rather to weaken than to strengthen my argument. But it is only, I think, the vague habit of conceiving death-apparitions as objective presences instead of as hallucinations, that makes a “ball of light” appear so much more *bizarre* and improbable a manifestation than the semblance of the distant person’s form. If the percipient has never on any other occasion had an experience of the kind, it seems unreasonable to leave the fact of the coincidence out of account, merely because the hallucination is of a rare type; and seeing that this small rudimentary class is backed by the far larger and more convincing class of recognised phantasms, we may admit the presumption thus raised that the smaller group, like the larger, is telepathic, while still admitting that the smaller group adds no appreciable weight of its own to the cumulative proof of telepathy. The same remarks apply to the rudimentary *auditory* cases, some of which will be given in the next chapter—though to these the conception of arrested development is less applicable.

§ 5. The types that next claim notice are peculiar in that they involve no coincidence with any ostensibly abnormal condition of the agent. Evidence that certain hallucinations are telepathic, and not purely subjective, in origin may be afforded by coincidences of a different sort. Thus, a person may have a hallucination representing a friend in some costume in which he has never seen him or imagined him, but which proves to have been actually worn by him at the time. Or again, several persons, at different times, may have had a hallucination representing the same person, though that person was apparently experiencing nothing unusual on any of the occasions when his form was thus seen. Clearly it would be difficult to regard a repetition of this sort as accidental. It being comparatively a rare event for a sane and healthy person to see the form of an absent person at all, that two or more sane and healthy persons at different times should see the form of the *same* absent person, is, on the theory of chances, so unlikely as to suggest a specific faculty on the absent person's part for promulgating telepathic impulses.

This latter type is important from its bearing on the question whether the peculiarity of organisation which conduces to telepathic transferences belongs rather to the percipient or to the agent, or (as experiment would lead us to suppose) in some measure to both. To decide this question we should naturally ask which happens the more frequently—that the same *percipient*, or that the same *agent*, is concerned in several telepathic incidents. Now of repetitions to the same percipient we have several examples;¹ but that the same agent should figure repeatedly is made unlikely by the very nature of the ordinary type of case, which implies (over and above any natural peculiarity of organisation) an exceptional *crisis*—indeed, more often than not the crisis of death, through which no one can pass more than once. The only chance for a dying agent to show a special faculty for originating telepathic impressions is by impressing *several persons*; and cases of simultaneous or collective percipience, which may possibly be so

¹ The evidence for one instance may of course be better than for another or others which may have fallen to the experience of the same percipient; but the following cases seem at any rate worth considering in respect of this feature of repetition:—Nos. 21, 38, 56, and 184; 41 and 477; 44 and 116; 53, with the preceding incidents; 69; 73 and 103; 74 and 423; 77 and 263; 80 and 201; 86, 479 and 480; 111, 161 and 464; 126 and 201; 129, 164 and 551; 136 and 137; 140 and 642; 167 and 315; 191 and 280; 198 and 274; 279; 311, 367 and 693; 370 and 665; 408, 553, 554 and 650; 411 and 463; 502; 513; 514 and 515; 559 and 560; the case on p. 355; and perhaps Nos. 99, 392, 619, 625, 692. See also the account which Thomas Wright, of Birkenshaw (the champion of the Wesleyans in the North of England), gives of his aunt's experiences (*Autobiography* pp. 5-7). Mrs. Newnham affords another instance, but with her the agent has always been her husband (Vol i., pp. 63-70, and cases 18 and 35). Compare in this respect cases 90 and 700; and also case 55.

explicable, will be considered later (in Chap. XVIII.). Meanwhile the cases where telepathic impressions seem now and again to be thrown off at haphazard, and independently of death or any other crisis, are theoretically of at least equal interest. For they tend to confirm what experiment would lead us to suppose, that agency as well as percipience depends on specific conditions as yet unknown; and this dependence on peculiarity of constitution in *two* people would go far to account for an otherwise puzzling fact—the rarity, in comparison with the number of deaths and crises that take place, of spontaneous telepathic incidents connected with them.

Of the class of *repeated* hallucinations representing the same person, we have about five presentable records.¹ Most of the incidents therein described seem to illustrate what may be called purely casual agency; but in a few of them the agent's state was more or less abnormal—which is so far of course in favour of a telepathic explanation of the phenomena. The first account is from Mrs. Hawkins, of Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds.

“ March 25th, 1885.

(254) “ I send you my cousins' accounts of my apparition.

“ I have also sent you the account of my next appearance, which unfortunately cannot now be related by the eye-witness.

“ Again, a third time one of my little sisters reported that she had seen me on the stairs, when I was seven miles off—but she might so easily have been mistaken that I have never put any faith in that appearance. Then I was about 20.

“ For many years after that these appearances seem to have entirely ceased, but in the autumn of 1877 I was seen in this house by my eldest son, then aged 27, who may, I hope, give you his own account of it.

“ LUCY HAWKINS.”

Mrs. Hawkins prefaces her cousins' accounts thus :—

“ The event described in the enclosed accounts took place at Cherington, near Shipston-on-Stour, in Warwickshire, the residence of my uncle, Mr. William Dickins, who was for many years chairman of Quarter Sessions in

¹ I am excluding from the list a case received from Miss E. D. Jackson, of Strangeways, Manchester, where she and her hostess, on separate occasions, saw the figure of a maid-servant who was not really present; partly because the experiences both took place when the percipient was in bed in the morning, which we have seen to be a condition favourable to purely subjective hallucinations; partly because the sight of a person who is daily before the eyes is a common form for such hallucinations to take. (See Vol. i., p. 505.)

None of the hitherto published cases of the repeated appearance of the same person's “double” rest on good traceable authority. The case of Mdlle. Sagée, published in Mr. Dale Owen's *Footfalls* (p. 348), in 1863, was withdrawn in a later edition, as second-hand and not well substantiated. Some instances are recorded in connection with witchcraft—*e.g.*, in Mather's *Wonders of the Invisible World* (Boston, 1693), pp. 106-112; but here the idea of the person whose form appeared was present as a permanent source of apprehension in the minds of all the percipients.

the county. The ladies who saw the appearance are two of his daughters, one of them a little older than myself, the other 3 or 4 years younger. I was then just 17.

“The only mistake that I can discover in either of the accounts is that Mrs. Malcolm says I had been hiding with her ‘brother,’ whereas I had really been all the time with her sister, Miss Lucy Dickins—a fact of no importance except that she (Miss D.) might (if necessary) bear witness that I *had* really been with her all the time in the washhouse, and so could not have been near where I was seen.

“I remember we were all somewhat awed by what had happened, and that it broke up our game. I myself quite thought it was a warning of speedy death; but as I was not a nervous or excitable girl, it did not make me anxious or unhappy, and in course of time the impression passed off.

Writing to Mrs. Hawkins in September, 1884, Miss Dickins said:—

“Georgie [Mrs. Malcolm] is coming here on Friday, and I propose then to show her your letters, and Mr. Gurney’s, and that we should each write our impressions of what we saw independently, and see how far they agree, and we will send the result to you. It is all very fresh in my memory, and I can at this moment conjure you up in my mind’s eye, as you appeared under that tree and disappeared in the yard. I even recollect distinctly the dress you wore, a sort of brown and white, rather large check, such as was in fashion then, and is now, but was in abeyance in the intermediate years.”

Shortly afterwards Miss Dickins wrote:—

“Cherington, Shipston-on-Stour.

“September 29th, 1884.

“I send the two accounts which Georgie and I wrote about your apparition. We wrote them independently, and so I think they are wonderfully good evidence, as they tally to almost every particular, except the little fact that I thought she joined me in searching the yard for you, and she thinks not—but that has nothing to do with the main fact of the story, our entire belief that we saw you in the body.”

“In the autumn of 1845, we were a large party of young ones staying in the house, and on one occasion were playing at a species of hide-and-seek, in which we were allowed to move from one hiding-place to another, until caught by the opposite side. At the back of the house there was a small fold-yard opening on one side into the orchard, on the other into the stableyard, and there were other buildings to the left. I came round the corner of these buildings, and saw my cousin standing under some trees about 20 yards from me, and I distinctly saw her face; my sister, who at the moment appeared on the other side, also saw her and shouted to me to give chase. My cousin ran between us in the direction of the fold-yard, and when she reached the door we were both close behind her and followed instantly, but she had entirely disappeared, though scarcely a second had elapsed. We looked at one another in amazement, and searched every corner of the yard in vain; and when found some little time afterwards, she assured us that she had never been on that side of the house at all, or anywhere near the spot, but had remained hidden in the same place until discovered by one of the enemy.

“S. F. D.”

"I well remember the incident of your 'fetch' appearing to us. I believe I wrote down the details at the time, but do not know what has become of that record, so must trust to my memory to recall the circumstances, and do not fear its [not] being faithful though nearly 40 years have passed.

"We were playing our favourite game of Golowain, which consisted in dividing into sides at hide-and-seek, the party hiding having the privilege of moving on from place to place until they reached the 'Home,' unless meanwhile caught by the pursuing party.

"As I stood towards the end of the game, as a seeker, in the orchard, I saw you, who belonged to the opposite party, stealing toward me. As your dress was the same as your sister's, and there was the possibility of my mistaking you for her, who was on my side, I shouted her name, and she answered me from the opposite side of the wood. I then gave chase, and you turned, and looked at me laughing, and I saw your face distinctly. But at the same instant, Nina, also my friend, but your enemy, appeared round some corner, and being still nearer to you than I was, I left the glory of your capture to her. She was close upon you as you fled into a cow-yard. I was so sure your fate was sealed that I followed more slowly, and hearing the bell ring, that, according to the rules of our game, recalled us to the 'Home,' I went on there, to find Nina upbraiding you for having so mysteriously escaped her in this cow-yard.

"In astonishment you said you never had been near the place. Of course I supported my little sister in her assertion; whilst our brother supported *you*, saying he had been hiding with you, and that, being tired, you had both remained hidden in one place until the bell warned you that the game was over—that place being a washhouse in a distinct part of the premises from the cow or fold-yard, into which we believed we had chased you.

"G. M. (*née* Dickins)."

In answer to inquiries, both Miss Dickins and Mrs. Malcolm say that they have never had any other experience of visual hallucination.

Mrs. Hawkins continues:—

"The second appearance of my 'double' was in the spring (February or March) of 1847, at Leigh Rectory, in Essex, my father, the Rev. Robert Eden (now Primus of Scotland), being rector of the parish.

"The person who saw it was the nurserymaid. I am not quite sure of her name; but if, as I think, she was a certain 'Caroline,' she has been dead many years, therefore I can only give you my own very vivid recollections of her story, told with tears of agitation.

"But first I should mention that I had the mumps at that time, and was going about with my head tied up, and the only other person in the house who had it was my little brother, nearly 10 years younger than myself, who could not possibly be mistaken for me.

"On the first floor of Leigh Rectory there is a passage which runs the length of the house, terminated at one end by the door of a room that was then the nursery. One morning, about 10.30, 'Caroline' came out of the nursery, and, walking along the passage, had to pass a doorway opening on to the stairs which led down into the front hall. As she passed, she glanced down, and saw me (conspicuous by the white handkerchief round my head,

and facing her) come out of the drawing-room door and walk across the corner of the hall to the library. She proceeded along the passage, and, coming to the foot of the attic stairs, met our maid, who said to her, 'Do you know where Miss Eden is? I want to go to her room.' 'Oh yes,' answered Caroline, 'I just saw her go into the library. So they came together up to my room, which was one of the attics, and found me sitting there, where I had been for at least half an hour, writing a letter. After a moment's pause of astonishment, they fled, though I called to them to come in. When I went downstairs a few minutes afterwards, and reached the passage, I saw in the nursery a group of maids, all looking so perturbed that, instead of proceeding down the front stairs, I went on to the nursery and asked what was the matter. But as no one answered, and I saw the nurserymaid was crying, I thought they had been quarrelling, and went away, quite unconscious that it was on my account they were so disturbed.

"LUCY HAWKINS."

The following account is from Mrs. Hawkins' son:—

"June 20th, 1885.

"In the autumn of 1877, I was living at my father's house, Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds. The household consisted of my father, mother, three sisters, and three maid servants. One moonlight night I was sleeping in my room, and had been asleep some hours, when I was awakened by hearing a noise close to my head, like the chinking of money. My waking idea, therefore, was that a *man* was trying to take my money out of my trousers pocket, which lay on a chair close to the head of my bed. On opening my eyes, I was astonished to see a *woman*, and I well remember thinking with sorrow that it must be one of our servants who was trying to take my money. I mention these two thoughts to show that I was not thinking in the slightest degree of my mother. When my eyes had become more accustomed to the light, I was more than ever surprised to see that it was my *mother*,¹ dressed in a peculiar silver-grey dress, which she had originally got for a fancy ball. She was standing with both hands stretched out in front of her as if feeling her way; and in that manner moved slowly away from me, passing in front of the dressing-table, which stood in front of the curtained window, through which the moon threw a certain amount of light. Of course, my idea all this time was that she was walking in her sleep. On getting beyond the table she was lost to my sight in the darkness. I then sat up in bed, listening; but hearing nothing, and, on peering through the darkness, saw that the door, which was at the foot of my bed, and to get to which she would have had to pass in front of the light, was still shut. I then jumped out of bed, struck a light, and instead of finding my mother at the far end of the room, as I expected, found the room empty. I then for the first time supposed that it was an 'appearance,' and greatly dreaded that it signified her death.

"I might add that I had, at that time, quite forgotten that my mother had ever appeared to any one before, her last appearance having been about the year 1847, three years before I was born.

"EDWARD HAWKINS."

¹ This is an excellent instance of *delayed recognition*; cf. case 249 above, and Chap. xii., §§ 2 and 3.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. E. Hawkins says :—“ I can assure you that neither before nor since that time have I ever had any experience of the sort.”

The second account is from the Rev. T. L. Williams, Vicar of Porthleven, near Helston.

“ August 1st, 1884.

(255) “ Some years ago (I cannot give you any date, but you may rely on the facts), on one occasion when I was absent from home, my wife awoke one morning, and to her surprise and alarm saw my *είδωλον* standing by the bedside looking at her. In her fright she covered her face with the bedclothes, and when she ventured to look again the appearance was gone. On another occasion, when I was not absent from home, my wife went one evening to week-day evensong, and on getting to the churchyard gate, which is about 40 yards or so from the church door, she saw me, as she supposed, coming from the church in surplice and stole. I came a little way, she says, and turned round the corner of the building, when she lost sight of me. The idea suggested to her mind was that I was coming out of the church to meet a funeral at the gate. I was at the time in church in my place in the choir, where she was much surprised to see me when she entered the building. I have often endeavoured to shake my wife’s belief in the reality of her having seen what she thinks she saw. In the former case I have told her, ‘ You were only half awake and perhaps dreaming.’ But she always confidently asserts that she was broad awake, and is quite certain that she saw me. In the latter case she is equally confident.

“ My daughter also has often told me, and now repeats the story, that one day, when living at home before her marriage, she was passing my study door which was ajar, and looked in to see if I was there. She saw me sitting in my chair, and as she caught sight of me I stretched out my arms, and drew my hands across my eyes, a familiar gesture of mine, it appears. I was not in the house at the time, but out in the village. This happened many years ago, but my wife remembers that my daughter mentioned the circumstance to her at the time.

“ Now nothing whatever occurred at or about the times of these appearances to give any meaning to them. I was not ill, nor had anything unusual happened to me. I cannot pretend to offer any explanation, but simply state the facts as told me by persons on whose words I can depend.

“ There is one other thing which I may as well mention. A good many years ago there was a very devout young woman living in my parish, who used to spend much of her spare time in church in meditation and prayer. She used to assert that she frequently saw me standing at the altar, when I was certainly not there in the body. At first she was alarmed, but after seeing the appearance again and again she ceased to feel anything of terror. She is now a Sister of Mercy at Honolulu.

“ THOMAS LOCKYER WILLIAMS.”

[The circumstances, and the frequency, of this third percipient’s experiences decidedly favour the view that they were merely subjective.]

Mrs. Williams writes :—

“ June 20th, 1885.

“ As requested, I write to tell you what I saw on two occasions. I

am sorry that I am unable to give you the dates, even approximately, as many years have passed since I had the experiences referred to. On one occasion my husband was absent in Somersetshire, and on waking one morning I distinctly saw him standing by my bedside. I was much alarmed, and instinctively covered my face with the bedclothes. My friends have often tried to persuade me that I was not broad awake, but I am quite certain that I was, and that I really saw my husband's appearance.

"The other occasion was on a certain evening I was going to church, and on getting to the churchyard gate, which is about 20 yards from the door of the church, I saw my husband come out of the church in his surplice, walk a little way towards me, and then turn off round the church. I thought nothing of it until on entering the church I was startled at seeing him in his place in the choir, about to conduct the service. It was then broad daylight, and I am quite sure that I saw the appearance. Nothing whatever occurred after either of these appearances, and, of course, I can in no way account for them.

"EMMA WILLIAMS."

In reply to the question whether his wife or daughter had ever experienced any other hallucination of the senses, Mr. Williams replies confidently in the negative.

The following account is from Miss Hopkinson, of 37, Woburn Place, W.C. It will be seen that in this case and the next, the evidence is not first-hand from any of the percipients; nor are the cases strictly covered by the rule (Vol. I., p. 148) which admits to the body of this work the evidence of persons to whom the percipient's experience has been described before the arrival of news of the agent's exceptional condition.¹ But that there was here no such exceptional condition does not in any way increase the probability that the narrator has imagined that she was informed of experiences of which in fact she was not informed. And the news that some one has had a waking vision of *oneself* being calculated to make rather a special impression on the mind and memory, the agent in these instances is at any rate in a different position from an ordinary second-hand witness.

"February 20th, 1886. *London*

(256) "In the course of my life I have been accused four times of appearing to people; neither can I account for those supposed visits."

Asked to give details, and to obtain corroboration, Miss Hopkinson replied:—

"It would be really quite excusable if you did not believe one word of my statements. I can get you no further information to support them. In the first instance of my supposed appearance, which happened

¹ Miss Hopkinson's case, however, as regards one incident in it—the third—is not even an apparent exception to the rule.

some years ago, the young lady died very shortly afterwards. Her parents, too, are also dead. In the second, I gave the gentleman on whom I called to understand that he had made a mistake—I could not ask him about it now. In the third, though the lady only a day or two ago repeated to me her original account of my visit to her, she totally declined writing it out for me, or letting me use her name, on the idea, which I find very common, that these sort of things are irreligious. The fourth time rather differed from the others; but the young lady in that case died soon after. I am conscious that in all these cases I was thinking intensely of the individuals.”

The following are the fuller details:—

“Case 1 occurred many years ago. A young lady, sleeping in a house next door to the one I was in, declared that I visited her during the night when she was lying awake, and that I performed some slight service for her. She was so positive in her statements that my denial was not believed by those around her. I was perfectly certain I had never left my room, nor could I have done so without its being known. I will not draw on my memory for further particulars; I might be wrong after so long a time.

“Case 2. Seven years ago. I had gone into the City (a place I always avoid) on a small matter of business connected with a relative of mine, and I was very anxious he should know nothing about it; my thoughts therefore were occupied by him. I was almost startled from my reverie by the clock of Bow Church striking 3. In the evening I saw my relative, and the first thing he said was, ‘L., where did you go to-day? I saw you come in to my place, but you passed my office and I don’t know what became of you.’ I said, ‘At what time were you ridiculous enough to think I should call upon you?’ ‘As the clock struck 3,’ he replied. I turned the subject—nor have I ever reverted to it since. This gentleman knew my dress and general appearance most intimately. Of course, I was not likely to visit him except on business, and by appointment.

“Case 3. About 6 years ago. I was staying in a country town 100 miles from London, at a busy, matter-of-fact home, with bright young people. One morning I came down to breakfast oppressed with a sensation I could not understand nor shake off. It resolved itself towards the afternoon in an absorbing thought of a relative in London, and I then wrote to ask her what she was doing. But a letter from her crossed mine, to ask me the same question. When I next saw her she told me what only last week she exactly repeated again: she was sitting quietly working, when the door opened, and I walked in, looking as usual; and though she believed I was miles away, she concluded I had come back, and did not realise to the contrary till I turned and walked out of the room.

“Case 4. Four years ago. A young lady asserted I stood at the bottom of her bed (she was not well at the time) and told her distinctly to get up and dress herself, and that I thought her well enough to do so. She obeyed. I told her she was quite mistaken; I had done nothing of the sort. She evidently thought I was denying the fact for some reason. I was about 20 minutes’ walk from this young lady’s room at the time.

She was perfectly clear in her statement; and I would not argue the point with her. Her illness was not in the least mental.

“LOUISA HOPKINSON.”

The next account is from Mrs. Stone, of Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport.

“1883.

(257) “On three occasions, each time by different persons, I have been seen when not present in the body. The first instance that I was thus seen was by my sister-in-law, who was sitting up with me, the night after the birth of my first child. She looked towards the bed where I was sleeping, and distinctly saw me and my double; the first my natural body, the second spiritualised and fainter; several times she shut her eyes, but on opening them there was still the same appearance, and the vision only faded away after some little time. She thought it a sign of my death. I did not hear of it for many months.

“The second instance was by my niece; she was staying with us at Dorchester. It was rather early on a spring morning; she opened her bedroom door, and saw me ascending the flight of steps opposite her room, fully dressed in the mourning black gown, white collar, and cap, which I was then wearing for my mother-in-law. She did not speak, but saw me, as she thought, go into the nursery. At breakfast she said to her uncle, ‘My aunt was up early this morning, I saw her go into the nursery.’ ‘Oh! no, Jane,’ my husband answered, ‘she was not very well, and is going to have her breakfast before coming down.’

“The third instance was the most remarkable. We had a small house at Weymouth, where we occasionally went for the sea. A Mrs. Samways waited on us when there, and took care of the house in our absence; she was a nice quiet woman, thoroughly trustworthy, the aunt of my dear old servant Kitty Balston, then living with us at Dorchester. She had written to her aunt the day before the vision occurred, telling her of the birth of my youngest child, and that I was going on well. The next night Mrs. Samways went to a meeting-house, near Clarence Buildings; she was a Baptist. Before leaving, she locked an inner door leading into a small courtyard behind the house, and the street-door after her, carrying both keys in her pocket. On her return, unlocking the street-door, she perceived a light at the end of the passage, and on going nearer saw, as she thought, the yard-door open. The light showed the yard and everything in it, but in the midst she clearly recognised me, in white garments, looking very pale and worn. She was terribly frightened, rushed into a neighbour’s house (Captain Court’s), and dropped in the passage. After recovering, Captain Court went with her into the house, which was exactly as she had left it, and the yard-door securely locked. I was taken very faint about the same time, and lingered for many weeks, hovering between life and death.”¹

¹ Taken in connection with these instances, the following experience of Mrs. Stone’s own is of considerable interest. (See Vol. i., p. 553, note.)

“When about 9 or 10 years old I was sent to a school in Dorchester as a day boarder; it was here my first curious experience occurred that I can clearly remember. I was in an upper room in the school, standing with some others, in a class opposite our teacher, Miss Mary Lock; suddenly I found myself by her side, and looking towards the class saw myself distinctly—a slim, pale girl, in a white frock and pinafore. I felt a strong anxiety

Professor Sidgwick has visited Mrs. Stone, and after thoroughly questioning her on her narrative, he writes (September 23rd, 1884):—
 “She certainly understands thoroughly the importance of accuracy. She said she had heard of her apparition direct from the seers, in the two first cases mentioned. She had never heard of her sister-in-law having had any other hallucination before this time (1833) or afterwards, until very lately, when she has had an apparition of a dead person. She is old, and Mrs. Stone is unwilling to trouble her on the matter. Nor does she think that her niece, Jane Studley (who is dead), ever had any other hallucination. As regards the third instance, Mrs. Stone only heard it after her recovery, from Kitty Balston, whose account—as repeated by Mrs. Stone—was that Mrs. Stone was taken ill in the evening, or rather just before the evening, and was quite unconscious at the time when she was seen by Mrs. Samways.”

[In the last of Mrs. Stone's cases, we should naturally conclude that the appearance, if telepathic, was connected with her illness; but the other two appearances seem to have been purely casual. Possibly, however, the first may have been due to her sister-in-law's failing to focus the two eyes together, which is a common infirmity in some cases of debility; but we should expect a person who suffered in this way to be aware that she was in the habit of seeing objects double.]

The remaining account is from Mr. Gorham Blake,¹ mining engineer, now residing at Loudsville, White Co., Georgia, U.S.A., and was sent to Professor Barrett in the summer of 1884. Mr. Blake begins with an account of long-continued success in alleviating pain by hypnotic processes—a success which he attributes in great measure to abstinence from stimulants, and to the fact that his profession has necessitated much active exercise in the open air. He then narrates the following cases, in all of which (except the first, where the percipient's experience was not sensory in character) the agency, if such it was, seems to have been purely casual.

(258) “In 1869, I crossed the great Humboldt (40 mile) desert, in the State of Nevada, for the sixth time, alone, in the saddle; by an accident my horse, a wild mustang, escaped, leaving me at 10 a.m. on foot in that ankle-deep alkali sand, under the blazing July sun, and twenty miles from a drop of water, except that in my saddle-bags on my horse. Hours were spent in the chase for my horse. Then I tried to shoot him, but he escaped, leaving me exhausted, sunstruck, dizzy, and finally helplessly dying on the hot shadeless alkali, about noon. I passed the agony of death by thirst, heat, and exhaustion, and became insensible. It was rarely

to get back, as it were, but it seemed a violent and painful effort, almost struggle, when accomplished. I was much frightened, but did not mention it till many years after.”

I may mention that Mrs. Stone's daughter has had a similar experience; so that here is perhaps another example of hereditary tendency.

¹ In the case of foreign informants whose personal acquaintance we have been unable to make, we have taken pains to assure ourselves as to their character and position. I mention this because the absence of testimonials has led some persons to imagine that we accept accounts without criticism or inquiry.

a traveller passed that way in that season, the track marked only by the bones of dead animals. A chance traveller came, saw my horse, and found me insensible, laid me in the shade of his waggon, and bathed me with water and vinegar until I came back to life. He lassoed my horse, and at sundown I mounted and rode to the settlements. Between 2.30 and 3 o'clock that afternoon one of my sensitive lady friends in Boston, Massachusetts (2,600 miles distant), while talking with her husband, suddenly threw up her hands and said, 'Mr. Blake is dead,' and could not be reconciled to the contrary. She persuaded her husband to visit my father in the same city, and learn where I was, &c. Two years after (in 1871) I visited the friends, and was immediately asked, 'Where were you two years ago, the last week in July?' On comparing notes, and allowing for the difference in time, we concluded that at the time I became insensible in the desert my lady friend received the intelligence. I know I thought of the lady and her husband while lying on the sand, as we were long dear friends."

The percipient in this case, Mrs. Copp, and her husband, are dead. But I have copied the following extract from a letter (dated Boston, Dec. 19, 1885) written to Mr. Gorham Blake by Mrs. Dresser, who was one of their most intimate friends. She says: "It is written just as I remember Mrs. Copp and the Captain telling us on their side." Mrs. Dresser's account begins by describing how the friendship between the Copsps and Mr. Blake began, through the latter's care of Captain Copp in a dangerous illness on board ship.

"In the year 186—[she is not sure of the date] Mr. B. had not been in Massachusetts for years. One day Mrs. C. was talking cheerfully with her sister about trifling matters, and, while walking across the room, holding a dish with both hands, suddenly the dish and contents were dropped on the floor, and at the same instant she exclaimed, 'Oh, dear! B. is dead!' Her sister, surprised, said, 'What do you mean?' The answer was, 'I don't know.' But again, in the same impulsive way, she cried out, 'Oh, he is dead!' She could give no reason why she said this, only that she was *made* to do it. This fact impressed her so sadly, and also her husband when he was told of it, although it was inexplicable, that they agreed to write down the date, so that they could refer to it should occasion require. A month afterwards, Captain C. inquired by letter of Mr. B.'s brother what news had been received from California, but gave no reasons for this inquiry. 'Yes,' was the reply, 'we have just heard from there; and he was in good health.' After this report Captain C. and wife did not trouble themselves about the above incident.

"It so happened that in that same autumn Mr. B. visited Massachusetts; and these friends were among the first seen. After a mutual interchange of the news which had occurred, Captain C. happened to remember that curious incident, and inquired at once, 'B., what were you doing one day last——? Were you sick at the time?' B. replied, 'No, I was well—nothing was the matter with me.' But after further inquiry about the time, Mrs. C. consulted the record she had made of the exact date when the event happened, and then told him of her peculiar experience,"—whereupon Mr. B. narrated his adventure, of which Mrs. Dresser's version agrees with his own description above.

[It will be seen that the discrepancies between the two accounts are very trifling.]

Mr. Blake continues :—

“In the year 1870 I was in Cambridge, Massachusetts, near Boston, and had an occasional correspondence with Miss S., an American, then residing in Europe. I received a letter from her, dated Mürzzuschlag, August 6th, 1870, in which she says : ‘Yesterday I sat alone in my room, arranging my herbarium, till I was very tired, but there was such a fascination in the work that I did not seem able to break the spell and leave it ; but of a sudden someone touched my shoulder with such force that I immediately turned. You were as plainly to be seen as if in the body, and I said, “Why, Mr. Blake, are you really here ?” and directed by you I laid aside my work, and went to the woods. I do not know that my mind was upon you at the time. I tried to trace the influence to a concentration of thought upon you, but failed to do it. Whether it was your letter, your spirit, or my imagination, certainly it was a reality to me.’ I wrote for more particulars. She answered : ‘Vienna, Austria, 23rd October, 1870. In explanation of your coming to me, I heard your voice, or a voice, speak my name. I turned, and you stood near me. I arose as if it were a reality, and as I turned again you were gone ; and yet before I did that it seemed many minutes, for I said, “Is it you ?” and you replied, “Do you not know me ?” and then you said, “I have come because you are tired, for you to go to the woods and rest yourself,” and, as I told you, I obeyed the summons, and wished that I could have a tangible evidence of your companionship.’ My diary does not record any dream or thought of Miss S. on August 5th, 1870. I was at home, and quiet, and under good conditions for such a visit as that described by Miss S.

“In November, 1883, being in New York, I was in correspondence with Mrs. G., who was residing in San Francisco. A letter written by her in November, says : ‘Last evening, I saw you distinctly standing by my side ; you seemed trying to speak, but did not ; you made passes over me, and I felt your influence plainly ; you were here several minutes, then disappeared.’

“In another letter she wrote : ‘You came to me yesterday afternoon, in Market Street, at the corner of Stockton Street, you crossed the street with me. I turned to speak with you, and you were gone. I have seen you many times in this way.’

“While Mrs. G. has been sitting in a room, sewing and conversing, I, being in a room 40 feet distant, have willed, or asked, that she come to me, and she instantly broke off the conversation, came to my room, knocked, and on my asking her to come in she opened the door, entered, and seemed a little confused, and said, ‘Well, I don’t know what I came in here for.’ I have had many instances of this kind.”

Mr. Blake has forwarded to us the following letter, written to him by the Mrs. G. of these last incidents. It will be seen that she is to some extent predisposed to hallucination, which of course weakens these items of the evidence.

“San Francisco, Cal.

“March 22nd, 1885.

“DEAR SIR,—You ask me to narrate the circumstances under which

I saw you, as I wrote you in November, 1883. At that time I was in my room in San Francisco, Cal., and I saw you distinctly standing by my side. It was about 11 o'clock p.m. You seemed trying to speak, but did not. You made passes over me, the influence of which I plainly felt. You remained several minutes, then disappeared.

"Another time you came to me at 12 o'clock, while I was walking on Market Street, near the corner of Stockton. You crossed the street with me. I turned to speak with you, but you had disappeared. I have seen you several times that way, as I have three other persons whom I know to be alive and in good health.—Yours truly, "MARY A. GORDON."

Mr. Blake continues :—

"On September 28th, 1870, I arrived in New York from Boston about 7 o'clock a.m., having with me a valise and umbrella. I went to Dr. P.'s house on Fourth Avenue, rang the bell, and Dr. P. came to the door, when the following conversation took place :—Blake : 'Good morning. Can you accommodate me with a room?' Dr. P. : 'Yes, but why didn't you come in last evening?' B. : 'Because I was in Boston last evening.' P. : 'Why you called here last evening!' B. : 'That's impossible, for I have just arrived on the boat this morning.' P. ; 'I certainly saw you here last evening. You asked for a room. I asked you to walk in ; you turned and went away. I thought it strange, and that you must have misunderstood me. I think my wife saw you too.' Turning to his wife : 'Did you see Mr. B. last evening?' Mrs. P. : 'Yes, he was standing at the door with a valise in one hand and umbrella in the other ; then turned and went away. I saw him as I passed through the hall.'¹ B. : 'It's a mistake, or my double, for you can see by my diary that I was in Boston yesterday, and the business I attended to.'

"I left my baggage in the room and went down town, returning in the evening. Dr. P. called me into the parlour, where I met an acquaintance, Dr. C. Dr. P. immediately said, 'Another witness on our side. Dr. C. saw you down town last evening.' 'Yes,' said Dr. C., 'I saw you walking along Broadway. You seemed to be in a hurry, and I was in a hurry to catch the ferry-boat ; I bowed to you, and you returned it, and hurried on. You had a valise in your right hand and umbrella in your left hand, and had on a high silk hat, while I have seen you before in a felt hat, low crowned.' We all concluded it was my double, as at about the hour they saw me, 6 p.m., I was resting quietly aboard the boat before she left, and remembered thinking where I should take a room after getting to New York in the morning ; but I did not remember the particulars related by Dr. and Mrs. P., or Dr. C. I think I fell into a doze, or short sleep, while resting, as has been the case several other times when *my double* has been seen at a distance from where my body was.

"GORHAM BLAKE."

The first-hand testimony of the percipients is of course much needed, and I explained to Mr. Gorham Blake the importance of obtaining it. He has made efforts to do so, but cannot ascertain the present addresses of the persons concerned. He writes —

¹ It will be observed that this hallucination (if such it was, and not a mere case of mistaken identity) was *collective*, as also was the first experience described in case 254. The discussion of this feature is reserved for Chap. xviii.

“I enclose the only two papers on the subject that I can now find; one from Mrs. Gordon [quoted above], and one from Mrs. Gould, that I did not before write of. In connection with the latter I will say that I called at the *Light for Thinkers* office, Atlanta, Georgia, and saw Mrs. Gould for the first time. She said she had seen my face before, and told me as related in enclosed paper. She was not feeling well, and I held her hands, and placed mine on her head to impart magnetism, and relieved her. I saw her two or three times while in the city, and received the enclosed from her after my return home.”

The enclosure is as follows:—

“April, 1885.

“One day, while resting, I happened to glance towards a window, in the fifth story, and, just outside, beheld the spirit¹ of my friend, Mr. Blake, who seemed unable to get into the room; but, on rising and throwing up the sash, he appeared to come in and stand by my chair, make passes over me, magnetising me, and seeming to envelope me with something, just as a spider does a fly in its web. Before this, in fact some three or four weeks before I had ever met or seen him, while in a passive mood, I saw his head clairvoyantly, so distinctly that when he came to my office for the first time I recognised him as the person. And although he was at these times alive and well, I saw and recognised his presence as distinctly as though he had been there in form.

“C. E. GOULD.”

[The last incident cannot, of course, carry much weight, as the recognition was a completely retrospective act; and as regards Mrs. Gould's other experience, the fact that Mr. Blake had been hypnotising her must perhaps be regarded as favouring the hypothesis of a purely subjective hallucination. At the same time, I am not aware of any sufficient evidence that hypnotic treatment induces a liability to hallucinations representing the hypnotiser, unless that hallucination has been specially imposed on the “subject's mind—as any other might be—while in the state of trance.]

Another foreign example is omitted, as we have been unable to obtain the testimony of the percipients. It is clear that the fact of the telepathic transference in these casual cases cannot be considered to be proved;² but the mention of the type here may serve to elicit further instances.

§ 6. Of the other class mentioned, where peculiarities of dress or aspect afford the only presumption that a hallucination was more than purely subjective—*i.e.*, was due to an absent agent who, nevertheless, was in a perfectly normal state at the time—the following examples may serve.³ The first is from Captain A. S. Beaumont, of 1, Crescent Road, South Norwood Park.

¹ See p. 48, note.

² The class, it may be remembered, is the second of the four types of “ambiguous cases” defined in Vol. i., p. 505.

³ As regards the connection of these appearances with the agent's sub-conscious sense of his own aspect, I need not repeat the remarks already made (Chap. xii., § 8) in respect of the far stronger group where there were similar peculiarities *plus* some exceptional condition of the agent.

“February 24th, 1885.

(259) “About September, 1873, when my father was living at 57, Inverness Terrace, I was sitting one evening, about 8.30 p.m., in the large dining-room. At the table, facing me, with their backs to the door, were seated my mother, sister, and a friend, Mrs. W. Suddenly I seemed to see my wife bustling in through the door of the back dining-room, which was in view from my position. She was in a *mauve* dress. I got up to meet her, though much astonished, as I believed her to be at Tenby. As I rose, my mother said, ‘Who is that?’ not (I think) seeing anyone herself, but seeing that I did. I exclaimed, ‘Why, it’s Carry,’ and advanced to meet her. As I advanced, the figure disappeared.¹ On inquiry, I found that my wife was spending that evening at a friend’s house, in a *mauve* dress, which I had most certainly never seen. I had never seen her dressed in that colour. My wife recollected that at that time she was talking with some friends about me, much regretting my absence, as there was going to be dancing, and I had promised to play for them. I had been unexpectedly detained in London.

“ALEX. S. BEAUMONT.”

The following corroboration is from the friend who was present :—

“11, Grosvenor Street, W.

“March 5th, 1885.

“As far as I can recollect, Captain Beaumont was sitting talking, when he looked up, and gave a start. His mother asked him what was the matter. He replied, ‘I saw my wife walk across the end of the room, but that is nothing; she often appears to people; her servants have seen her several times.’ The room we were in was a double dining-room, one end was lit with gas, and the other, where Mrs. Beaumont appeared, was comparatively dark. No one else saw her except her husband. Mrs. Beaumont was at the time in Wales, and this happened in Inverness Terrace, Bayswater.

“FLORENCE WHIPHAM.”

Mrs. Beaumont says :—

“I distinctly remember hearing from my husband, either the next day or the second day after his experience; and in his letter he asked, ‘What were you doing at such an hour on such a night?’ I was able to recall that I was standing in a group of friends, and that we were regretting his absence. I was in a *mauve* dress, which I am confident that he could never have seen.²

“C. BEAUMONT.”

¹ The disappearance of the figure on sudden speech or movement is a feature which occurs both in subjective and telepathic phantasms, and there could not well be a clearer indication of the hallucinatory character of the latter. In my large collection of subjective cases I have only three or four distinct instances, *e.g.*, the first narrative in Chap. xii., § 2; but then it is only in a few cases that the percipient, by speaking or distinctly moving, has afforded the condition. The point was one of those observed in Dr. Jessopp’s well-known case (*Athenæum* for Jan. 10, 1880). For telepathic examples, see cases 26, 159, 163, 178, 192, 196, 201, 214, 241, 540.

² A similar case is described by Miss E. M. Churchill, of 9, Eversley Park, Chester, who, in October, 1883, when at lunch, had a visual hallucination representing an absent sister.

“I remember remarking at the time that I thought I saw my sister all in brown, and that she had nothing of that colour as far as I knew. A few days afterwards I received a letter from another sister, in which she mentioned that my younger sister and she had

Captain Beaumont adds that he has never had any other hallucination of the senses except on the occasion next described. This other case, in which the same agent and percipient were concerned, and a third case appended to it (in which the sameness of agent and difference of percipient recall the *repetitions* of the preceding section), would be quite without evidential value if they stood alone; but they are of interest in connection with the foregoing stronger example.

“February 24th, 1885.

(260) “In 1871 I was staying at Norton House, Tenby, for the first time, and had just gone to bed, and was wide awake. I had the candle on my right side, and was reading. At the foot of the bed and to the right was a door, which was locked, and, as I learnt afterwards, pasted up on the other side.

“Through this I saw the figure of my future wife (the lady of the house) enter, draped in white from head to foot. Oddly enough, I was not specially startled. My idea was that some one was ill, and that she had come to get something out of the room. I averted my head, and when I looked up again the apparition was gone. I suppose that I saw it for two or three seconds.

“ALEX. S. BEAUMONT.”

Mrs. Beaumont says :—

“February 24th, 1885.

“In 1872, two or three months after my marriage, Captain Beaumont and I returned from London to Tenby. I went up into my dressing-room and gave the keys of my luggage to my servant, Ellen Bassett. I was standing before the looking-glass with my back turned to her, and I heard her utter a little sharp cry. I turned round, saying, ‘What’s the matter?’ and saw her with my nightcap in her hand. She said, ‘O, nothing, nothing,’ and I went downstairs. The day after, my husband saw her taking off the paper which pasted up the door between my bedroom and

been getting new winter things, and were dressed in brown from head to foot. I think I was quite well at the time, but my sister was ill, which I was not aware of for some weeks afterwards.”

Miss Churchill has often had slight momentary hallucinations, as of some one at her side; but says that this one was far the most distinct that she has ever experienced. But brown is, of course, a common colour, and the case is only worth quoting in connection with the one in the text.

The following is a dream-case of the same type, which has been narrated to Mr. Myers by both the persons concerned. The narrator is Mrs. W.

“Mrs. P., a friend of Mrs. W., was staying in Devonshire, and one night had a curious dream about Mrs. W. She dreamt that she (Mrs. P.) came into the drawing-room in Mrs. W.’s house at T., and had not been many minutes in the room, before Mrs. W. came in in a loose, red dress, looking very ill. Mrs. P. said to her, ‘How very ill you look!’ Mrs. W. then answered she had been very unwell, and was then rather better. Mrs. P. thought this dream odd, and mentioned it to her friends. About a week after, she came on a visit to Mrs. W., and while she was sitting in the drawing-room, mentioned the dream, and pointing to a rose-coloured flower, remarked that was the exact shade of the dress worn in the dream. After comparing notes as to the date, they found that on the day of Mrs. P.’s dream Mrs. W. had been very unwell, and had worn a dressing-gown of the exact shade almost all day. The chief peculiarity in this is, that Mrs. P. had never seen her friend in any colour, Mrs. W. always wearing black, so if she had thought of Mrs. W. naturally it would be in black.”

the dressing-room. He said, 'What are you doing?' She said she was opening that door. He said, 'Why, the first night that I slept in this house, I saw your mistress walk through that door.' (I must explain that Captain Beaumont had been a guest in this house on a good many occasions before our marriage. On the occasion mentioned, he had imagined that perhaps someone was ill in the house, and that I had entered his room to get something, thinking him sure to be asleep.) Then the maid told him that she had seen me the night before we came home—she did not know exactly what day we were coming, and had been sleeping in the same bed as he had been in when he saw me. She was just going to step into bed, when she saw me enter 'through the door,'¹ with a nightcap on, and a candle in my hand. She was so terrified that she rushed out of the room by the other door, and told the other servants she was sure I was dead. They comforted her as well as they could, but she would not return to the room. The cause of her crying out, when I heard her do so, was that, in unpacking, she recognised the identical nightcap that the apparition had worn. The curious point is that the nightcap was one that I had bought in London, and had not mentioned to her, and was perfectly unlike any that I had ever worn before. It had three frills. I had been accustomed to wear nightcaps of coloured muslin without frills.

"The same servant, some months after the nightcap incident, went into the kitchen and said to the other servants, 'We shall have news of missus to-day; I've just seen her standing in the dining-room door; she had on a black velvet bonnet and black cloak.' (We had been in London some weeks.) This occurred about 9 o'clock a.m. About 10.30 she received a telegram from us to say we should be home that evening; the telegram was sent from Paddington Station as we waited for our train. The bonnet and cloak had been bought in town without her knowledge.

"The maid was with me for years, and was certainly not nervous or hysterical. I have now parted with her for some years.

"C. BEAUMONT."

The next case is from Mrs. Murray Gladstone, of Shedfield Cottage, Botley, Hants.

"January 18th, 1886.

(261) "I went on Saturday afternoon [last] to see an old man and woman named Bedford, who live in a cottage about half a mile from our house. Mrs. Bedford was ill in bed, and I went upstairs to see her. I sat down by the bedstead, and talked to her for a few minutes. Whilst I was there, the thought struck me that the light from the window, which was opposite the foot of the bed, was too strong for the invalid; and I determined, without saying a word about it to either Mr. or Mrs. Bedford, to give her a curtain. This (Monday) afternoon I again went to see the old couple; but this time I only saw Mr. Bedford in the room downstairs. And after a few remarks he said, 'My wife has seen you yesterday (Sunday) morning; she turned her head towards the side of the bed and said, "Is that her?"' (I did not speak, as I thought she was dreaming.) "Yes," she went on, "it is Mrs. Gladstone, and she is holding up a curtain with both her hands" (imitating the posture), "but she says it is not long enough. Then

¹ See Vol. i., p. 432, note.

she smiled and disappeared.” When Mr. Bedford had told me the above, I exclaimed, ‘That is just what I did yesterday morning whilst I was dressing. I went to a cupboard in my room, and took out a piece of serge, which I thought would answer the purpose, and held it up with both hands to see the length, and said to myself, “It is not long enough.”’ I may mention that I had only once before been to visit Mrs. Bedford, about a year ago, before I went on Saturday; and, of course, both times wore my walking dress. But when seen by Mrs. Bedford in this vision, she particularly noticed that I wore no bonnet, which must have been the case, as this occurred before 9 o’clock.

“AUGUSTA GLADSTONE.”

Mrs. Gladstone adds :—

“Mrs. B. described me as being in white, and I asked her what I had on my head. She said, ‘A thing like this’—taking hold of a woollen cap which I had given her. It was the fac-simile of one which I must have had on at the time; and they were not common, for I had knitted them of wool and of a particular shape.”

Mrs. Bedford has had one other hallucination, when she saw the figure of a young grandchild standing by her bedside. This, however, happened at night, and may have been half a dream.

When Mrs. Bedford described her experience to the present writer, she did not use the word *curtain*, and she did not recall the *remark* about the stuff not being long enough; which suggested that these items might have crept into the narrative *after* Mrs. Gladstone’s side of the affair had been related. Mr. Bedford is, however, positive that they formed part of what his wife told him at the time, and before he saw Mrs. Gladstone; and Mrs. Gladstone is equally positive that they were included in his account to her, and also that she has herself heard of them from Mrs. Bedford.

The next example is from Colonel Bigge, of 2, Morpeth Terrace, S.W., who took the account out of a sealed envelope, in my presence, for the first time since it was written on the day of the occurrence.

(262) “An account of a circumstance which occurred to me when quartered at Templemore, Co. Tipperary, on 20 February, 1847.

“This afternoon, about 3 o’clock p.m., I was walking from my quarters towards the mess-room to put some letters into the letter-box, when I distinctly saw Lieut.-Colonel Reed, 70th Regiment, walking from the corner of the range of buildings occupied by the officers towards the mess-room door; and I saw him go into the passage. He was dressed in a brown shooting jacket, with grey summer regulation tweed trousers, and had a fishing rod and a landing-net in his hand. Although at the time I saw him he was about 15 or 20 yards from me, and although anxious to speak to him at the moment, I did not do so, but followed him into the passage and turned into the ante-room on the left-hand side, where I expected to find him. On opening the door, to my great surprise, he was not there; the only person in the room was Quartermaster Nolan, 70th Regiment, and I immediately asked him if he had seen the colonel, and he replied he had not; upon which I said, ‘I suppose he has gone upstairs,’ and I immediately left the room. Thinking he might have gone

upstairs to one of the officer's rooms, I listened at the bottom of the stairs and then went up to the first landing place ; but not hearing anything I went downstairs again and tried to open the bedroom door, which is opposite to the ante-room, thinking he might have gone there ; but I found the door locked, as it usually is in the middle of the day. I was very much surprised at not finding the colonel, and I walked into the barrack-yard and joined Lieutenant Caulfield, 66th Regiment, who was walking there ; and I told the story to him, and particularly described the dress in which I had seen the colonel. We walked up and down the barrack-yard talking about it for about 10 minutes, when, to my great surprise, never having kept my eye from the door leading to the mess-room (there is only one outlet from it), I saw the colonel walk into the barracks through the gate—which is in the opposite direction—accompanied by Ensign Willington, 70th Regiment, in precisely the same dress in which I had seen him, and with a fishing-rod and a landing-net in his hand. Lieutenant Caulfield and I immediately walked to them, and we were joined by Lieut.-Colonel Goldie, 66th Regiment, and Captain Hartford, and I asked Colonel Reed if he had not gone into the mess-room about 10 minutes before. He replied that he certainly had not, for that he had been out fishing for more than two hours at some ponds about a mile from the barracks, and that he had not been near the mess-room at all since the morning.

“ At the time I saw Colonel Reed going into the mess-room, I was not aware that he had gone out fishing—a very unusual thing to do at this time of the year ; neither had I seen him before in the dress I have described during that day. I had seen him in uniform in the morning at parade, but not afterwards at all until 3 o'clock—having been engaged in my room writing letters, and upon other business. My eyesight being very good, and the colonel's figure and general appearance somewhat remarkable, it is morally impossible that I could have mistaken any other person in the world for him. That I *did* see him I shall continue to believe until the last day of my existence.

“ WILLIAM MATTHEW BIGGE,
“ Major, 70th Regiment.”

On July 17th, 1885, after Colonel Bigge had described the occurrence, but before the account was taken from the envelope and read, he was good enough to dictate the following remarks to me :—

“ When Colonel R. got off the car about a couple of hours afterwards, Colonel Goldie and other officers said to me, ‘ Why that's the very dress you described.’ They had not known where he was or how he was engaged. The month, February, was a most unlikely one to be fishing in. Colonel Reed was much alarmed when told what I had seen.

“ The quartermaster, sitting at the window, would have been bound to see a real figure ; he denied having seen anything.

“ I have never had the slightest hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.”

[It will be seen that these recent remarks exhibit two slips of memory. It is quite unimportant whether Colonel Reed was seen walking in at the gate or getting off a car. But in making the interval between the vision and the return two hours instead of ten minutes, the later account unduly diminishes the force of the case. If there is any justification at all for the

provisional hypothesis that the sense of impending arrival is a condition favourable for the emission of a telepathic influence, it is of importance that, at the time when the phantasmal form was seen, Colonel Reed was not busy with his fishing, but was rapidly approaching his destination ; for thus the incident, at any rate, gets the benefit of analogy with other cases. This illustrates what was said above (Vol. I., p. 131), that where memory errs, it is not always in the direction of exaggeration.]

§ 7. The last case quoted might equally well serve as an example of the next and concluding group, the peculiarity of which is that the real person whom the phantasm represents is—unknown to the percipient—actually approaching. When these “arrival cases” were referred to above (Vol. I., p. 517), it was noted that the mere sense of returning home cannot be held to constitute an abnormality in the least degree parallel to death, or the other recognised conditions of spontaneous telepathy ; and our first-hand specimens are in themselves too few for complete assurance that we have in them a genuine type of transfer. At the same time they find a parallel in the *impression*-cases quoted in Vol. I., pp. 252-4 ; and taken in connection with the two preceding groups, they at any rate increase the probability that impressions from a *normal* agent may be occasionally capable of acting as the germ of a telepathic phantasm.

The first example is from Mr. James Carroll, who gave the account quoted in Vol. I., p. 281. The agent was the same twin-brother who was concerned in that former case.

“September, 1884.

(263) “In the autumn of 1877, while at Sholebrook Lodge, Towcester, Northamptonshire, one night, at a little after 10 o'clock, I remember I was about to move a lamp in my room to a position where I usually sat a little while before retiring to bed, when I suddenly saw a vision of my brother. It seemed to affect me like a mild shock of electricity. It surprised me so that I hesitated to carry out what I had intended, my eyes remaining fixed on the apparition of my brother. It gradually disappeared, leaving me wondering what it meant. I am positive no light or reflection deceived me. I had not been sleeping or rubbing my eyes. I was again in the act of moving my lamp when I heard taps along the window. I looked towards it—the window was on the ground-floor—and heard a voice, my brother's, say, ‘It's I ; don't be frightened.’ I let him in ; he remarked, ‘How cool you are ; I thought I should have frightened you.’

“The fact was, that the distinct vision of my brother had quite prepared me for his call. He found the window by accident, as he had never been to the house before ; to use his own words, ‘I thought it was your window, and that I should find you.’ He had unexpectedly left London to pay me a visit, and when near the house lost his way, and had found his way in the dark to the back of the place.”

In reply to inquiries, Mr. Carroll says :—

“You are quite right in supposing the hallucination of my brother to be the only instance in my experience.”

In another letter, Mr. Carroll says :—

“As to the apparition of my brother in Northamptonshire, at a place and window where he had never before been,—I think I said the room was very light indeed, the night very dark. Even had I looked out of the window I could not have seen him. With my head turned from the window, I distinctly saw his face. I was affected and surprised. It seemed like a slight shock of electricity. I had not recovered from the effects when the second surprise came, the reality—my brother. I did not mention the subject to him then, being rather flattered at his astonishment at my cool demeanour. The coolness was caused by the apparition first of him. The window my brother came to was at the back of the house. He found my window out only by accident, or, as he said, he thought it was my window.”

[Mr. Carroll is a clear-headed and careful witness. He is quite positive as to this being his only experience of a hallucination. In conversation, he stated that there were no mirrors in the room, and that the figure was seen *not* in the direction of the window. He thinks that the interval between the hallucination and his brother's appearance was about a minute.]

Here the *gradual* disappearance, if correctly remembered, is interesting as a feature which is occasionally met with in purely subjective hallucinations (Chap. XII., §§ 2 and 10).¹

The next example is a “collective” case,² but had better be quoted in the present connection. The narrator is the late Rev. W. Mountford, of Boston, U.S.A., a minister and author of repute.

(264) “One day, some 15 years ago, I went from the place of my abode to see some friends who resided in the fen districts of Norfolk. They were persons whom I knew, not merely well, but intimately. They were two brothers who had married two sisters. Their houses were a mile and a quarter apart, but standing on the same road, and with only two or three other habitations intervening. The road was a straight, bare, open road, like what is so often to be seen in the fens, and used chiefly and almost exclusively by the occupants of the few farms alongside of it. The house at which I was visiting stood about 10 yards from the edge of the road. The day was fine and clear—a day in March. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon I stood at the window, and looking up the road I said, ‘Here is your brother coming.’ My host advanced to the window and said, ‘Oh yes, here he is; and see, Robert has got Dobbin out at last.’ Dobbin was a horse which, on account of some accident, had not been used for some weeks. The lady also looked out at the window, and said to me, ‘And I

¹ Compare cases 185, 194, 207, 263, 311, 315, 331, 350, 488, 503, 514, 544, 553, 567, 672, 673; also cases 189 and 328, and the account in Vol. i., p. 454, note, where the expression “melted away” is used.

² Compare the carriage cases described in Chap. xviii., § 5.

am so glad, too, that my sister is with him. They will be delighted to find you here.'

"I recognised distinctly the vehicle in which they rode as being an open one, also the lady and the gentleman, and both their dress, and their attitudes.

"Our friends passed at a gentle pace along the front of the window, and then turning with the road round the corner of the house, they could not longer be seen. After a minute my host went to the door and exclaimed, 'Why, what can be the matter? They have gone on without calling, a thing they never did in their lives before. What can be the matter?'

"Five minutes afterwards, while we were seated by the fireside, the parlour door opened, and there entered a lady of about 25 years of age; she was in robust health and in full possession of all her senses, and she was possessed, besides, of a strong common-sense. She was pale and much excited, and the moment she opened the door she exclaimed, 'Oh, aunt, I have had such a fright. Father and mother have passed me on the road without speaking. I looked up at them as they passed by, but they looked straight on and never stopped nor said a word. A quarter of an hour before, when I started to walk here, they were sitting by the fire; and now, what can be the matter? They never turned nor spoke, and yet I am certain that they must have seen me.'

"Ten minutes after the arrival of this lady, I, looking through the window up the road, said, 'But see, here they are, coming down the road again.'

"My host said, 'No, that is impossible, because there is no path by which they could get on to this road, so as to be coming down it again. But sure enough, here they are, and with the same horse! How in the world have they got here?'

"We all stood at the window, and saw pass before us precisely the same appearance which we had seen before—lady and gentleman, and horse and carriage. My host ran to the door and exclaimed, 'How did you get here? How did you get on to the road to be coming down here again now?'

"'I get on the road? What do you mean? I have just come straight from home.'

"'And did you not come down the road and pass the house, less than a quarter of an hour ago?'

"'No,' said the lady and gentleman both. 'This is the first time that we have come down the road to-day.'

"'Certainly' we all said, 'you passed these windows less than a quarter of an hour ago. And, besides, here is Mary, who was on the road and saw you.'

"'Nonsense,' was the answer. 'We are straight from home, as you may be very sure. For how could you have seen us pass by before, when you did see us coming down now?'

"'Then you mean to say that really you did not pass by here 10 or 15 minutes ago?'

"'Certainly; for at that time, probably, we were just coming out of the yard and starting to come here.'

"We all of us remained much amazed at this incident. There were four of us who had seen this appearance, and seen it under such circum-

stances as apparently precluded any possibility of our having mistaken some casual passengers for our intimate friends. We were quite satisfied that we had really not seen our bodily friends pass down the road, that first time when we thought that we saw them. As for myself, I was sure that it was not they; and yet hardly could I help feeling that it could have been no persons else.

“There is an old saying about keeping a thing 10 years, and then finding a use for it. This curious experience of mine is as vivid in my mind as though it were of yesterday. Is it of use as illustrating mistakes as to identity, or is it rather a singular instance of what is called second-sight?

“M.”

This account was first published in the *Spiritual Magazine* for August, 1860. On our writing to Mr. Mountford on the subject he replied:—

“Beacon Street, Boston, U.S.A.

“8th August, 1884.

“The narrative of which you have sent me a copy was written by myself, as you had rightly supposed. It was carefully prepared, and I believe it to be as exactly true as any report ever made by phonograph or photograph.

“At the time when the occurrence happened, I was simply amazed at it, and I felt but just simply as some untaught ploughman might have felt in the open field, if an aerolite had fallen at his feet, hot from the skies.

“The persons besides myself, of whom I wrote in that account, were all of the family name of Coe, and were all of Islington, near King’s Lynn; and they were all living at the time when I wrote about them, but they have all been carried away.

“I have only to add that Mrs. Robert Coe said that she and her husband knew of their daughter’s having started to see her aunt, but that they had had no intention of following her till Mr. Robert Coe, suddenly starting from his chair by the fireside, exclaimed ‘Let us go to Clement’s.’”

[It is much to be regretted that this experience was not recorded in writing at the moment, and signed by all the persons concerned. At the same time the hypothesis that it was a mere mistake or illusion is strongly discountenanced by the persistence of the contrary impression in a sound and rationally sceptical mind. For the natural tendency of such a mind is undeniably to be *less* certain of the reality of abnormal facts after a long interval than at the time of their occurrence.¹]

It will be convenient to complete the account of this “arrival” type by citing at once a couple of auditory cases, which belong by rights to the next chapter. The following account is from Mr. J. Stevenson, of 28, Prospect Street, Gateshead.

¹ It is interesting, for instance, to find an able observer, M. Marillier, candidly admitting that, but for written notes and other indisputable evidence, he could easily come to believe that his own very vivid subjective hallucinations of some years ago were a disease of memory, and were never really experienced (*Revue Philosophique* for February, 1886, p. 206).

“ April 20th, 1885.

(265) “ During the months of May and June, 1881, my brother was staying with us. He went out one Sunday night between 5 and 6 o'clock. He did not say what time he would return, but his time was generally about 10 p.m. About 7 o'clock, while I was reading by the window, and Mrs. Stevenson by the fire, all being quiet, I heard a voice say ‘ *David is coming.*’ I instantly turned to Mrs. S., asking what she said. She said, ‘ I have not spoken a word.’ I told her that I heard someone say that ‘ *David is coming.*’ I then thought I had imagined it, but, lo and behold ! in less than 3 minutes, in he comes, quite unexpected. I was surprised, but did not mention anything to him about it. The position of the house prevented us from seeing him until just about to enter the house. He was in good health, as we all were at the time. This is a candid statement of the facts.

“ JOS. STEVENSON.”

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Stevenson adds :—

“ This was the sole experience I have had of the kind. I have never experienced any hallucination.”

Mrs. Stevenson corroborates as follows :—

“ In reference to my husband's letter of April 20th, I have pleasure in testifying to the accuracy of his account, and of his drawing my attention to the fact at the time mentioned.

“ SERENA STEVENSON.”

The remaining auditory specimen (266) is from Mrs. Robinson, residing at The Warren, Caversham, Reading, who has never experienced a hallucination on any other occasion. Some 14 years ago, she tells us, she was sitting at needlework in the evening, when she heard the voice of her son, Stansford Robinson—who was supposed to be abroad, but had not been heard of for some time—calling, “ Nar, Nar, Nar,” the pet name of an old family nurse. The triple call was twice repeated. Mrs. Robinson opened the door, fully expecting to find her son in the hall, but no one was there. The son “ returned unexpectedly next day, very ill, and died soon after.”¹

¹ It is perhaps worth while to point out the wide difference between such hallucinations of voices and one of the alleged phenomena sometimes included under the general name of “ second-sight ”—to wit, notice given of the approach of travellers, some time before their actual arrival, by a sound of horses' feet outside the house. (See, e.g., *Description of the Isle of Man*, by George Waldron, 1744, p. 75.) It is obvious (1) how easily an auditory impression of that sort may be a mere illusion—just as the swirling of leaves is probably accountable for many of the tales of phantom carriages driving up to the door ; and (2) how certain it is that, among a population holding such a belief, the occasional coincidence, when the suggestive sound was heard and the guest arrived, would be noted as a marvel, and the sounds which no arrival followed would find no place in the reckoning. It would not occur to a Manx peasant to make capital out of even the failures—as I have actually seen done—by calling them “ inverted coincidences ” !

CHAPTER XV.

FURTHER AUDITORY CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE
PERCIPIENT.

§ 1. IN examining cases of auditory phantasms which have strikingly corresponded with real events, we have two main points to look to. First, there is the phantasm regarded merely as a sensory phenomenon, on a par with the visual phantasms. This, of course, is the sound in itself; which is occasionally of an inarticulate sort, a simple noise; but which in the large majority of instances represents the tone of a human voice—the voice, like the visual phantasm, being either recognised or unrecognised. But, secondly, when the phantasm is a voice, there is a further element, which has as a rule no analogue in the visual class—namely, what the voice says; and this is likely to afford us some clue as to whether a complete and definite idea has been telepathically conveyed from the agent or merely an impulse or germ which the percipient has developed in his own way. We find that the auditory cases, like the visual, present various stages of apparent externalisation;¹ but the discriminations here are less marked—it being more difficult in the case of sounds than of sights to decide, in recalling them, how far the impression seemed inward, and how far outward; while even if the special stage be clear in the percipient's mind, it is not easy to find words to describe it.

I will begin with recognised voices; and will first quote a few cases where the analogy to experimental thought-transference is strongest, inasmuch as what the percipient heard seems to have represented the actual sensation of the agent,² the very words which he was hearing while he uttered them—in one instance, however, so dulled as to be indistinguishable as words. The following account

¹ See the account of some of these stages as exemplified in purely subjective hallucinations, Vol. i., pp. 480-2.

² See Vol. i., p. 536, note.

is from Mrs. Stone, of Walditch, Bridport, the narrator of case 257, above.

267

“January 29th, 1883.

(257) “On the 13th of January, 1882, my eldest son, who had been paying us a visit, left by a morning train for his home; but I did not know the exact time at which he would reach his destination. In the afternoon of that day, my daughter having gone to the neighbouring town (Bridport), I was sitting at work by a window of which the upper ventilator was open. Suddenly I heard my son’s voice distinctly; I could not mistake it; he was speaking eagerly, and as if bothered; the voice seemed wafted to me by an air current, but I could not distinguish words. I was startled, but not very much frightened; the voice did not seem to indicate accident or calamity. I looked at my watch, which pointed to three minutes past 3. In perhaps a few seconds, his voice began again, but soon became faint, and died away in the distance. When my daughter came in, I told her, and mentioned the hour; she said that was just the time my son expected to arrive, if the train was punctual. I also mentioned it to my son who is living with me. The next morning I was very thankful to get a post-card from my eldest son: ‘Arrived all right, train very punctual, just three minutes past 3; but to my annoyance, I found no carriage waiting for me, or my luggage, only Frank on his bicycle. He explained that they had made a mistake by looking at the station clock (which was an hour too slow), and had driven away again.’ I wrote the whole account to my son, but he is rather sceptical on these subjects; he could not but own it was a strange coincidence, but asked, ‘Why, mother, didn’t you hear Frank’s voice too?’

“LUCIA C. STONE.”

Miss Edith Stone has confirmed verbally what is recorded of her in the above account. Another son, Mr. Walter Stone, also recollects having been told of the incident.

On February 16th, 1885, Mrs. Stone wrote as follows:—

“A few days since, I came upon my son’s letter, written rather more than a week after the occurrence. The post-card mentioned was lost, and it was by chance this letter turned up. I enclose the first page for what it is worth, very trivial save for the impression it made on me. I am more than ever convinced of the value of verifying matters of this kind.”

The first page of the son’s letter ran as follows:—

“Eton, January 22nd, 1882.

“DEAREST MOTHER,—If you heard my voice it must have been when I was waiting for the arrival of the carriage, and expressing loudly my surprise at its not having arrived at the station to meet me. I think I told you that Frank was there, on his bicycle, and we both jabbered considerably. You ought to have heard him too.”

[Mrs. Stone has had no other hallucination of a recognised voice, except on one occasion, 20 years ago, soon after a bereavement (see Vol. I., pp. 510-2). More than five years ago, she had on several evenings the impression of hearing voices in the room below her own. This slight predisposition to auditory hallucination would hardly affect the case; but the coincidence is of course rendered less striking by the reflection that

Mr. Stone may have spoken "eagerly and as if bothered" on a good many other occasions.]

The next case is more complete, inasmuch as the actual word used by the agent was distinguished by the percipient. The account is from Mr. R. Fryer, of Bath, brother of our valued friend and helper, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, of Clerkenwell, who tells us that he "distinctly remembers being told of the occurrence within a few weeks of its happening." He explains that "Rod" was the name by which his brother, the percipient, was called in the family.

"January, 1883.

(268) "A strange experience occurred in the autumn of the year 1879. A brother of mine had been from home for 3 or 4 days, when, one afternoon, at half-past 5 (as nearly as possible), I was astonished to hear my name called out very distinctly. I so clearly recognised my brother's voice that I looked all over the house for him; but not finding him, and indeed knowing that he must be distant some 40 miles, I ended by attributing the incident to a fancied delusion, and thought no more about the matter. On my brother's arrival home, however, on the sixth day, he remarked amongst other things that he had narrowly escaped an ugly accident. It appeared that, whilst getting out from a railway carriage, he missed his footing, and fell along the platform; by putting out his hands quickly he broke the fall, and only suffered a severe shaking. 'Curiously enough,' he said, 'when I found myself falling I called out your name.' This did not strike me for a moment, but on my asking him during what part of the day this happened, he gave me the time, which I found corresponded exactly with the moment I heard myself called."

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. R. Fryer adds:—

"I do not remember ever having a similar experience to the one narrated to you; nor should I care to, as the sensation, together with the suspense as to the why and wherefore of the event, is the reverse of pleasant."

In conversation, he has explained that he had frequently expostulated with his brother on the latter's habit of alighting from trains in motion; and the automatic utterance of his name, on this occasion, might thus be accounted for by association.

The agent's account of the matter is as follows:—

"Newbridge Road, Bath.

"November 16th, 1885.

"In the year 1879, I was travelling, and in the course of my journey I had to stop at Gloucester. In getting out of the train, I fell, and was assisted to rise by one of the railway officials. He asked if I was hurt, and asked if I had anyone travelling with me. I replied 'No' to both questions, and inquired why he asked. He replied, 'Because you called out "Rod."' I distinctly recollect making use of the word Rod.

"On arriving home, a day or two afterwards, I related the circumstance, and my brother inquired the time and date. He then told me he had heard me call at that particular time. He was so sure of its being my voice that he made inquiries as to whether I was about or not.

"JOHN T. FRYER."

*Doc. in P.
No. 302
re: 1879
Bath*

Curiously similar is the next case, sent to us by Miss Frome, of Ewell, Surrey, in the handwriting of the friend, a doctor by profession whose experience is narrated. She thoroughly relies on his word, and has communicated his name. He himself dislikes the subject, and has no belief that such coincidences can be anything but accidental.

“April 14th, 1884.

(269) “In February, 1862, an undergraduate of one of our northern universities was, and had been for some time, reading hard for the approaching examination for the degree which he was desirous of acquiring. His brother, an officer in the merchant service, was at sea, and at this time in a ship not far from the coast of the East Indies.

“One evening, about 7 p.m., the former was at work in his own rooms, in company with a friend, also studying with the same object, when he suddenly heard his Christian name, shortened as was the custom in his own family circle, of which there were none (or even of intimate friends) in the city he was then inhabiting. He heard himself called sharply and clearly, and, astonished rather, looked up from his books and asked his friend if he spoke, who answered in the negative, evidently surprised. Again, in an instant, he heard the sound again, and turned to his friend, saying, ‘Don’t be foolish; what is it?’ The reply was, ‘I said nothing.’ He then asked, ‘Did you not hear anything? My name called?’ ‘No, I heard nothing,’ was the answer.

“Almost as these brief words were passing between the two men, he of whom this story is related heard again, once, twice, quickly repeated, his name, clearly and distinctly, and then he seemed to recognise it as like his brother’s voice. He could not understand it, and, feeling rather mystified and put out, thought he would stop work and rest, so telling his friend he would do no more that night, went off to the theatre. On his return, sitting over the fire, he thought the matter over, and came to the conclusion that, being out of health to some extent, the mental fatigue he was going through had upset his brain functions a little; so he put the subject from him, simply making a note of the occurrence, and thought no more of it.

“Some months later, about the end of June, he was in London to meet his brother, who was returning from sea. On the evening of the arrival of the latter, the two brothers were talking together, the younger describing his voyage and the various incidents that had happened, and suddenly said, ‘By the way, I was very nearly not coming home any more; I had a very narrow squeak of being drowned. I fell overboard one night somewhere about midnight, and I thought I was done for, but after a while I was luckily picked up. However, it was a close shave, and I did not expect to see you again, old chap, but I thought of you, and sung out and called at you.’

“The elder brother, recollecting the occurrence to himself in the northern city, asked the other when this occurred, and heard in reply that it was on the same day on which that which has been stated happened to him. He then told his brother his story, and, comparing the two, all points agreed except the hours, about 7 o’clock and about midnight—when the sailor brother quietly pointed out that, allowing for the difference of time in the two places, the actual time was probably the same.

“They talked the matter over, but could make no more of it. Neither of them had any belief in supernatural manifestations. Nothing of the kind ever happened to them again in after life in any degree. The younger brother died at sea a few years ago.”

Here we have once more the feature of *repetition* after a short interval, which seems, by the way, to be decidedly commoner in auditory hallucinations of the telepathic than of the purely subjective class.¹ Another fact to be noticed is that the voice was not heard by the percipient's companion—this being a point in which the hallucinatory character of telepathic affections of the senses often appears (Chap. XII., § 10).²

In the following case, it is alleged that the actual words heard were used by the agent. The narrative is from an English physician residing in a foreign town, who wishes his name suppressed, fearing professional prejudice.

“October 22nd, 1883.

(270) “Years ago there were two girls, half Italian half English, here, one with a very fine voice. The poor girl from over-straining got spitting of blood. I attended her. One morning she begged me to see her sister, who was crying her heart out, as she expressed it, hysterics, &c., &c., owing to an absurd dream, she said. I went into her sister's room, and found her as described; she then told me it was not a dream, but that she was broad awake, and heard her sister's voice from the garden—‘Georgie, Georgie, I must see you before I die.’ By dint of coaxing, bullying, reasoning, and exhortation, I got her quieted down, and nothing more was thought of it; but at the time required to hear from England, a letter came announcing her sister's death; and further inquiries elicited that it occurred exactly at the time she heard the voice (allowing for distance), and that the last words she uttered were those heard from the garden.”

[In answer to an inquiry, the narrator says that he did not actually see the letter which conveyed the intelligence of the sister's death; the exactitude of the coincidence rests therefore on second-hand evidence. He was, however, in daily communication with the family.]

In the next case, the words heard were vividly imagined by the agent, and may very probably have been uttered, or half-uttered. The account is from Mr. J. Pike, of 122, Stockwell Park Road, S.W.

“October, 1883.

(271) “Travelling some years since from Carlisle to Highbury, by the night mail train, and, finding myself alone in my compartment, I lay at full length on the seat with a view to sleep, having previously requested the

¹ Compare cases 154, 266, 278, 285, 287, 341, 342, 508, 674, 676, 679; and see Chap. xii., § 10.

² See, e.g., cases 28, 34, 189, 206, 212, 242, 265, 271, 274, 307, 329, 337, 347, 355, 491, 517, 522, 534, 561, 567, 607, 609, 610, 618, 620, 633, 634, 638. Cases 552 (see “Additions and Corrections,” under heading p. 511), and 685 should perhaps be added. In cases 666 and 684, the experience was unshared by one of the persons present.

No record
second

What
second

guard to wake me at the Camden Town Station. I soon fell into a deep sleep, one of those profound slumbers the awakening from which is almost painful. Roused suddenly by the guard waking me (somewhat roughly and impatiently, because the train was behind its time), I found that I had been dreaming (what proved indeed to be the case) that it was morning; that I was at home, in my bedroom, in the act of dressing, and at the moment of awakening had been on the landing and twice called the servant by her name, 'Sarah,' and asked her to bring me some hot water.

"On actually arriving at home, I learnt that at the time when I had been thus dreaming that I was calling to the servant, she had heard her name called by me *twice*, distinctly; that—forgetting for the moment that I was not in the house—she, hastily discontinuing the breakfast preparations, ran upstairs, and afterwards came down again 'as white as a ghost'—according to the description given to me by the children who, with astonishment, witnessed her proceedings, and not having themselves heard the call, naturally wondered what it all meant. Sarah subsequently informed me that the 'fright' she experienced on realising the fact that I was not there had made her 'quite ill.'"

Mr. Pike's daughter gave the following corroboration on Oct. 30, 1883:—

"I distinctly remember the incident of our servant being frightened by hearing my father's voice calling from upstairs, at a time when we knew he could not be anywhere near our home. The servant took a poker in her hand and went upstairs, thinking there must be some man there who had imitated my father's voice. Nothing, however, was discovered to explain the mystery until my father's arrival at home, when he told us that at the time the call was heard he had been dreaming that he was at home and calling for hot water.

"ALMA M. PIKE."

[The genuineness of this case does not, of course, depend on the servant's evidence, but on the testimony of Miss Pike that the servant mentioned her experience before Mr. Pike's arrival. I have stated above (Vol. I., p. 514) that my collection of purely subjective hallucinations includes several instances where a servant has seemed to hear her mistress calling her—a fact which of course goes to weaken the force of the described coincidence. But the superior vividness of the impression in the present instance seems proved by the emotion and alarm which followed it, and which had no sort of parallel in the purely subjective cases referred to.]

Here, it will be seen, the condition of the agent was not one of distress or crisis, but simply that of vivid dream; and the case is in this way exceptional. Affections of a waking percipient by a dreaming agent—or at any rate cases which could be used as evidence for such affections—seem a rarer type than that of simultaneous and correspondent dreaming, illustrated in Vol. I., pp. 314-8, and in Chap. III. of the Supplement; but cases 94 and 96 were very probably examples of it. In the present instance, it should be noted that the part of the dream which apparently affected the percipient took place in the very shock of waking; and such a shock,

though not critical or exactly painful, clearly involves a far wider and more sudden change of psychical condition than often occurs to us during waking life.

In the next case it is very possible that the agent actually used the words heard, but proof of this fact is unattainable. If he did not, we must suppose some idea of his distress to have been objectified by the percipient in the "agonised tone." The account is from Mr. Lister Ives, master at the Grammar School, Stockport.

"1883.

(272) "About midday of the 24th July, 1875, I was in the baths at Llandudno, when I suddenly and distinctly heard my boy's voice calling loudly and in an agonised tone. So assured was I of it being his voice, that I hastily got out of the bath and looked out of the nearest window, thinking he must be on the rocks beneath—the bath-house stands on a rock, though since then much has been cut away—though I believed him at the time to be, as indeed he was, at the other side of the Orme's Head, three or four miles away. The boy was killed at that very time by a fall from the rocks."

We find from a report of the accident in the *Stockport Advertiser* that the date was the 26th (not the 24th) of July. The boy had joined his parents on the 24th, which may perhaps account for the mistake.

Mrs. Ives says:—

"Until late at night, when the boy did not return, my husband had thought no more of the circumstance. When the boy could not be found he exclaimed, 'We shall never see him alive again,' for he remembered the sound of the voice; but it was not until some time afterwards that he told me that he felt assured he had heard the last cry, not a supernatural warning, but a cry for help when none could reach him. I made memoranda of all the circumstances connected with the unhappy affair, and of that [*i.e.*, the voice] among the rest. With regard to the distance which the sound came, I can scarcely give absolute information. The headland is of peculiar form; but according to local maps, if they are to be relied upon, if it were possible to take a direct line *through* the mountain from the Crab Rocks, where my boy was found, to the baths where Mr. Ives was, it would measure something over 3,000 yards; round by the path, as it then was, about 3 miles; over the summit, I cannot tell how far."

Mr. C. Kroll Laporte, of Birkdale, Southport, says:—

"Mr. Ives told me all this [*i.e.*, the incident of the voice] the day after the funeral, and I noted it down."

[Our colleague, Mr. Richard Hodgson, has had an interview with Mr. and Mrs. Ives. Mr. Ives has had no other hallucinations. The time of the boy's death was *estimated* only. He was expected back to dinner at 1 p.m., and it was between 12 and 1 p.m. that Mr. Ives was bathing and heard the cry. The words he heard were, 'Papa! mamma!' in an agonised tone. The boy was 18 years of age. He appeared to have fallen on the rocks face downwards, from a height of about 80 feet. The

cliff at the spot begins at the summit with a sloping bank of grass, which suddenly, however, is followed by an almost sheer precipice, not seen from the top of the bank.]

§ 2. We come now to cases where the name heard was probably not actually spoken. The fact that the impression so often takes the form of a call of the percipient's name might be connected with the fact that this is also the commonest form of purely *subjective* auditory hallucination; and might be taken as a fresh indication—parallel to the indications which have been noted in the visual class—that the telepathic phantasm, as a sensory phenomenon, truly belongs to the class of hallucinations. But it is in the very nature of this form of communication that it should strongly suggest—what in the following instance is positively affirmed—a certain occupation of the agent's thoughts with the percipient. We have often independent reason to suppose a similar condition in the visual cases; but there is seldom anything in the visual phantasm of the agent to make it apparent.

The first case is from Mr. G. A. Witt, of Fontenay House, Grove Park, Denmark Hill, S.E.

“September 26th, 1885.

(273) “When I left Bombay, on March 1st, 1876, by ss. ‘Persia,’ for Naples, an elder brother of mine was living in Germany, and in very bad health, though I did not, at the time, anticipate his early death. When in the Red Sea one day, sitting on deck and reading the *Saturday Review*, with other passengers—and I think Mrs. Fagan also—sitting near me and reading, I fancied I heard my brother's voice calling me by my Christian name. It seemed so distinctly his voice, and I thought I heard my name so clearly called, that it quite startled me, and made such an impression on me that I mentioned it to some of my fellow passengers, and at their suggestion took note of the hour and day it occurred.

“On arriving at Naples, some 12 or 14 days later, I found a letter there from my mother, bearing the same date as the one I had put down in the Red Sea, in which she told me that she was sitting writing by my brother's deathbed, &c., adding in a postscript the same day that he had just passed away.

“I never ascertained whether the hour I had put down was the same in which my poor brother had died, and now really all I remember is what I have just stated.

“G. A. WITT.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr Witt says:—

“I was, at the time, not at all anxious about my brother; and the ‘voice’ at the time impressed me as very strange, as I really had not thought of him for some time. My brother died in Kiel, Holstein. The date was the 13th of March, 1876. This was the date of my brother's death; and I remember that that was what caused me to mention the matter again to those whom I had told on board the steamer that I

thought I had heard my brother's voice. I must repeat, however, that what I am stating now is from memory only, and the 'note' I had made of the occurrence at the time no longer exists.

"It is also the only time that, as far as I remember, anything of the kind has happened to me." [This is in answer to the question whether he had experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.]

Mrs. Fagan, of 26, Manchester Square, W., writes to us as follows :—

"August 28th, 1885.

"On board ship, coming from India, one morning I passed Mr. Witt, who was reading on deck. He stopped me and said that a strange thing had happened to him, and on my asking what it was, said that he had heard his brother's voice calling him, 'Gustave,' more than once (three times, I think, but am not sure). He added that he had heard, before leaving Bombay, that his brother was very seriously ill,¹ and thinking that perhaps he was then dying, or just dead, he made a note of the date. I asked him to let me know afterwards if the brother really died about that time, and he said he would do so.

"On meeting him in London afterwards, I inquired if his conjecture had proved correct, and he said it had. I do not know whether the time when Mr. Witt heard the voice coincided exactly with the brother's death, as the difference in the local time made it difficult to decide that point without calculation; and I did not hear that any calculation was made. But the two events occurred at about the same time. Mr. Witt offers no explanation or opinion on the matter, only saying that it was very strange."

We have procured, through the *Bürgermeister* of Kiel, an official certificate of the death of Mr. John T. Witt, which shows that it occurred on March 13, 1876, at 9.30 p.m. Supposing therefore that Mr. G. A. Witt's experience was immediately mentioned by him, and that Mrs. Fagan is right in her recollection that this was in the morning, it must have preceded the death by a good many hours. If either of these suppositions is incorrect, the coincidence may have been closer.

The next account is from Mrs. Stella, of Chieri, Italy, who was the percipient in the visual case, No. 198.

"December 29th, 1883.

(274) "On the 22nd of May, 1882, I was sitting in my room working with other members of my family, and we were talking of household matters, when suddenly I heard the voice of my eldest son calling repeatedly 'Mamma.' I threw down my work exclaiming, 'There is Nino,' and went downstairs, to the astonishment of every one. Now my son was at that time in London, and had only left home about a fortnight before, for a two months' tour, so naturally we were all surprised to think he had arrived so suddenly. On reaching the hall, no one was there, and they all laughed at my imagination. But I certainly heard him call, not only once, but three or four times, impatiently. I learnt, a few days afterwards, that on that day he had been taken ill in London at the house of some friends, and

¹ This of course was true, in a sense; but, in view of the possible suggestion that the hallucination was due to mere anxiety, it is important to notice that Mr. Witt had regarded his brother as a *chronic* invalid, and expressly affirms that, so far from being anxious about him, he had not even thought of him for some time.

that he had frequently expressed a wish that I should come and nurse him, as not speaking English he could not make himself understood."

Mrs. Stella tells us, on inquiry, that this is her only experience of an auditory hallucination.

The following corroboration is from a lady who was present at the time :—

"Breslau, February 18th, 1884.

"Mrs. Stella asked me to give you an account of an episode which occurred in my presence, while on a visit to her two years ago ; and the following are the facts as nearly as I can remember them. We were sitting working together, when Mrs. Stella said she heard the voice of her son, who was absent in England at the time, calling her. This caused us some surprise, as he was not expected home, nor had we heard any sounds of an arrival.

"On going downstairs to meet him, we found no one, which astonished us, as Mrs. Stella had been so positive that she had heard him call. We afterwards heard that on that day he had been taken ill in London. I may here remark that young Mr. Stella is very much attached to his mamma, and especially dependent upon her in sickness.

"CLARA SCHMIDT."

The next case is from Mr. W. T. Bray, of Schekoldin's Paper Mill, Vimishma, Government of Kostroma, Russia.

"June 14th (O.S.), 1885.

(275) "I was employed as assistant engineer on the Moscow-Kursk Railway, and one day was standing in the erecting shop. There were 14 engines under repair, and 4 tenders, and amidst all the attendant noise of such work of fitters and boilermakers, I heard a voice quite close to me call twice, 'Will, Will!' The voice resembled my father's (he was the only person who called me 'Will'), and in a tone he used when he wished to particularly draw my attention to anything. When I went home I remarked to my wife I was afraid, if ever I heard from poor father again, or from any one about him, [there had been a certain breach of intercourse,] it would be bad news, for I distinctly heard him call me twice. About three weeks afterwards, I had a letter from a sister, stating he had died, and when ; and his last words were, 'Good-bye, Will! good-bye, Will!' Upon comparing the date and time, he died about the time I heard the voice."

Mr. Bray adds, in a letter dated August 21st (O.S.), 1885 :—

"I am sorry I cannot get a few lines likely to confirm my statement to you ; the circumstance occurred so long ago. I remember mentioning it to my wife at the time, but she cannot distinctly remember it, and I mentioned it to no one but her, and then only at the time. I remembered the work I was looking after at the time, and upon hearing of my father's death I traced the time by the factory books ; and as no one either here or in England ever called me 'Will' but he, I always feel quite satisfied in my own mind that I heard his voice, especially as I was told in the letter announcing his death his last words were, 'Good-bye, Will ! good-bye, Will !'

"W. THOS. BRAY."

In answer to a question whether he had ever had any other auditory

hallucination, Mr. Bray replies, "Such a thing never occurred to me before, neither has anything occurred since." He adds that his father died on March 22, 1873; and we have confirmed this date by the Register of Deaths.

We first heard of this case from Mr. Bray's son, who said that he was himself told of his father's experience at the time, and that at his suggestion a note of the day and hour was made. But his account presents so many differences from the first-hand one that his memory on this point cannot be relied on.

The next case is from Mr. D. J. Hutchins, of 173, Severn Road, Cardiff.

"December 17th, 1883.

(276) "My father died suddenly, about 48 miles away from where my mother resided. I had to acquaint her of the melancholy fact. A railway journey, and then a drive of 12 miles would take me to her abode. I should arrive about 6 a.m. on a dark November morning. Secretly perplexed how I should break the news, I was relieved and surprised to see, as I neared the house, smoke issuing from parlour and kitchen chimneys. On arriving at the gate, and before time was given me to jump out of the trap, mother was at the door and said, 'Daniel, your father is dead.' I asked, 'How do you know?' She replied, 'He came and called for me last night about 9 o'clock, and then vanished. I have not been to bed since.' Sorrow, combined with a strange feeling that somehow or other she might have been the means of hastening his death, caused her to die suddenly a short time afterwards. She was an intensely religious woman, without superstition. I well remember the anger she always displayed when she heard that her children had been listeners to the usual fireside talk about ghosts and presentiments.

"D. J. HUTCHINS."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hutchins adds:—

"February 15th, 1886.

"With reference to the time of the death of my father, it was on the 21st November, 1855. He was found dead in the fields between Llantrissant Station and Lanclay House, Llantrissant, where he had for many years resided as house-steward to Lady Mary Cole. [In conversation Mr. Hutchins has explained that his father was last seen alive, walking from the station, and apparently in perfect health, about 6 p.m., and that his body was found soon after 9 o'clock the same evening.] My mother was in our cottage—Rose Cottage—near Penrice Castle, where we usually resided during summer. She was preparing to leave just preparatory to closing the place for the winter. My father left her on the morning of the day of his death, [having been requested to superintend some work at a distance].

"At the time when I wrote to you, the circumstances were more vivid in my memory than at present; consequently I cannot actually say whether my mother said, 'Your father appeared to me,' in connection with his voice. But this I distinctly remember: my mother said, 'I heard your father call me by my name, "Mary, Mary," and then I went to the door; and I have not been in bed since.'" In conversation, however, it appeared that Mr. Hutchins is morally certain that the experience was visual as well as auditory.

In a later letter, Mr. Hutchins expressed some doubt as to the year of the occurrence; and we find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on November 21st, 1853, not 1855.

The next case is from Miss Burrows, residing at Hollard Hall, Stretford Road, Manchester.

“December, 1884.

(277) “I can furnish you with an instance of my name being called by my mother, who was 18 miles off, and dying at the time. I was not aware she was ill, nor was I thinking about her at the time, No one here knew my name, and it was her voice calling, as I was always addressed at home, ‘Lizzie.’ I can give you more exact information if you require it.

“E. BURROWS.”

Later, Miss Burrows writes :—

“March 18th, 1885.

“In regard to the voice which I heard call my name on the 19th February, 1882, I recognised it instantly as being that of my mother. It was *very loud*, sharp, and impetuous, as if frightened at something. Our house is detached, very quiet, and the only inmates of the house beside myself were two gentlemen, aged respectively 58 and 37, and a widowed daughter-in-law [of the elder gentleman] who had lived with them five years; and not one of them knew my Christian name. I was thunder-struck, and ran out of my room to see if I could account for the voice. *I told the lady the same morning.*

“I never saw anything I thought supernatural, and only once before had anything like a similar hallucination. [This other experience took place 12 years previously, when Miss Burrows and her mother heard some sounds which seemed to them unaccountable.] My father and mother were not superstitious people, and a healthier family could not possibly be than ours.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Burrows adds :—

“I heard the voice call my name on the Sunday morning at 8. My mother was dying, and quite unconscious, from the Saturday night (the night before) until the Monday at 8 a.m., when she died.”

We find from an obituary notice in the *Bury Guardian* that Mrs. Burrows died on Monday, February 20, 1882.

Mrs. Griffiths, of 31, Rosaville Road, Fulham Road, S.W., confirms as follows :—

“March 25th.

“I am very glad to be able to corroborate the statement made by Miss Burrows, about hearing herself called by name at the time of her mother’s death. I cannot remember the exact date, but it was a Sunday morning in February, 1882, and when I came down to breakfast she told me about it, and said that a voice called ‘Lizzy’ distinctly, and it sounded just like her mother’s. The next morning she had the news of her mother’s death; and she had not any idea that she was ill before, so that it could not have been fancy.

“H. GRIFFITHS.”

It will be seen that Miss Burrows gives February 19th as the date of her experience, and Mrs. Griffiths mentions independently that the day

was a Sunday in February. The 19th of February, 1882, fell on a Sunday. There having been an interval of 24 hours between the percipient's experience and the death, the case could not be included in the group which I used in the statistical argument above, Chap. XIII., § 6.]

We owe the next case to Mrs. Passingham, of Milton, Cambridge. The narrator is Mrs. Walsh, a sick-nurse whom Mrs. Passingham knew well, and of whom she says :—

(278) “The fact of her having quarrelled with her favourite sister, and her dying without a reconciliation, affects her deeply, and she had tears in her eyes as she told me the story. She *declares* she was *not* asleep, and it was *not* a dream ; she had only just put out the light and had not got into bed.”

Mrs. Walsh writes to us on May 6th, 1884 :—

“107, Queen's Crescent, Haverstock Hill. uncert. in

“On October 24th, 1877, I was in London, and after preparing to go to bed, I had just extinguished the light, when I heard the voice of my sister, who was then in Wolverhampton, call me by my name, ‘Joanna.’ I instantly answered, ‘Yes, Polly.’ The voice was low, almost a whisper, but perfectly clear, and I was so sure that she spoke that I turned to the part of the room from which the voice came. Again I heard the voice, and after that, once more, making three times in all.

“When I realised that it could not possibly be my sister, I felt—not exactly frightened—but awed, and I could not sleep till near morning for thinking of it. The next day, I heard from my family that they had had a telegram to say that she was dangerously ill, and some one was to go to her. Another sister went and found her dead ; and the time of her death agreed exactly with the time when I heard the voice. She died very suddenly of mortification, and I had not the least idea she was ill ; also, we had become estranged from each other, although we were exceedingly fond of each other, and I think that is the reason she spoke to me.

“JOANNA WALSH.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place at Wolverhampton on the 23rd October, 1877, and not the 24th. The 24th was probably impressed on Mrs. Walsh's memory, as being the day when the alarming news reached her.

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Walsh adds :—

“In answer to your first question I must tell you that at the time of my sister's death I was with almost entire strangers, and therefore do not think I mentioned what I had heard to anyone until after I had a letter saying she was ill, and almost directly afterwards a telegram saying she was dead. To explain clearly, when I had the letter saying she was ill, I mentioned it to my sister who brought the letter ; then when I had the telegram to say she was dead, I found that the time corresponded exactly with the time I heard her voice.

“This is the only experience of the kind that I ever had. [This is in answer to the question whether she had ever had any other hallucination of the senses.]

“I didn’t for one moment doubt whose voice it was, as I immediately answered by name.”

§ 3. I may make the transition from the recognised to the unrecognised auditory phantasms by an account of several experiences, occurring to the same percipient, in one of which the voice was recognised, but not in the others. The witness is Mrs. Wight, of 12, Sinclair Road, West Kensington.

(279) “On five occasions in my life I have heard my Christian name uttered in a peremptory manner, as if by some one who was in need of my aid; and after each occasion I have learnt that a relation had died at a time closely corresponding to the call. I have *never on any other occasion* had any sort of hallucination of the senses whatever.

“The first two occasions of my hearing the call corresponded with the deaths of two aunts, who had brought me up in my childhood, when my parents were in India. In these cases I cannot say whether the call was on the very day of the death or not; it was certainly within a very few days.

“The next and most striking occasion was at the time of the death of my mother, which took place in India, on November 8th, 1864. I was living at the time with a cousin, Mrs. Harnett, and her husband, at St. John’s Wood. I was sitting one morning in a room with Mr. Harnett, when we both distinctly heard a voice utter my name as it seemed from outside the room. I at once went to look, but it proved that no inmate of the house had called me. Indeed, there was no one except my cousin who would have used my Christian name; and all our search and efforts to solve the mystery were unavailing. As Mr. Harnett had heard of the similar occurrence on the death of my aunts, he made a note in writing of the date. In about three weeks, we received the news of my mother’s death in India, after a week’s illness; and I had Mr. Harnett’s assurance, as well as my own memory, that the date of death corresponded with the day of the call.

“The next occasion was at Brighton; and this was the only time when the voice was *recognised*. As I awoke in the morning, I heard the voice of Admiral Wight, my father-in-law, who had died before my mother, calling me as he frequently had done in life. In a day or so, his widow wrote and told me of the death of his son, my husband’s half-brother. I had known that he was very ill, but was not in immediate anxiety about him.

“The fifth occasion was in June, 1876, and was immediately followed by the news of the death of an infant niece, aged 9 months, whom also I had known to be ailing. In these last two cases, again, I cannot be sure whether the days of the call and of the death corresponded; if not, they most certainly very nearly did.

“SARAH WIGHT.”

[The above account was written out by me, January 31st, 1884, immediately after a long interview with Mrs. Wight, in which every detail was gone over again and again. I sent the account to Mrs. Wight, who made a few trifling additions, and signed it.]

Mrs. Wight adds :—“Mrs. Harnett is in delicate health, and I should not like to trouble her. When I spoke to her about it, she remembered the incident.”

The strength of this narrative, of course, lies in the third case, where the correspondence of day was made out to be exact. The hypothesis that the call on this occasion was a real call outside the house, though repudiated by Mrs. Wight, cannot be so confidently rejected by those who realise the difficulty of localising sounds with precision. Still, the fact of her having on other occasions experienced impressions of exactly this form—the commonest of all forms of sensory hallucination—distinctly supports the view that the experience was hallucinatory; and if so, the coincidence of day is a strong point in favour of the telepathic explanation. I will not pause here on the fact that in this instance there was a *second* percipient, as that topic will be fully discussed in the chapter on “Collective Cases.”

The next account is from Mr. Goodyear, now of Avoca Villa, Park Road, Bevois Hill, Southampton, who refers in it to a visual case quoted in Chap. XII., § 3.

“February 9th, 1884.

(280) “I am very fond of shooting, and one evening I had gone out with my bag and gun. I was crossing some open meadows, when suddenly a fearfully shrill cry of ‘Tom’ rang in my ears. I instantly answered loudly, ‘Yes, yes,’ turning sharply round to see who was in pain, but there was no one near, and again the scream rang out terribly loud. I answered again, ‘Yes, yes,’ and then I heard no more. I retraced my steps, for I was quite unstrung; but later on, when it was dark, I went over to see the keeper in whose woods I was going to shoot, and told him what had happened. He said, ‘Bad news,’ and he was right; for next morning summoned me to join my bereaved sweetheart, who at that very time, certainly to within a very few minutes, lost her father. I knew her father was ill, had been for some 18 months, but was not thinking about them at the time. I do not know whether these cases are particularly striking, or whether there are heaps of similar ones, but they are just what happened, and will for ever live fresh in my memory.

“T. W. GOODYEAR.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on March 7, 1876, after a 2 years’ illness.

Asked if this is the only auditory hallucination that he can recall, Mr. Goodyear replies in the affirmative.

Asked whether the lady really uttered his name at the time, he replies, “My wife does not think she uttered my name aloud, though for several reasons she was thinking intensely of me.” He has told me in confidence special circumstances which caused the mind of the dying man

to be much occupied with him, and which caused the mind of his *fiancée* to be directed towards him with a special longing for his presence.

The following account was received in October, 1884, from Mrs. Wilkie, who prefers that her address should not be published.

(281) "In September, 1875, I was in Callander, in lodgings with my sister and other friends. On the night of the 8th I had gone to bed, but had only lately put out the light, and was quite wide awake; when I heard from apparently just behind the curtain, at the side of the bed, the words 'Oh! Eliza,' (my name) in a mournful tone. I was so much impressed by the occurrence that I noted down the date next morning, and told my sister of what I had heard. As time passed on, and I heard from all my own people and heard of nothing having happened to any of them, I quite forgot the circumstance.

"Several months after, I heard of the death by drowning, in the Fiji Islands, of a gentleman, a distant cousin of mine, whom I had known very well. His relations did not know on which day his death took place, but it was between the 7th and 9th of September, as they got a letter from him begun on the 7th, and his partner, who was away from the place, came home on the 9th, and found him drowned. He had gone out bathing, it was supposed, and taken cramp.

"E. K. WILKIE."

We find a notice in the *Edinburgh Courant* which states that the death occurred "early in September, 1875."

In answer to the question whether this was the only hallucination of the senses that she has ever had, Mrs. Wilkie replies, "Yes, the only one." She believes that the diary in which her experience was at once noted may still be in existence, but has searched for it in vain. Should she ever find it, she has promised to show me the entry.

Mrs. Wilkie's sister, Mrs. Rowe, writes to us on December 1, 1884:—

"South Ste. Marie, Mich., U.S.A.

"In the year 1875, the month of September, I was staying at Callander with my sister, Mrs. Wilkie. I remember her telling me one morning of having heard her name spoken the night before, from behind the curtain at the head of her bed, these words: 'Oh! Eliza'; and this occurred *before* she heard of the death of her friend.

"DORA H. ROWE."

The narrator of the next case is Mrs. Wyld, of 59, Devonshire Road, Birkenhead.

"May 10th, 1885.

(282) "I would very gladly write the short statement you ask for, but though to my own mind it is pretty concise, still I feel that to outsiders it is wanting in two important details: (1) I mentioned the fact of hearing the voice to no one at the time [but see below], and (2) I could not tell whose voice it was.

"It was on Thursday evening, January 10th, 1884, that I was sitting alone in the house reading, and it seemed strange, and still not strange, to hear my name called with a sort of eager entreaty.

“Shortly after, the others came in. I was leaving for Ellesmere next day, and in the bustle of departure I thought no more of the circumstance. It was only when coming down to breakfast on the Saturday morning and finding the letter telling of E.’s death, that I instantly recalled the circumstances, and saw that the *time* and *day* corresponded with when they knew she must have slipped out, and down to the river.

“I wonder I did not associate it with her, for she had written me some very pitiable letters beforehand. I had not the least idea her mind was affected. We were school-fellows together for nearly three years and great friends.
“MARY WYLD.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Wyld adds :—

“I never have had a hallucination of the senses at any other time. It was about 8 o’clock in the evening, I fancy, when I heard the voice. She was not found till 2 o’clock the next morning when the tide turned on the river ; she then had been dead several hours, having slipped out, I fancy, between 7 and 9 the previous evening.”

We have verified the date given, and the circumstances of the death, in two local newspapers. It appears that though the body was not recovered till early next morning, it was seen, and the shawl that was round it was even seized and drawn into a boat, at 10 p.m.

Mrs. Wyld afterwards found that she *had* mentioned her experience at the time to her mother, who writes to us on March 19, 1886 :—

“Mrs. Wyld was staying with me in Scarborough, when she heard the voice in which you are interested. She was alone in the house (excepting servants), and when I returned, an hour after, she related what had seemed to her peculiar. The date I do not now remember ; but Mrs. Wyld left Scarborough the next day ; and in two or three days after, she wrote to tell me of the sad event having taken place that evening.

“M. BALGARNIE.”

[The *non-recognition* here rather tends to strengthen the case, by increasing the improbability that the hallucination was due to anxiety about the absent friend.]

The following case is from Miss Harriss, of 25, Shepherd’s Bush Road, W.

“January 25th, 1884.

(283) “Exactly the hour in the afternoon that my mother died, being out for a long walk in the country with a companion, and having parted from her to pick wild flowers, I heard myself distinctly called several times. With a feeling as if some ill were approaching, I looked at my watch instinctively, and found it half-past 4. I cannot tell why I did so, for I was then only a school-girl, and calling to my companion I found she had not addressed me. I dreamed of my mother’s death the same night.

“A. HARRISS.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Harriss adds :—

“My mother died on 25th September, 1875. She was in better health than I had seen her for years when I left her about six weeks before, which was the reason of my doing so. She died suddenly of heart disease. I had heard from her only two days before, in good health and spirits. The

hour of death was stated in the letter and telegram ; I think I have both still.

“ I never had another auditory hallucination. I never had another dream of death besides that about my mother ; it was very vivid and distressing. I saw her dying.”

The following is an extract, copied by the present writer, from a letter written to Miss Harriss by her father, and dated September 25, 1875 :—

“ Ashfield.

“ MY DEAR ANNIE,—You will be much surprised that your dear mamma passed away this afternoon about 3.45, so gently that we could not believe that she was really gone. . . I think she was not quite conscious at the time.—Your affectionate father, “ J. H. HARRISS.”

The friend who was with Miss Harriss at the time writes to us on July 12, 1884, from 58, Cornwall Gardens, S.W. :—

“ The following is an answer to your inquiries regarding my recollection of a certain incident relating to the death of Miss Harriss’ mother. I remember her coming down one morning much disturbed at a very vivid dream she had during the night, in which she saw her mother lying dead. About an hour after she told us, the post came in, bringing Miss Harriss the news of her mother’s death. The previous day Miss Harriss had been in the woods with me, and came and asked me why I called her, and what was the matter. On finding I had not, she told me she had been quite sure some one was calling her, and wanted her. I believe afterwards we were struck at the curious coincidence of her mother being taken ill that afternoon, and being actually dead about the time of her dream.

“ EDITH DARWIN.”

[In conversation, Miss Harriss assured me again that she is positive that the hour at which she heard the voice was the hour of her mother’s death. If her recollection of the time which she noted by her watch is correct, this is an instance of exaggeration of correctness, as there was an interval of three-quarters of an hour.]

Here we can hardly attribute the dream to any excitement caused by the previous hallucination, since that does not appear to have suggested her mother to Miss Harriss. If we regard both incidents as telepathic, and as due to a common cause, the case would be an interesting instance of “ deferred impression ”—the dim impulse which immediately after the death emerged as an unrecognised phantasm, developing into more definitely “ veridical ” shape in sleep.

§ 4. And now we come to cases where the auditory impression was of a complete sentence, conveying either a piece of information or a direction. The following account is from the Rev. R. H. Killick, of Great Smeaton Rectory, Northallerton, and is quoted from an undated letter to the Rev. R. H. Davies, of Chelsea, who tells me, on November 25th, 1885, that it must have been received “ ten or

twelve years ago." Mr. Killick sent us on April 23rd, 1884, an almost precisely similar account. We have not been able to obtain direct confirmation from his wife, who is an invalid; but he tells us that her memory confirms his own. The incident happened, however, rather more than 30 years ago.

(284) "A very much loved little daughter (now married) was with my family at our vicarage in Wiltshire, and I was in Paris. One Sunday afternoon, I was sitting in the courtyard of our hotel, taking coffee, when a sudden thought shot into my mind, 'Etta has fallen into the water.' [In the later account the parallel clause is—"when all at once I seemed to hear a voice say, '*Etta has fallen into the pond.*'"] I should tell you that we had large grounds, and a fine piece of artificial water, with a grass walk all round, and a waterfall and cave, &c.—a favourite part. [In the later account, Mr. Killick adds that this pond "was my horror for the children. They were never allowed to go near it, except with one of the family."] I tried to banish the thought, but in vain. I went out into the city and walked for hours, trying to obliterate the impression in every possible way, but in vain. I walked till I was too tired to walk any longer, and returned and went to bed, but not to sleep. I went next day to the Post-office, hoping for letters; but there were none. I could not stay in Paris, so I went to the Ambassador's and got a passport for Brussels.

"In the course of time I had letters saying all were well; and I finished my journey, and never spoke of my 'foolish nervousness'—as I admitted it to be.

"Some months afterwards I was at a dinner party, and the hostess said, 'What *did* you say about Etta, when you heard?'

"'Heard what?' I said.

"'Oh!' said the lady, 'have I let out a secret?'

"I said, 'I don't leave till I learn!'

"She said, 'Don't get me into trouble, but I mean about her falling into the pond.'

"'What pond?'

"'Your pond.'

"'When?'

"'While you were abroad.'

"I was about leaving, so I said very little more, but hastened home. I sought our governess, and inquired what it all meant.

"She said, 'Oh, how cruel to tell you, now it's all over! Well, one Sunday afternoon we were walking by the pond, and Theodore said, "Etta, it's so funny to walk with your eyes shut"; so she tried, and fell into the water. I heard a scream, and looked round and saw Etta's head come up, and I ran and seized her and pulled her out. Oh, it was so dreadful! And then I carried her up to her mamma, and she was put to bed, and soon got all right.'

"I inquired the day; it was the *very Sunday* that I was in Paris, and had this dreadful conviction.

"I asked the hour. About 4 o'clock! The very time, also, that the unwelcome thought plunged into my mind.

*div from
must have
been in
her bed*

"I said, 'Then it was revealed to me in Paris the instant it happened'; and, for the first time, I told her of my sad experience in Paris on that Sunday afternoon.

"R. HENRY KILLICK."

Mr. Killick writes us on May 6th, 1884 :—

"As to your queries: you ask was the impression *unique* in my experience. I think it was. I cannot remember anything like it. You ask, was the pond a source of danger, &c. The children were *never* allowed to go near it without grown-up people being with them; it was prohibited; and it was quite away from their part of the grounds. We were so strict and careful that the accident seemed an impossibility. We had never had any alarm on the subject.

"At that time I had ten children at home; and yet it was the *special* one that had the accident who was present to my mind at that moment. The voice seemed to say, '*Etta* has fallen into the pond.'"

The two expressions "A sudden thought shot into my mind," and "I seemed to hear a voice say," are perfectly compatible, as expressing a hallucination only slightly externalised (Vol. I., pp. 480-1); but such descriptions might, no doubt, apply equally to something too inward to be called hallucination at all; and in fact a parallel but less distinct case (No. 80) has been classed among emotional and not sensory impressions. In other respects, the present narrative reminds us of Mr. Jukes's case (Vol. I., p. 407), and of Mr. Everitt's case (Vol. I., p. 409). The sense of a third personality—a messenger—implied in the form of the message, may be interpreted as the subjective contribution of the percipient; who projects his impression in the fashion in which it would most naturally strike his senses, if it really came to him in a normal way from without.

A still more remarkable case has been supplied to us by Dr. Nicolas, Count Gonémys, of Corfu, a member of our Society, from whose long paper, which was in French, the following account is abstracted. The first person is retained for the sake of clearness.

"February, 1885.

(285) "In the year 1869, I was Officer of Health in the Hellenic army. By command of the War Office, I was attached to the garrison of the Island of Zante. As I was approaching the island in a steamboat, to take up my new position, and at about two hours' distance from the shore, I heard a sudden inward voice say to me, over and over again, in Italian, 'Go to Volterra.' I was made almost dizzy by the frequency with which this phrase was repeated. Although in perfectly good health at the time, I became seriously alarmed at what I considered as an auditory hallucination. I had no association with the name of M. Volterra, a gentleman of Zante with whom I was not even acquainted, although I had once seen him, 10 years before. I tried the effect of stopping my ears, and of trying to distract myself by conversation with
any person whom he knew or a stranger.

the bystanders; but all was useless, and I continued to hear the voice in the same way. At last we reached land; I proceeded to the hotel and busied myself with my trunks; but the voice continued to harass me. After a time a servant came, and announced to me that a gentleman was at the door who wished to speak with me at once. 'Who is the gentleman?' I asked. 'M. Volterra,' was the reply. And M. Volterra entered, weeping violently in uncontrollable distress, and imploring me to follow him at once, and see his son, who was in a dangerous condition.

"I found a young man in a state of maniacal frenzy, naked, in an empty room, and despaired of by all the doctors of Zante for the last five years. His aspect was hideous, and rendered the more distressing by constantly-recurring choreic spasms, accompanied by hissings, howlings, barkings, and other animal noises. Sometimes he crawled on his belly like a serpent; sometimes he fell into an ecstatic condition on his knees; sometimes he talked and quarrelled with imaginary interlocutors. The violent crises were often followed by periods of profound syncope. When I opened the door of his room he darted upon me furiously, but I stood my ground and seized him by the arm, looking him fixedly in the face. In a few moments his gaze fell; he trembled all over, and fell on the floor with his eyes shut. I made mesmeric passes over him, and in half an hour he had fallen into the somnambulant state. The cure lasted two months and a half, during which many interesting phenomena were observed. Since its completion, the patient has had no return of his malady."

A letter written to Count Gonémys by M. Volterra, dated Zante, 7th (19th) June, 1885, contains the most complete corroboration of the above statement in all that concerns the Volterra family. The letter concludes as follows:—

"Before your arrival at Zante I had no acquaintance with you whatever, although I have been many years at Corfu as Deputy to the Legislative Assembly; nor had we ever spoken together, nor had I ever said a word to you about my son. As I before said, we had never thought of you, nor desired your assistance, until I called on you on your arrival as officer of health, and begged you to save my son."

"We owe his life first to you and then to mesmerism."

"I hold it my duty to declare to you my sincere gratitude, and to subscribe myself affectionately and sincerely yours,

(Additional signatures) "DEMETRIO VOLTERRA, Count Crissoplevri.
 "LAURA VOLTERRA" [M. Volterra's wife].
 "DIONISIO D. VOLTERRA, Count Crissoplevri."
 "Ο θεραπευθεὺς Αναστάσιος Βολτέρρα." (Anastasio Volterra, the cured patient).
 "C. VASSOPOULOS (*come testimonio*)"
 "DEMETRIO, COMTE GUERINO (*confermo*)."
 "LORENZO T. MERCATI."

The form of the monition here, as the form of the statement in the former cases, I should attribute to the percipient's shaping imagination. The narrative, however, will be seen to present one

peculiarity which we have encountered in no other instance;¹ at the time that the impression was received, the agent and the percipient were personally unknown to one another. Still, if my surmise be allowable as to the conditions by which a line of telepathic communication may be established between persons unconnected by blood or affection, we might certainly find a likely condition in such an attitude as that of the supposed agent in this case. We cannot reasonably suppose that any casual stranger had as good a chance of being telepathically impressed by M. Volterra as the person who—though his name and personality may have had no place in M. Volterra's mind—was yet, by virtue of his special knowledge and of his actual approach, more nearly connected than any one else with the engrossing subject of his thoughts.

The following example, from a clergyman who unfortunately withholds his name from publication, is very similar, the *inward* nature of the sound being again noticeable. But here the agent and percipient were friends.

(286) "In March, 187—, I went to the curacy of A., and had been, as well as I remember, about a month there, when the following happened. I am a native of a town in the North of England, and in my childhood had a friend of my own age whom I will call C. Our friendship lasted till manhood, though our circumstances and walks of life were very different; and I had always a great deal of influence over him, insomuch that he would allow himself to be restrained by me when he would not by others. He became, towards his 20th year or so, rather addicted to drink, but I always had the same friendship for him, and would have done anything to serve or help him.

"In 187— his family were living at X. (near Z.), and as all my other old friends had long left the neighbourhood of Z., my native town, I always used to go to them whenever I visited that part, as I was and am still on sufficiently friendly terms with them to go at any time without notice. On the day in question I had been visiting some of the parishioners, and having made an end of this, came to a cross-road of two of the lanes near the church; and not only was I *not* thinking of my friend, whom I had not heard of for some years, but I distinctly remember what I *was* thinking of, which was whether to go home to my lodgings for my tea, turning to the left, or whether to trespass on the hospitality of a lady who lived to the right of the crossing. When thus standing in doubt, a kind of shudder passed through me, accompanied by a most extraordinary feeling, which I can only compare to that of a jug of cold water poured on the nape of the neck, and running down the spine;² and as this passed off, though I cannot say I *heard* a voice, I was distinctly conscious of the words, 'Go to Z. by this evening's train,' being said in my ear. There was no one at the

¹ A possible exception is case 30, Vol. i., pp. 214-8.

² Cf. case 223, p. 37, and the note thereon.

time within 100 yards of me. I was not very flush of money just then, and could not well afford the expense, besides not wishing to absent myself from duty so soon after taking it up. But it seemed so distinct that I almost made up my mind to obey it; but on announcing the fact to my landlady, to whom, of course, I could not tell my true reason, she remonstrated so earnestly that, coupling this with the affairs of my duty, &c., I did conclude to disregard it. I could not, however, settle to anything, read, write, or sit in comfort, till the time was elapsed when I could have caught the train, when the uneasy, restless feeling gradually went off, and in a few hours I was ready to laugh at myself.

“Three or four days after, I received the sad news that my friend had on that day gone down home from London, had been taken ill, and two days afterwards had, in a fit of temporary insanity, put an end to his life. I have no doubt in my own mind that had I obeyed the intimation I might have saved his life; for I must have gone to their house, no other in the neighbourhood being available; and had I found him in the condition in which he was, you may be very sure he would never have got out of arm’s length of me until all danger was over. I have ever since reproached myself with it, and have made up my mind that should I ever have such another experience I will do what is directed, seem it never so absurd or difficult.”

In reply to inquiries, the narrator adds:—

“I was in health just as usual, no better and no worse. I had good health all the time I was at A., and in particular I never have suffered from indigestion since I was a child. I have never at any other time had such a physical sensation, or such a sensation of a voice; and nothing has ever happened to me which would lead at all satisfactorily to the conclusion that any abnormal phenomena were present.”

The narrator has privately told us the year of the occurrence, and the place where the suicide took place; and we have verified these details in the Register of Deaths. The event took place later in the year than he imagined—in November. In conversation, he has explained that “Go to Z” practically meant the same for him as “Go to these friends,” as he would be quite certain to stay with them. Their place of business was still at Z. At the time of his experience, his friend was in a very critical condition.

The next case is worth quoting as parallel to the two last, though it has less evidential force; for, at this distance of time, we cannot make sure that something had not occurred during the preceding days, that might have half unconsciously suggested to the percipient the need which he was so strangely impelled to relieve. The account is from Dr. Joseph Smith, for many years leading medical practitioner in Warrington, and a class-leader in the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

“November 24th, 1884.

(287) “When I lived at Penketh, about 40 years ago, I was sitting one evening reading, and a voice came to me, saying, ‘Send a loaf to James Gandy’s.’ Still I continued reading, and the voice came to me again, ‘Send a loaf to James Gandy’s.’ Still I continued reading, when a third

time the voice came to me with greater emphasis, 'Send a loaf to James Gandy's'; and this time it was accompanied by an almost irresistible impulse to get up. I obeyed this impulse, and went into the village, bought a large loaf, and seeing a lad at the shop door, I asked him if he knew James Gandy's. He said he did; so I gave him a trifle and asked him to take the loaf there, and to say a gentleman had sent it. Mrs. Gandy was a member of my class, and I went down the next morning to see what had come of it, when she told me that a strange thing had happened to her last night. She said she wanted to put the children to bed, and they began to cry for food, and she had not any to give them; for her husband had been for four or five days out of work. She then went to prayer, to ask God to send them something; soon after which a lad came to the door with a loaf, which he said a gentleman gave him to bring to her. I calculated, upon inquiry made of her, that her prayer and the voice which I heard exactly coincided in point of time.

"JOSEPH SMITH, M.D."

§ 5. I will now give one case where the sound heard, though vocal, was not articulate.¹ The seemingly direct reproduction of the actual sound which the agent was making (and therefore hearing) at the time recalls the first cases of this chapter; but in the present instance there was no recognition, which is of course an evidential defect. The case is one where *pros* and *cons* have to be carefully balanced; it has been admitted as the experience of a matter-of-fact man, but would certainly have been rejected had it been that of a nervous or imaginative woman. The narrator is Mrs. B., who contributed also case 192, (to which she refers in the first line,) and whose name may be given to anyone interested in the subject.

"December, 1884.

(288) "Some six years after the above occurrence, in the September of 1870, my husband was at D. Hall for his holiday. His parents were then living at Dieppe. He was roused one night by a peculiar moaning, as if some person or animal was in pain. He got up and went through the house and out into the gardens and shrubberies, but could see nothing. He heard the same noise at intervals all that day, but could not find out the cause. He returned to London next day, to find a telegram summoning him to Dieppe, as his mother was dying. When he got into the house at Dieppe, the first sound he heard was a repetition of the same noise that he heard at D. Hall, and he found it was his mother who was making it, and he learned she had been doing so for two days. She died a few hours after he arrived. We had no knowledge of Mrs. B.'s illness at the time my husband heard the noise.

"My husband's parents had been obliged to leave D. Hall under painful circumstances, and possibly the thoughts of her loved home may have been paramount with Mrs. B., or it may have been that they flew to

¹ The strongest example in our collection that can be thus described is the *scream* case, No. 34, to which some "borderland" parallels are given in Vol. I., pp. 403-5. As possibly a direct reproduction of the agent's sensation, the present experience might be compared to cases 151 and 342.

my husband, who was her youngest son. At any rate, my husband always held that it was his mother's moaning he heard at D. Hall though she was in France. She was speechless when he reached her, so no solution could be arrived at.

“E. A. B.”

We find from a newspaper obituary that the death took place at Dieppe, on September 12, 1870.

In reply to inquiries, the narrator says :—

“My late husband was *alone*, at his old home in Norfolk, when he heard the moaning I told you of. He was shortly after (the same afternoon, I think) telegraphed for to go to Dieppe to see his mother. He was quite unaware, till he got the telegram, that she was ill. He returned to Selhurst, where we were living, and where I was, *on his way to Dieppe*, and then told me about this noise. On his *return* from Dieppe, after his mother's death, he said, ‘You remember my telling you of the moaning I heard at D. The first sound I heard in the house at Dieppe was the same, and it was my mother making it.’ He further added that he was told she had made it for a day or two. I am perfectly clear about his hearing it first at night *in* the house, and on the following morning in the shrubberies, which were a little distance from the house. I never heard either my husband or his father speak of ever hearing sounds, or seeing anything before or after the occurrences I have mentioned [*i.e.*, this case and case 192]. They were both matter-of-fact men, and very free from superstitious ideas. I was a young woman at the time these things took place (I am only 41 now), so my memory of them is very clear and good. Six weeks or two months after my husband heard these sounds, we were together at D., and he showed me the spot in the shrubbery where the sound had been loudest.”

[If the percipient's experience had been confined to the moaning heard in the night, the incident would not have been worth attending to, for reasons to be immediately adduced. But the continuance of the sound during the day, and out of doors, makes a decided difference.]

§ 6. We now come to a few specimens of the non-vocal sound-phantasms—the mere noises or shocks—which are the parallel among auditory hallucinations to the rudimentary visual hallucinations which were considered in the last chapter. But the auditory cases need a far more jealous scrutiny, before we are justified in regarding them as even probably telepathic in origin. Odd noises, especially at night, are very common phenomena; and though the particular cause of them is often hard to detect, the physical conditions of our indoor life are prolific of possible causes. Most of us are in constant proximity to wind that may blow through crevices, and rattle or flap or dislodge loose parts of our windows and walls and chimneys; and to water in pipes or cisterns that may leak, or burst, or may contain bubbling air; and to slates that may fall; and to wooden furniture and floors that may crack and creak. And if any one should say that he has heard a noise which, from its nature or its position, could not be

accounted for by any such ascertainable cause, he might be reminded that sounds are the hardest things in the world to localise ; and that no one who has not given special attention to the subject can realise how easy it is to mistake the source and character of an auditory impression.¹ Thus, while it is impossible to contend that the "ball of light" which appeared to Mr. Saxby was a real ball, and impossible therefore to deny that the coincidence of the hallucination with the death of some one to whom he was attached was an odd circumstance, it is quite possible to contend that some unaccountable crash which some one has heard was not a hallucination at all, but a real objective sound ; and the coincidence of such a crash with the death of a near relative is the less odd in proportion as unaccountable crashes are common occurrences. Still, unaccountable noises are not of such daily and hourly occurrence but that a sufficiently large and well-established group of the coincidences in question might be taken as possible

¹ I may mention, as a marked instance of this, a personal experience which I have again and again repeated. The dripping of a small fountain, heard from some yards off, produces on my ears the precise effect of a heavy waggon which is being slowly dragged up a gravelly road at a considerable distance.

The following is probably a case of mistaken localisation. The account is from the Rev. Edward Bonus, of the Rectory, Hulcot, Aylesbury.

"July, 1882.

"The house is the Rectory of — in the county of Wilts. Of the two clergymen concerned, one is now dead ; the other has read through and signed this account, certifying its accuracy. This matter happened about 20 years ago.

"One day, a friend of the then rector came on a visit for a few days, and rode on horseback. It was winter time. He put his horse into his friend's stables, and the two clergymen spent the evening together. They went to bed as usual about 11. During the night the friend heard the steps of a horse very distinctly on the stairs ; was not frightened, but greatly surprised. He at once got up, lighted his candle, and went downstairs, but could see nothing, and now *was* frightened. He returned to bed, and shortly again heard the same noise ; again he got up, this time too frightened to go downstairs, but went to his friend's room. He was asleep, so he roused him, and told him what he had heard ; they then remained together, leaving the light. Very soon they both heard the noise in the most certain and distinct manner ; so they both dressed and searched the house—could see or find nothing ; they then went to the stables, and to their sorrow the horse was dead.

"They both believed the spirit of the horse had entered the house. The horse died of heart disease ; it was afterwards examined. Never again, as far as I have ever heard, was the same man visited by any kind of noise.

"I was intimately acquainted with the two clergymen, and have heard them tell the story very many times.

"EDWARD BONUS."

"This account is correct.—H. S. L."

What one may surmise to have happened is that the friends heard a sound resembling heavy steps, and *inferred* that it was on the stairs. We learn, on inquiry, that "a horse kicking in the stables could be distinctly heard in the house" ; which suggests the true nature of the particular horse's "agency" in the matter.

In Morrison's *Reminiscences of Sir W. Scott* there is an account of the strange sounds—like the drawing of heavy boards along the new part of the house—which woke Scott and his wife on the night of the death of their friend, Mr. Bullock, who had lately been assisting them in the work of building and improving. The coincidence made a great impression on Scott, which, however, we cannot hold to have been justified. For Lockhart's *Life* contains a letter of Scott's, from which it appears that the same sound had been heard on the *preceding* night, when, though "awaked by a violent noise," he only "fancied something had fallen, and thought no more about it."

indications of telepathic action, especially as we have the analogy of rudimentary visual hallucinations to point to.¹ Moreover, there is no doubt that surprising noises and crashes, though often due to undiscovered external causes, are also a form of purely subjective hallucination²—which makes it at least probable, if telepathy be a reality, that they will also be a form of telepathic hallucination.

The kinds of non-vocal impression which are least likely to be due to a real but undiscoverable cause in the vicinity are those which are distinctly *musical*—the sound being produced not in the gliding random fashion of an Æolian harp, but in a series of well-defined tones. Some examples of literal music will be given in Chap. XVIII. But I will give here an example where the sound heard was of the ringing of bells, which is a known form of hallucination.³ The narrator is a gentleman who does not wish his name and address to be published, though he has no objection to their being communicated privately.

“ May 28th, 1885.

(289) “ In 1862, I sailed to Bombay in one of Dunbar’s old frigate-built ships. I was depressed the whole voyage with an undefined presentiment of ‘ bad news from home.’ At Bombay I used to get my messmates to go ashore for letters (a great privilege), even when it was my turn to do so ; my nervousness was so great. However, we sailed for home, and reached and left St. Helena, and no *black letter* was delivered to me.

“ Two days after leaving St. Helena I was up aloft doing some trifling sailor’s work with the fourth officer, on the mizen topsail or top gallant yard, when I heard a bell begin to toll. I said to him, ‘ Do you hear that bell tolling ? ’ ‘ No,’ he said, ‘ I hear nothing.’ However, my agitation was so great that I went down and examined both our bells ; and placed my arm near them, to see if they were vibrating or if any chance rope was swinging loose and striking them. However, while doing this, I still heard the boom of the tolling bell, and it seemed far away. I then, when I had satisfied myself that the sound was not attributable to either of our ship’s bells, went up aloft and scanned the horizon in search of a sail, but saw none. I then said to my messmates, ‘ That’s my “ black letter.” I knew I should have bad news this voyage.’

¹ A combination of rudimentary visual with rudimentary auditory hallucinations is recorded by Madame Guyon (*La Vie de Madame Guyon, écrite par elle-même*, Paris, 1791, Vol. iii., p. 170)—in a case, however, which cannot be presented as telepathic, inasmuch as Madame Guyon was expecting the death of the friend which coincided with the hallucination. The sight was a glimmer in the room, which caused some little gilt nails near the bed to glow : the sound was a crash as if all the window-panes in the house had fallen.

² See the statistics given in Vol. i., p. 503.

³ For instance, no one is likely to explain as a misinterpretation of real sounds the case given by Mr. Kinglake in *Eothen*, p. 239. In the midst of the desert he heard pealing for ten minutes, as it appeared to him, the familiar bells of his native village. I have received a very similar example from a lady who heard bells when leading a very solitary life in a remote part of India—which is one of the 7 cases mentioned in Vol. i., p. 503. A second apparently telepathic case is No. 344.

“At Falmouth we called for orders; and there I found that a lady who filled the place of elder sister to me (my aunt by marriage), and to whose younger sister I am married now, had been suddenly carried off by illness—at that time, as near as we could calculate, allowing for the different longitude. She was young (29), lovely, and most winning in her manners. I, boy-like, adored her, and she used to say that I was her young sailor lover; as my uncle, a captain in the Navy, was her old sailor lover.

“I am 40 years old now, and have been through dangers of all sorts, in imminent danger of death many times, but I have never had a presentiment since. After nearly 25 years I can still remember the boom, boom, of that old bell in the Manx churchyard, which I heard in latitude 14 S., or thereabouts.”

Asked whether he had ever experienced a hallucination on any other occasion, the narrator replied:—

“I have never suffered from any hallucinations. I have led an active life, including much loneliness, being for weeks together in the jungles shooting and surveying alone, save for native servants, and far from white men, and during all that time my brain never played me any tricks.” Later, he wrote:—“I have not been a dreamer, fool, or a mystic, but a hard-working, clear-headed man of business. I tell you all this, not in a boasting spirit, but simply to prove, so far as possible, that I am not a likely subject for ‘illusions’ or ‘hallucinations.’ You must remember that this occurred when I was a careless youngster of 17, on my first voyage to sea. I could not account for it then; nor can I now. The impression is as vivid as ever.”

Asked whether any bells would have been ringing at the time of the lady’s death, he says:—

“Yes. Malen Church bell would have been tolling in Castletown at that time, for the *passing bell* or for the funeral. I never asked whether the *passing bell* was rung, but it is a common habit in the Isle of Man to toll the church bell immediately after the decease of any one of some social importance. I feel sure it was done in this case; we were so well known there. I mean it is done for the gentry, and such of the farmers and shopkeeping class who care to pay for it.

“I may add that the lady who died was inexpressibly dear to me, being more like a sister than an aunt.”

The name of the lady was given to us in confidence, and also the date of her death; and we have verified this date by reference to an Isle of Man newspaper. The day proved to be a Sunday. This was pointed out to our informant, in case he might be able to recall anything which would point to a Sunday as the day of his experience. He replied:—

“I cannot well remember the day, but I think that, from what I do remember, it was a Sunday. I was probably stowing the mizen top-gallant sail, or doing some necessary work up aloft; but I remember that when I went down to look at the bells the ship was still, and I don’t remember any work going on. I am, however, not certain on this matter.”

If this case was telepathic, it must remain doubtful whether the form of the impression represented the last sensations or ideas of the dying person, or was a piece of death-imagery supplied by the percipient, as illustrated in several of the visual cases of Chap. XII. The preceding distress and nervousness were probably subjective, but can scarcely be regarded as the cause of the hallucination.

When we pass from musical impressions to noise proper, the degree of oddness and unaccountableness in a sound is a point which it is very hard to judge of from description. The reader may form his own opinion of the following account, received from Mrs. Samuda, of Shipton Court, Chipping Norton. I do not number it as an evidential case.

“If the details of what occurred to me (and which I believe to have been purely accidental) can be of any service to your Society, I will with pleasure describe them; but in doing so I must beg that you will thoroughly understand that I do not in the least believe in any of these coincidences, and at the time was much amused when I was told that the sounds I heard were death-warnings. On the 5th of October, 1878, about 3 o'clock in the morning, I was suddenly aroused by three *distinct loud knocks* exactly over the head of my bed. At the time I was ill, and the nurse was sleeping in my room. She also distinctly heard the sounds. The first thing the next morning, I received a telegram to say my grandfather, Sir Francis Grant, P.R.A., had died suddenly the night before at 8 o'clock. When I told the nurse of the telegram, she instantly said the three knocks I had heard were a death warning.

“On the 20th March, 1879, I received a letter from my mother, saying that my brother, Rupert Markham, *had* been ill, but was now going on quite well again, and that I need not be the least anxious. On the morning of the 21st, about 3 o'clock in the morning, I distinctly heard the same three knocks; my husband also heard them. At 10 o'clock that morning I received a telegram desiring me to come immediately, as my brother was dying. When I arrived at Melton Mowbray, 9.30 p.m., my brother was just dead.

“About the 2nd of May, 1879, at 6 o'clock in the morning, my husband and I both heard the same three knocks, and were so much impressed at this occurring for a third time that he instantly made a note of it. At that time my eldest brother had just started for Zululand, so we much feared something might have happened to him. For three weeks after this we heard nothing, then a letter came saying my brother was dangerously ill, but shortly afterwards we heard by telegram that he was perfectly well again. I tell you this third instance to show you that there cannot possibly be anything but a mere chance in these accidents being repeated.”

[The coincidence in the first case was probably closer than is represented; for all the newspaper accounts give the date of Sir F. Grant's death as Saturday, October 5th; the *Times* and the *Leicester Chronicle* say “Saturday morning”; and the *Daily Telegraph* says, “early on Saturday morning.”

The *Leicester Chronicle* confirms the date of death in the second case.]

Mrs. Samuda does not say whether she herself regards the knocks as hallucinations, or as objectively caused. If they were the former, then the question of "belief in these coincidences"—*i.e.*, the question whether they are due to accident, or to telepathy—must (as we have seen) be judged by the application of the doctrine of chances on a basis of very wide statistics; and certainly will not be decided in favour of accident by the fact that the percipient has observed a coincidence in two cases and not in a third. But the coincidence with the death was not very close in the second case, and possibly not in the first; and real sounds due to some defect in the house or furniture may have happened to be a little louder than usual on these occasions, and perhaps afterwards became exaggerated in memory. The fact that the experience was in each case shared by a second person is strongly (though, as we shall see later, not decisively) in favour of this view.

The following case has more weight. The account was written down on June 2nd, 1876, by Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood, from the dictation of the percipient, the late Miss Vaughan, of 6, Chester Place, Regent's Park, N.W.

(290) "In the autumn of 1856, Mrs. D. was lying dangerously ill, near Windsor; when I received a letter on Friday from her daughter, who had been invited to the marriage of Mr. Cox with Miss Alderson, telling me that as their mother was rather better, they thought they might come up to the marriage on Tuesday if I could give them a bed. On the Saturday night I went to bed at my usual hour, 12 o'clock, but did not go to sleep for some time; when I was suddenly startled by three sets of three extraordinary loud knocks, like strokes of a hammer on an empty box, at my bed head, followed immediately by a long loud cry of a woman's voice, which seemed to die away in the distance. I called my maid instantly, and begged her to look out of the window, and see if there was anyone in the street. She opened the shutters, threw up the window, and said there was no one; that I must have been dreaming; it was quite late. I said 'No, it had not yet struck 1,' and sent her to look at the clock; she returned, and said it wanted 10 minutes to 1. I said the noise must have come from the room adjoining mine, in the next house. She said the house was empty; but this I could not believe, so I sent her early on Sunday morning to see. She came back, saying the windows were all shut, and she had knocked for some time in vain. On the following morning I sent her to the person in Albany Street who had charge of the house, thinking somebody must have slept in it on Saturday night. The person in charge said this could not be the case, as she had the key; but she went to look, and came to tell me that no one could possibly have got in.

"In a very few hours afterwards I received a letter from one of the Miss D.'s, to tell me that their mother became suddenly worse on

Saturday morning, and had died in the course of the night. Some time subsequently, I had an opportunity of seeing the nurse, and she told me that Mrs. D. had exactly died at a quarter before 1 on Sunday morning, uttering a loud cry at the moment of her death. She had just been giving her a cup of beef tea, and had replaced it on the mantelpiece, where there was a clock, on which she observed the hour. I had thought that the whole must have proceeded from the next house.

"Mrs. D. had been a very intimate friend of mine; I know I was much in her thoughts, and a few days before her death she had said she hoped, now she was a little better, to be well enough to see me."

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mrs. D.'s death took place on a Sunday—October 26th, 1856.

In November, 1876, Mr. H. Wedgwood read the account of Miss Vaughan's vision to Miss E. T., a common friend of Miss Vaughan's and Mrs. D.'s, whom Mr. Wedgwood has known all his life. She was staying with her sister at Hastings at the time of the incident, and received a letter from Miss Vaughan telling them of Mrs. D.'s death, and of her having come to her. Miss T. was greatly interested in this intelligence, and hurried up to London, where she heard from Miss Vaughan the story exactly as narrated by Mr. Wedgwood, down to the news of Mrs. D.'s death; but Miss Vaughan had not then seen the nurse, and was consequently ignorant of the precise agreement in time between the fact of her outcry at the moment of death and Miss Vaughan's hearing the scream. Two or three months after, Miss Vaughan told her what she had heard from the nurse.

Miss T. has seen this statement, and appends the words: "Quite correct.—E. H. T. November 5th, 1883."

Mrs. Vaughan, of the Deanery, Llandaff, writing on June 10, 1886, sends us an account of the occurrence which differs from Miss Vaughan's only in one or two trifling details, and adds: "Miss Vaughan often spoke of it to us."

The fact of the scream, though it seems to have corresponded with an actual cry of the supposed agent, could not be pressed; as such sounds are not uncommon in London streets at night, and the loudness and apparent closeness of the cry may have been exaggerated. But the knocks in this case, if correctly described, seem less easy to explain, except as hallucination; and the hallucination (if the present class be admitted at all) would have a *primâ facie* claim to be considered telepathic—the tie of affection between the two parties being a strong one, and the coincidence extremely close. Technically, the incident ought perhaps to be classed among "borderland" cases; but this particular form of hallucination does not seem to be specially connected with the moments that immediately precede or follow sleep; and the percipient must apparently have been wide awake before the sounds ceased. A few more examples of the non-vocal sort will be found among the "collective" cases in Chap. XVIII.; others,

in view of the evidential weakness of the class, are relegated to the Supplement.

I will conclude this chapter with a case of a phantasm which, though located in the ear, perhaps rather concerned the sense of touch than that of hearing. If it was telepathic, it is a remarkably clear instance of the direct reproduction of the agent's sensation in the percipient's consciousness.¹ The account is from Mrs. Arthur Severn, of Brantwood, Coniston.

“1883.

(291) “Years ago, in Scotland, at my own home, I was in the drawing-room with my mother and aunt; the latter was busy writing at a table in the middle of the room, facing my mother, who was on a sofa sewing, while I was quietly amusing myself in my own way. It was all very quiet, when suddenly I was much startled by my mother, who gave a scream and threw herself back on the sofa, putting both her hands up to cover her ears, saying, ‘Oh, there’s water rushing fast into my ears, and I’m sure either my brother, or son James, must be drowning, or both of them!’ My aunt Margaret jumped up, and was rather angry and said, ‘Catherine, I never heard such nonsense, how *can* you be so foolish!’ My aunt seemed vexed and ashamed it should happen before me, for I was very frightened, and remember it all so vividly. My poor mother cried, saying, ‘Oh, I know it’s true, or why would this water keep rushing into my ears?’

“Alas! it proved too true, for very soon I could see people running very hard towards the bathing-place, and I remember the shudder that then ran through me, and the hope that my mother would not look out of any of the windows. Soon my uncle came hurrying to the house very white and distressed; all he could say was, ‘hot blankets!’ but it was too late—poor James was drowned. He was 21 years old, and my mother’s eldest child. Both the other witnesses of this scene are dead.

“JOAN R. SEVERN.”

[The narrator’s brother, James Agnew, was drowned while bathing in the river Bladnoch. The date, as we find from a copy of an inscription in Wigton churchyard, was June 8, 1853.]

It is to be noted that the narrator here was herself the percipient in the still more remarkable case of apparently direct transference, quoted in Vol. I., p. 188.²

¹ Other drowning cases, on the other hand, if correctly described, afford an equally clear illustration of the percipient’s independent investiture of the idea transferred, the impression being of the *dripping* of water—a sound which would be neither in the agent’s ears nor in his thoughts. See, *e.g.*, cases 513 (1) and 528; and compare the account of the Breton tradition in the *Dictionnaire Historique et Géographique de la Province de Bretagne*, by J. B. Ogée (Edition of 1845), Vol. i., p. 374.

² Other possible instances of hereditary or family susceptibility to telepathic influence are cases 14 and 15; the cases mentioned in Vol. i., p. 424, note; cases 310, 497, and 617; cases 413, 111, 161, 464; cases 232 and 561; cases 450 and 462; cases 421 and 503; cases 422 and 586; cases 496 and 532; case 562; and several of the collective cases in Chap. xviii., §§ 2 and 6, and in the Supplement, Chap. ix. I may add that my collection of casual subjective hallucinations of the sane includes 4 cases where a parent and child have been affected at different times. In one of these cases (received from Mrs. Freese, of Granite Lodge, Chislehurst) the son’s vision nearly reproduced the one which his mother had experienced years before. Another instance of hereditary susceptibility to hallucinations is mentioned by Abercrombie; see Vol. i., p. lxxii.

CHAPTER XVI.

TACTILE CASES AND CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES.

§ 1. IN the chapter on "borderland" cases, and again in Chapter XII., when illustrating the development of hallucinations by the percipient's own imagination under the stimulus of a telepathic impulse, I quoted several instances in which two of his senses played a part—as where an impression of sound preceded and led up to the visible phantasm. And I have mentioned (pp. 23-4) that the proportion of the telepathic cases in which the experience assumes such a complex or multiple form seems decidedly larger than obtains among the purely subjective hallucinations of the sane. The present chapter will contain those remaining telepathic instances which belong to seasons of complete waking consciousness. In some of these, as it happens, the sense of *touch* is involved; and I may take the opportunity of saying a necessary word or two on affections of that sense.

Among purely subjective hallucinations of the sane, those of touch seem to be rarer even than those of sight, and much rarer than those of hearing. My large collection includes only 68 examples (a few being cases of *repeated* experiences), of which 43 were of touch only, 8 were associated with a visual hallucination, 13 with an auditory hallucination, while 4 concerned all three senses. The canvassed group of 5705 persons (pp. 7, 8) yielded only 23 distinct experiences of the sort; and of these 23, one occurred to a person who was out of health, one in association with a visual, and two in association with an auditory hallucination. Moreover, in many of the cases where touch alone has been concerned, it is easy to suppose that the sensation was caused by an involuntary muscular twitch—an instance is even on record where a hallucination of sight and sound took its origin in an objective sensation, caused by the momentary cramp of a muscle¹—

¹ Paterson's paper in the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* for Jan., 1843.

so that the number of genuine tactile hallucinations would be even smaller than appears. It will not surprise us, then, to find that telepathic affections of this sense—or what might reasonably be adduced as such—are also rare. A couple of cases have been already quoted; in neither of which did the touch suggest any human contact, while each included a peculiarity beyond the mere touch—the first that of *pain* (Vol. I., p. 188), and the second probably that of *sound* (p. 132, above). We have, however, a few cases where the mere touch is alleged to have been more or less distinctive,¹ of which I will quote here one specimen. Mr. J. C. Harris, of Wellington, New Zealand, proprietor of the *New Zealand Times* and *New Zealand Mail*, writes:—

“July 6th, 1885.

(292) “My wife had an uncle, a sea captain, who was very fond of her as a child, and often, when at home at London, used to take her on his knee and stroke down her long thick hair. She, with her parents, went from London to Sydney, and her uncle pursued his avocation in other parts of the world. Some 3 or 4 years afterwards, she was upstairs, dressing for dinner, and had her hair loose upon her shoulders; suddenly she felt a hand placed on the top of her head, and brought down smartly along her hair on to her shoulders. Startled, she turned round and exclaimed, ‘Why, mother, how could you frighten me so?’ for she assumed her mother had played a little joke on her. There was no one there however. When she related the circumstance at the dinner-table, a superstitious² friend present advised them to make a note of the day and date. This was done. In due course came the news of the death of her uncle, William, on that day—allowing for difference of longitude at about the time she felt the hand on her head.

“J. CHANTREY HARRIS.”

The following is Mrs. Harris’s own account of her experience:—

“Hill Street, Wellington, New Zealand.

“December 5th, 1885.

“I regret extremely that, anxious as we are to assist, in however small a degree, the cause of science, it is not in my power to give confirmatory evidence of my own little experience. Of the friends who were associated with me at the time, but one is living, and she lives away in Queensland. The notes were not considered of sufficient consequence to be kept; and neither mourning card nor obituary notice are available. Consequently my account cannot, as I quite understand, have much value, uncorroborated as it is. However, as a matter of courtesy, I will make my statement, feeling well assured that you will accept it as authentic.

¹ In 11 out of the 43 cases just mentioned, the touch is alleged to have been recognised, and in 7 of these the person whose presence was suggested was dead. There is no difficulty in regarding such cases as “after-images”; but see Vol. i., p. 512, note.

² We are bound to accept Mr. Harris’s description; and can only wish that superstition oftener took the form, as here, of prompting the only scientific course.

“The occurrence happened so long ago that, while the incident is fresh enough to my memory, the precise date (never carefully noted) has escaped it. The year was 1860, the month April. I was a young girl, standing before the dressing-table in my bedroom, arranging some detail of my toilet. It was about 6 p.m., at that time of year, twilight, when suddenly a hand was placed upon my head, passed down my hair, and fell heavily on my left shoulder. Startled at the unexpected touch, I turned quickly to remonstrate with my mother for entering so quietly, when, to my surprise, I found no one there. On the instant my mind flew to England, whither my father had gone the preceding January, and I thought ‘something has happened,’ though what I could not define.

“I went downstairs, and related my fright to the family. In the course of the evening, Mrs. and Miss W. came in, and, on commenting upon my paleness, were told about the matter. Mrs. W. immediately said, ‘Put down the date, and see what comes of it.’ This was done; and the incident soon ceased to trouble us, though the family awaited with some anxiety my father’s first letter from home. It came in due time, and told how, when he reached England, he found his brother Henry seriously ill—dying, in fact. As a child I had been his little favourite, and in death my name was the last word he uttered.

“Upon comparing dates, and allowing for difference in longitude, we found that the time of my uncle’s death coincided exactly with that of my strange experience. I recollected, too, that it was a familiar habit of my uncle to stroke my hair with a caressing touch. My mother, who resides with me, is the only person who can confirm the story, and she appends her signature to this, in confirmation thereof.

“ELIZABETH HARRIS.”

(Attesting signature) “ELIZABETH BRADFORD.”

In answer to the question whether she has ever had a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion, Mrs. Harris replies:—

“This is the only experience of the kind in my life.”

We find from the *Thame Gazette* and the *Oxford Chronicle* that Mrs. Harris’s uncle died on May 12, (not in April,) 1860, aged 51.

[The coincidence here seems to have been very close, if we can trust Mrs. Harris’s memory that a written note of the date of her impression was compared with the date of the death. But it will be seen that she did not at the time associate her experience with her uncle’s former mode of touching her.]

But the more conclusive cases of recognition are naturally those where a *second* sense has been concerned; the element of touch being then a natural enough feature in a highly developed phantasmal impression. In the following case the second sense involved is that of hearing. The account is in the words of Mrs. Stone, of Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport; it is attested, as will be seen, by the percipient.

(293) “A well-known inhabitant of Walditch, a little village near Bridport, Dorset, died suddenly last May, 1881. We were all very sorry, and felt much for those she had left. She was an honest, industrious woman, a good, affectionate wife and mother. She had been somewhat ailing for

some time past, but there was no special cause for alarm, and my daughter saw her engaged (she was a washerwoman) in her usual occupation the day before her death. From her husband I heard the following narrative of facts, which he received from his son, when the latter came down to his mother's funeral:—

“My wife latterly was uneasy about one of her sons, Joseph Gundry, who is a pointsman on the Midland Railway, and had risen to an office of much responsibility. Not hearing from him for some time, she feared that he had fallen ill, and did not like to write till there should be no longer any cause for alarm. There was, in fact, such a press of business that he could not find time to write. On the night, or rather morning, of his mother's death, he had the night-duties, and, there being no train about, he sat down for a short time, leaning his arms on a table. He was not asleep and had hardly settled himself, when a hand was placed on his shoulder, and a voice said distinctly: ‘Joe, your mother wants you.’ As far as we can ascertain this was about the time that his mother passed away. He did not recognise the voice, and saw no one. As there is no post from Bridport that could reach him under two days, his father telegraphed. When the telegram was brought to him, he said, “I know what it is, my mother is dead.””

The percipient writes:—

“Hay Street, Sawley, Derby.

“February 16th, 1883.

“I have perused the attached, [*i.e.*, the above account] and find it to be substantially correct. I attest the accuracy of the report as printed, and I am prepared to bear it out.

“JOSEPH GUNDRY.”

Mr. Gundry further informs us that he has never on any other occasion experienced any sort of hallucination of the senses.

In the next example the sense of sound is again concerned. The case might be added to those quoted in Chapter XII., § 3, of the gradual development of telepathic hallucinations, leading finally to recognition. The narrator is the Rev. P. H. Newnham, late Vicar of Maker, Devonport, already so often mentioned.

(294) “In July, 1867, I was living at Bournemouth, and was temporarily acting as chaplain to the Sanatorium there. A very sad case came in unexpectedly of a young man in the last stage of consumption. He was so ill that we could not take him into the institution, but accommodated him in lodgings. I visited him for some time, as his clergyman. Then the chaplain returned home; and I myself left for my holiday. I did not expect to see the young man again; but, to my surprise, on my return home, on September 21st, I found he was still alive; and the doctors said he might yet live some weeks.

“On Sunday, September 29th, I had been reading prayers at the chapel in the Sanatorium, and the chaplain preached at the evening service. It was near the end of the sermon, and about 8 o'clock, not later, but I cannot tell to five minutes. I suddenly felt a firm, but gentle touch on my right shoulder. So impressed was I with the instinct

that this indicated the presence of some unseen being, that I at once asked 'Is it S.?' (the Christian name of a pupil of mine, who died in 1860). The answer came back at once, in the clear tones of the inner voice,¹ 'No, it's William.' I have no recollection of anything more.

"After service was over, I inquired about my young friend, and was told that the matron had been sent for to him, as he was suddenly taken much worse. Next morning I heard that he died about 8.10. It was, therefore, about 10 minutes before his actual death that I experienced the communication. I may add that I had not been thinking specially about him, that I had not visited him, or received any message from him since my return, and that I had no reason whatever to expect his speedy decease.

"P. H. NEWNHAM."

An obituary notice in the *Lymington and Isle of Wight Chronicle* confirms the fact that William Bryer died on September 29, 1867.

Mrs. Newnham corroborates as follows:—

"I perfectly remember my husband telling me, on his return home from the service at the Sanatorium Chapel, of the touch and voice, and saying he felt sure William was dead. He did not hear of his death till the next morning.

"M. NEWNHAM."

[Mr. Newnham seems to have a slight predisposition to subjective auditory phantasms, but has never experienced a similar vivid hallucination of touch.]

This can hardly be regarded as a subjective experience due to anxiety. Mr. Newnham had, no doubt, a certain emotional interest in the young man who died, and was aware of his critical condition. But if his hallucination had been a purely subjective one, caused by the latent emotional idea, one would certainly have expected that it would have taken a form suggestive of William; whereas Mr. Newnham actually connected it at first with a different person. So that the non-recognition in this case tends to increase the probability of the telepathic explanation (*cf.* case 282 above).

In the next case, the second sense involved is that of sight. The narrator is Mrs. Randolph Lichfield, of Cross Deeps, Twickenham. Her husband was precluded from attesting the account in writing, by a painful affection of the hand.

"1883.

(295) "I was sitting in my room one night, before I was married, close before a toilet-table, on which the book I was reading rested; the table fitted into the corner of the room, and the wide glass on it reached nearly to the ceiling, so that any one in the room could be seen full length. The book I was reading was not at all calculated to affect my nerves, or excite

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 480-1.

The true nature of such a phantasm is not to be confused with the hallucination of touch.

my imagination in any way. I was perfectly well, in good spirits, and nothing had occurred since receiving my morning's letters, to remind me of the person concerned in the strange experience you have asked me to relate.

"My eyes were fixed on my book, when suddenly I *felt*,¹ but did not see, some one come into my room. I looked straight before me into the glass to see who it was, but no one was visible. I naturally thought that my visitor, seeing me deep in my book, had gone out again, when, to my astonishment, I felt a *kiss* on my forehead—a lingering, loving pressure. I looked up, without the least sensation of fear, and saw my lover standing behind my chair, stooping as if to kiss me again. His face was very white and inexpressibly sad. As I rose from my chair in great surprise, before I could speak, he had gone, how I do not know; I only know that, one moment I saw him, saw distinctly every feature of his face, saw the tall figure and broad shoulders as clearly as I ever saw them in my life, and the next moment there was no sign of him. For the first minute I felt nothing but surprise; *perplexity* expresses better what I mean; fear, or the idea I had seen a spirit, never entered my mind; the next sensation was that there must be something the matter with my brain, and a feeling of thankfulness that it had not conjured up some terrific vision, instead of an agreeable one. I remember praying that I might not fancy anything that would frighten me.

"The next day, to my great surprise, there was not my usual morning's letter from him; four posts came in and no letter; all the next day, no letter. I naturally objected to the novel feeling of finding myself neglected, but should not have thought of letting the neglecter know it, so would not write to inquire the cause of his silence. On the third night—still no letter all day—as I was going upstairs to bed, thinking of something totally unconnected with R., as I put my foot on the top stair, I felt, suddenly, but most intensely, that he was in my room, and that I could see him just as I had done before. For the first time came the fear that something had happened to him. I knew well how intense his desire to see me would be, and thought—'Could it have been really that I saw him the other night?'

"I went straight to my room, convinced I should see him; there was nothing to be seen. I sat down and waited, and the sensation that he was there, and striving to speak to me, and to make me see him, became stronger and stronger. I waited till I became so sleepy I could not sit up any longer, and went to bed and to sleep. By the first morning's post I wrote and told him I feared he must be ill, as I had not had a letter for three days. I said not one word of what I have told you in this. Two mornings after, I had a few lines, shockingly written, to tell me he had hurt his hand out hunting, and could not hold a pen till that day, but was in 'no danger.' It was not till a few days after, when he could write distinctly, that I knew the whole truth.

"This is it. He had been riding an Irish hunter, a splendid horse across country, but a most vicious creature. This horse was so used to getting rid of any one he found on his back, if he objected to their presence there, and had such a variety of methods of doing so, throwing

¹ If, as is probable, this *feeling* was due to a faint *auditory* hallucination (Vol. i., p. 528, second note), the case would be one of the rare instances of hallucination of *three* senses. Compare Nos. 185, 306, 313, 504, 513 (1), 569.

grooms, huntsmen, any one, when the fit seized him, and when he found no amount of rearing, kicking, no bolting, and stopping suddenly, no 'buck-jumping' would unseat my *fiancé*, and that he had at last found his master, he became desperate. He stood still for an instant, then rushed across the road backwards, reared perfectly straight, and pressed his rider's back against the wall. The crush and pain were so intense, R. thought it must be death, and remembered saying, as he lost consciousness, 'May, my little May! don't let me die without seeing her again.' It was that night he had bent over and kissed me. He turned out not to be really injured, though, of course, in frightful pain, and his hand could not possibly hold a pen. The night I felt so suddenly and so certainly that I should see him, and, when I did not, felt so thoroughly he was there and trying to let me know it, he was at the time worrying himself about not writing to me, and wishing intensely that I might feel there was some reason for his silence.

"I told my mother [since deceased] all, just as I have told you, and she advised me to say nothing about his supposed visit to me till he was quite strong and well again, and I could do so personally. When he came to see me afterwards, I made him tell the whole of his account before I mentioned one word of my strange experience of those two nights.

"I have just read this over to him, and he vouches for my having exactly described his share of this strange experience."

§ 2. The remaining cases involve the senses of sight and hearing. The following account is from the Rev. J. A. Haydn, LL.D., Rector of Nantenan, Co. Limerick, and was first communicated by him to the Oxford Phasmatological Society.

"Nantenan Glebe, Askeaton.

"June 18th, 1883.

(296) "I beg to submit to your Society the following brief narrative, extracted from my diary.

"Nine miles from my residence, in the town of Adare, Co. Limerick, lived a gentleman, named Phillips, and his wife. They were on terms of unusually close and affectionate intercourse with myself and my family; they frequently driving over to spend the day here, and we as frequently returning the visit.

"On Thursday, October 16th, 1879, the accouchement of Mrs. Phillips took place; it had been anticipated with some anxiety by her medical attendant; but we were gratified to learn by a letter from Mr. Phillips that the event had passed without evil consequences, and that his wife was rapidly recovering.

"Matters were in this condition when, at 10 o'clock on the night of the ensuing Wednesday, October 22nd, I went to bed as usual. I slept in a little bedstead in an angle of my study downstairs; *all* the members of the household sleeping in the upper story. I had seen the doors fastened, and the children and servants were all in bed. As is my custom, I was reading in bed, when, in the midst of the hitherto unbroken silence, I heard quick, light footsteps, evidently those of a female, proceeding along the hall, as if entering from the front door, and then traversing the passage that leads to my study door.

“Arrived immediately outside, they seemed to me to resemble those of a person in the dark, vaguely trying to find where the door was. Under the full impression that my wife had come downstairs, I called her name loudly, and asked what was the matter. While I spoke, the noise ceased, but it recommenced immediately; and while I stared at the door, I both heard and saw the handle turned halfway round,¹ and then let go, as if the person entering had changed her mind. Surprised and alarmed, I sprang up with the lamp in my hand and opened the door. All was perfectly still and silent without. None of the household had stirred, nor was any door opened that had been closed.

“I returned to bed, and some few minutes after I heard the clock strike 11. No further disturbance occurred. *This* happened, observe, on Wednesday night, October 22nd, at a little before 11 o'clock.

“On Friday morning I got a letter from Canon O'Brien, the rector of Adare, to say that Mrs. Phillips had died on Thursday morning. I immediately set out to Adare to see my bereaved friend, and found him almost beside himself with grief. Mrs. Phillips, while in other respects advancing to convalescence, had suddenly been seized with scarlatina, which had proved fatal. Thinking it might ease my poor friend to tell me the sad details, I encouraged him to speak on the subject. He complained, as one of his bitterest griefs, that for the last night of her life his wife was delirious, and did not know him or her mother, who was present. ‘She sank gradually on Wednesday,’ he said, ‘and lost her senses on that night—raving about persons and places that had been familiar to her, and evidently fancying herself actually present in distant spots. You were one of the first-mentioned; she imagined that she was in your house speaking to you. I quietly asked whether he happened to have any idea as to what hour this was at, when he answered, ‘A few minutes before 11, as I distinctly remember looking at my watch.’

“Thus, at the very time that I, nine miles away, heard the unaccountable noises, my dying friend was speaking and acting as if she were in my presence. It seems impossible not to connect the circumstances.

“JOHN ARMOUR HAYDN.”

In answer to our inquiry whether he had ever experienced any other hallucination, Mr. Haydn replies, “My senses have never on any occasion played me false.” He further explains:—

“The facts of the narrative and its dates are extracted from the diary, but not the actual language. Those facts were written by me in my diary immediately after their occurrence; my custom, as a general rule, being to record the events of any given day on the following morning. The actual extracts I can give, if required, and should be happy to do so. The story, as told in the printed slip [*i.e.*, the above account], is accurate in all particulars, and most utterly reliable. I may add, and deeply regret to do so, that poor Phillips himself has since died.”

The following are the verbatim extracts from the diary:—

“Thursday, October 16th, 1879. Birth Phillips. On the 16th inst., the wife of John D. Phillips, S. I. Adare, Royal Irish Constabulary, of a son.”

“Thursday, October 23rd, 1879. A most singular thing occurred last night. Just after going to bed, while I was reading, I heard steps

¹ See p. 612 note, and compare cases 696 and 698.

outside my door and in the passage, as of a female walking aimlessly. Thinking it might be Louey, I called, but there was no answer. Immediately after the sounds ceased, the clock struck 11."

"Friday, October 24th, 1879. Letter from Lucius O'Brien, to say—and it was appalling news—that Mrs. Phillips is dead! She died yesterday morning, of fever and scarlatina. I at once determined on going over to Adare, although the roads were knee-deep and the day savagely showery. I can never forget the agony of poor Phillips. . . . He told me that she was getting rapidly worse all day on Wednesday, and that *at about half-past 10 on Wednesday night she became delirious, and raved of places where she had been.*"

The *Limerick Daily Chronicle* confirms Oct. 23, 1879, as the date of death.

The hallucination here, if telepathic, well illustrates the manner in which the impression received may be developed by the percipient (Vol. I., pp. 539-40). The dying woman's thoughts, in turning to her friend, would naturally be of seeing him and speaking to him, not of an ineffectual attempt to enter his room. But the impression which the brain externalised seems to have got no further than the suggestion of a strange and unexpected visit.

The next account is from Miss Paget, of 130, Fulham Road, S.W. It will be seen that the words which the percipient heard may not unnaturally be referred to the sudden idea in the agent's mind that his unforeseen accident would probably get him into a scrape.

"July 17th, 1885.

(297) "The following is the exact account of the curious appearance to me of my brother. It was either in 1874 or 1875. My brother was third mate on board one of Wigram's large ships. I knew he was somewhere on the coast of Australia, but I have no recollection of my having been thinking of him in any special way; though as he was my only brother, and we were great friends, there was a very close bond always between us. My father was living in the country, and one evening I went into the kitchen by myself, soon after 10, to get some hot water from the boiler. There was a large Duplex lamp in the kitchen, so it was quite light; the servants had gone to bed, and I was to turn out the lamp. As I was drawing the water, I looked up, and, to my astonishment, saw my brother coming towards me from the outside door of the kitchen. I did not see the door open, as it was in a deep recess, and he was crossing the kitchen. The table was between us, and he sat down on the corner of the table furthest away from me. I noticed he was in his sailor uniform with a monkey jacket on, and the wet was shining on his jacket and cap.¹ I exclaimed, 'Miles! Where have you come from?' He answered in his natural voice, though very quickly, 'For God's sake, don't say I'm here.' This was all over in a few seconds and as I jumped towards him he was gone. I was very much

¹ Compare cases 513, 520, 535, 537.

frightened, for I had really thought it was my brother himself; and it was only when he vanished that I realised it was only an appearance. I went up to my room and wrote down the date on a sheet of paper, which I put away in my writing-table, and did not mention the circumstance to any one.

"About three months afterwards my brother came home, and the night of his arrival I sat with him in the kitchen, while he smoked. I asked him in a casual manner if he had had any adventures, and he said, 'I was nearly drowned at Melbourne.' He then told me he was ashore without leave, and on returning to the ship, after midnight, he slipped off the gangway between the side of the ship and the dock. There was very little space, and if he had not been hauled up at once, he must have been drowned. He remembered thinking he was drowning, and then became unconscious.¹ His absence without leave was not found out, so he escaped the punishment he expected. I then told him of how he had appeared to me, and I asked him the date. He was able to fix it exactly, as the ship sailed from Melbourne the same morning, which was the reason of his fear of being punished, as all hands were due to be on board the evening before. The *date* was the same as the date of his appearance to me, but the hours did not agree, as I saw him soon after 10 p.m., and his accident was after midnight. He had no recollection of thinking specially of me at the time, but he was much struck by the coincidence, and often referred to it. He did not like it, and often when he went away said, 'Well, I hope I shan't go dodging about as I did that time.'

"I was about 22 at the time, and he was 20. I was always rather afraid I might see him or others after this, but I have never, before or since, had any hallucination of the sense of sight. My brother died abroad three years ago, and I had no warning then, nor do I imagine I shall ever see anything again. I am never on the look out for things of that kind, but if I ever saw anything again I would make a note of it. I destroyed the note I made of the date as soon as I had verified it, not thinking it could interest or concern anyone else. "RUTH PAGET."

[I received a third-hand account of this incident two years before the above was written, and this older account completely agreed with the present more recent one; which shows, at any rate, that the incidents stand out with distinctness in Miss Paget's memory. In conversation, Miss Paget told me that at the moment when she mistook the apparition for her brother himself, she accounted for the *wetness*, which she so distinctly remarked, by supposing that he had got wet through with rain. She is quite sure that the coincidence of night was clearly made out, when she and her brother talked the matter over—which of course makes her statement as to the coincidence of *date* technically incorrect, as the accident occurred after midnight. If longitude be allowed for, the impression must have followed the accident by about 10 hours.]

The next case is from Marian Hughes, confidential maid and secretary to Miss Julia Wedgwood, of 31, Queen Anne Street, W.

¹ See p. 26.

“December, 1882.

(298) “In the winter of 1878, my sister, Mrs. Barnes, was much pressed to marry a man named Benson, who was much attached to her; and not succeeding in his suit, he told her if she would not marry him, he would take employment in India. He obtained a situation to go out to Madras.

“One Saturday night, about 9 o'clock, I, in the following spring, went to see my sister; she was much agitated, and told me that, just before I came in, she had been on her knees scrubbing the floor of a room on the ground floor (with a window that anyone could stand at and look in), when she heard herself called twice, ‘Annie, Annie,’ and looking up at the window, she saw what looked to her like the face of the friend who had wanted to marry her. She at once got up and rushed out, but finding no one there became convinced she had seen an apparition announcing the death of her friend. On the following Monday, she sent to the firm in the City with which he was connected, and was informed that he had been ill, but was better when last heard of. Shortly afterwards, knowing Mr. H. Wedgwood's interest in this kind of story, I informed him of the occurrence, before it was known how it fared with my sister's friend in India.

“My sister, some weeks afterwards, told me that she had learnt from his employers in the City that he had died on the evening of the day she had seen the apparition in London. “MARIAN HUGHES.”

The Registrar of the Diocese of Madras writes to us that he can find no record of Benson's burial; and an exhaustive search in the records of the India Office has been equally unsuccessful. We learn, however, from the India Office that the returns do not profess to be absolutely complete.

Writing on the case on March 4, 1883, Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood says:—

“The story was told me by Marian Hughes, my daughter's confidential maid and attached friend, whose truthfulness may be entirely relied on. I wanted to hear it from her sister herself, but found that she considered it too solemn a subject to speak about. I was told of the apparition of the friend in India shortly after it occurred, and requested Marian to inform me as soon as they had news of the result.” He adds:—

“My note of the case [*i.e.*, the original note made when he first heard Marian Hughes' account] was dated May 16th, 1878. I say, ‘One Saturday evening about six weeks ago,’ &c. On July 19th, in an article, I say, ‘By the end of June it was known that Annie's friend had died suddenly on the evening of Saturday, 30th March, the day noted by Annie as the day of the apparition.’”

[Mrs. Barnes has had an auditory hallucination on one other occasion, when she heard herself called by the voice of her husband, who, it turned out, had died at a distance two days before.]

It is rare for *nautical* stories to reach the level of evidence. The following, however, is a case where the testimony seems hardly to leave room for a doubt that a hallucination of a particular kind was experienced at a particular crisis; and the question of its interpretation is a matter not of nautical but of scientific judgment. The statement (which was first published in the *Spiritualist*) was drawn up sixteen

days after the incident occurred, through the prompt energy of Mr. W. H. Harrison, and on the suggestion of the late Mr. Cromwell F. Varley, F.R.S., who had questioned Captain Blacklock on the subject.

(299) "The steamship 'Robert Lowe' returned to the Thames on Tuesday, October 11th, 1870, from St. Pierre, Newfoundland, where she had been repairing one of the French Atlantic Telegraph Company's cables. An engineer on board, Mr. W. H. Pearce, of 37, Augusta Street, East India Road, Poplar, was taken ill with the typhus fever, and on the 4th of October last he died. One of his mates, Mr. D. Brown, of 1, Edward Street, Hudson's Road, Canning Town, Plaistow, a strong, healthy man, a stoker, not likely to be led astray by imagination, attended him till the day before he died. [Brown, it appears, bore the best of characters, and had a strong friendship for Pearce.] On the afternoon before his death, at 3 o'clock, in broad daylight, Brown was attending the sick man, who wanted to get out of bed, but his companion prevented him. And this is what the witness says he saw:—

"I was standing on one side of the bunk, and while trying to prevent Pearce from rising, I saw on the other side of the bunk, the wife, two children, and the mother of the dying man, all of whom I knew very well, and they are all still living. They appeared to be very sorrowful, but in all other respects were the same as ordinary human beings. I could not see through them; they were not at all transparent. They had on their ordinary clothes, and, perhaps, looked rather paler than usual. The mother said to me in a clearly audible voice, "He will be buried on Thursday, at 12 o'clock, in about fourteen hundred fathoms of water." They all then vanished instantly, and I saw them no more. Pearce did not see them, as he was delirious, and had been so for two days previously. I ran out of the berth in a state of great excitement, and did not enter it again while he was alive. He died on Tuesday, not Thursday, and was buried at 4 o'clock, not 12.¹ It was a sudden surprise to me to see the apparitions. I expected nothing of the kind, and when I saw them I was perfectly cool and collected. I had never before seen anything of the kind in my life, and my health is, and always has been, good. About five minutes afterwards I told Captain Blacklock I would stop with the sick man no longer, but would not tell him why, thinking that if I did, nobody else would take my place. About an hour later, I told Captain Blacklock and Mr. Dunbar, the chief engineer, whose address is Old Mill, near Port William, Wigtonshire, Scotland.'

"The other sailors on board say that they saw that Mr. Brown was greatly agitated from some cause, and they gradually drew this narrative out of him." Captain Blacklock says:—

"Brown came down into the cabin, looking very pale and frightened, and declared in a strong and decided way that he would not attend the sick man any more on any conditions—not for a thousand pounds. I told

¹ This markedly illustrates the absence, from first-hand and immediate accounts, of the spurious marvels which have done so much to mask the facts of telepathy. It would be a tolerably safe prophecy that in any third-hand version of this occurrence the great point would be that the death and burial took place on the day and at the hour predicted.

him that he ought to attend a sick and dying comrade, especially as a storm was raging, and he needed kind and considerate help, such as any of us might need one day. I pressed him all the more, as I wanted a strong steady man to attend the delirious invalid ; besides, it being bad weather, the other men were fagged and over-worked. Brown would not go back, and he left the cabin, as I think, crying, so I sent him out a glass of brandy. Shortly after that, I heard he was very ill, and that his mates had some trouble in soothing and calming him.

"We the undersigned, officials on board the 'Robert Lowe,' declare the above statements to be true, so far as each of the circumstances came under our personal notice, but we none of us commit ourselves to any opinion as to the cause of the phenomenon. We give the statement simply because we have been requested to do so, rumours of the occurrence having gone abroad and caused inquiries to be made.

(Signed) "J. BLACKLOCK, Commander."

"ANDREW DUNBAR, First Engineer.

(Signatures of six other members of the crew.)

"Witness, W. H. HARRISON.

"October 20th, 1870."

[Captain Blacklock is dead. The "Robert Lowe" was lost in 1872, and only one or two of the crew escaped. The account included a description of some distressing experiences of Mrs. Pearce's, which had occurred in London during the few days before her husband's death, and filled her with anxiety on his account ; but this anxiety cannot be safely assumed to have been in any way a condition of Brown's experience.]

It cannot, of course, be proved that this was not a case of purely subjective hallucination, as Brown knew the Pearce family by sight. But the vision, both in its character and its effects, was unlike any of those which were treated above (Vol. I., Chap. XI.) as due to expectancy or anxiety. And we at any rate have the coincidence that a healthy man experienced the one hallucination of his life—and an extremely vivid and highly-developed specimen—in broad daylight, at a time when the friend in whose beclouded mind the very scene evoked may well have been dominant, was dying in close proximity to him.¹

The following is another nautical case, as to which it is not easy to form an opinion. The points against it are that it is from an uneducated witness ; and that it contains an account of an experience which in one respect—the length of its duration—has scarcely a parallel, as far as I know, among hallucinations of sane and healthy persons.² Nevertheless, unless the account is an absolute fabrication,

¹ As regards the supposition that the agent was the sick man himself, cf. case 30, Vol. i., pp. 214-6. As to the appearance of more figures than one, see the remarks on case 202.

² See however cases 590 and 621.

which seems very unlikely, the reasonable conclusion, I think, would be that a telepathic hallucination was produced, though its details may have been exaggerated. Mr. Louis Lyons, of 3, Bouverie Square, Folkestone, wrote, on October 21st, 1882 :—

(300) “Some time ago, my son told me that a friend of his, a rough and simple-minded fellow, had returned from Shields, and told him a curious tale. The man is a sailor, and had served with his father ever since he was a boy, in a collier which trades between this port and the North. The youth, having become very proficient in his calling, went on his voyages, leaving his father, now an elderly man, at home. During a stormy voyage, and not far off the Humber, the young sailor saw his father, whom he had left in excellent health, pacing the deck, and calling out several times, as he was wont to do, ‘Mind your helm, Joe!’ The young man wished to speak to his father, but could not; some occult power prevented him. At the end of the voyage a letter awaited the young sailor, announcing the death of the father at the precise time when he appeared to his son; but please to remark (a matter of some importance, I think,) that the apparition remained on deck some three hours, until the vessel got to Grimsby. [This differs from the first-hand account.]

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

At our request Mr. Lyons interrogated Edward Sings more formally, the next time that the latter visited Folkestone. The following is Sings’ own account :—

“Folkestone.

“December 29th, 1882.

“I left my father last about six years ago, on a Good Friday. He was in good health when I left him. We were in a gale of wind, and we were running in the Humber; we carried the main gaff away; I was at the wheel steering her in. He came to me 3 or 4 times, tapped me on the shoulder, and told me to mind the helm, and I told the captain my father was drowned, or something happened to him. After we got in, when it was my watch, he was walking to and fro with me, and I went down below and told my mate I could not stop up, and I did not like to. My mate took my watch. I never could speak to my father, for something kept me from doing so. I heard of my father’s death a week afterwards. No one else saw my father’s spirit.¹ My father stopped on deck with me an hour, and as I could not stand it any longer I went below, and my mate took my place. We cast both anchors, and were towed into Grimsby. My mother and sister were at my father’s death-bed, and they told me that my father asked several times whether I was in the harbour.

“I certify this to be a true account.

“EDWARD SINGS.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that E. Sings’ father died on

¹ See p. 48, note.

April 7, 1877, aged 53. Good Friday fell on March 30; and this, it will be seen, corresponds very well with the above statement.

Mr. Lyons has kindly visited Sings' mother and sister, at 67, Tontine Street, Folkestone, and received a similar account from them.

The next case is from a lady whose name may be given privately. She herself would have been perfectly willing that it should be published, because the incident "is as natural and real to me as any other event in my life"; but she thinks that the publication might give annoyance to some of her relatives.

"C— Rectory.

"May 23rd, 1884.

(301) "In June, 1878, when nursing a brother who was ill, I woke up suddenly about 2 o'clock on the night of the 24th, calling him, and feeling strongly that he wanted me. I jumped up and went to the table, intending to get his medicine, as I was in the habit of doing by day, but the touch of the table brought me to my senses, and I went back to bed, thinking it was merely fancy. I was 17 then, quite strong and well, and had never been conscious of any such impression before. My sister, who slept in a room opening off mine, heard me call my brother's name, and came in to see what I was doing, and stayed with me for some time.

"On asking my brother the next morning what sort of night he had had, he said, 'Very wakeful at first, but after you came in at 2 o'clock I went to sleep all right.' I said nothing to him of my experience at that hour, but told him I had never been in his room all night. He answered, 'Of course you were; you came in and gave me my drops, and settled my pillows, and then I got up and did what you told me,' which was opening the window. I assured him I had done nothing of the kind, when he said quite impatiently, 'I couldn't have imagined it unless you had; but you mustn't do it again or you will catch cold, running about the house at night.'

"I said no more about it for fear of alarming him, and I never told anyone of it, lest they should think the nursing was making me ill, but I was quite strong and well at the time. I put it down in my note-book that day, and a year later I have another reference there to this same event.

"Two months later, in August, 1878, I was in Hampshire, my brother in Sussex. I knew he was dying, but had no reason for thinking him in any more immediate danger on that day. About 9 o'clock, during breakfast, a sudden feeling of great depression came over me, which increased and I could not shake it off all the morning, though I did not particularly connect it with my brother. One of my sisters noticed it, and asked if I felt ill. Later on, a telegram came to say that my brother had died quite suddenly, a few minutes past 9 o'clock. I only mention this because it was the only other occasion on which I ever remember being conscious of such a sensation.

"K. A. O."

[This last coincidence may easily, of course, have been accidental.]

Miss O. adds :—

“My sister is away from home, so I wrote to her without giving any reason for wanting her evidence, and tried to say nothing that would recall this occurrence to her mind. I simply asked her, ‘Do you remember your coming into my room one night during H.’s illness? If you do, I want a written statement of what you remember.’

“I enclose her reply. She mentions that I called his name, and that she found me crying, which was true, as the impression that he wanted me was so strongly upon me, and yet I believed it to be fancy. She knows that I never left my room, otherwise I might have thought that I had really gone down the passage to my brother’s room, which was at the other end, but I never walked in my sleep in my life.

“My brother was so positive about it that I felt certain he believed I had actually done what I had tried to do in my own room. It seemed perfectly natural to me, but I said nothing to my people, for fear they should think the strain of nursing would make me ill.

“These are the references in my note-book: On June 25th, 1878, among other things about my brother, ‘He said that in the night he woke up, firmly persuaded that I had been in his room, and was talking to him, and he got up at once, and did exactly as I told him.’ On June 24th, 1879: ‘It was this night last year that I woke up in the middle of the night calling H., and then E. came in. And the next morning he told me that just at that moment he thought I came into his room, and he got up to do as I told him.’

“I can’t account for his thinking I told him to open the window, unless from the fact that I got up and went over to the window in my room where the table was.

“My brother was several years older than myself, and I was extremely attached to him; he was accustomed to my doing this sort of thing for him by day.

“This happened at Salehurst Vicarage, in Sussex, two months before my father came here. I never spoke of it to them until this week, when I told my brothers and sisters.”

The following is the enclosure mentioned :—

“May 21st, 1884.

“I remember well the event you allude to, of how you awoke one night, calling for Herbert, and I went into your room, found you crying, and tried to comfort you. I have often thought of it since.

“EMILY C. O.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss K. A. O. says :—

“You ask if this experience was unique in my brother’s case, and I believe it to be so. He would have treated anything of the kind merely as a joke, and the idea that such a thing as thought-transference was possible would never have crossed his mind. Nothing that I had done before could have made him expect me at night, for I had never done any night nursing, and he himself scolded me for what he imagined the imprudence of my proceeding. If I had been in the habit of going to his room, then I should have gone at once when I felt he wanted me, but as I

had never done so, I was afraid of alarming him by going in at night. I have never had any similar experience."

This case resembles No. 271 above, in the point that the "agency" was apparently exercised at the moment of startled waking from sleep; but considering the circumstances, the present coincidence could more easily than the other be regarded as accidental. Had the brother's experience been a dream, or even a vision between sleeping and waking, we should feel that to be the reasonable view. There is one feature in the account, no doubt, which looks very like dreaming—the brother's remark, "*You gave me my drops.*" But it will be observed that this is not mentioned in the entry in the note-book; it seems therefore very probable that it was an unconscious addition on Miss O.'s part. On the other side we have her brother's recorded testimony that the phantasmal visit took place at a time when he was "very wakeful"; and it would be at least noteworthy that he should have had what we are led to suppose was the one waking hallucination of his life, at the very time that his sister was also experiencing a unique and closely corresponding impression. ??

§ 3. The next case is of a rarer type; as, though the senses of sight and hearing were both affected, the two impressions were not combined in the same incident, but were separated by several hours interval. The account is from Mr. Garling, of 12, Westbourne Gardens, Folkestone, a witness as free from credulity and superstitious fancies as can well be imagined.

"February, 1883. 149. 290
n.c.

(302) "One Thursday evening, about the middle of August in 1849, I went, as I often did, to pass the evening with the Rev.—Harrison and his family, with whom I had for many years lived on terms of the closest intimacy. The weather being very fine, we made up a party with the neighbours, and went to the Surrey Zoological Gardens, and spent the evening there. I note this particularly, because it proves that he and his family were in good health incontestably on that day, and that no suspicion of what was to follow so soon existed with anyone. The next day I went down on a visit to some relatives in Hertfordshire, who lived at a house called Flamstead Lodge, about 26 miles from London, on the high road. We usually dined at 2 o'clock, and on Monday afternoon following, after their early dinner, I left the ladies in the drawing-room, and sauntered through the paddock down to the high road. You will note the time was in the middle of a sunny August day, in a wide, public, commonplace high road, not a hundred yards from a roadside public-house—I myself in a perfectly cheerful, healthy frame of mind—no surroundings of any kind to excite the imagination, some country people not far off,

indeed, at the time I speak of. Suddenly a 'phantom' stood before me, so close that had it been a human being it must have touched me; blotting out for a moment the landscape and surrounding objects; itself indistinct in outline, but with lips that seemed to move and murmur something, and with eyes fearfully distinct that fixed and followed and glared into mine, with a look so intense and deeply earnest that I fairly recoiled from the spot and started backwards. I said to myself instinctively and probably uttered it aloud, 'Good God, it is Harrison!' though not thinking of him or having reason to think of him in the remotest degree at the moment. In probably a few seconds, which seemed to me far longer, it vanished, leaving me rooted to the spot for a few moments, and sensible of the reality of the vision by the curious physical effect it left upon me. This was as if the blood was like ice in my veins;¹ no flutter of the nerves, but a deadly chill feeling that lasted more or less for nearly an hour, and only gradually wore off as the circulation returned. I have never felt any similar sensation before or since. I said nothing to the ladies when I returned, as I should have frightened them out of their wits, and the impression made upon me gradually became fainter as the day wore out.

"I have said that the house was near the high road; it stood in its own grounds by the side of a country lane leading up to the village, 200 or 300 yards or more from any other habitation, with a seven-foot iron railing in front to keep out tramps; gates always locked at night; about 30 feet of hard gravel and paved pathway from front door to lane. A beautiful quiet summer evening followed. Placed as the house was, with hard gravel and high iron palisade and paving, no one could have approached the house in the deep silence of that summer evening without being heard a long way off. There was, moreover, a large dog in a kennel, placed so as to command the front entrance, especially to warn off intruders; and a little terrier inside that barked at everybody and at every noise. We were just retiring to bed, and were sitting in the drawing-room, which was on the ground floor, close by the front door, the terrier within. The servants had already gone to bed in a room quite at the back, 60 feet away. They, when they came down, told us they were *asleep*, and were roused by the noise. Suddenly there came to the front door a noise so loud and continuous (the door seeming to shake in the frame and to vibrate under some tremendous blows), that we started to our feet in amazement, and the servants came in a moment after, half-dressed, running downstairs from their room at the back to know what it was. We went at once to the door, but could neither hear nor see anything or anybody. And the dogs gave no tongue whatever. The terrier, contrary to its nature, slunk shivering under the sofa, and would not stop even at the door, and nothing could induce him to go into the darkness. There was no knocker on the door, nothing to fall down, and no possibility of anyone approaching or leaving the house, so situated, in that profound silence, without discovery. They were all horribly frightened, and I found it very difficult to get them to go to bed, but I was myself in so unimpressionable a frame of mind that I did not at the time connect it with the 'phantom' in the afternoon; but still went to

¹ See p. 37, note.

bed myself, pondering upon it and seeking some obvious explanation to satisfy the members of the household, but without success.

"I stopped there till Wednesday morning, having no suspicion of what had happened in my absence. On that morning I returned to town to my chambers, then at No. 11, King's Road, Grays Inn. My clerk met me at the door with, 'Sir, a gentleman has been here two or three times; is most anxious to see you; says he must see you immediately; he is gone out for a few minutes to get a biscuit, and he will be back directly.' In a few minutes the gentleman returned, and I recognised at once a Mr. Chadwick, also an intimate friend of Harrison and his family. He then told me, to my amazement, 'There has been a fearful visitation of cholera in the Wandsworth Road,' meaning at Mr. Harrison's; '*all are gone.*' Mrs. Rosco was attacked on Friday, and died; her maid the same evening, and died. Mrs. Harrison was attacked on Saturday morning, and died that evening. The housemaid died on Sunday. The cook also was taken ill, was carried away, and escaped very narrowly. Poor Harrison was attacked himself on Sunday night, was fearfully ill all Monday and yesterday, and has been taken away from the Pest-house in the Wandsworth Road to Jack Straw's Castle at Hampstead, to get into a better air; he was begging and praying for the people about him, all Monday and yesterday, to send for you, but nobody knew where you were gone to. You must take a cab at once and come with me, or you will not see him alive.' I went with Chadwick at once, but he was dead before I reached the place.

"H. B. GARLING."

The obituary in the *Watchman*, for August 15th, 1849, shows that Mrs. Rosco died from cholera on August 4th, Mrs. Harrison on August 8th, and the Rev. T. Harrison on Thursday (not Wednesday), the 9th, at Hampstead.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Garling says:—

"The ladies were old, and have been dead some 25 years. Of the servants at the house all trace has been lost."

Mr. Garling added a few details in conversation with the present writer. The figure met him on the high road, so close to his face that he hardly observed anything in detail except the face. He has had one other hallucination, when he seemed to see the figure of a friend at the foot of his bed. But the friend was one whose funeral he had just been attending, and who, moreover, had been accustomed, in life, to sit where the figure was seen; and Mr. Garling himself was going to sleep at the time. The experience, therefore, cannot be argued to show any special proclivity to subjective hallucination.

The auditory experience here is a good specimen of what I have called the *rudimentary* type—a class of which the inconclusiveness has been sufficiently dwelt on. But clearly the presumption that the sound was telepathic in origin is strengthened by the fact of the visual experience which preceded it. Telepathy having (as we may reason-

*longer...
a real...
the...
was...*

ably suppose) produced the first phenomenon, it is not unreasonable to credit it with the second; especially since the second, though it affected so many persons, seems in itself particularly hard to account for by any objective cause in the vicinity. It may appear, no doubt, extremely strange that the conditions which first flashed an impression to the one person directly interested should afterwards involve the whole household in a psychic storm; but this topic belongs to the concluding chapter, on "Collective Cases."

CHAPTER XVII.

RECIPROCAL CASES.

§ 1. WE have now to consider a quite new type of telepathic action. In the classes which have so far been passed in review, whether experimental or spontaneous, the parts of the agent and the percipient have been well defined, and the current of influence has set from the one to the other in an unmistakable fashion. But in several cases, it may be remembered, (especially Nos. 35 and 94,) we have had indications that the influence might be a *reciprocal* one—that each of the parties might receive a telepathic impulse from the other, and so each be at once agent and percipient. The cases referred to were doubtful, because the experience at one end of the line was a dream; and dreams having an almost limitless scope, it was conceivable enough that that of Mr. Newnham, for instance, though it curiously corresponded with his *fiancée's* actions and surroundings at the time, did so by accident; and that therefore his mental condition, while it affected her, was not affected by her. But had he had a *waking* vision of her, as she had of him, we should have considered it probable that the influence was mutual; since if two rare or unique events, which present so obvious a *primâ facie* connection as A's vision of B and B's vision of A, fall at the same time, we cannot readily assume the coincidence to be accidental. And if there are further and more distinct grounds for attributing B's vision to telepathy—say because A is dying at the time—it will be only reasonable to regard A's vision as part of the same complex phenomenon, rather than to suppose that A has an *accidental* vision at the same time as B has a *telepathic* one. But of course the proof of a reciprocal influence would be stronger still if, at the ~~the~~ time of B's impression of A, A expressed in words some piece of knowledge as to B's condition which could not have been acquired in a normal manner. We thus see that a group of cases which have all the same claim to be considered

telepathic, may have different claims, ranging from the very doubtful to the very conclusive, to be considered *reciprocally* telepathic.¹

I will begin with a couple of the more doubtful cases. The following account was received through the kindness of Mr. G. J. Romanes, F.R.S., who is well acquainted with the narrator.

“March 18th, 1883.

(303) “On the night of the 26th of October, 1872, I suddenly felt very unwell, and went to bed about half-past 9, an hour earlier than usual, and fell asleep almost immediately, when I had a very vivid dream, which impressed me greatly; so much so, that I remarked to my wife, on waking, that I feared we should shortly receive bad news. I imagined I was sitting in the drawing-room near a table, reading, when an old lady suddenly appeared seated on the opposite side, close to the table. She neither spoke nor moved much, but gazed very intently on me, and I on her, for at least 20 minutes. I was much struck by her appearance, she having white hair, very dark eyebrows, and penetrating eyes. I did not recognise her at all, but thought she was a stranger. My attention was then directed to the door, which opened, and my aunt entering and seeing me and the old lady staring at each other in this extraordinary way, with much surprise and in a tone of reproach exclaimed, ‘John! don’t you know who this is?’ and without giving me time to reply said, ‘Why, this is your grandmother,’ whereupon my ghostly visitor suddenly rose from her chair, embraced me, and vanished.

¹ The numerous cases where two friends in different places prove to have been each exceptionally engrossed with the idea of the other at the same moment, must not be put forward as instances of telepathic, much less of reciprocal, action; for we may always suppose that the impressions only appeared to have been exceptionally vivid *after* the fact of the coincidence had given them a certain exceptional interest. The undue importance often attached to such incidents is to be regretted, since it confuses the subject, and to some extent excuses a similar confusion on the part of opponents—as, *e.g.*, when an eminent man of science thinks telepathy sufficiently refuted by this very consideration, that by accident friends sometimes think of one another, and even write to one another, simultaneously (*Deutsche Rundschau* for Jan., 1886, p. 45). Nor will it suffice for the exceptional character of *one* of the impressions to be established beyond doubt. For example, Miss Edith Taylor, of 9, Endsleigh Gardens, N.W., tells us of the following experience of herself and a friend.

“June 25th, 1884.

“I was living at the time in Germany, and my friend in Holland. She had been visiting at the house where I was staying, but had returned home some weeks before the ‘illusion’ occurred. One evening in the autumn of 1880, I was walking alone in the garden, trying to learn some German poetry, and not succeeding very well, when I heard some one step on to the gravel walk behind me. I then felt the touch of a hand on my arm, and my friend’s voice said pretty distinctly, ‘Edith, Edith.’ I turned round very quickly, and I believe I said, ‘Why, what is it?’ I certainly expected to find some one behind me, and had a sort of wild idea that it must be my friend, from the curious way in which my name was spoken, the foreign accent in the word. Seeing nobody I was frightened, and went in. In answer to the letter in which I told her what had passed, my friend wrote back that it was curious that I should have fancied her so near me just then. She had been reading Italian, which we had studied together for a while, and had very much wished to speak to me about some passage that had struck her in the lesson. My friend had not heard or imagined that she heard me, but she said she felt as if the air were full of me.”

Miss Taylor’s hallucination was quite unique in her life; but we cannot tell that her friend’s thoughts were not pretty constantly directed to her at this period; and there is, therefore, no reason why the coincidence, such as it was, should not have been a pure accident.

At that moment I awoke. Such was the impression it made on my mind, that I got my note-book and made a note of this strange dream, believing that it foreboded bad tidings. However, several days passed without bringing any dreaded intelligence, when one night I received a letter from my father, announcing the rather sudden death of my grandmother, which took place on the very night and hour of my dream, half-past 10.

“About four months after her death, I went to the Isle of Wight, where she lived, to get information from my relatives as to what my grandmother was really like. My aunt and cousin described her in every particular, and their descriptions of her coincided most marvellously with the figure and face that appeared to me, the white hair and dark eyebrows being a peculiarity in her. This I particularly observed in my dream. I learnt, too, that she was extremely fussy in the arrangement of her cap, always being anxious that no part, even the strings, should be out of place, and curious to relate, I noticed in my dream that she was nervously touching her cap strings, now and again, for fear they should be out of place. My cousin, who was with her when she died, told me that my grandmother had been delirious for some time previous to her departure; and for a moment, when in that state, she suddenly put her arms round my cousin’s neck, and on opening her eyes and regaining consciousness, she said with a look of surprise, ‘Oh, Polly, is it you? I thought it was some body else.’ This seems to me very curious, as it was just what she did before she vanished from me in the drawing-room. I must add that I had not seen my grandparent for at least 14 years, and the last time I saw her she had dark hair, but this had gradually changed to white, leaving her eyebrows dark, and I am positive that nobody ever mentioned this peculiarity to me.”¹

“J. H. W.”

Mrs. W. says :—

“July 1st, 1885.

“I quite remember my husband telling me, on my going to my room on the evening of the 26th October, of a remarkable dream he had just had, and also his making an entry in the pocket book on the following morning.

“F. W.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that Jane W. died at the age of 72, on Oct. 26, 1870 [see below], at Brixton, Isle of Wight.

Mr. Podmore says :—

“I called on Mr. J. H. W. to-day (July 4th, 1884), and heard the account from him *viva voce*. His cousin’s corroboration, for a reason which he explained to me, cannot be obtained. But he explained to me that he went to see his cousin within three months of the death, and received full particulars of the death-scene from her then. I asked him if he stood by the phrase ‘at least 20 minutes,’ pointing out that it was difficult to attach any precise meaning to these words; if they were a correct description of his impressions, a grotesque incident must have been interpolated

¹ In respect of this last feature, the case may be classed with those of Chap. xii., § 8. The nervous fidgeting with the cap-strings may possibly be regarded as a distinctive habit, sufficiently deeply organised to be a feature in the person’s latent representation of her own physique. See the remarks at the end of the section referred to.

in the midst of an otherwise realistic dream. He maintains that the words are correct ; it seemed to him that he and the old lady sat staring at each other across the table for a very long time. Mr. W. told me that he dreams very little ; and that he has never had another dream which he thought worth noting. He has never dreamt of death."

After a second call, Mr. Podmore writes :—

"I received an account from Mrs. W. of her husband's dream, as she remembered to have heard it within an hour of its occurrence and subsequently, which tallied precisely with the account here given. I saw also the note made on the following morning. It occurs at the head of the first page of a small pocket sketch-book, the rest of the page being occupied with pen or pencil memoranda of accounts, &c. The entry is 'Odd dream, night of October 26th, 1870.' The last numeral, which is very indistinct, is apparently 0. Mr. W., in writing his original account in March, 1883, had referred to this note and read the final numeral as 2. Hence the discrepancy. He has no other memorandum of the death.

"I pressed him as far as I could, but he still declines to give his name, fearing that he might acquire the reputation of being 'ghostly' and fanciful, and thus injure his professional prospects."

Clearly the *dream* here is far less likely to have been accidental than Mr. Newnham's. But the inference from the dying woman's words, that she may have been in some way affected with a sense of her grandson's presence, is, of course not one that can be pressed. And the same remark applies to several cases where A, who is in the crisis of illness, professes actually to have seen, as though by some clairvoyant flash, an absent relative, B, who turns out to have had at the same time a telepathic impression of A ; for unless special details of B's aspect or surroundings are described, A's alleged perception of him may always be supposed to have been a mere subjective dream or vision, and the percipience is not demonstrably reciprocal. ¹

The next example—from Mr. J. T. Milward Pierce, of Bow Rancho, Knox County, Nebraska, U.S.A.,—stands somewhat apart.

"Frettons, Danbury, Chelmsford.

"January 5th, 1885.

(304) "I live in Nebraska, U.S., where I have a cattle rancho, &c. I am engaged to be married to a young lady living in Yankton, Dakota, 25 miles north.

"About the end of October, 1884, while trying to catch a horse, I was kicked in the face, and only escaped being brained by an inch or two ;

¹ For instances of the sort, see cases 245 and 354 ; also 612, and Mrs. Fox's account, given in a note to that case.

as it was I had two teeth split and a severe rap on the chest. There were several men standing near. I did not faint, nor was I insensible for a moment, as I had to get out of the way of the next kick. There was a moment's pause before anyone spoke. I was standing leaning against the stable wall, when I saw on my left, apparently quite close, the young lady I have mentioned. She looked pale. I did not notice what she wore; but I distinctly noticed her eyes, which appeared troubled and anxious. There was not merely a face, but the whole form, looking perfectly material and natural. At that moment my bailiff asked me if I was hurt. I turned my head to answer him, and when I looked again she had gone. I was not much hurt by the horse; my mind was perfectly clear, for directly afterwards I went to my office and drew the plans and prepared specifications for a new house, a work which requires a clear and concentrated mind.

"I was so haunted by the appearance that next morning I started for Yankton. The first words the young lady said when I met her were, 'Why, I expected you all yesterday afternoon. I thought I saw you looking so pale, and your face all bleeding.' (I may say the injuries had made no visible scars.) I was very much struck by this and asked her when this was. She said, 'Immediately after lunch.' It was just after my lunch that the accident occurred. I took the particulars down at the time. I may say that before I went into Yankton, I was afraid that something had happened to the young lady. I shall be happy to send you any further particulars you may desire.

"JNO. T. MILWARD PIERCE."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Pierce says:—

"I think the vision lasted as long as a quarter of a minute." He has had no other visual hallucination, except that once, when lying shot through the jaw by an Indian, he thought he saw an Indian standing over him, and infers that it was not a real one, or he would have been scalped.

Mr. Pierce wrote on May 27th, 1885:—

"I sent your letter to the lady, but did not get an answer before leaving England, and upon arriving here found her very ill, and it is only recently I have been able to get the information you wished for. She now wishes me to say that she recollects the afternoon in question, and remembers expecting me, and being afraid something had happened, though it was not my usual day for coming; but although at the time she told me that she saw me with a face bleeding, she does not now appear to recollect this, and I have not suggested it, not wishing to prompt her in any way."

In another letter of July 13th, 1885, Mr. Pierce says:—

"I am sorry I can do no better for you than the enclosed letter. The fact seems to be that events of absorbing interest, and illness, appear to have driven nearly all remembrance of the incident from Miss MacGregor's mind, attaching no particular importance to it at first. I have prompted her memory, but she only says, no doubt I am right, but that she can't now recollect it."

The letter enclosed from Miss Macgregor is as follows:—

“Yankton, D.T.

“July 13th, 1885.

“I have read the letter you sent to Mr Pierce. I am afraid I cannot now recall the time you mention clearly enough to give you any distinct recollection.

“I remember feeling sure some accident had happened, but I told Mr. Pierce at the time everything unusual I felt, and events that have since occurred have, I am afraid, completely effaced all clear recollections of the facts.
“ANNIE MACGREGOR.”

Knowing Mr. Pierce, I have no doubt that his recollection of what Miss MacGregor told him at the time is substantially accurate, and if so, it would be natural to interpret *her* experience as telepathic. But *his* vision may have been purely subjective. I am not aware, it is true, of any precisely parallel case, unless indeed it be Mr. Pierce's other experience, with the Indian. In my collection of purely subjective cases, I have one from a lady who was troubled by hallucinations for some time after a concussion of the brain; but the blow which Mr. Pierce received was a comparatively slight one. Still, seeing that on the one hand his faculties may have been momentarily disordered by it, and that on the other the person whose form he saw was in a completely normal state at the time, it is safer not to lay stress on the reciprocal aspect of the case.

§ 2. The remaining cases are, I think, less doubtful. The following account is extracted from the evidence given by the late Mr. Cromwell F. Varley, F.R.S., before a Committee of the Dialectical Society, on May 25, 1869 (*Report*, p. 161. Another case of Mr. Varley's will be found in Vol. I., p. 288).

(305) “In a second case my sister-in-law had heart disease. Mrs. Varley and I went into the country to see her, as we feared, for the last time. I had a nightmare and could not move a muscle. While in this state, I saw the spirit¹ of my sister-in-law in the room. I knew that she was confined to her bedroom. She said, ‘If you do not move you will die’; but I could not move, and she said, ‘If you submit yourself to me, I will frighten you, and you will then be able to move.’ At first I objected, wishing to ascertain more about her spirit-presence. When at last I consented, my heart had ceased beating. I think at first her efforts to terrify me did not succeed, but when she suddenly exclaimed, ‘Oh, Cromwell! I am dying,’ that frightened me exceedingly, and threw me out of the torpid state, and I awoke in the ordinary way. My shouting had aroused Mrs. Varley; we examined the door, and it was still locked and bolted, and I told my wife what had happened, having noted the hour, 3.45 a.m., and

¹ See p. 48, note.

cautioned her not to mention the matter to anybody, but to hear what was her sister's version, if she alluded to the subject. In the morning she told us that she had passed a dreadful night; that she had been in our room, and greatly troubled on my account, and that I had been nearly dying. It was between 3.30 and 4 a.m. when she saw I was in danger. She only succeeded in arousing me by exclaiming, 'Oh, Cromwell! I am dying.' I appeared to her to be in a state which otherwise would have ended fatally."

Even this incident might possibly be explained (like case 94) as an instance of simultaneous dreams¹—an independent and original nightmare of one of the two parties concerned inducing that of the other, without being reciprocally influenced by it. The next case, if correctly recorded, could not be so regarded. The account is contained in a letter from Mr. T. W. Smith, late of Leslie Lodge, Ealing, to the Psychological Society, dated February 26th, 1876, and kindly lent to us by Mr. F. K. Munton, who was secretary of that Society. Mr. Smith, who was known to Prof. Barrett, left Ealing early in 1877, and his present address cannot be ascertained.

(306) "I found the lady who is now my wife at a large public institution to which I was appointed headmaster, in 1872. On leaving her situation, I induced her, for certain reasons, to conceal the fact of our intended marriage from those of her friends whom she had left behind at the school, and the only way to do this was not to write to any of them. u. c.

"Some six months after our marriage, I was reading in bed, according to a habit of mine, my wife asleep at my side, when she awoke suddenly, sat up, and exclaimed, in very earnest tones, 'Oh, I have been to ——.' I, of course, treated what she forthwith began to relate to me as a more than usually vivid dream, and the next day ceased to think of it. She, however, recurred to her dream from time to time, and I remember the circumstantial way in which she dwelt upon each point of it, especially a peculiar expression which I did not forget, though I made no written note of it at the time. Three months later my wife went to visit her mother, and found there a letter from one of her friends, urgently entreating some one to write and say whether Miss —— (my wife) was alive or dead. I was induced to go and see the writer, and then ascertained the cause of her hastily-written and strangely-worded epistle. The two occurrences on the same day—as well as I could fix the date, for neither of us were quite certain as to that essential particular—present a coincidence which I have never been able satisfactorily to explain on any hypothesis consistent with what is at present known of nature's laws."

"My wife dreamt that she was in a well-remembered room, at the base of the building, in company with four females—two of whom were old friends and two strangers to her. They were talking and laughing and preparing to retire to their several sleeping apartments. She saw one of them turn off the gas. She followed them upstairs, entered with two of

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 314-20, and the opening cases in Chap. iii. of the Supplement.

them into a bedroom, saw 'Bessie' place some things in a box, undress, and get into bed; then she went to her, took her by the hand, and said, 'Bessie, let us be friends.' So much for the dream.

"The writer of the letter gave me this account of what had occasioned her writing; and I need scarcely say that I did not first mention what my wife had dreamt, for in that case it might be supposed that I had myself assisted in suggesting the remarkable expression, which, in my opinion, removes the occurrence from the category of 'remarkable coincidences.' She and her friend, 'Bessie,' had gone to bed one Sunday night, when an alarming cry from the latter brought the other to her bedside: 'I have just seen ——' (my wife); 'she touched me and said, "Let us be friends."'

"The next day, on discussing the matter, though some of them thought that Bessie had been dreaming, and imagined what she declared she saw, others thought it a 'sign' that my wife was dead. And the one who was the best scribe amongst them undertook to write to the only address they possessed, in order to ascertain the truth. The letter had not been forwarded to us because my wife had, it seems, told her mother my wish that no communication with her former friends should take place.

"The odd thing about the dream is that my wife had always been on good terms with 'Bessie,' and was so on parting with her.

"In the foregoing account of the dream, and what I may call its complement, I omit many minor points, such as the fact that two new comers *had* taken the place of two former friends of my wife; that the effect on both my wife and Bessie was beyond what any ordinary dream would have produced; and that the two females, whom my wife in her dream saw enter the bedroom, did really occupy the same room."

[It is much to be regretted that we have had no opportunity of examining the letter; ¹ but the correspondence of the two experiences would hardly have impressed Mr. Smith as it did, if it had not included a very striking detail.]

¹ The importance, in these apparently reciprocal cases, of obtaining independent evidence from both sides, is well shown in the following example. A lady of good sense, occupying a responsible position—whose name is suppressed not by her wish, but because our view of the case differs considerably from hers—wrote to us on November 29, 1884:—

"In the summer of 1864, I had cause for grave anxiety concerning the moral condition of a very dear friend. I knew that W. had formed a connection which, if persisted in, would lead to his ruin, present and eternal. On the 30th of August, 1864, I retired to rest about half-past 10. As the clock struck 11 my husband was alarmed by my violent sobbing, which caused me to awake, on which I exclaimed, 'Oh, husband! it is all over with poor W. I have seen him, in my dream, brought under great temptation by the wicked words of that woman. In a passion of tears I implored him to have mercy on himself. At first he seemed to hesitate, then, at a sign from her, he motioned me angrily away, saying, "I will have none of your restrictions. I have been held back by them too long already." With these bitter words I awoke, to find myself bathed in tears.'

"For three days this vision haunted me with a tenacity I could not shake off. Judge then my surprise at receiving the following narrative from W. :—

"On the night of August 20th, while sitting smoking my cigar (after 10 p.m.), the last person on earth I wished to see was announced. She came forward to me with words of bitter reproach, followed by tender persuasion, in the midst of which the door of my dining-room again opened, and you appeared, in a long white gown, your hair floating over your shoulders. With a wild burst of weeping you implored me not to listen to another word she uttered, and when I angrily replied, "I will have none of your restrictions," with a look of anguish unutterable you slowly faded from my sight. Not so the impression produced on my mind. I felt God had sent you as my guardian angel, and, like one of old, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. I was saved in a moment

The evidential weakness of this narrative is, of course, the doubt as to the exactitude of the coincidence. Supposing the two experiences to have fallen on the same night, we can hardly help connecting "Bessie's" impression (which seems to have been a hallucination and not a dream) with Mrs. Smith's remarkable vision; which latter is again, apparently, an instance of thought-transference of that extreme form which I have described as telepathic clairvoyance.¹

That this last word is the appropriate one for describing (it is far enough of course from explaining) the process appears from other examples; and a glance at the condition of these reciprocal cases will show that it would naturally be so. There is, as a rule, no difficulty in deciding to which of the two persons concerned the origin of the complex phenomenon should be traced; since one of the two is in a more or less abnormal condition, as compared to the other. In Mrs. Smith's case, the abnormality (outwardly at any rate) was nothing beyond sleep; but in other examples it is far more pronounced. If, then, it is A who is in the abnormal state—dying, or whatever it may be—we attribute B's vision of him to that state. But we cannot inversely attribute A's vision of B to B's state, if B's state is completely normal. It may, no doubt, be said that B's state ceases

of supreme danger, and desire to give God the glory for so evident an interposition on my behalf.'

"I did not keep the letter, but am absolutely positive of its date and its corroboration of the remarkable vision.

"E. A. A."

Mrs. A.'s husband corroborates as follows :—

"January 29th, 1885.

"I can distinctly recollect the night on which my wife had the remarkable dream referred to, the particulars of which she related to me directly she awoke. She was greatly excited and much troubled, and repeated several times, 'I hope nothing has happened to W. G.'

"A day or two afterwards—it may have been the second or third day; of this I am uncertain—she received a letter from our friend, which I saw and read, and which confirmed in an extraordinary manner the connection with her dream. Mrs. A., I think, has already told you the particulars, which I need not enter into further.

"J. A."

Now though this account was undoubtedly given in good faith, it contains some very suspicious points. The conversational style of interview between the gentleman (whose previous excited state naturally marks him as the "agent") and the apparition, finds hardly any parallel in our first-hand records; and it is rendered doubly strange by his accepting his friend's intrusion—at that hour and in that guise—as a quite natural incident. We might surmise that possibly something of a telepathic nature took place; but that it was exactly, or even approximately, what is reported could not be assumed without independent corroboration. I therefore wrote to the gentleman concerned, and asked him whether he remembered having ever seen the phantasmal figure of a friend, whose visit was apparently intended to warn him at a critical juncture. He replied: "I remember the circumstance you refer to distinctly;" adding that he was at the time overwrought in body and mind. But on my asking him whether any one else was present at the time, and what were the words spoken, he replied, "There was no one present, nor any words spoken, to the best of my recollection; had there been, I don't think I should have forgotten." Clearly a case where there is this amount of discrepancy between the two principal witnesses cannot be quoted as evidence.

¹ Compare Mr. Moule's case, Vol. i., p. 110, note.

to be normal at the moment when A affects him ; and that possibly the power to react telepathically on the impression is started by the mere fact of receiving it. But the more natural account of the matter would surely trace A's impression, no less than B's, to the peculiarity of A's state—by supposing either that A's power to act abnormally in a certain direction has involved an abnormal extension of *his own susceptibility* in the same direction ; or else that some independently-caused extension of his own susceptibility has involved the power to act abnormally.¹ In either case, his reception of the impression would be active rather than passive ; of the sort that partly seems (as I tried to express it before) like the momentary using of B's faculties—although B's state is not now, as in the former clairvoyant pictures and dreams,² supplying any exceptional telepathic stimulus. Still, though A's percipience may not be conditioned by B's *state*, it must, I conceive, be conditioned by B's *existence* and *relation to A* ; and the distinction again stands clear between *telepathic* clairvoyance, and that alleged *independent* clairvoyance where what is discerned cannot be traced in any natural way to the contents of any other human mind.

The next example is from the Hon. Mrs. Parker, of 60, Elm Park Gardens, S.W., who wrote to us on May 24th, 1883 :—

(307) “The following experience happened in the month of November, 1877, in Regency Square, Brighton. My husband [since deceased] was undergoing a course of magnetism from Mr. L., an American. The treatment consisted of rubbing by mesmeric passes down the back and arms and legs, but in all this there was no intention of putting my husband to sleep. The passes were intended to give strength. Mr. L. called himself, I believe, a professional mesmerist, but at the time we employed him he was not practising as such. He had come to Brighton for rest.

“After the treatment my husband was in the habit of sitting, for some hours, in his wheel-chair, at the top of the Square garden, and on the day

¹ This latter hypothesis seems specially applicable to cases where A's condition has been one of mere sleep or trance, and not abnormal in any more serious way. For, considering that nearly all the evidence that exists for the reality of clairvoyance goes further to show that sleep and trance are the conditions most favourable to it, we should certainly rather conceive that what enables A to affect B is the clairvoyant perception itself of B or B's surroundings, than that this perception is a secondary result, dependent on the fact that A has impressed B by dint merely of being asleep or entranced. Case 271, above, may possibly be an instance of what is meant. We should naturally expect that where the conditions are much the same on *both* sides, A's and B's parts in the phenomenon might be exactly equal and parallel—each being perceived by the other in the other's own environment ; and case 644 seems to be an example of this.

I may note here that the evidence for a heightening of telepathic susceptibility at the time of death, and in seasons of illness, is not confined to the class of cases now in question. See for instance cases 126, 147, 167, 303, 308, 311, 416 ; and the opening cases of Chap. ii. of the Supplement, which are of the more ordinary thought-transference type.

² Vol. i., pp. 258-67, 338-40, and 368-88.

of which I am writing he had expressed a wish to stay out rather later than usual. I went into the house for luncheon, leaving him alone, but on looking out of the window a little later, at 2 o'clock, I saw a man standing in front of his chair, and apparently talking to him. I wondered who it was, and concluded it must be a stranger, as I did not recognise the figure, or the wide-awake hat and rather oddly-cut Inverness cape which he wore. However, as it very often happened that strangers did stop and speak to him, I was not surprised. I turned away my eyes for a moment, and when I again looked up the garden, the man had disappeared. I could not see him leaving the garden by any of the numerous gates, and remarked to myself how very quickly he must have walked to be so soon out of sight. Regency Square does not possess a tree and scarcely a shrub, so that there was nothing to impede my view.

"When my husband came in a little later, I said to him, carelessly, 'Oh, who was that talking to you in the square just now?'

"He replied, 'No one has spoken to me since you left. No one has even passed near me.'

"'But I saw a man standing in front of you and—as I thought—talking to you about a quarter-of-an-hour ago. His dress was so odd, I couldn't at all tell who it could be.'

"At this my husband laughed, saying, 'I should think not, for there was no one to recognise. I assure you not a soul has been near me since you left.'

"'Have you been asleep?' I asked, though I did not think it very likely. He assured me he had not. So the subject dropped; still in my own mind I knew I had seen the mysterious figure.

"Two days afterwards, Mr. L., after giving my husband his treatment, came, as was his usual habit, to speak to me before leaving the house. After a few words and directions, he said, 'It is a very odd thing, but the same experience has happened to me twice since I have attended your husband, that, when in quite another place, I have suddenly felt as if I were standing by his side, either in your drawing-room or out there in the garden.'

"I looked at him, and for the first time noticed his overcoat which he had put on before coming into the room, and the wide-awake in his hand. It struck me that these articles were very similar to those worn by the figure I had seen, and that in every way Mr. L. resembled this same figure. I asked him when, and at what time, he had had the last experience spoken of? 'The day before yesterday,' was the reply. 'I had just finished an early dinner, and was sitting in front of the fire with a newspaper. It was about 2 o'clock; I remember the time perfectly. Suddenly I felt I was no longer there, but standing near your husband in the Square garden.'

"I then told him of the figure I had seen at the same time and place, and how I now recognised it to be his. Afterwards I asked my husband if he had mentioned the circumstance to Mr. L., but he had not done so, and had indeed forgotten all about it. My husband was the *only* person to whom I had mentioned the fact of my vision. It could not by any possibility have got round to Mr. L.

"AUGUSTA PARKER." No.?

[In answer to the inquiry whether she had ever had any other halluci-

nation of the senses, Mrs. Parker replied that she had had one other. It seems likely, however, that this was merely a case of mistaken identity, the figure being seen at the end of a long hotel-passage; and this was her own impression at the time.]

This case again seems difficult to explain except on the reciprocal theory. It is true that there is not the same proof in the case of Mr. L. as in that of Mrs. Smith above, that the scene which he saw was transferred, and not spontaneously pictured; for the place was familiar to him, and no unusual details are mentioned. But, on the other hand, his experience seems to have been quite unlike an ordinary dream; its very unusualness is what allows us to connect it with Mrs. Parker's simultaneous and unique vision; and if we may regard it as having been conditioned by the presence in the perceived scene of his patient, Mr. Parker—who forms, so to speak, the pivot of the case—the fact that Mr. Parker himself was not consciously affected can still be accounted for on the analogy of such instances as Nos. 242 and 355.¹

The next case was one of *collective* percipience; but its best place is in the present chapter. The full names of the persons concerned may be mentioned, but not printed. Mrs. S., one of the percipients, writes:—

“April, 1883.

(308) “A and B² are two villages in Norfolk, distant about five miles from each other. At the time of the occurrence about to be related, the clergymen of these parishes both bore the same name, though there was no relationship between them; at the same time there was a great friendship between the two families. On the 20th February, 1870, a daughter, Constance, about 14 years old, of the clergyman of A, was staying with the other family—a daughter, Margaret, in that family, being her great friend. Edward W., the eldest son of the Rector of A, was at that time lying dangerously ill at home with inflammation of the lungs, and was frequently delirious. On the day mentioned, at about noon, Margaret and Constance were in the garden of B Rectory, running down a path which was separated by a hedge from an orchard adjoining; they distinctly heard themselves called twice, apparently from the orchard, thus: ‘Connie, Margaret—Connie, Margaret.’ They stopped, but could see no one, and so went to the house, a distance of about 40 yards, concluding that one of Margaret's brothers had called them from there. But to their surprise they

¹ I should further conjecture one of the conditions of Mrs. Parker's percipience to have been the fact that she was actually contemplating the scene in which Mr. S. seemed to find himself (see pp. 267-9).

² These letters are substituted for those actually given for the sake of clearness. The names of the villages were not suppressed in the accounts that follow; but as they were suppressed in this first one, it has been thought right to suppress them throughout.

found that this was not the case; and Mrs. W., Margaret's mother, assured the girls no one had called them from the house, and they therefore concluded they must have been mistaken in supposing they had heard their names repeated. This appeared to be the only explanation of the matter, and nothing more was thought of it.

"That evening Constance returned to her home at A. On the following day, Mrs. W. drove over to inquire for the sick boy Edward. In the course of conversation, his mother said that the day before he had been delirious, and had spoken of Constance and Margaret, that he had called to them in his delirium, and had then said, 'Now I see them running along the hedge, but directly I call them they run towards the house.' Mrs. W., of B, at once called to mind the mystery of the previous day, and asked, 'Do you know at what time that happened?' Edward's mother replied that it was at a few minutes past 12, for she had just given the invalid his medicine, 12 being his hour for taking it. So these words were spoken by Edward at the same time at which the two girls had heard themselves called, and thus only could the voice from the orchard be accounted for.

"M. K. S."

(The "Margaret" of the narrative.)

The following statement is from Mrs. R., the "Constance" of the narrative.

"Sept. 1884.

"Margaret and I were walking in some fields at B., away from the road, but not very far from the house. Here I heard a voice call 'Connie and Margaret' clearly and distinctly. I should not have identified it with Ted's voice [*i.e.*, her brother's at A.], for we thought it was one of the B brothers at the time, till we found no one had called us. I remember that it was before early dinner, and that I was expecting to be fetched home that same morning, because of Ted's illness; and that Mrs. W. thought of asking mother if Ted had mentioned our names in any way, *before* she told her of what had passed at B. I ought to add that an explanation of the story might be found in the conduct of some B plough-boy, playing a trick upon us. The situation was such that he might easily have kept out of sight behind a hedge.

Mr. Podmore says:—

"C. E. R."

"November 26th, 1883.

"I saw Mrs. R. yesterday. She told me that they recognised the voice vaguely as a well-known one at the time. She thinks that the coincidence in time was quite exact, because Mrs. W. of B made a note of the circumstance immediately. Her brother—an old school-fellow of mine—cannot recollect the incident at all."

[If a written note was made, the girls' experience must have seemed odder than the "nothing more was thought of it" in Mrs. S.'s account would imply.]

Mrs. W. of A says:—

"My son was about 17 years old. He had had fever and inflammation, and was weakened by illness. It was about 12 o'clock. I was sitting with him, after his washing and dressing, and he seemed quiet and

sleepy, but not asleep. He suddenly sprang forward, pointed his finger, with arms outstretched, and called out in a voice the loudness of which astonished me, 'Connie and Margaret!' with a stress on each name, 'near the hedge,' looked wildly at them, and then sank down, tired. I thought it odd at the time, but, considering it a sort of dream, did not allude to it. The next day, Mrs. W. called with Connie and Margaret, and said the girls had heard their names called; had run home; were walking by a hedge in their field, had found no one had called them from B Rectory. The voice sounded familiar, but as far as I can remember—my daughter will say—it was not distinctly thought to be Edward's. I at once told my story, as it was too striking not to be named. They said it was about 12 o'clock. Though he was constantly delirious in the evening, when the pulse rose, he was never so in the middle of the day, and there was no appearance of his being so at the time this occurred.

"M. A. W."

Mrs. W. of B says:—

"August, 1884.

"Connie was staying with us on account of the illness of her brother Edward, and had—with Margaret—been reading with me one morning. At about 11.30 they went into the garden to play (they were girls of about 13 and 14), and in half an hour came up to the window to know what I wanted. I said 'Nothing,' and that I had not called them, though they had heard both their names called repeatedly. I asked them where they were when they heard it, and they said in the next walk—which, you will remember, is formed on one side by the orchard hedge. Margaret said directly, 'There, Connie; I said it was not mother's, but a boy's voice.' Then I turned to look at the clock—for we had some boys as pupils then—and I said, 'It would not be one of the boys, for they are not out of the study; it is now 12 o'clock, and I hear them coming out.'

"I was to take Connie home that afternoon,¹ and, on arriving, of course my first question was, 'How was Edward?' Mrs. W. told me that he had not been so well, and had been very delirious. She said that morning he had been calling, '*Margaret! Connie! Margaret! Connie! Oh, they are running by a hedge, and won't listen to me.*' I did not say what had happened at home, but asked if she knew at what time this had so distressed him. She said 'Yes;' for she had looked at the clock, hoping it was nearly time to give him his medicine, which always quieted him, and was thankful to find it was just 12 o'clock."

Here we seem to have, on the part of the two girls, a telepathic hallucination, reproducing the exact words that were in the mouth and ear of the sick boy; and, on his part, a vision reflected from their minds, and once more illustrating how what might be described as clairvoyance may be a true variety of thought-transference. The suggestion at the end of Mrs. R.'s account must not be over-

¹ The other accounts make it probable that it was not till next day that Mrs. W. of B went to A.

looked; but I should be glad to know of precedents for hidden plough-boys calling out the Christian names of clergymen's daughters and their friends. Nor do I quite see how such a freak could merit the designation of a "trick"; it would surely be a mere piece of aimless and pointless rudeness—unless, indeed the plough-boy was enjoying a telepathic chuckle at the idea that his cry might be confounded with another, which was being simultaneously uttered five miles off.

It will be seen that the number of these reciprocal cases (even with the addition of those in the Supplement) is small—so small that the genuineness of the type might fairly enough be called in question. There is some danger that our view of the rarer telepathic phenomena may be unduly affected by the sense of certainty that gradually and reasonably forms with regard to the broad fact of telepathy itself. The argument for the reality of telepathy, we must remember, depends on a mass of narratives so large as to make a universal error in the essential point of all or nearly all of them exceedingly improbable; and is not available in respect of peculiar features, which are present in only a very small proportion of the alleged cases. For these, the various possibilities of error so fully discussed in the general sketch of the evidence (Vol. I., Chap. IV.) may seem quite sufficient to account; and the greater the theoretic interest of the peculiarities, the more jealously must their evidential claims be scrutinised. As to reciprocity, the reader will form his own opinion. That the examples should be few, as compared with those of the simpler telepathic types, cannot at this stage of our inquiry seem unnatural. For if, amid all the apparent opportunities that human lives present, the unknown and probably transient conditions of telepathic percipience and of telepathic agency only occasionally chance to coincide, so as to produce a telepathic phenomenon at all (pp. 77-8); and if, of the two, the conditions of percipience are the rarer, as experimental thought-transference would lead us to suppose; then the complete conditions of a reciprocal case must be rare among the rare. Still, if they have occurred, they will occur again. If my colleagues and I are right in supposing the type to be a genuine one, we ought to obtain, as time goes on, some more well-attested specimens of it; and to this we look forward with considerable confidence.

CHAPTER XVIII.

COLLECTIVE CASES.

§ 1. THE telepathic cases quoted in the foregoing chapters have almost all affected a single percipient only; and the fact that sometimes the percipient was in company at the time, and that his sensory experience was unshared by any one present,¹ has confirmed the view (to which all other considerations seemed to converge) that telepathic affections of the senses are in the most literal sense *hallucinations*. But we have already encountered a few cases where the senses of more than one percipient have been affected;² and what awaits us in the present chapter is the discussion and complete illustration of this perplexing feature.

Of course the first view which is suggested by the fact that two or more people have seen or heard the same thing at the same time is that the sight or sound, however abnormal and unaccountable, was due to some objective reality within the range of their sense-organs—in other words, that it was not a hallucination at all.³ Hence those apparently telepathic instances where a sensory experience, representative of some absent person, has been shared by more than one percipient, would imply the immediate presence of some sort of physical wraith, or at any rate of an objective human presence.

I scarcely know how far the idea of a literal wraith is seriously entertained by any educated person in the present day. Gaseous and vaporous ghosts are, I imagine, quite at a discount; but the word “ether” seems sometimes to be used as a way out of the

¹ See the list of cases given in p. 105, second note.

² Nos. 14, 36, 169, 254 (first incident), 258, 264, 279, 302 (second incident), 308; case 166 is a possible instance. See also the dream-cases 127 and 144.

³ It was in this occasional feature of *collective* percipience that Falck, in 1692, found the strongest argument for the production of hallucinations by an external and dæmonic power. See p. 72 of his able and elaborate dissertation against Hobbes and Spinoza, in *De Demonologiâ recentiorum Autorum*.

difficulty. For many ears the word has, no doubt, a convenient vagueness; but, in fact, we know of no mode by which ether can affect the retina, except through waves started by luminous substances of known type. And even if ethereal ghosts could be *seen*, the *auditory* phenomena would remain a hopeless obstacle to a satisfactory physical explanation of them. For even the assumption of some tenuous and elusive form of matter, which somehow hangs about in relation to the mysterious ether, seems less desperate than the assumption that such a tenuous presence could move the air in the infinitely complex vibration-patterns which correspond to speech or music—that is to say, could produce at will an effect of inconceivable difficulty and complexity on certain gross elements of the known material world.

As to the notion of an objective presence which may affect the perceptive faculty of several persons without producing changes in the external world, one sort of case is conceivable which would no doubt favour it—*e.g.*, if two persons, situated at some distance from one another, saw the appearance in the respective relations of distance and posture which a real object of the same kind would bear to them—one of them, it might be, seeing a full face, and the other a profile. But I know of no examples of this sort. And as a mere theory, the notion in question may be left with a single general comment; for though our path skirts, it had better not enter, the metaphysical labyrinth suggested by the words “objective reality.” Let it be conceded then that, where there is a consensus of perception, it becomes a nice question for Idealism to determine how far, or in what sense, the percept lacks 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 if he said so, would they agree with him? But then in this case, or in a less extreme one of the same kind, we might at any rate ask one of the perceivers to tell us what meaning he can attach to the *objectivity* of his percept, beyond that it has its existence in other minds besides his own. If he fails to supply us with any further meaning, on him surely lies the *onus* of proving that the conditions of the percept lie outside the perceiving minds; and if no proof be forthcoming, I then see no definite way of distinguishing this “objective” view of “collective hallucinations” from the view to be considered

immediately, which regards the community of percipience as a form of thought-transference.¹

“But”—some objectors may say—“the question has been begged by assuming that the collective percept eludes physical tests. True, apparitions have not yet been subjected to spectroscopic analysis, nor have phantasmal remarks been recorded by the phonograph; but suppose that the form of a dying person not only appears, but opens the door or the window, and the door or the window *remains open*, thus affording to the muscles of the servant who closes it a test of a physical change in the external world—what account is to be given of this?” Now clearly such phenomena, even if established, would afford no convincing analogy by which to judge of cases where no similar physical tests are included. But, as a matter of fact, no records of the sort that we have met with have reached the evidential standard which would entitle them to a place in this book (see Vol. I., p. 165); and until they are established by irrefragable evidence, there is another analogy which has in every way a prior claim—namely, the facts of telepathy as so far set forth. Cannot our further facts be explained without going beyond the purely psychical transference for which we believe that we have ample evidence?

Let us see in what ways a theory of purely psychical impressions could cover the phenomena of collective hallucination. Two possible views of what may happen present themselves. The *first* of these would apply only to veridical cases—cases which are “telepathic” in the literal sense. On this view the simultaneous experiences would be traced to a cause external to the percipients; but this cause would not be a real object within the range of the percipients’ senses, but a real condition of an absent person. A, who is passing through some crisis at a distance, produces a simultaneous telepathic impression on the minds of B and of C, who happen to be together; both B and C project this impression as a hallucination of the senses, in the way that has been so fully considered; and the hallucinations more or less nearly resemble each other.

The *second* view would apply equally to the cases which are, and to those which are not, telepathic, in this literal sense of relating to a

¹ A *psychical* condition outside the perceiving minds might, no doubt, be found in “disembodied intelligence.” For the present, it is enough to remark that this change of “agency” to some further mind would leave the nature of the phenomenon unchanged. Experience thus caused may be called objective, if we will, but it is still thought-transference; just as in Berkeley’s view the whole objective universe was only thought-transference *in excelsis*.

distant agent. The view is that the hallucination of one percipient, however caused, begets that of the other, by a process of thought-transference; the hallucination is in itself, so to speak, infectious. B and C are together, and B has a hallucination—it may be veridical and due to a telepathic impression from the distant A, or it may be non-veridical and due to a spontaneous pathological disturbance of B's own brain; and this experience of B's is then communicated to C, whose brain follows suit and projects a kindred image. The process in fact would strongly recall those cases of simultaneous dreaming where one dream may be regarded as the cause of the other.¹ It would be a fresh example of the psychological identity between the sleeping and the waking hallucinations on which so much stress has already been laid.

Such are the two possible views; and we have now to decide how far either, or both, may be reasonably entertained. I may state at once that in my opinion the best solution that the problem at present admits of involves a certain combination of the two (see § 7 below); but I shall consult clearness by first considering each of them separately.

§ 2. First, then, as regards the theory of the simultaneous origination of two or more hallucinations by a distant agent—we certainly know of no reason why a state of the agent which is telepathically effective at all, should be bound to confine its effects to a single percipient. That it generally does so confine them, may be easily explained by supposing a special susceptibility on the percipient's part, or a special *rapport* between him and the agent; but that occasionally the impression should extend to others, who have also been sympathetically related to the agent, may seem no very astounding fact. Now if the impression were a merely inward experience, an impression of a merely ideal or emotional kind, and did not give rise to actual hallucination, this account of the matter might be plausible enough: it would apply for instance to Mr. H. S. Thompson's case, Vol. I., p. 99. But it will be remembered that we have seen reason to regard the *hallucination* as distinctively the *percipient's* work—as something projected by him under a telepathic stimulus; and we have found these sensory projections to take various forms according to the projector's idiosyncrasies. We have found, moreover, that the time during

¹ Vol. i., pp. 314-20, and the opening cases in Chap. iii. of the Supplement.

which such hallucinations may take place extends over several hours—that we cannot name an exact moment at which the telepathic message will reach consciousness, or externalise itself to the sense. It becomes, then, extremely improbable that two or more persons should independently invest their respective telepathic impressions, at the *same* moment, with the *same* sensory form; that they should all at once see the same figure, or hear the same sound, in apparently the same place. We should expect to find one of them embodying it in sound, and another, perhaps half an hour later, in visible shape; or one of them embodying it in sound or shape, and another only conscious of it as an inward idea; and so on. And for divergences of this sort, the evidence, though it exists, is small in amount.

But this is not all. On the theory that joint telepathic hallucinations are all exclusively and directly due to a distant agent, there is one thing that we should *not* expect to happen, and one thing that we *should* expect to happen. (1) We should *not* expect the group of percipients to include anyone who was a stranger to the agent; or who was not personally in such relations with the agent as would have rendered it natural for him, had he chanced to be alone at the time, to suffer the same telepathic experience. Nevertheless, cases exist where such an outside person has shared in the perception. And (2) we *should* expect that in a fair proportion of cases two or more percipients would share the perception, though they were not in each other's company at the time. For on the theory that is being considered, there would be no virtue in the mere local proximity of the percipients to one another; the agent is supposed to affect them by dint of his respective relations to each of them, which have nothing to do with their being together or apart. Now, in point of fact, we have a group of cases where the persons jointly affected have been apart, but they are disproportionately rare in comparison with the experiences shared by percipients who have been together; and in several of them, moreover, B and C, the two percipients, were near each other, and had been to some extent sharing the same life—conditions which may have had their share in the effect (see pp. 266-8). However, the existence of this type might no doubt be regarded as an argument for the occasional production *ab extra* of several similar and simultaneous hallucinations; and our few specimens may conveniently be cited at once.

I have already given (Vol. I., pp. 362-3) a case where two vivid dreams of a quite unexpected death were dreamt by persons who

were in the same house, but not in the same room. The following is a somewhat similar instance, but only one of the experiences was a dream. Mrs. Bettany, of 2, Eckington Villas, Ashbourne Grove, Dulwich (the narrator of case 20,) writes :—

“June, 1885.

(309) “On the evening of, I think, March 23rd, 1883, I was seized with an unaccountable anxiety about a neighbour, whose name I just knew, but with whom I was not on visiting terms. She was a lady who appeared to be in very good health. I tried to shake off the feeling, but I could not, and after a sleepless night, in which I constantly thought of her as dying, I decided to send a servant to the house to ask if all were well. The answer I received was, ‘Mrs. J. died last night.’

“Her daughter afterwards told me that the mother had startled her by saying, ‘Mrs. Bettany knows I shall die.’

“I had never felt an interest in the lady before that memorable night. After the death, the family left the neighbourhood, and I have not seen any of them since.

“JEANIE GWYNNE BETTANY.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mrs. J. died on March 23, 1883.

The following is the evidence of the servant who was sent to inquire :—

“January, 1886.

“I remember Mrs. Bettany sending me to inquire if all were well at Mrs. J.’s. The answer they gave me was that Mrs. J. was dead. Mrs. Bettany sent me to inquire, because she had a presentiment that Mrs. J. was dead or dying.”

Mrs. Bettany adds :—

“My cook, to whom I had not mentioned my presentiment, remarked to me on the same morning: ‘I have had such a horrible dream about Mrs. J., I think she must be going to die.’ She distinctly remembers that some one (she does not know *who*, and I think never did) told her in her dream that Mrs. J. was dead.”

The following is the first-hand evidence to the dream :—

“January 11th, 1886.

“I remember that some one in my dream said ‘Mrs. J. is dead.’ I do not remember the rest of the dream, but I know it was horrible. I told Mrs. Bettany at the time, and she then told me about her presentiment about Mrs. J.

“M. WENT.”

[M. Went has occasionally dreamt of the deaths of people she knows, without any correspondence.]

This case would seem to have been in some way “reciprocal”; and it is unfortunate that we cannot obtain further details of the dying woman’s impression.

The next is a waking and sensory example of the same kind. It was first obtained in writing from Mrs. Fagan, of Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot, the mother of one of the percipients; and her account exemplifies the inaccuracies which second-hand evidence may sometimes introduce, without really affecting the case in any vital point.

“ 1883.

(310) “While the Rev. C. C. T. Fagan [Mrs. Fagan’s son], then Chaplain of Sealkote, India, was dressing for dinner on Christmas Day evening, 1876, his cousin, Christopher¹ Fagan, being similarly employed in an adjacent room, both heard the name ‘Fagan’ called. The Rev. C. C. T. Fagan, though thinking it strange his cousin should thus address him, yet knowing no one else was in the house, went to him asking what he wanted, why he had not called him ‘Charlie’ as usual, and remarking that the voice was like that of Captain Clayton, a cavalry officer, who had been under his pastoral charge, but was then at a distant station. His cousin replied that he too had heard the voice, and probably it was that of Major Collis, whom they were expecting to dinner. Upon this they adjourned to the drawing-room, where they found the Major, but as he had only just come in, he had neither called nor heard the voice.

“While telling him of what had occurred, they all three heard the same voice repeat the same name, and Major Collis remarked, ‘It is like Clayton’s voice.’

“The next morning a telegram was received to the effect that Captain Clayton died at that hour from an accident received while playing at polo.”

Major Collis told our friend, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, of Clerkenwell, that Mr. Fagan and his cousin were standing in the doorway of the drawing-room talking, when they heard the call, “Fagan.” He himself was dressing in his room, and they called out to him to know what he wanted; but he had not spoken, nor had he heard the call. Whilst they were talking together, the voice came a second time, and all three heard it.

On being applied to with regard to the discrepancy between these two accounts, the Rev. C. C. T. Fagan writes:—

“Sitapur, August 25th, 1883.

“So far as my memory serves, the statement of Major Collis is correct as to the curious coincidence of which he has told you. He was certainly staying in my house at the time, and was not a guest merely invited to dinner—as my cousin was. I cannot now say who suggested the voice sounded like that of Captain Clayton. “C. C. T. FAGAN.”

Mr. Fagan says, however, in another letter: “I am under the impression that my cousin did not hear the voice.” He adds: “At or about the time in question, and on more occasions than one, I have imagined that I heard people calling me, but, I may add, this experience is now seldom or ever happening to me.”

¹ By a slip, Mrs. Fagan has called her nephew by her son’s name—Christopher, instead of George.

Major Collis writes to us on August 2, 1884 :—

“ 3, Barton Terrace, Dawlish.

“ In reply to the questions you ask, I have never had experience of any other auditory hallucination : neither have I ever had any hallucinations of the senses whatever.

“ G. COLLIS.”

Mr. Fagan's cousin, Lieutenant G. Forbes Fagan, of the 10th Lancers, writes to us :—

“ Simla, July 31st, 1885.

“ I remember that on the afternoon of the day on which Captain Clayton met his death, I was in the Rev. C. Fagan's house at Sealkote ; and he said he had heard his mother's voice calling to him, and that something was sure to happen. I heard no voice myself. When news arrived of Captain Clayton's death, my cousin said the voice must have had some connection with it.

“ G. F. FAGAN.”

In an interview with Mrs. Fagan, Professor Sidgwick learnt that Captain Clayton was intimate with the Rev. C. C. T. Fagan, and also knew Major Collis.

The *Calcutta Englishman* of December 28th, contains a telegram of December 26th : “ Last evening Captain Clayton, extra aide-de-camp to the Viceroy, was thrown while playing polo, and died during the night.”

In answer to a question as to the hour of the accident, Major Lord William Beresford writes to us :—

“ As well as I remember, it was 6.15 in the evening of Christmas Day, 1876, and he died in my arms exactly as the clock struck 12. He never spoke after he fell.”

[The somewhat ragged form in which this evidence is presented is due to the fact that the Rev. C. C. T. Fagan and Major Collis are understood to dislike the subject, and that we have scrupled to press them. But it seems quite certain that at a time closely corresponding to that of the accident, two percipients, one of whom has never had any other hallucination, heard a voice which belonged to no one in their vicinity. As to the immediate connection of the voice with Captain Clayton, the evidence is not so clear ; but as regards Lieut. Fagan's recollections, we cannot but remark the extreme unlikelihood that the two hearers should imagine Mrs. Fagan's voice as calling her son by his surname ; and also the unlikelihood that, if it was *her* voice that her son recognised, he should have altered this interesting point in the account which he gave her. The case is, of course, to some extent weakened by the fact that the Rev. C. C. T. Fagan has had other auditory hallucinations. It is worth adding, however, that one of these experiences, when he heard his mother's voice urgently calling him, proved to have coincided with a very sudden and exceptional longing for his presence on her part (Supplement, Chap. VI., § 1) ; and it may possibly have been the mention of this fact that caused a confusion in Lieut. Fagan's memory, and led him to associate Mrs. Fagan with the present experience.]

The following case is part of a record of some singular hypnotic experiences, of which some further specimens will be given in

Chap. I., § 3, of the Supplement. Mrs. John Evens, of Oldbank, Enniskillen, narrates as follows:—

“December 4th, 1885.

(311) “With regard to the apparition or optical illusion, I have a perfect and clear remembrance. It occurred after the experience related [*i.e.*, after a cataleptic fit produced under hypnotic influence]. The operator had left me with an earnest request to my husband to send for, or fetch him, should anything seem to require it.

“I was wide awake, and enjoying the freedom from pain; my room being carefully darkened. The operator had, while with me, been seated on a chair midway between my bed and a chest of drawers—about three feet from each. I was thinking very gratefully of the relief I had experienced, when I noticed a blueish-white light round the chair. It seemed to be flickering and darting in a large oval, but gradually concentrated on a figure seated on the chair.¹ The appearance did not startle me in the least; my first thought was, ‘It is Mr. T., a young officer with whom we were very intimate, and who had been in the house that evening. But the expression of the mouth struck me then, and I thought ‘Can it be Mr. D.?’—a dear friend who had died some little time before. All this time the face seemed to be changing, and, as it were, *settling*. Suddenly it flashed into my mind ‘It is Mr. B.’ (the father of the operator). I did not know this gentleman at all, except from having seen his photograph, but had no doubt on the subject. (Curiously enough his mouth and that of Mr. D.’s were singularly alike in expression.) The figure sat in a kind of dim halo. I felt no surprise; nor did I speak to it, but thought, ‘Oh, you have come to find P. (the son); he has been here all the evening, but has gone home now.’ As I thought this the halo gradually diffused itself, as it had before become concentrated, and the figure vanished. Besides the distinctness of feature, a movement, of crossing and uncrossing the knees two or three times, struck me.

“That same night, and it must have been nearly at the same time, the friend who had magnetised me was awoke by hearing his name called twice. His impression was that I needed his aid, and he was prepared to come (he was living a mile off), if he heard the call repeated. But it was not. The next day, when I saw him, without telling him any of this, I asked, ‘Has your father any noticeable habit or trick of movement?’ At first he said ‘No,’ and then, ‘unless you would describe as such a way he has of frequently crossing and uncrossing his knees. He has varicose veins, and is restless at times!’

“This was the whole matter. The father, who dislikes such subjects, would never say whether he had dreamed or been thinking intently of his son; but probably it was so. “AGNES EVENS.”

In a letter dated 18th December, 1885, Mrs. Evens writes that she thinks the occurrence took place in September or October, 1881. She has never experienced any other visual hallucination.

In answer to inquiries, she adds:—

¹ As to the oval, see the remarks on case 220; as to the gradual appearance and gradual disappearance, see Chap. xii., §§ 2 and 3, also above, p. 73, note, and p. 97; and compare case 315 below.

(1) "I cannot be sure as to the time at which I saw the appearance, but, putting circumstances together, I should think between 12 and 1 o'clock—nearer the latter hour.

(2) "I am perfectly certain that I uttered no sound; the phantom's disappearance seemed to answer to the thought that passed through my mind, 'You want Preston; he has been here all the evening, but went back to Fort Tourgis some time since.'

(3) "I had not any wish for his presence. I was lying in quiet enjoyment of the relief from agonising pain and quivering nerves, in which condition one has no active line of thought. I very likely thought about him, with a lazy kind of gratitude to him as the author of the relief I was experiencing."

Captain Battersby, R.A., F.R.A.S., of Ordnance House, Enniskillen, son-in-law of Mrs. Evens, writes :—

"December 21st, 1885.

"I had mesmerised Mrs. E. for several months, for severe neuralgia, with the view of affording her natural sleep. One night she had been in the mesmeric trance, and had been awoke by me, and I had returned to barracks—situated about half-a-mile from her house—leaving her in her room. I went to bed, and to sleep, and was awakened with a start by hearing my name called very distinctly. I sat up in bed, and looked for the caller, but saw no one. It was too dark to look at my watch, so that I cannot say what the time may have been. It occurred to me at the time that Mrs. E. might want me for something. I did not recognise the voice, and indeed had no chance of doing so, as it did not call again. In the morning I went to see Mrs. E., in order to find out whether she had had any unusual experience. She asked me if anything had happened to me the night before. I said 'Yes,' and asked her why she put the question. She said, 'Has your father a habit of moving one leg over the other, now and then, in a restless way?' This was the case. She then said, about 1 a.m. she had been roused from sleep, and saw a phosphorescent appearance on the chair near her bed, which resolved itself into a human figure, recognised by her as my father from a photograph in my possession. It did not speak, but seemed to ask her mentally 'Where is Preston?' To which she responded, also mentally, 'He was here, but is gone home'; whereon the figure disappeared. I was somewhat alarmed at the occurrence, and wrote to ask if my father was well. He was so; and did not remember having any dream of me on that night. Mrs. E. particularly remarked his habit of crossing first one leg and then the other, of which I had not previously told her.

"T. PRESTON BATTERSBY."

In answer to inquiries, Captain Battersby says :—

"I beg to say that at no time, except on the occasion referred to by me in my previous letter, have I woken from sleep with the impression of having been called. In fact this was the only occasion in my life in which I heard or saw anything unusual."

The "collective" character of these two experiences is clearly very doubtful; they may not have been due to any agency on the

part of Captain Battersby's father, or connected with each other. But considering that the accidental coincidence of the two unique experiences would be most improbable, and that a hypnotic *rapport* probably existed between Captain Battersby and his patient, it is a reasonable supposition that his mind was either the source or the channel of a telepathic communication to hers.

The next case was received from Mrs. Polson, of 4, Nouvelle Route de Villefranche, Nice.

“January, 1884.

(312) “Some years since, when living at Woolstone Lodge, Woolstone, Berks, of which parish and church, &c., &c., my husband was clerk in Holy Orders, I left the fireside family party one evening after tea, to see if our German *bonne* could manage a little wild Cornish girl to prepare her school-room for the morning. As I reached the top of the stairs a lady passed me who had some time left us. She was in black silk with a muslin ‘cloud’ over her head and shoulders, but her silk rustled. I could just have a glance only of her face. She glided fast and noiselessly (but for the silk) past me, and was lost down two steps at the end of a long passage that led only into my private boudoir, and had no other exit. I had barely exclaimed ‘Oh, Caroline,’ when I felt she was a something unnatural, and rushed down to the drawing-room again, and sinking on my knees by my husband’s side, fainted, and it was with difficulty I was restored to myself again. The next morning, I saw they rather joked me at first; but it afterwards came out that the little nursery girl, while cleaning her grate, had been so frightened by the same appearance, ‘a lady sitting near her, in black, with white all over her head and shoulders, and her hands crossed on her bosom,’ that *nothing* would induce her to go into the room again; and they had been afraid to tell me over night of this confirmation of the appearance, thinking it would shake my nerves still more than it had done.

“As chance would have it, many of our neighbours called on us the next morning—Mr. Tufnell, of Uffington, near Faringdon, Archdeacon Berens, Mr. Atkins, and others. All seemed most interested, and Mr. Tufnell would not be content without noting down particulars in his own pocket-book, and making me promise to write for inquiries that very night, for my cousin, Mrs. Henry Gibbs. She had been staying with us some time previously for a few days, and I had a letter half written to her in the paper case.

“I wrote immediately to my uncle (the Rev. C. Crawley, of Hartpury, near Gloucester,) and aunt, and recounted all that had happened. By return of post, ‘Caroline is very ill at Belmont’ (their family place then), ‘and not expected to live’; and die she did on the *very day* or evening she paid me that visit. The shock had been over-much for a not very strong person, and I was one of the very few members of the Crawley or Gibbs family who could not follow the funeral.

“GEORGIANA POLSON.”

[The three gentlemen whom Mrs. Polson mentions as having been immediately informed of her experience, have since died. If the narrative

should happen to meet the eye of any near relative of the late Rev. G. Tufnell, it might perhaps be possible to find out whether the entry in the pocket-book is still existing. According to the account, it would appear that the Rev. C. Crawley had not heard of the death on the second morning after its occurrence. This may seem a little unlikely (as he was a relative living at no very great distance), but is still quite possible.]

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Polson adds :—

“I have never before or since suffered from any experience of the kind [*i.e.*, had any visual hallucination].

“I cannot give you the date, it was so long ago. Still, the past days are often present with me, and the scenes of that night are as fresh in remembrance as if all had occurred yesterday.

“I have no idea whatever what became of the Cornish nursery girl.

“I wrote to my aunt and uncle, near Gloucester, to tell them of what had occurred. They replied they had heard Mrs. Gibbs (Caroline) was very ill, and the next communication informed us of her departure ; but I do not remember whether it took place earlier in the afternoon or later at night than when I saw her.”

The following is from the lady who was with Mrs. Polson as governess at the time :—

“Clarence Villa, Church Road, Watford.

“January 11th, 1884.

“I do not in the least object to let you know what I remember of the incident you mention. Many years ago Mr. and Mrs. Polson, with the children and myself, were sitting one evening in the drawing-room at Woolstone. In the middle of the evening Mrs. Polson left the room, but soon returned ; remaining silent, I looked up, and saw her drop down on the rug fainting. When she recovered, she told us she had seen Mrs. Gibbs on before her in the long passage.

“I recollect hearing that the little Cornish girl said she had seen that same apparition while cleaning her grate. As to the date of the incident I can only say that, to the best of my recollection, it happened before the year 1851.

“H. L. MACKENZIE.”

We find from the *Times* obituary that Mrs. Gibbs died on February 16, 1850.

In the next case one of the experiences was emotional, not sensory, but was apparently of a very marked sort. The account is from an intelligent informant, who has been for many years in the service of a family known to the present writer. Neither the witness nor (he believes) his mother ever had any other experience of the sort. His mother has been dead for some years.

“9, Blandford Place, Clarence Gate, Regent’s Park.

“October 21st, 1882.

(313) “In the winter 1850-51, I, Charles Matthews, was living as butler, 25 years of age, with General Morse at Troston Hall, near Bury St. Edmunds. My mother, Mary Ann Matthews, was in the same establishment as cook and housekeeper, a very upright and conscientious woman,

and was much liked by all the servants excepting the ladies' maid, whose name was Susan, but her family-name I have forgotten. This Susan rendered herself disliked by all in consequence of her tale-bearing and mischief-making propensities, but she stood in some awe of my mother, whose firmness of character kept her in check to a great extent.

"Susan fell ill of jaundice, for which she was medically treated for some months at Troston Hall, but ultimately was removed to Bury St. Edmunds Hospital, and placed in the servants' ward, at General Morse's expense, where she died about a week after admission. He used to send a woman from the village to the hospital, seven miles distant, to make inquiries, on such days as the carriage did not go to Bury St. Edmunds; and on a certain Saturday the woman went, but did not return until the Sunday evening, when she said she had found Susan unconscious on her arrival, and as death was evidently approaching, she was permitted to remain in the ward until the end.

"During this Saturday night the following mystery occurred, which has ever since been a puzzle to myself. Being asleep, I was awakened with or by a sudden feeling of terror. I stared through the darkness of my bedroom, but could not see anything, but felt overcome by an unnatural horror or dread, and covered myself with the bed-clothes, regularly scared. My room door was in a narrow passage leading to my mother's room, and anyone passing would almost touch my door. I passed the remaining portion of the night in restlessness. In the morning I met my mother on coming downstairs, and observed that she looked ill and pale, and most unusually depressed. I asked 'What's the matter?' She replied, 'Nothing; don't ask me.' An hour or two passed, and I still saw that something was amiss, and I felt determined to know the cause, and my mother seemed equally bent on not satisfying me. At last I said, 'Has it anything to do with *Susan*?' She burst into tears and said, 'What makes you ask that question?' I then told her of my scare during the night, and she then related to me the following '*strange story*':—

"I was awakened by the opening of my bedroom door, and saw, to my horror, *Susan* enter in her night-dress. She came straight towards my bed, turned down the clothes, and laid herself beside me, and I felt a cold chill all down my side where she seemed to touch me.¹ I suppose I fainted, as I lost all recollection for some time, and when I came to myself the apparition had gone—but of one thing I am sure, and that is *that it was not a dream*."

"We heard by the village woman on her return the Sunday evening, that Susan died in the middle of the night, and that previous to becoming unconscious her whole talk was about 'returning to Troston Hall.' We had had no apprehension whatever of the death. We thought she had gone to the hospital, not because she was in danger, but for the sake of special treatment.

"This is a simple relation of facts, so far as I can state them. I myself was not a superstitious or simple fellow, at the time, having seen a good deal of the world; but I have never yet been able to satisfy my own mind as to the why or wherefore of the occurrence."

¹ Among transient hallucinations of the sane—alike of the purely subjective and of the telepathic class—affections of *three* senses are extremely rare (p. 25, note).

Mr. Matthews tells me that he has never had any similar sensation ; and he believes that the hallucination was unique in the experience of his mother, who died some years ago.

In the remaining cases the percipients were much more widely separated ; but unfortunately the evidence as to identity of time is very far from complete. The following account is from Mrs. Coote, of 28, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

“ July 29th, 1885.

(314) “ On Easter Wednesday, 1872, my sister-in-law, Mrs. W., sailed with her husband and three young children from Liverpool in the steamer, ‘Sarmatian,’ for Boston, U.S., where they arrived in due course and settled. In the following November she was seized with, and died from, suppressed small-pox, at that time raging in Boston. About the end of November, or the beginning of December in the same year, I was disturbed one morning before it was light, as near as may be between 5 and 6 a.m., by the appearance of a tall figure, in a long night-dress, bending over the bed. I distinctly recognised this figure to be no other than my sister-in-law, Mrs. W., who, as I felt, distinctly touched me. My husband, who was beside me asleep at the time, neither saw nor felt anything.

“ This appearance was also made to an aged aunt, residing at this time at Theydon Bois, near Epping, Essex. She is now alive, aged over 80 years, and residing at Hextable, near Dartford, in Kent. She is still in full possession of all her faculties. She told my husband as recently as the 4th inst., that the appearance came to her in the form of a bright light from a dark corner of her bedroom in the early morning. It was so distinct that she not only recognised her niece, Mrs. W., but she actually noticed the needlework on her long night-dress ! This appearance was also made to my husband’s half-sister, at that time unmarried, and residing at Stanhope Gardens. The last named was the first to receive the announcement of the death of Mrs. W., in a letter from the widower dated December (day omitted), 1872, from 156, Eighth Street, South Boston, still preserved. The death was announced, among other papers (as my husband has recently learned), in the *Boston Herald*. A comparison of dates, as far as they could be made in two of the cases, served to show the appearance occurred after the same manner, and about the same time, *i.e.*, at the time of, or shortly after, the death of the deceased. Neither myself nor the aged Mrs. B., nor my husband’s half-sister, have experienced any appearance of the kind before or since. It is only recently, when my husband applied to his half-sister to hunt up the Boston letter, that we learnt for the first time of this *third* appearance.”

Mr. Coote writes to us as follows :—

“ That Mrs. Coote’s ‘vision’ occurred within a week of the death of Mrs. W., in Boston, U.S., is undoubted ; and without any effort to make our memories more precise, I may add, that from the first I have always thought that the most marked feature in the case was (judging, of course, from an opinion formed at the time when the circumstances were fresh in my memory) that it occurred within the 24 hours after death. I am afraid after this lapse of time that nothing conclusive can be arrived at as to ‘times’ in the other two cases, beyond the general idea that still

obtains in the minds of both the aged Mrs. B. and Mrs.—, that the visions occurred about the same time as that of Mrs. Coote, and after the same manner. Mrs. Coote desires me to add that to this hour she has never exchanged ideas upon this vision, even with the aged Mrs. B., which precludes all possibility of collusion in the matter.

“C. H. COOTE.”

[It is not possible to obtain a first-hand account of the vision from Mr. Coote's half-sister at present.]

The final example of this type is from Mr. de Guérin, of 98, Sandgate Road, Folkestone, who has had another apparently telepathic experience (Vol. I., p. 424). He has had no subjective hallucinations.

“1883.

(315) “The first instance occurred when I was in Shanghai. It was the month of May, 1854. The night was very warm, and I was in bed, lying on my back, wide awake, contemplating the dangers by which we were then surrounded, from a threatened attack by the Chinese. I gradually became aware there was something in the room; it appeared like a thin white fog, a misty vapour,¹ hanging about the foot of the bed. Fancying it was merely the effect of a moonbeam, I took but little notice, but after a few moments I plainly distinguished a figure which I recognised as that of my sister Fanny. At first the expression of her face was sad, but it changed to a sweet smile, and she bent her head towards me as if she recognised me. I was too much fascinated with the appearance to speak, although it did not cause me the slightest fear. The vision seemed to disappear gradually in the same manner as it came. We afterwards learned that on the same day my sister died—almost suddenly. I immediately wrote a full description of what I had seen to my sister, Mrs. Elmslie (the wife of the Consul at Canton), but before it reached her, I had received a letter from her, giving me an almost similar description of what she had seen the same night, adding, ‘I am sure dear Fanny is gone.’

“When I promised that I would send you these particulars I at once wrote to my sister, Mrs. Elmslie, and she replies, ‘I do not think I was awake when Fanny appeared to me, but I immediately awoke and saw her as you describe. I stretched out my arms to her and cried ‘Fanny! Fanny!’ She smiled upon me, as if sorry to leave, then suddenly disappeared.’

“When this occurred we [*i.e.*, Mr. de Guérin and Mrs. Elmslie] were upwards of 1,000 miles apart, and neither of us had a thought of her being seriously, much less dangerously ill. Before her death she had spoken of us both to those around her bedside. She died in Jersey, on the 30th May, 1854, between 10 and 11 at night.”

The Jersey Register of Deaths confirms the date given.

Mr. de Guérin kindly applied to Mrs. Elmslie for a further account. In her reply, she rightly remarks that at such a distance of time memory of details is unreliable, and is not sure “whether that which took place was in the nature of a dream or of a vision.” She desires, therefore,

¹ Cf. cases 193, 194, 311, 332.

that her full description of what she saw shall not be published ; but says that the face was unmistakable. She adds :—

“ I really forget whether it appeared immediately at the time of our dear sister’s death ; but I know my impression at the time was that it foreshadowed such an event, the news of which in due course came by mail.”

In conversation, Mr. de Guérin told me that the figure appeared self-luminous (see Chap. XII., § 7). He is certain that his own and Mrs. Elmslie’s visions were on the same night, and that his own was about 11 o’clock. He cannot be certain whether the death took place at 11 o’clock p.m., of the *previous* day, in which case it must have preceded the visions by some twelve hours ; or 11 o’clock p.m. of the *same* day, in which case it must have followed the visions by about twelve hours. Mr. de Guérin further told me that, though in a decline, his sister had been very decidedly better of late, and he was in no sort of anxiety about her. The last account had been that she was gaining strength and flesh. The death was extraordinarily sudden.

§ 3. I turn now to the second of the two theories above propounded—the theory that one percipient catches the hallucination from another by a process of thought-transference. This is certainly the explanation that would suggest itself in telepathic cases where one of the percipients has previously had no relations, or only slight relations, with the distant agent. But clearly the most conclusive evidence for the theory of infection would be derived from cases involving no distant “agent” at all ; cases which in their inception are pathologic, not telepathic—purely subjective delusions on the part of some one present—but which proceed to communicate themselves to some other person or persons. If it can be shown that this self-propagation is an occasional property of hallucinations as such, there will be no difficulty in extending the same explanation to cases where the hallucination is in its inception due to a distant agent. If B’s *purely subjective* hallucination may affect C, it is only what we should *à priori* expect that B’s *telepathic* hallucination might affect C : such communicability would merely be one more of those points of resemblance, which we have already seen to be so numerous, between the purely subjective and telepathic classes. And as collective hallucinations even of subjective or non-veridical origin (*i.e.*, not due to the critical situation of some distant agent) would constitute in themselves a form of thought-transference, no excuse is needed for examining them here at some length.

What evidence, then, do we find that hallucinations of the senses, as such, may be infectious ? It must be allowed at starting that no property of the sort has ever been attributed to them by

psychologists of repute:¹ the doctrine would be as new to science as every other variety of telepathic affection. This, however, is easily accounted for. We have already seen that psychologists have never made hallucinations, or at any rate transient hallucinations of the sane, the subject of careful collection and tabulation; and it is among the sane rather than the insane² that we should expect any phenomenon of thought-transference to present itself. It is therefore not surprising that the rare and sporadic evidence for collective hallucinations should have escaped notice. But if, on the one hand, collective hallucinations have not been recognised by science, on the other hand phenomena have sometimes been described by that title which have no sort of claim to it. It is here that the real importance of distinguishing *illusions* from *hallucinations* lies; and I cannot well proceed without first making this distinction plain.

Illusion consists either in perceiving a totally wrong object in place of the right one, as when Don Quixote's imagination transformed the windmills into giants; or in investing the right object with wrong attributes, as when the stone lion on Northumberland House was seen to wag its tail.³ Either sort of illusion may easily be collective. The error is not in the actual sensory impression, which is given by the real object and is common to all present, but in the subsequent act of judgment by which the nature of the object is determined; and in this act of judgment one person has every opportunity of being influenced by another. In the attitude of trying to imagine what further attributes will fit in naturally with those which the senses perceive, and will with them compose some known object, the mind is almost at the mercy of external suggestion. We see this constantly exemplified in cases where a group of people are puzzling as to the nature of some barely visible object, or of some imperfectly heard sound: as soon as someone expresses an opinion, someone else is pretty sure to endorse it, and to see or hear the thing in the suggested sense, though on nearer approach this may prove to have been incorrect. Even in cases

¹ This was written before the appearance of Dr. E. von Hartmann's tract on *Spiritism* (lately translated by Mr. C. C. Massey), in which he treats the apparitions seen at séances as collective hallucinations; but he regards the influence exercised on the sitters by the medium as to some extent exceptional in kind.

² As an instance of the insusceptibility of the insane to abnormal influences, it is worth noting that they are peculiarly difficult to hypnotise. On the other hand, I ought to state that the 2nd chapter of the Supplement contains two cases of what looks like telepathic affection of a person of more or less unsound mind.

³ I have never discovered on what authority this anecdote rests; but such an illusion is, I believe, quite possible.

where we feel as if we were right beyond the possibility of mistake, it often needs an effort to realise how little is given us, and how much we ourselves supply. A few slight sensory signs will introduce to the mind a whole array of attributes that have been associated with them on other occasions; the whole is then taken to be a single and immediate perception of the object; and since the actual sensory signs may be common to several different groups of attributes—*i.e.*, to several different objects—it may easily happen that they suggest some group which is not the object actually present. For instance, the slight sensory signs which Scott would normally have interpreted as the folds of coats and plaids hanging in a dimly-lit hall, were interpreted by him, at a moment when the idea of Byron was running strongly in his head, as the figure of the deceased poet.¹ Here the idea which happened to be dominant at the moment was what determined the false judgment; and such a dominant idea may, of course, often operate upon many minds at once; as when, in a conflagration at the Crystal Palace, a sympathetic crowd watched the struggles of an agonised chimpanzee—*alias* a piece of tattered blind—in the roof; or when a horrified crew recognised in a piece of old wreck, which was floating on the waves, the form and peculiar limping gait of a drowned comrade.² The case of the proverbial crowd and the stone lion's tail is somewhat different; for there the object was clearly seen, and recognised for what it was. But we are all of us well exercised in imagining familiar objects as moving in position and changing in contour; and the power of evoking mental pictures is often, I think, strong enough to enable us slightly to modify our visual impressions; while such devices as half-closing our eyes, or shutting them alternately in quick succession, or moving or inclining

¹ An interesting case was given by Mr. W. H. Pollock, in the Christmas number, for 1884, of the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, under the title "The Ghost at the Lyceum." Mr. Pollock has assured me that the description is "an absolute record of fact, without a word of garnish"; and his recollection of the incident, and of the bewilderment that it caused, was quite confirmed by his companion's account, as reported to me independently by a common friend. Seated in a box at the theatre, Mr. Pollock and a friend saw, during several hours (with intermissions when the lights were turned up), the vivid appearance of a decapitated head, with a fine profile and a grey Vandyke beard, resting on the lap of a lady in the stalls. At the time, they rejected the idea that this could have been an optical effect due to the folds of the lady's garments—as they noticed that she moved more than once in the course of the evening, while the face remained the same. Mr. Pollock seems to have been unaware that, as a possible example of *collective hallucination*, the vision had a very high scientific interest; or he would scarcely, even for "sporting and dramatic" purposes, have taken refuge in so meaningless a designation as "ghost." It may be, however, that the case was after all one not of hallucination, but only of illusion. It is at any rate impossible, from the record, to be quite sure that adequate means were taken to exclude this hypothesis, which, as Mr. Pollock has recently informed me, is the one that he is now inclined to adopt.

² Dr. Hack Tuke, *Influence of the Mind upon the Body*. 2nd Edition, p. 59; Wundt, *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii., p. 358.

the head, will increase the illusion. It is not surprising, then, that a strong effort to see a thing in a way in which others are professing to see it, should, for a brief period, introduce illusory elements into what seems to be a clear and complete view of the object.

These considerations will certainly suffice to explain the majority of the collective apparitions on record. The visions seen during battles, such as are especially frequent in the history of the Crusades—either signs in the heavens or phantom champions—may easily have had some objective basis. The streak of cloud, which at one moment may be “very like a whale,” might at another be equally like a fiery sword; real horsemen might be unrecognised, and the first breath of rumour that they were supernatural assistants would be caught up with avidity.¹ More deceptive cases however occur, which are not illusions, but yet have as little claim as the preceding to be called collective *hallucinations*, if that word be (as throughout this treatise it is) confined to the strict sensory meaning. Nothing, for instance, could better illustrate what collective hallucinations are *not*, than two cases which Dr. Brierre de Boismont² has adduced to illustrate what they are. A battalion of infantry, after a 40 miles’ march under a June sun, was quartered for the night in a dismal building which had the reputation of being haunted. The surgeon of the regiment describes how, about midnight, these soldiers rushed out of their quarters with wild cries, and declared that the devil had entered their chamber “in the form of a large black dog with curly hair, who had bounded upon them, ran over their chests with the rapidity of lightning, and disappeared on the side opposite to the one at which he had entered.” Now—on the supposition

¹ The reader will recall the phantom battle in the sky, described by Motley (*The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, pp. 559-60), as to which the depositions of five witnesses were taken on oath. The collective vision of an army marching on *terra firma*, described by the Duke of Argyll in *Good Words* for January, 1875, would be less easy to account for as an illusion: but the record is second-hand, and was not written down till more than 50 years after the incident is alleged to have occurred. Phantom champions are not yet extinct. Mr. J. T. Milward Pierce, of Bow Rancho, Nebraska, U.S.A., has told me of a quite recent case, narrated to him by one of the witnesses—where the form of a defunct Indian Chief, “Brown Bear,” led his tribe in a battle against the Dakotahs. Mr. Pierce has since sent me a first-hand account of the incident from another professed witness.

A recent case of a more ordinary type is the following, from Mrs. Lane, of 49, Redcliffe Square, S.W. When at school, she was sleeping in the bed of a Miss Winch, who had been sent home ill; and waking up, she was much alarmed to see this girl standing at the foot of the bed. She addressed the figure, which nodded slowly. She then roused her companions, “and they all said they saw Miss Winch, too.” The girls did not know, what was learnt next day, that Miss Winch was dying; but even supposing the first percipient’s vision to have been telepathic, her terrified words, and the dim light, would probably be quite sufficient to convert a bed-hanging or a curtain into the suggested form for her companions’ eyes.

² *Des Hallucinations* (Paris, 1862), pp. 280, 396.

that no real dog or cat had a share in shaping the idea—what can be more likely than that the general nervousness took sudden form from one man's sudden cry, on waking from a nightmare? There is not the slightest proof that all present simultaneously saw the dog, and followed his movements. I have already drawn attention to the ease with which uneducated persons may slip into believing that they have seen what they have only heard of; and under excitement this is, of course, doubly easy. One man may have believed that he *saw*; the rest may merely have believed they *had seen*. De Boismont's second case is that of Dr. Pordage's disciples in the middle of the seventeenth century, who saw "the powers of hell pass in review before them, seated in chariots, surrounded by dark clouds, and drawn by lions, bears, dragons, and tigers. These were followed by inferior spirits, who were provided with the ears of a cat or a griffin, and with deformed and distorted limbs." But here the fact that "it made no difference whether their eyes were open or shut" renders it doubtful how far the impression was really more than a vivid inward picture; and there is nothing to contradict, and everything to suggest, the notion that one person described his impressions in language which would easily conjure up the general scene in kindred and excited minds.

But apart from such spurious types, cases undoubtedly remain of really externalised collective hallucination, which are still perfectly explicable without resorting to thought-transference. The history of religious epidemics supplies instances where a whole group of persons have professed to behold some exciting or adorable object, and probably actually projected its image into space as part of the surrounding world; but where, without proof (which has never been presented) that what was seen was independently observed and described, it would be rash to suppose any other cause for the similarity of the individual experiences than a previous common idea and common expectancy.¹ Nor is even expectancy a necessary condition; there are cases where the suggestion of the moment seems sufficient. The most marked of these are *hypnotic* hallucinations: it is as easy for a mesmerist to persuade a group of good "subjects" that they all see a particular phantasmal object, as to persuade one of them that he sees it. And I think it must be admitted as possible

¹ A probable example is the recent remarkable delusion at Corano—starting from a peasant girl's alleged vision of the Virgin—in which a crowd of children and many adults shared. It is described in the *Times* for July 31, 1885.

that mere verbal suggestion may act similarly on certain minds at certain times, without the preliminary of any definite hypnotic process. I say *at certain times* advisedly; for all clear evidence of the sort seems to connect the phenomenon with circumstances of rather special absorption or excitement, sometimes even with a state of semi-trance.¹ I do not know of any instance where the sane and healthy A, simply by saying at a casual moment to the sane and healthy B, "There is such and such an object" (not really present, and not capable of being imposed as an illusion on some object really present), has at once caused the object to be conjured up in space before B's eyes. In the most extreme case that has come to my knowledge, where something like this has proved possible, very strong insistence and repetition on A's part, of the sort that a mesmerist employs when seeking to dominate a "subject's" mind, are needed before the impression develops into sensory form. In cases, therefore, where A has himself had a hallucination of which he has spoken at the moment, and B has shared it, it is too much to assume at once that B's experience *must* have been exclusively due to the verbal suggestion; for if A's mere suggestion can produce such an effect on B at that particular moment, why not at other moments when he suggests the imaginary object without having himself seen it? None the less, of course, ought the hypothesis of verbal suggestion to be most carefully considered, in relation to the special circumstances of each case, before any other hypothesis is even provisionally admitted.

I have, perhaps, said enough to define the phenomena which are really of interest for us here. Fairly to allow of explanation by

¹ If (as intelligent English eye-witnesses believe,) a semi-hypnotic condition, due to abnormally concentrated attention, is in great part answerable for the extraordinary illusions of Indian jugglery, the same condition might naturally be looked for in cases of collective hallucination. Very suggestive in this respect is the following record, by Professor Sidgwick, of a scene described to him by Mazzini:—

"In or near some Italian town, Mazzini saw a group of people standing, apparently gazing upwards into the sky. Going up to it, he asked one of the gazers what he was looking at. 'The cross—do you not see?' was the answer; and the man pointed to the place where the cross was supposed to be. Mazzini, however, could discern no vestige of anything cruciform in the sky; and, much wondering, went up to another gazer, put a similar question, and received a similar answer. It was evident that the whole crowd had persuaded itself that it was contemplating a marvellous cross. 'So,' said Mazzini, 'I was turning away, when my eye caught the countenance of a gazer who looked somewhat more intelligent than the rest, and also, I thought, had a faint air of perplexity and doubt in his gaze. I went up to him, and asked what he was looking at. "The cross," he said, "there." I took hold of his arm, gave him a slight shake, and said, "There is not any cross at all." A sort of change came over his countenance, as though he was waking up from a kind of dream; and he responded, "No, as you say, there is no cross at all." So we two walked away, and left the crowd to their cross.' It is nearly 20 years since I heard this story; but it made a considerable impression on me, both from the manner in which Mazzini told it, and from its importance in relation to the evidence for 'spiritualistic' phenomena."

thought-transference, a collective case must present evident marks (1) of being a hallucination and not a mere illusion; (2) of having occurred, so to speak, in an isolated way, and not under the dominance of any special prepossession; and (3) of having been independently projected by the several percipients, and not merely conjured up by one on the suggestion of another. It is naturally not always easy to ascertain how far these conditions are met. In judging of the auditory cases, especially, great caution is necessary; for, as we have seen above (pp. 125-6), there is scarcely any sort of mere noise which may not have some undiscoverable external origin in the house or the neighbourhood. Intelligent speech, on the other hand, and certain musical sounds, such as bell-sounds or distinct melodic sequences, if externally caused, imply conditions the presence or absence of which it is usually possible to ascertain. So again in the visual cases, the fact of dim or uncertain light may favour the hypothesis of illusion; but where the light is good, the presence or absence of an adequate external cause in the vicinity can often be determined with all but complete certainty.¹ One point of uncertainty often remains, owing

¹ I am including only cases of hallucinations which have occurred to more than one percipient *simultaneously*, or very nearly so. The extremely perplexing cases, few, but well attested, where the same phantasm has been independently described by different persons who have at different times encountered it in the same locality, may possibly be also connected with the infectious character of hallucinations; for we cannot pronounce it to be indispensable that the infectious influence should act at the moment. A certain amount of evidence for this explanation is afforded by cases where the experience (not apparently due to suggestion or illusion) has sometimes occurred to one person alone, and at other times to several together. But the hypothesis, as thus extended, becomes doubtful and difficult, and is, moreover, only one out of several hypotheses, all about equally doubtful and difficult, that may be suggested. (See Mrs. H. Sidgwick's paper "On the Evidence, collected by the Society, for Phantasms of the Dead," in the *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, Vol. iii., especially pp. 146-8.)

Clearly no such explanation is needed for the general run of *traditional* appearances—the white ladies, headless horses, and phantom dogs, which are the most widely-spread forms; or the phantasms which are more or less indigenous to a particular district, like the "corpse-candles" of some Welsh counties, and the figures in shrouds of the Western Scottish islands. To account for these, we need not go beyond the latent idea in the percipient's own mind. But it seems occasionally to happen that the percipient of a traditional phantasm is a person not previously acquainted with the tradition. Thus Mr. Lowell tells me that he once saw the appearance of the "Witch-farm," on the Massachusetts coast, though unaware of the local legend concerning it, at the very place to which he found afterwards that the legend assigned it; and in Dyer's *English Folk-Lore*, p. 208, a case is reported where a phantasm, coinciding with and possibly originating in a death, took a form that exactly accorded with the ideas of death-apparitions current in the place, though the percipient was a transient sojourner whom no rumour of those ideas had reached.

Another type (recorded by Aubrey, Martin, Dalrymple, Napier, Gregor, and other writers on "second-sight," and possibly genuine), which seems to strain the hypothesis of infection somewhat less, is that where *physical contact* with the percipient of an abnormal sight or sound has enabled a second person to share it. Our own collection contains a couple of modern instances—one first-hand from Mrs. Taunton, of Brook Vale, Witton, near Birmingham, the other from two daughters and a son-in-law of the late Mr. and Mrs. George Whittaker, of the Bowlands, Clitheroe, the first-hand witnesses. Such a phenomenon might at least be compared with the favouring effect of contact in certain "thought-reading" results, which (by rare exception among results where contact is a condition) seem not to be explicable as "muscle-reading."

to the way in which the evidence reaches us: we cannot be sure how far the mere verbal description of one percipient, after the occurrence, may not have caused another to fill in or modify his own recollection with details which he did not himself observe. But if both clearly shared in the experience, it is not important that their percepts may not have been so precisely similar as is sometimes alleged. So far, indeed, from telling against the theory of mental transfer, such want of identity is rather what we might have expected, both from the numerous *approximate* successes in experimental thought-transference—*e.g.*, in reproducing drawings—and from the evidence that a telepathic impression is liable to be reacted on in various ways by the person whom it affects.

§ 4. I fear to weary the reader by yet further explanations and distinctions before examples are given. But difficulty of exposition and risk of misapprehension alike culminate in this final chapter; and the patience which has been able to accompany me thus far must be so considerable that I venture to make one more demand on it.

I have propounded the question, what evidence do we find that purely subjective hallucinations of the senses may be infectious? and I have implied that I am able to produce some evidence of the sort. And, in fact, I am about to cite examples which I think that the majority of my readers—or of such of them at any rate as accept the substantial accuracy of the facts—will regard as going some way to establish the point. But there are those, I am aware, in whose minds some of my instances will produce a doubt whether the experiences were really subjective—whether they may not have had some unknown origin external to any of the perceiving minds; and I admit, though the doubt weakens my argument, that it is one which I in some measure share. To explain this, I must recur to a point that was very briefly touched on in Chap. XI. (Vol I., p. 512, note). It may be remembered that the question there arose whether *post-mortem* appearances of persons some time deceased were necessarily subjective hallucinations, or whether they might not be amenable to a telepathic explanation; and I observed that, while telepathy—being a psychical and not a physical conception—was quite able to embrace these phenomena as possibly due to the action of human minds continuing after bodily death, yet the *evidence* for them (of a sort that would preclude their being regarded as purely subjective experiences) was scanty and inconclusive; and I dismissed the topic

as not germane to an inquiry concerning telepathic transferences between the minds of living persons. But the topic which was rightly thus dismissed when we were considering affections of a *single* percipient, forces itself on us again when we encounter cases of *joint* percipience. For suppose that the object which B and C both simultaneously behold is the form of the deceased A. Then, if (1) the idea of B's and C's affection by the still continuing mind of A be rejected—as it would be by disbelievers in survival after physical death—yet B's and C's *simultaneous affection* remains a fact which demands recognition in this book; because, if A does not affect them, then one of them must affect the other, *i.e.*, the case is one of transference between the minds of living persons. And if (2) the idea of A's continuing power to affect B or C be admitted as tenable, but the *joint* affection of B and C by A be regarded as improbable, (owing to the difficulties already pointed out of conceiving the projection, under a telepathic impulse, of exactly simultaneous and corresponding hallucinations) yet again a fact remains which demands recognition in this book; because, if A affects B and not C, then C's vision of A must be obtained from B, and the case is again one of transference between the minds of living persons.

The reader will now, perhaps, divine why I hesitate to apply the words "purely subjective" to some, at any rate, of the cases in the group that awaits us. Though no absent living person was concerned in them as agent, I think it would be rash and unscientific to prejudge the question (deliberately left open in Chap. XI.) whether they had an origin in psychical conditions which have survived the change of death. I have shown that alike on either of the above hypotheses—alike, whether the dead (1) have not, or (2) have, minds which can influence the living—cases of collective percipience suggestive of the dead fall within the legitimate scope of the present inquiry; but I am anxious to avoid any appearance of dogmatic decision between (1) and (2). I am about equally dissatisfied with the arguments adduced for the former, and with the evidence adduced for the latter. But in my view the cases, *whatever else* they involve, at any rate involve an element of quite mundane thought-transference between the minds of the living persons concerned; and I must beg the reader to bear in mind that it is simply as probable or possible cases of thought-transference, and not as manifestations from the dead, that those of them which may seem to have reference to the dead are here adduced. If the senses of B and C are similarly and simultaneously

not long
The
be
simultaneous
by the
by the
B
but not
the father

not pro

affected without the presence of any material cause, then alike whether there *is* or is *not* a real immaterial cause outside their two selves, I believe that the joint phenomenon still depends (partly, if there is such a cause, wholly, if there is not) on psychical communication between their two minds. As to the point that is left in abeyance—the existence or non-existence of the said cause—all varieties of opinion will be allowed for by defining the group, not positively, as cases of “purely subjective” origin, but negatively, as cases which do not apparently originate in the condition of any absent living person.

§ 5. I will begin with visual examples. The following is a collective hallucination of what I have called a rudimentary type, as not suggesting any special form or human presence; but it is a remarkably prolonged and elaborate specimen of the sort.¹ The narrator is Mrs. Ward, of Glen Aray Lodge, Windsor.

¹ Another striking rudimentary hallucination, of the *cloud* type, in which two persons (out of the four who were present) shared, is described in *Notes and Queries* for September 8th and 22nd, and November 10th, 1860, and for January 5th, 1861. The narrator is Mr. E. L. Swift, who was Keeper of the Jewels in the Tower at the time when the event occurred, in the Jewel House. An incorrect version was given, without authority, in Gregory's *Animal Magnetism*.

In Vol. i., p. 483, I drew attention to a particular kind of impression, which, without actually developing into a sensory form, yet strongly suggests a particular person's presence. It is interesting to observe that such an impression—which seems a sort of potential hallucination—may be collective. Mrs. Easton, of 14, The Crescent, Taunton, writes, in January, 1884:—

“I have been, on one occasion, impressed with the certainty that a sort of—so to speak—invisible presence was in the room, and my sister, who was in the same room, told me some hours after, that she had the same impression at that particular moment, I not having spoken of the matter to her. This took place about two or three days after the death of a near relative.”

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Easton adds:—

“In answer to the first question as to whether we ever had such an impression at any other time, for myself I can answer ‘No,’ decidedly, and my sister cannot remember anything of the kind.

“The second question was, did we connect the impression with our deceased relation at the time? For myself, I can answer, ‘Yes’; my sister has described her thoughts at that particular moment in the enclosed letter.

“The third question, ‘Was there a strong bond of affection?’ Yes.

“Fourth question, ‘Can we be sure that the impression in each mind exactly corresponded in time?’ I am *quite certain* that, whatever produced this unusual feeling, we both experienced it at the same moment, although perhaps in a different way, being so unlike in temperament; I remember looking at my watch on awakening, to know the time.

“Fifth question, ‘How long did the impression last?’ For some seconds; the impression on my mind was that some unusual presence, something not material, was near.”

The enclosure, from Mrs. Welch, of 5, Colleton Crescent, Exeter, was as follows:—

“In August last, I was sleeping in the room with my sister. I think it was the third night after our father's death, and he was lying in a room below. I was aroused out of my sleep with a feeling as if some person had entered the room, and come as far as the foot of the bed when I awoke.

“I am particularly nervous at all times, of course after the recent event more so than usual; yet when I awoke, I did not feel the slightest fear, and only wished I could see the time, as I instantly thought I should hear of something having happened at that moment—the more so as our step-mother, we knew, was in a very precarious state.

“My sister awoke at the same time, and on my telling her of my sensations she told me she had felt the same, although she is not in the least of a nervous temperament.”

In reply to a question whether such an impression was *unique* in her experience, Mrs. Welch says:—

“I never experienced the same feelings before, that I can recollect.”

(316) "In May, 1851, I and my husband, the late E. M. Ward, R.A., had a curious experience which we were at a loss to account for, though it became a subject of frequent conversation, and every effort was made to find for it a fitting and rational explanation.

"We were living at No. 33, Harewood Square. It was in the month of May, and my husband and I had been to a quiet gathering of friends in the neighbourhood; we returned about 12 o'clock, letting ourselves in, for the servants were in bed, and went straight to our bedroom. Having passed such a quiet, unexciting evening, there was nothing much to talk about, and my husband was quickly in bed and asleep. I very soon followed him, and was just getting into bed, having put out my candle, with my face towards the door, when, much to my surprise, I saw, as though suspended a little distance from the top of the door, a strange, flickering flame; it was about six inches high, and four inches across the widest part, pear-shaped, and of a blueish lilac tint. I was considerably startled and must have been much agitated, for my husband (as he informed me afterwards) was roused by the sound of my fast beating heart. In reply to his inquiries, I drew his attention to the strange flame which I still saw suspended from the door frame, and whilst we were both wonderingly speculating as to what it could be, it was joined by another flame, similar in every respect, but smaller. Greater still was our surprise when we observed these two mysterious little lights slowly advancing, side by side, towards us; they came right on to our bed, and then, determined to analyse their nature, we both sat up, and my husband grasped them with his hands, rubbing them and endeavouring to rid us of their society. But, to our astonishment, this treatment had no more effect upon them than to break them into small luminous grains, which ran all over the bed-covering like quicksilver. Gradually, however, this bright inundation began to fade, and, as we still continued our efforts to extinguish it, it disappeared.

"Such is the account of the occurrence. That it actually did occur to us we never entertained the slightest doubt. I was certainly wide awake at the time, and my mind was troubled in no way, and I was in good health—otherwise there might be some ground for the belief that the appearance was the hallucination of a disordered mind, or of an over-wrought brain. My husband, too, was undoubtedly wide awake, and retained a perfect recollection of all the details of the vision the next day. We discussed it, and tried to fathom its meaning, over and over again, but could never arrive at any conclusion about it at all—except that as it did not act as a forewarning to any coming event, did not correspond to any important event, and did not appear to serve any purpose at all, its appearance was utterly meaningless.

"HENRIETTA MARY ADA WARD."

In a later letter, Mrs. Ward adds:—

"As the lights were coming to the bed, there were two streaks of moonlight on the counterpane, which could not come from any window, as the room was darkened. They also when touched, with the two lamps, merged into a mass of diamonds."

In conversation, Mrs. Ward told us that she had never experienced any other hallucination of the senses

*There is no
to suppose the
hallucination
all
An usual
unusual
by the occ
withness*

??

We have several other examples of collective hallucinations of light. In one (described to us by Mrs. G. T. Haly, of 122, Coningham Road, Shepherd's Bush, W., as having occurred a few days after her husband's death, and assumed by her to be connected with him), a flame as of a candle, but bluer, passed and repassed the bed on which the two percipients were lying, at about 18 inches height from the floor. In another, a luminous ball was seen in a corner of the room. A fourth very remarkable instance, of the brilliant illumination and then sudden darkening of an empty room, is described to us by the Rev. Edward Ram, of Norwich, as a personal experience of himself and his wife—but this was in a house where other unaccountable phenomena have been observed; as was also the case in a fifth instance, where a light is described by one percipient, Mrs. W. B. Richmond, as a glow over the whole room, out of which (according to her recollection) two bright little balls of light seemed to flash out; and by the other (her mother) as "flickering about" specially in a particular part of the room. In none of these cases does it seem possible that the light was in any way cast or reflected into the room from outside.¹

Coming to instances of a more developed type, we have a considerable group of cases as to which it might be a possible—though I think a rather desperate—assumption that what was seen was a real object, most strangely misinterpreted, or else appearing in most improbable circumstances; and which I do not therefore number as evidential items. Specially baffling are some of the cases where a carriage, as well as human beings, has appeared. For instance, Major W., resident near Conon Bridge, Ross-shire, writes:—

"February 9th, 1882.

"It was the month of August; rather a dark night and very still; the hour, midnight; when before retiring for the night I went, as is often my custom, to the front door to look at the weather. When standing for a moment on the step, I saw, coming round a turn in the drive, a large close carriage and pair of horses, with two men on the box. It passed the front of the house, and was going at a rapid rate towards a path which leads to a stream, running, at that point, between rather steep banks. There is no carriage-road on that side of the house, and I shouted to the driver to stop, as, if he went on, he must undoubtedly come to grief.

¹ In the last case, the second percipient suggests the lantern of thieves trying to rob the pigeon-house. But in the first place, the pigeon-house was not robbed, and no vestige of thieves was found; and in the second place, the light would have had to penetrate a very dark green blind, and thieves are not wont to require for their work an advertisement of such preternatural brilliancy.

The carriage stopped abruptly when it came to the running water, turned, and, in doing so, drove over the lawn. I got up to it; and by this time my son had joined me with a lantern. Neither of the men on the box had spoken, and there was no sound from the inside of the carriage. My son looked in, and all he could discern was a stiff-looking figure sitting up in a corner, and draped, apparently, from head to foot in white. The absolute silence of the men outside was mysterious, and the white figure inside, apparently of a female, not being alarmed or showing any signs of life, was strange. Men, carriage, and horses were unknown to me, although I know the country so well. The carriage continued its way across the lawn, turning up a road which led past the stables, and so into the drive again and away. We could see no traces of it the next morning—no marks of wheels or horse's feet on the soft grass or gravel road; and we never again heard of the carriage or its occupant, though I caused careful inquiries to be made the following day. I may mention that my wife and daughter also saw the carriage, being attracted to the window by my shout. This happened on the 23rd of August, 1878."

After a visit to the house in September, 1884, Mr. Podmore wrote:—

"Major W., on whom I called to-day, is practically satisfied that what he and his family saw was not a real carriage. He showed me the whole scene of its appearance. The spot where the carriage appeared to turn barely leaves sufficient room for the passage of an ordinary carriage, and that a carriage should turn round there seems almost impossible. The carriage went for some distance across the lawn—a mossy and rather damp piece of grass—and stopped in front of the house for more than a minute, the while Major W. spoke to the man, but without receiving any reply. His wife, whom I also saw, was attracted to the window by the sound of the wheels, in the first instance, on the gravel. Major W. made many inquiries among his neighbours, but could not find that anyone had seen the carriage at all. The house is situated on a peninsula stretching between the Cromarty and Moray Firths, and some 3 miles from the neck of the peninsula. The locality is very lonely, there being no villages or hamlets, and but few private residences of any kind; and it is difficult to imagine the errand which could bring a strange carriage into such a country at the dead of night. Major W. has had one other purely subjective hallucination."

In another of the carriage-cases, the hallucination was of a more bizarre sort, the coachman and footman on the box having black faces, and the four ladies inside being dressed completely in black. The vehicle passed the window without producing any sound on the gravel. In a third case (quoted above, pp. 97-9), one of the percipients was altogether apart from the three others—they seeing the phantasmal carriage pass the window, and she meeting it some way down the road. In a fourth case, our informant—Mr. Paul Bird, of 39, Strand, Calcutta—followed a phantom gharrie for 100 yards, into the very portico of Hastings House at Alipore, while the same vehicle was watched in its approach by his wife from a window. But

more of a puzzle even than the carriage-cases is a narrative received from two daughters of a well-known clergyman—neither romantic nor superstitious witnesses—who describe a vast swarm of soundless phantasmal shapes, dressed in old-fashioned garments, most of them dwarfish, and two with sparks round their faces, by which they and a maid were once accompanied for about 200 yards in a lane near Oxford. “One might imagine it to be a kind of mirage; only the whole appearance [owing to the dresses] was so unlike what one would have seen in any town at the time we saw it.”¹ If this must be regarded as illusion, because it occurred in misty moonlight, yet an identity of impression is described which still suggests mental infection:—“If one saw a man, all saw a man; if one saw a woman, all saw a woman; and so on.”

I pass by, however, as necessarily inconclusive, the greater number of our instances of collective impression where the appearance was seen out of doors in imperfect light—though there is not one of them which would not be decidedly more remarkable, as a specimen of joint illusion, than any that I have found recorded in print.² The following daylight example is from the Misses Montgomery, of Beaulieu, Drogheda.

“March 2nd, 1884.

(317) “About the year 1875, I and my sister (we were about 13 years old then) were driving home in the tax-cart one summer afternoon about 4

¹ This case, which in brief abstract may sound like a frightened girl’s story, will not, I think, produce that impression in the complete account, which may be found in the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., Vol. iii., p. 77.

² The following case, remote but first-hand, is made interesting by the fact that one of the persons present did not share the experience. Mrs. Stone, of Walditch, Bridport, tells us that one beautiful summer evening, after sunset but while it was still quite light, she was driving home with a cousin and a friend—“three more merry girls could hardly be met with”—and a man-servant.

“I saw the figure of a man on the right-hand side, walking, or rather, gliding, at the head of the horse. My first idea was that he meant to stop us, but he made no effort of the kind, but kept on at the same pace as the horse, neither faster nor slower. At first I thought him of great height, but afterwards remarked that he was gliding some distance (at least a foot) above the ground. Mary was sitting by me. I pointed out in a low voice the figure, but she did not see it, and could not at any time during its appearance. Emily was sitting by the man-servant on the front seat; she heard what I said, turned round, and speaking softly, ‘I see the man you mention distinctly.’ Then the man-servant said, in an awful, frightened voice, ‘For God’s sake, ladies, don’t say anything! please keep quiet!’ or words to that effect. I had heard that horses and other animals feel the presence of the supernatural; in this instance there was no starting or bolting, the creature went on at an even pace, almost giving the idea of being controlled by the figure. The face was turned away, but the shape of a man in dark clothing was clearly defined. My cousin and the man-servant saw it distinctly, but my friend was unable to do so, though the figure stood out plainly against the evening light; she was so placed that she ought to have seen it particularly well. At the entrance of the village of Charminster it vanished, and we saw it no more. I never heard the road was haunted.”

This may perhaps have been an optical effect due to the horse’s breath; but many breathing horses are out on summer evenings, and I should be glad to know of a similar effect in other instances. It is at any rate odd that it should have been interpreted in the same way by several observers.

o'clock, when there suddenly appeared, floating over the hedge, a female figure moving noiselessly across the road; the figure was in white, and the body in a slanting position, some 10 feet above the ground. The horse suddenly stopped and shook with fright, so much so that we could not get it on. I called out to my sister: 'Did you see that?' and she said she had, and so did the boy Caffrey, who was in the cart. The figure went over the hedge, on the other side of the road, and passed over a field, till we lost sight of it in a plantation beyond. Altogether, I suppose, we watched it for a couple of minutes. It never touched the ground at all, but floated calmly along. On reaching home we told our mother of what we had seen, and we were perfectly certain it was not a mere delusion or illusion, nor an owl, or anything of the kind.

"I have never seen anything like this nor any apparition before or since. We were all in good health at the time, and no one had suggested any grounds for the apparition beforehand; but we afterwards heard that the road was supposed to be haunted, and a figure had been seen by some of the country folks.

"VIOLET MONTGOMERY.

"SIDNEY MONTGOMERY."

Professor Barrett, who knows the witnesses, adds that Mrs. Montgomery remembers the incident well, and the terror her children were in. They both agreed as to the reality of the figure. Caffrey has gone to America, and been lost sight of.

No one probably will suppose that the witnesses here have agreed to repeat, for our benefit, a romance which they fabricated for their mother's at the time; and however much allowance be made for childish terror or exaggeration, the community of experience in broad daylight seems to exceed what can be attributed to verbal suggestions, passed from one to another, *à propos* of a fleece of cloud or an owl. We have a very similar instance from Mr. W. S. Soutar, solicitor, of Blairgowrie, N.B.—who records that he and his brother, as young boys, at play behind their father's house, in the gloaming of a summer evening, "both saw an apparition in the shape of a female figure, plainly dressed, with a striped apron over the face, and which *glided*, without any apparent movement of the feet, from the road till about half-way between it and the hedge surrounding a shrubbery near the house, when the figure suddenly disappeared. There was no cover near, behind which the person (if in the body) could hide, the spot where it disappeared being bare and open." This case, however, is remote, and the second witness is dead. A much more striking example (brought to our notice by Mr. A. Farquharson, of North Bradley, Trowbridge, Wilts) is one where the senses of two adults—a gentleman-farmer, described as a hard-headed unromantic businessman and his wife—were similarly deluded in an exposed space and in

broad daylight ; but the timidity of the witnesses precludes me from giving details.

To come, however, to indoor cases, of a less dubious type. As a rule, the figure seen (just as in purely subjective cases occurring to a single percipient) is unrecognised. The following account, though remote, is first-hand, and at any rate deserves quotation. It occurs in *Letters of Philip, 2nd Earl of Chesterfield* (1829), p. 11. The incident was recorded by Lord Chesterfield in an MS. volume containing his letters and "notes for my remembrance of things and accidents, as they yearly happen to me."

(318) "A very odd accident this year [1652] befell mee, for being come about a law sute to London . . . I, waking in the morning about 8 o'clock, . . . plainly saw, within a yard of my bedside, a thing all white like a stand^s sheet, with a knot atop of it, about 4 or 5 foot high, w^h I considered a good while, and did rayse myself up in my bed to view the better. At last I thrust out both my hands to catch hold of it, but, in a moment, like a shadow, it slid to the feet of the bed, out of w^h I, leap^s after it, c^d see it no more. . . . Doubting least something might have happened to my wife, I rid home that day to Petworth in Sussex, where I had left her with her father, the Earl of Northumberland, and as I was going upstairs to her chamber, I met one of my footmen, who told me that he was comming to me with a packet of letters, the w^h I having taken from him went to my wife, who I found in good health, being . . . with Lady Essex, her sister, and another gentlewoman, one Mrs. Ramsey . . . They all asked me what made me to come home so much sooner than I intended. Whereupon I told them what had happened to me that morn^s; which they all wondering at desired me to open and read the letter that I had taken from the footman, which I immediately did, and read my wife's letter to mee aloud, wherein she desired my speedy return^s as fear^s that some ill w^d happen to mee, because that morning shee had seen a thing all in white, with a black face, standing by her bedside. . . . By examining all particulars we found that the same day, the same hour, and (as near as can be computed) the same minute, all that had happened to me had befallen her, being fortie miles asunder. The Lady Essex and Mrs. Ramsey were witnesses to both our relations."¹

¹ In another case where a phantasm, again of a very unusual aspect, was simultaneously perceived by two persons at a distance from one another, we have the special reason for supposing it to have been purely subjective in origin, that both percipients were somewhat liable to subjective visual hallucinations ; but though it comes to us on good authority, it is third-hand, and cannot receive an evidential number. Dr. T. King Chambers, F.R.C.P., of Shrubs Hill House, Sunningdale, writes :—

"December 26th, 1885.

"My uncle by marriage, Colonel Macdonald, was subject to frequent hallucinations, when sitting up late reading, and working at some improvements in fortification and Semaphore telegraphy, which he thought would be of value. The hallucinations were wholly visual, I understood, not aural ; though he used to be heard hailing them, and what he called 'conversing' ; yet the conversation was in his usual style of pure monologue. He was always quite sane—as have been all his children and grandchildren. His son, Charles, was a civilian in the E.I.C. Service, and, whilst a student at Haileybury

Here, it will be seen, the two percipients were widely separated, which excludes the idea of joint illusion or of verbal suggestion ; and the case forms a parallel, among sensory phantasms, to that given in Vol. I., p. 240, where the common experience was of an ideal and emotional kind.

In the next example the percipients, though near together, were not actually in one another's company. The case is of special interest, inasmuch as the two percepts were slightly different,—the figure being seen by one observer with a hat on, and by the other without, and the difference corresponding with the associations natural to each in their respective positions. A clergyman writing to us from Lincoln, on April 29th, 1885, describes an afternoon call of the preceding January.

(319) "I was ushered into the drawing-room, and was asked to take a low arm-chair in the middle of the room ; but I preferred sitting on a couch drawn up at right angles to the side of the fireplace, where I could command a view, through the window, of the garden. Facing me, with her back to this window, sat one lady ; to my left, seated not far from the arm-chair mentioned, was another lady, fronting the hearth. While we sat chatting upon the subject of my visit, an old man, of somewhat sad appearance, dressed in a dark blue over-coat—somewhat shabby—and with a flat-topped felt hat, and remarkable for a white beard, passed the window ; and immediately after the front door bell rang. The lady of the house was expecting a visit from some lady friend, and remarked 'This must be ——.' I said, 'No, it's an old man with a white beard.' At which both ladies present expressed surprise, and began wondering who it could be. Just then the door of the room opened, and in walked a well-known local practitioner. As soon as he had shaken hands all round, the lady of the house said, 'But where is the old man with the white beard ?' To which the doctor replied, 'Yes ; where is he ?'

"Our friend, the doctor, had happened to be passing the gate a short time before, and had, without premeditation as he says, suddenly turned in, struck with the idea of paying an afternoon call. He came up the walk towards the hall door, and, in passing the window mentioned, looked into the

College, was a constant visitor at our house in Keppel Street, and also in Essex. He was the only one of the family who inherited his father's peculiarity, which they both considered to be an hereditary racial disease, or rather mental malformation, of no practical importance for good or harm, when once so understood by the afflicted person.

"Shortly before my cousin went to India [where he was killed in a mutiny] when I was quite a child, he slept a night at my father's in Keppel Street ; and while going to bed he saw a man with a face he did not recognise, dressed in an old-fashioned Spanish costume. He was not alarmed, or particularly interested ; but as a matter of chit-chat, mentioned it in a letter to his father at Exeter, who answered by return of post that, at the same time, he had seen an exactly similar figure, in the same strange dress. I was too young at the time to be safely told ghost-stories ; but my father and mother often detailed the circumstances as a singular instance of coincidence. I should explain it by the fact that both my uncle and cousin were at home in Devon, and fond of history. Both would be likely to have a store of half remembered dates relating to the defeat of the Armada and Spanish affairs, and the day may have suggested the forgotten date, and clothed it in appropriate costume.

"T. K. CHAMBERS."

room where we were sitting, and saw, *seated in the low arm-chair*, an old man exactly answering to the description of the old man I had seen passing the window (doubtless when the doctor passed), with this exception, that the person he saw had, of course, no hat on. The doctor was surprised not to find the old gentleman in the room; hence his strange reply to the lady's question.

"Now observe: I saw the old man exactly at the time the doctor was passing the window. I did *not* see the doctor, whom I know well, who is much shorter than the figure I saw, and who wore a *brown* top-coat, a silk hat, and no beard. And the doctor saw the figure *in* the room, sitting down and without a hat.

"I am not, as far as I know, subject to similar hallucinations, if the affair may be rightly so-called."

Dr. Cant writes to us as follows:—

"Silver Street, Lincoln.

"May 7th, 1885.

"I have seen Mr. — [the clergyman], and quite agree with all he said. The old man was sitting down in the room, and I felt certain of his presence, and was greatly astonished not to find him in the room. The reports we have given are absolutely true, without any doubts in either of our minds.

"W. T. CANT."

Dr. Cant was asked whether he had ever had any other hallucinations; and also whether he would have been certain to see any real person occupying the position where the clergyman saw the figure. He replied:—

"In answer to your questions these phenomena are quite new to me, and I never remember having one of the sort before. It was quite *impossible* for the figure that Mr. — saw to have been there, as I must have seen it when passing, and he only saw one figure, and did not see me at all."

The next two cases resemble the last, in the point that the two percipients do not seem to have seen exactly the same thing. Surgeon-Major Samuel Smith, of Wyndham House, Kingsdown Parade, Bristol, sent the following account to the *Western Daily Press* (Nov. 30, 1881), and has since confirmed it to us.

(320) "I solemnly vouch for the truth of the statement made. I will add that I have been, although not a professed teetotaler, a total abstainer from stimulants for the past 10 years, and that I am not a believer in Spiritualism as it exists in the present day.

"About 20 minutes past 11 o'clock on the night of the 20th of April last, I was engaged with my wife's mother in playing a selection from 'La Figlia del Reggimento' for the flute and piano. We were seated in the drawing-room, which was brilliantly lighted by three large gas-lights burning in globes which hung from the centre of the ceiling, the only other occupants of the room being my wife, who had fallen asleep upon the couch, and the baby asleep in the cradle. My wife's brother, who had been with us, left the room at 11 o'clock, and retired to rest. The room itself is spacious, lofty, and parallelogram-shaped, the piano occupying a position immediately opposite to the only door of entrance in

the middle of the corresponding long side, so that in playing we sat with our backs to the door, which was closed.

"I was thoroughly intent upon the music, which was new to me, and difficult to read, so far as the flute was concerned, owing to the small size of the notes ; when suddenly, in the midst of the performance, a strange feeling of mingled awe and fear came over me, and I distinctly felt the approach of someone, or rather of something, coming behind me, and this although I was so engrossed with playing ; and in my mind I seemed to perceive the shape. As it approached nearer, I turned my head to the right, and distinctly perceived a shade of a greyish colour standing by me upon my right hand, a little in advance of me. I did not see the whole figure, but what I saw was part of a shadowy face, the outline of the forehead, nose, mouth, chin, and a part of the neck being visible. Strange to say, I do not remember seeing the eye, but the figure appeared to have a top hat upon its head. As I gazed upon it, it vanished, and with it the feelings, to a great extent, to which it gave rise. Of the mingled feelings which its presence raised in my mind, I should say that awe predominated.

"I did not cease playing, and subsequently played other pieces by the old masters, sang some songs, and finally went to bed, and slept well. Nor did I mention the matter to my wife's mother that night, either at the time of the occurrence, or before retiring to rest. Now, however, comes the most remarkable part of the matter. At or about 11.30 a.m. on the following day, my wife's mother came into the private room, and suddenly said, 'Did you see something when you turned your head last night, when you were playing?' I did not immediately reply, but the strange event of the preceding night flashed across my mind instantly. I was, indeed, too greatly surprised to reply at once, for I did not believe at the time that she had noticed the action upon my part ; and, as I have already said, I had not mentioned the matter to her, or even hinted at it.

" 'Why do you ask?' I replied.

" 'Because I thought you did.'

" 'Did you see anything?' I asked.

" 'Yes, I believed that someone had come into the room, as I felt that someone had come in.'

" 'Did you think it was a man or a woman?'

" 'I felt that it was a man, and at first believed it to be James' (my wife's brother), 'who had come down, and I wondered how he could come in without my hearing him.'

" 'Did you see anything?' I asked.

" 'Yes, I saw the back and shoulders of the form of a man ; it passed across like a shadow behind you, stood to your right hand, and then disappeared. I was not alarmed, but surprised.

"So ends the narrative. In no way can I explain the cause, or sequence of events. As they occurred, so I present them."

Surgeon-Major Smith (January 15th, 1886), in sending his mother-in-law's confirmation, adds :—

"In speaking of the matter to-day she said she felt the presence of the visitor in her mind before she saw it ; and this is my experience of it. I felt its presence before I saw it."¹

¹ See Vol. i., p. 483, and Chap. xii., § 2.

“Wyndham House, Kingsdown, Bristol,

“January 15th, 1886.

“Agreeably to the request of Mr. Gurney, I write, but have nothing to add to the statement of my experience of the strange visitation described in the *Western Daily Press* in November, 1881; the facts being as therein stated.

“HANNAH ROBINSON.”

Mr. Smith has repeated the account to me on the spot; and it then became evident that Mrs. Robinson, turning her head the instant after he did the same, would have seen any flesh-and-blood figure rather *more full-face* than he did; instead of which she saw the *back*. The extremely distinct and startling character of the experience came out more impressively in conversation than in the written account. Neither percipient can recall having had anything like a hallucination on any other occasion.

The following account is from the Rev. D. W. G. Gwynne, M.D., Neuaddvach, Pontardulais, South Wales. He first describes how he took up his abode at P—— House, near Taunton, in 1853, and how both he and his wife were made uncomfortable by auditory experiences to which they could find no clue. He proceeds:—

(321) “I now come to the mutual experience of something that is as fresh in its impression as if it were the occurrence of yesterday. During the night I became aware of a draped figure passing across the foot of the bed towards the fire-place. I had the impression that the arm was raised, pointing with the hand towards the mantel-piece, on which a night-light was burning. Mrs. Gwynne at this moment seized my arm, and the light was extinguished. *Notwithstanding*, I distinctly saw the figure returning towards the door, and being under the impression that one of our servants had found her way into our room, I leapt out of bed to intercept the intruder, but found, and saw, nothing. I rushed to the door, and endeavoured to follow the supposed intruder, and it was not until I found the door locked, as usual, that I was painfully impressed. I need hardly say that Mrs. Gwynne was in a very nervous state. She asked me what I had seen, and I told her. She had seen the same figure, but her impression was that the figure placed its hand over the night-light and extinguished it.

“The night-light in question was relit and placed in a toilette basin, and burned naturally. I tried to convince myself that it might have been a gust of wind down the chimney that put the light out; but that will not account for the spectral appearance, which remains a mystery.

“D. W. G. GWYNNE.”

Mrs. Gwynne writes, on April 15, 1884:—

“In addition to my husband’s statement, which I read, I can only say that the account he has given you accords with my remembrance of the ‘unearthly vision,’ but I distinctly saw the hand of the phantom placed over the night-light, which was at once extinguished. I tried to cling to Dr. Gwynne, but he leapt out of bed with a view, as he afterwards said, of intercepting some supposed intruder. The door was locked as usual, and was so when he tried it. He lit a candle at once, and looked under the bed, and into a closet, but saw nothing. The night-light was also relit,

which was placed on the wash-stand, and together with the candle, remained burning all night. I must observe that I had never taken to use night-lights before we lived there, and only did so when I had been so often disturbed and alarmed by sighs and heavy breathing close to my side of the bed. Dr. Gwynne, on the appearance of the phantom, in order to calm my agitated state, tried to reason with me, and to persuade me that it might have been the effects of the moonlight and clouds passing over the openings of the shutter, and possibly that a gust of wind might have extinguished the light, but I knew differently. When we had both been awakened at the same moment apparently, and together saw that unpleasant figure, tall and as it were draped like a nun, deliberately walk up to the mantel-piece and put out the light with the right hand, there could be no mistake about it; and I distinctly heard the rustling sound of garments as the figure turned and left through the door, after my husband's attempt to stop it with his open arms. The moonlight was very clear and the white dimity curtains only partly closed.

“MARY GWYNNE.”

[As telling against the purely subjective origin of this experience, I ought to mention that there was distinct evidence of others' having observed unaccountable phenomena in the house, though this was not known by Dr. and Mrs. Gwynne till after their own observation. They soon afterwards gave up the house.]

In the next case the difference is still more marked, the percept being visual to one person and auditory to the other; while at the same time something of the same idea seems to have been suggested to both. For the purpose in view, the case (in spite of certain discrepancies in the two accounts) is, perhaps, stronger than it looks. For the fact that the visual and the auditory experience were both unshared, is a decided indication that they were neither of them due to a real external cause; and if they were hallucinations, then (since no words passed till after both had been experienced) it seems at any rate very possible that one of them produced the other by thought-transference. Lady C. writes, on Oct. 13, 1884:—

(322) “In October, 1879, I was staying at Bishopthorpe, near York, with the Archbishop of York. I was sleeping with Miss Z. T., when I suddenly saw a white figure fly through the room from the door to the window. It was only a shadowy form, and passed in a moment. I felt utterly terrified and called out at once, ‘Did you see that?’ and at the same moment Miss Z. T. exclaimed, ‘Did you *hear* that?’ Then I said, instantly, ‘I saw an angel fly through the room,’ and she said, ‘I heard an angel singing.’

“We were both very much frightened for a little while, but said nothing about it to any one.”

“K. C.”

Miss T. writes:—

“December 19th, 1884.

“Late one night, about October 17th, 1879, Lady C. (then Lady K. L.)

and I were preparing to go to sleep, after talking some time, when I heard something like very faint music, and seemed to feel what people call 'a presence.' I put out my hand and touched Lady C., saying, 'Did you hear that?' She said, 'Oh, don't! Just now I saw something going across the room!' We were both a good deal frightened, and tried to go to sleep as soon as we could. But I remember asking Lady C. exactly what she had seen, and she said, 'A sort of white shadow, like a spirit.' The above occurred at Bishopthorpe, York.

"Z. J. T."

In the next two examples (in which the figure was unrecognised) no difference seems to have been noted in the impressions of the two percipients. Mr. Bettany, of 2, Eckington Villas, Ashbourne Grove, Dulwich, S.E., writes:—

"November, 1884.

(323) "One night, early this year, I became conscious of a figure in my bedroom. It was a crouching figure of a woman, enveloped in a black cloak and hood. My impression was that the woman was old, but I did not see a face. This figure slowly and stealthily advanced from the bedroom door to a wardrobe on the same side of the room. It then suddenly and entirely disappeared, and, from the sudden shock, I gave a sharp loud cry. I never saw such an appearance before or since. I consider myself unusually unlikely to see apparitions. This figure and circumstance were like no dream, but were to me real and evident, and there appeared to be no transition between waking and sleeping. I was convinced that what I saw was a waking sight. I have no idea whom the figure represented. I had then occupied this house nearly three years, and I know nothing of former occupants.

"No light was carried nor was any light burning in the room. The figure was visible and the wardrobe was visible; but when the figure disappeared darkness was complete.¹ The door was found locked.

"G. T. BETTANY."

Mrs. Bettany (the narrator of cases 20 and 309) writes:—

"On the night referred to, I woke suddenly, I know not from what cause. My husband was leaning on his elbow, looking intently at a strange woman whom I saw crouching by the wardrobe. I believed it to be a real person. It, however, suddenly disappeared. My husband then gave a cry as he describes. He then told me what he had seen. I tried the door and found it locked.

"The thought has occurred to me that I may have seen this by sympathetic transference from my husband; but, against this, I am much more likely to see something of this kind than he.

"Without having mentioned this apparition to my servants, the nursemaid told me, next day, that Muriel (a child of three years) had woke her in the night, saying, without any fear in her voice, 'Clara, Clara, there is an old woman in the room.' The nurse herself saw nothing. I may add that my cook has on several occasions asked me if I had entered

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 550-1.

her room during the night, on occasions when I had certainly not done so. She appeared much mystified on learning this.

“JEANIE GWYNNE BETTANY.”

The narrator of the next experience requests that her name may not appear.

“February 17th, 1884.

(324) “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 therefore 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 awake 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 awake 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. “L. S. B.”

[Unfortunately the sister’s letter was destroyed.]

The following case is a very singular one. The phenomenon of mutual hypnotisation (or rather of hypnotisation of one person through the process of hypnotising another) is one of which we have other examples. But I have met with no other instance of genuine transfer of a hallucination between two hypnotised persons; and, if this instance is a genuine one, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it depended on the peculiar condition established—the two not being “subjects” influenced in common by a third person, but the originator of the hallucination, whichever of the two it was, having exerted an

379. 290
Searched
✓ examined
Jan 1 -

active influence on the other, and presumably established the sort of *rapport* which is so common a feature of hypnotism. It could of course only be by the rarest accident that an operator who had established such a *rapport* should then and there become the victim of a sensory hallucination, which would thus have a chance of being transferred; and the accident in this case was the fact that the operator herself fell into an abnormal condition. I do not number the narrative, as it is impossible to be quite certain that some unconscious look or gesture on the part of one percipient did not evoke the image in the other's mind; for though the hypnotic state in itself has no special tendency to promote hallucinations, except such as are suggested and impressed in the plainest manner, in the present instance there seems to have been a certain amount of expectancy, which probably facilitated the affection in both the persons concerned. The case was received from Miss Becket, of Hotel Vendôme, Boston, U.S.A., an Associate of the S.P.R., who wrote on January 25, 1886.

Miss Becket begins by describing how on one occasion she attempted to hypnotise a friend who was standing two or three yards from her. She made slow downward passes till her friend "shivered with cold." She then reversed the passes, but soon herself became rigid, with outstretched arms. "Both the lady and myself turned our heads, and seemed to follow with our eyes the movements of some invisible body around the room. We seemed to see the same horrible something in the same part of the room, for our faces had an expression of unutterable horror. Sometimes we looked *behind* this one object, as at something following its progress round the room, but our eyes instantly returned to the greater attraction, and at last our faces seemed so frozen in an agony of fear that the gentleman sprang towards his wife, and dragged her to a seat, and used great physical force before he could rouse her from the terrible spell. I seemed to be in part liberated with her, but it was a long time before we were really free from the strange influence we had fallen under.

"When we could talk, we found that we had each seen the same vision, in every detail alike. I have always had a strong faith in religion. My friends were too philosophical to admit dogmas into their minds. But the one horrible central figure in our visions, it seems, must have originated in *my* brain, from its resemblance to *my* idea of a personal devil. At all events, we both saw, suddenly take form out of empty space, the giant figure of a man. His face expressed fiendish cruelty and wickedness, and we felt ourselves in part in his power, and knew that he was exulting in this power. He seemed to be followed by a great many pigmy figures, that danced about the room and made ugly faces at us, but dared not do more in the presence of this master spirit. It was when the supernatural malignancy of this frightful creature had almost overpowered us with fear and horror, that our faces expressed such torture as to cause the gentleman to interfere, and try to rouse us from the spell.

"As I have said, it was entirely out of our plan that *I* should *share* in

the vision. I had counted on watching the effects of my passes on my friend; and the shock of this unwelcome surprise put an end to any further experiments in future.

“M^{RS}. MARIA J. C. BECKET.”

The following is an independent and very different description, from Mrs. Frederic D. Williams, the lady who shared in the experience:—

“35^{bis}, Rue de Fleurus, Paris.

“March 24th, 1886.

She first narrates how Miss Becket and she used to try on each other, standing some distance apart, the effect of “magnetic passes,” and how she herself used to feel a hot current of air, and Miss Becket a cool one;¹ and continues:—“I cannot remember who [*i.e.*, which of us] acted as magnetiser on the particular occasion to which Miss Becket alludes: the chief feature of it I, however, do recollect. This was seeing a strange something—an appearance of a shadowy, transparent film, or veil, or sheet of thinnest vapour,² float slowly upward between Miss Becket and myself, but (as it appeared to me) nearer her. Any possible doubt, if not of the object itself, at least of our perception of something unusual, should be disproved by the fact of our exclaiming simultaneously, ‘Did you see that!’—or words to that effect. I hesitate to say anything of the truth of which I am not absolutely sure; but I have an impression amounting to certainty that it was upon the reverse passes being made that the above incident happened. [This detail agrees with Miss Becket’s statement.]

“L. L. W.”

On receiving this account, I told Mrs. Williams what Miss Becket’s version was, and also asked whether Mr. Williams remembered the incident. She replied that Mr. Williams could corroborate her statement as being the same that she made to him at the time, but does not remember having¹¹ been present, though he admits that he may have been. She remembers that her experience differed from Miss Becket’s in not being alarming, and that Miss Becket described hers as “infernal.” What she saw had the same sort of shape as a veil falling around a human form, and changed like a cloud while being watched. She concludes:—“I had forgotten that Miss Becket became rigid, but now remember the circumstance, and this fact, that I was very much alarmed, not at what I saw (although it is quite true we opened our eyes very wide at that), but at the state into which Miss Becket was thrown, and also at the possibility of having done her some serious harm through my inexperience in such matters; which would seem to decide, at least in my own mind, a point on which Miss Becket and I seem to be at variance, namely, that it was I who was ‘magnetising,’ and not she. I do not know, however, that this is of any importance.”

[Memory is clearly more likely to have erred as to the *resemblance* than as to the *difference* of the two visions. But even if we only had Mrs. Williams’s account, some germ of thought-transference would be strongly suggested by the sudden and simultaneous occurrence of two such singular experiences.]

¹ From this it would appear that Miss Becket confounded her friend’s temperature-sensations with her own. It seems to be an accident whether such subjective impressions take the form of heat or cold.

² This rudimentary sort of appearance, as we have seen, is a well established form of subjective hallucination (see, *e.g.*, p. 73, note).

Probably more
known earlier
felt.

I now come to cases where the figure was recognised. The following transitional instance, of semi-recognition, is from Captain Cecil Norton, late of the 5th Lancers, who tells us that he has had no other hallucination of the senses.

“ 5, Queen’s Gate, S.W.

“ December 20th, 1885.

(325) “ About Christmas time 1875 or 1876, being officer on duty, I was seated at the mess table of the 5th Lancers, in the West Cavalry Barracks, at Aldershot. There were 10 or 12 other officers present, and amongst them Mr. John Atkinson (now of Erchfont Manor, near Devizes, Wilts), the Surgeon-Major of the regiment, who sat on my right, but at the end of the table furthest from me and next to Mr. Russell. [Captain Norton was sitting at the end of the table and directly facing the window.] At about 8.45 p.m. Atkinson suddenly glared at the window to his right, thereby attracting the notice of Russell, who, seizing his arm, said, ‘ Good gracious, Doctor, what’s the matter with you ? ’ This caused me to look in the direction in which I saw Atkinson looking, viz., at the window opposite, and I there saw (for the curtains were looped up, although the room was lighted by a powerful central gas light in the roof and by candles on the table) a young woman, in what appeared a soiled or somewhat worn bridal dress, walk or glide slowly past the window from east to west. She was about at the centre of the window when I observed her, and outside the window. No person could have actually been in the position where she appeared, as the window in question is about 30 feet above the ground.

“ The nearest buildings to the window referred to are the Infantry Barracks opposite, about 300 yards distant. Behind where I sat is a conservatory, which was examined by me, as well as the front window, immediately after the occurrence. There was no person in the conservatory. [It was unused in the winter.] The nearest buildings to it are the officers’ stables, over which are the staff sergeants’ quarters, about 50 yards distant.

|| “ The occurrence made little if any impression upon me, though it impressed others who were in the room. All present had been drinking very little wine ; and the dinner had been very quiet.

“ It has just occurred to me that I may be wrong as to the time of year and that the occurrence may have taken place about 15th October or about 15th March.

“ CECIL NORTON.”

Mr. Atkinson writes :—

“ Erchfont Manor, Devizes.

“ August 31st, 1885.

“ The appearance of a woman which I saw pass the mess-room window at Aldershot seemed to be outside, and it passed from east to west. The mess-room is on the first floor, so the woman would have been walking in the air. There has been a very nice story made out of it—like most other ghost-stories, founded on an optical illusion.”

[Captain Norton’s *vivâ voce* account made it tolerably clear, in my opinion, that the case was one of *hallucination*, not illusion. He

further mentions that both Mr. Atkinson and he were "satisfied that the face and form of the woman seen were familiar," though they could not at the moment identify the person. Captain Norton afterwards felt sure that the likeness was to a photograph which he was in the habit of seeing in the room of the veterinary surgeon of the regiment, representing the surgeon's deceased wife in bridal dress. Oddly enough, this man was at the time, unknown to his friends, actually dying or within a day or two of death, in the same building. But Mr. Atkinson recalls nothing about the photograph; and the coincidence is not one to which we can attach weight.]

The next instance must be reckoned as "ambiguous" in origin; as, though the person whose form was seen was in an abnormal state, this had been to some extent chronic, and no reason is known why he should have exercised a telepathic agency on the day in question more than on any other. The narrator desires that her name may not be printed.

"October 28th, 1885.

(326) "In the month of November, 1843, myself, my eldest sister, and the man-servant were driving home from a small town to our parsonage in the country. The time might be about half past 4 or 5 p.m. As we came slowly up the hill by the churchyard wall, we saw a gentleman in walking-costume going into the vestry door. We both exclaimed, 'That's papa,' and the man George said at the same moment, 'Why there's the master.' My father was then ill, and away from home many miles away. He died the following January 23rd, 1844. He wore a particular long cloak which I should have recognised anywhere, and which he had many years, and wore as a loose wrap. [What is meant clearly is that the cloak in which the figure appeared to be dressed exactly resembled that of the narrator's father.] He looked exactly like himself, and was going in by the small vestry door he used to enter the church by when going to take duty. I do not think he looked at us, but seemed intent on entering the church, and disappeared inside. We were all much frightened, and searched round the house and church but could see no one, and no one had been seen about. I recollect the occurrence as if it had been yesterday, and, as I write, see all distinctly in my mind's eye.

"The man-servant is dead; my sister begs to corroborate my account.
"S. R."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. R. says:—

"My sister has always, when I have talked of the vision, said she saw it so likewise, and she reiterated that only last summer, but she is not equal to write about it. I quite see the weak point, if the church was not searched inside. I can't say it *was*, nor can I say it was *not*. Old George, the man, was most fond of his master, and may have gone into the church; but I can't say. I only know we were all so terribly frightened. The vision was sudden, so true to life, and even to the particular long cloak, all gathered in to a collar clasped at the throat. I ought to have said that the figure *seemed* in the act of going in by the vestry door: we did *not* see him enter, as we drove on in great fright to the house. My father was then under medical treatment at Northampton."

Mrs. R. gives details, showing the absolute impossibility that her father

At 9.30.
No value.

could really have "left Northampton, being a *dying* man, so to speak, when admitted," and come to the spot where he was seen, unknown to all his friends. "Then, again," she adds, "the church was always kept locked, the keys at the parsonage, supposing for a moment that we saw a living figure. I recollect that inquiry was made of the villagers as to any strange gentleman having been seen about, and the answer was 'No.'"

Asked whether she or her sister have ever had a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion, Mrs. R. says, "I can emphatically answer 'No,' for both of us." Her sister was about 19 at the time, and she herself 11—"a fresh young child with perfect nerves."

The following account is from Mrs. Moberley, of Tynwald, Hythe.

"May 9th, 1884.

(327) "The case of hallucination shared by myself and a friend was rather odd. We were both convinced we saw one afternoon a friend pass before the window in which we stood, and enter the garden. We both bowed to him, and believed he returned the greeting. He was in sight for some short time; quite long enough to allow of a distinct recognition, and the road along which he passed was near to the window at which we stood. A quiet country road, we knew every passer-by by sight and name, and our friend was a remarkable man in some ways, not one to be easily confounded with other people—a short, brisk, alert, foreign-looking man, with jet black hair and white whiskers, a decidedly un-English overcoat, and a salute peculiar to himself, a wave of the hat and a low bow, with which he never failed to greet us. We waited to hear him announced in vain. On her way home my friend met his son, who was extremely perplexed at hearing that his father had been to our house. He had been intending to come, but finding that he should be engaged had sent his son instead. Of course when we all met, the mystery was exhaustively discussed, and dismissed as a mystery. "FRAS. MOBERLEY."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Moberley says that the date was 1863; that she was 19, and in good health; and that she has never had any other hallucination. The lady who shared the experience with her declines to answer any questions, saying that "it is a question of principle." Mrs. Moberley adds, "She *has not forgotten* the circumstance: she would have been only too glad to say so."

Bearing in mind the "arrival" cases of Chap. XIV., § 7, we cannot here assume it as quite certain that the direction of the absent person's thoughts had nothing to do with the appearance; but if to this extent "ambiguous," the case seems at any rate one of collective hallucination. The same remark applies to the next example—from Mrs. Forsyth Hunter, of 2, Victoria Crescent, St. Heliers, Jersey.

"1882.

(328) "Another odd appearance¹ was that of my elder daughter, a bright lively girl of fifteen. I had placed her at a finishing school in

¹ Some apparently veridical cases from the same informant will be found below—Nos. 408, 553, 554, 650.

Edinburgh, and returned to my cottage, in M. Next morning at breakfast, I suddenly looked out of the window, and saw her quite distinctly coming in at the garden gate, in pork-pie hat, grey dress looped up over a red petticoat, just as she had been the day before. Not a word said I, but M., my second daughter [since deceased], exclaimed joyously and wonderingly, 'There is B!' For the few seconds the vision lasted, I saw her, as if stooping to undo the latch of the gate. Afterwards she told me how unhappy she had been for the first day in school, and what an intense longing had seized her to return to us. No doubt both her sister and myself were thinking of her, at the same time."

In answer to the question whether she can be quite certain that the figure seen was not that of a stranger bearing some resemblance to her daughter, Mrs. Hunter replies:—

"Your supposition amuses me. The figure *melted* away, in the act of seemingly stooping to undo the latch of our little gate. It was a bright autumn morning. We were seated at breakfast, the table close to a bow-window, overlooking a strip of garden, belonging to a cottage at Melrose; the gate being a low wooden gate, and no house near. It *was* my daughter's face, figure, and dress, just as she had appeared the day before, when I took her to school at Edinburgh. My daughter was distinguished-looking, and no one in that neighbourhood could at all be mistaken for her. Our sight was quite good, and neither short-sighted. In short, there is no doubt that in some mysterious way her longing and our thinking [of her] brought about this appearance. Another explanation might be that our imaginations might at the same moment have called up the figure."

[The facts that the phantasm presented exactly the aspect of the real figure so recently seen, and that Mrs. Hunter's thoughts were much occupied with her absent daughter, and further that she had previously had a subjective "after-image" of this very daughter (Chap. XII., § 4), decidedly favour the supposition that her experience on this occasion was also of that character. And if so, the case seems clearly to be one where a purely subjective hallucination has been transferred.] ^{n.c.} _{suggested} 0?

In the next example, the apparition seems more definitely independent of any conscious mental action on the part of the absent person; for it would be hard to attribute a special telepathic influence to some casual image of his usual resort that may have flitted across his mind, at the same time that his form appeared. The two percipients were at the time secretaries to societies of which the offices were in the same building. The narrator is Mr. R. Mouat, of 60, Huntingdon Street, Barnsbury, N. His account, which was written down soon after the occurrence, has been slightly condensed.

(329) "On Thursday, the 5th of September, 1867, about the hour of 10.45 a.m., on entering my office, I found my clerk in conversation with the porter, and the Rev. Mr. H. standing at the clerk's back. I was just on the point of asking Mr. H. what had brought him in so early (he worked ^{203.03}

in the same room as myself, but was not in the habit of coming till about mid-day) when my clerk began questioning me about a telegram which had missed me. The conversation lasted some minutes, and in the midst of it the porter gave me a letter which explained by whom the telegram had been sent. During this scene Mr. R., from an office upstairs, came in and listened to what was going on. On opening the letter, I immediately made known its purport, and looked Mr. H. full in the face as I spoke. I was much struck by the melancholy look he had, and observed that he was without his neck-tie. At this juncture Mr. R. and the porter left the room. I spoke to Mr. H., saying, 'Well, what's the matter with you? You look so sour.' He made no answer, but continued looking fixedly at me. I took up an enclosure which had accompanied the letter and read it through, still seeing Mr. H. standing opposite to me at the corner of the table. As I laid the papers down, my clerk said, 'Here, sir, is a letter come from Mr. H.' No sooner had he pronounced the name than Mr. H. disappeared in a second. I was for a time quite dumbfounded, which astonished my clerk, who (it now turned out) had not seen Mr. H., and absolutely denied that he had been in the office that morning. The purport of the letter from Mr. H., which my clerk gave me, and which had been written on the previous day, was that, feeling unwell, he should not come to the office that Thursday, but requested me to forward his letters to him at his house.

"The next day (Friday), about noon, Mr. H. entered the office; and when I asked him where he was on the Thursday about 10.45, he replied that he had just finished breakfast, was in the company of his wife, and had never left his house during the day. I felt shy of mentioning the subject to Mr. R., but on the Monday following I could not refrain from asking him if he remembered looking in on Thursday morning. 'Perfectly,' he replied; 'you were having a long confab with your clerk about a telegram, which you subsequently discovered came from Mr. C.' On my asking him if he remembered who were present, he answered, 'The clerk, the porter, you and H.' On my asking him further, he said, 'He was standing at the corner of the table, opposite you. I addressed him, but he made no reply, only took up a book and began reading. I could not help looking at him, as the first thing that struck me was his being at the office so early, and the next his melancholy look, so different from his usual manner; but that I attributed to his being annoyed about the discussion going on. I left him standing in the same position when I went out, followed by the porter.' On my making known to Mr. R. that Mr. H. was 14 miles off the whole of that day he grew quite indignant at my doubting the evidence of his eyesight, and insisted on the porter being called up and interrogated. The porter however, like the clerk, had not seen the figure."

892s
? Mr. R. has supplied independent and precise corroboration of these facts, so far as he was a party to them—the one insignificant difference being that he says he did not *speak* to Mr. H., but "gesticulated in fun to him, pointing to Mr. M. and the clerk, who were having an altercation about a telegram; but my fun did not seem at all catching, Mr. H. apparently not being inclined, as he often was, to make fun out of surrounding circumstances." He adds that he has never experienced any other hallucination of the senses; and Mr. Mouat made a similar statement *visà voce* to the present writer.

Cases of this type naturally suggest the question whether they may not be parallel to those cases of *casual agency* (Chap. XIV., § 5), where the same person has on several occasions, unconnected with any crisis, been the source of hallucination, now to one friend now to another. But even supposing such an impression as the above, of an absent person who is in a normal state, to be telepathic and not purely subjective in its inception, no one on reflection will maintain that by pure accident two percipients were casually affected in this extremely rare way *at the same moment*. And if not, then something took place between them; which—if what one saw was not suggested to the other by verbal or physical signs—must be of the nature of thought-transference.

The next narrative is from Mr. James Cowley, who wrote from 32, Langton Street, Cathay, Bristol, on Jan. 7, 1884:—

(330) "My eldest son is a twin. The night after his dear mother was laid in the grave at the Highgate Cemetery (1845) I had him in bed with me. (I was then residing at 39, Charlotte Terrace, Islington.) Something causing me to start from my sleep, I saw, with all the distinctness possible to visual power, my dearest angel receding, in a bent position, as if she had been blessing one or both of us, with a kiss. At the same instant the child, only two years and five months old, exclaimed, 'There's mother!' You will hardly wonder that, after the night had passed away, I was perplexed to know whether I had only dreamt it, or whether it was real. But the reference made to the matter by my dear little motherless one, the moment he awoke, removed all possibility of doubt."

The next account is from Mr. Charles A. W. Lett, of the Military and Royal Naval Club, Albemarle Street, W.

"December 3rd, 1885.

(331) "On the 5th April, 1873, my wife's father, Captain Towns, died at his residence, Cranbrook, Rose Bay, near Sydney, N. S. Wales. About 6 weeks after his death, my wife had occasion, one evening about 9 o'clock, to go to one of the bedrooms in the house. She was accompanied by a young lady, Miss Berthon, and as they entered the room—the gas was burning all the time—they were amazed to see, reflected as it were on the polished surface of the wardrobe, the image of Captain Towns. It was barely half figure,¹ the head, shoulders, and part of the arms only showing—in fact, it was like an ordinary medallion portrait, but life-size. The face appeared wan and pale, as it did before his death; and he wore a kind of grey flannel jacket, in which he had been accustomed to sleep. Surprised and half alarmed at what they saw, their first idea was that a portrait had been hung in the room, and that what they saw was its reflection—but there was no picture of the kind.

"Whilst they were looking and wondering, my wife's sister, Miss Towns, came into the room, and before either of the others had time to speak she exclaimed, 'Good gracious! Do you see papa?'

¹ See p. 33. note.

Evidence of
of illusion
object of
time spec
reflection
O'Connell

One of the housemaids happened to be passing down stairs at the moment, and she was called in, and asked if she saw anything, and her reply was, 'Oh, miss! the master.' Graham—Captain Towns' old body servant—was then sent for, and he also immediately exclaimed, 'Oh, Lord save us! Mrs. Lett, it's the Captain!' The butler was called, and then Mrs. Crane, my wife's nurse, and they both said what they saw. Finally, Mrs. Towns was sent for, and, seeing the apparition, she advanced towards it with her arm extended as if to touch it, and as she passed her hand over the panel of the wardrobe the figure gradually faded away, and never again appeared, though the room was regularly occupied for a long time after.

"These are the simple facts of the case, and they admit of no doubt; no kind of intimation was given to any of the witnesses; the same question was put to each one as they came into the room, and the reply was given without hesitation by each. It was by the merest accident that I did not see the apparition. I was in the house at the time, but did not hear when I was called.

"C. A. W. LETT."

"We, the undersigned, having read the above statement, certify that it is strictly accurate, as we both were witnesses of the apparition.

"SARA LETT.

"SIBBIE SMYTH (*née* TOWNS)."

Mrs. Lett assures me that neither she nor her sister ever experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion. She is positive that the recognition of the appearance on the part of each of the later witnesses was *independent*, and not due to any suggestion from the persons already in the room.

[We hope in time to receive the corroboration of Miss Berthon, and of Mrs. Crane, Mrs. Lett's nurse.]

These last are cases where the distinction to which I have called attention (pp. 190-2) must be specially borne in mind. My central object being to prove that ideas may be transferred from mind to mind without words or physical signs, I am presenting certain collective sensory experiences which I think may constitute one type of such transference. Now believers in communications with the departed will probably need so little convincing as to the general theory of the far less startling transferences between living persons, that on them I am not concerned to press the evidence of this particular type. But of the rest of my readers I would ask—supposing the above and similar occurrences to be truly described—on what hypothesis, other than that of the transferability of hallucinations as such, they would explain them.

I pass by some other examples of the same kind; as no insistence on my point of view in quoting them would prevent my seeming to some to be explaining away veritable manifestations as subjective delusions, and to others to be introducing "ghosts" by a side-wind. But I give the following as a further interesting case of impressions

which, though probably simultaneous, were not similar. The narrative was originally printed in July, 1883, in an account of the Orphanage where it occurred, entitled *The Orphanage and Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie, &c.* (pp. 44-5). The narrator throughout is the Rev. C. Jupp, Warden of the Orphanage.

(332) "In 1875, a man died leaving a widow and six orphan children. The 3 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 4 years of age. [Late one evening, about 6 months after the admission of the younger children, some visitors arrived unexpectedly; and] the Warden agreed to take a bed in the little ones' dormitory, which contained 10 beds, 9 occupied.

"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, looking at this strange appearance, took up my watch and found the hands pointing to 5 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 6 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 5 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."

In answer to inquiries, the Rev. C. Jupp writes to us:—

“The Orphanage and Convalescent Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie.
“November 13th, 1883.

“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. “CHAS. JUPP.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Jupp says that he has never had any other hallucination of the senses; and adds, “My wife was the only person of *adult age* to whom I mentioned the circumstance at the time. Shortly after, I mentioned it to our Bishop and Primus.”

Mrs. Jupp writes, from the Orphanage, on June 23, 1886:—

“This is to certify that the account of the light seen by the Warden of this establishment is correct, and was mentioned to me at the time”—*i.e.*, next morning.

It is possible that the child’s experience here was a dream; if so, the case might be taken as a link between the two classes of phenomena—collective hallucinations and simultaneous dreams—which I have referred to as so closely related (p. 171).¹

I will give one more “recognised” case, which presents the curious feature that the figure seen was that of one of the per-

¹ In the *Life and Correspondence of Charles Mathews*, by Mrs. Mathews, pp. 94, 95, a case is recorded which again illustrates this relation. One night, when Mr. and the future Mrs. Mathews were intimate acquaintances, but without any intention of marrying, and when they were at a distance from one another, they had a precisely similar vision, which so violently affected both of them that they fell out of their respective beds, and were found on their respective floors; Mr. Mathews was so much affected as to be extremely ill for a day afterwards. The experiences were independently described long before they were compared. The joint vision was one of which the substance might have been easily suggested to either of the parties by a recent incident; it was in fact the apparition of Mr. Mathews’ former wife, who, before her death, had tried to make them promise to marry one another; but it is difficult to believe that it was by accident that experiences so unique as those described corresponded and coincided. If, on the other hand, the incident was telepathic, and one experience was the cause or the condition of the other, it is interesting to remark that the visions in fact much more resembled waking hallucinations than genuine dreams; for Mrs. Mathews especially records that both she and Mr. Mathews had been unable to sleep through restlessness.

The following case is interesting enough to deserve quotation, though not ostensibly “collective,” and possibly no more than a single subjective hallucination. We received it from the Rev. Arthur Bellamy, of Publow Vicarage, Bristol, in February, 1886; but the particulars were first published in 1878.

“When a girl at school my wife made an agreement with a fellow pupil, Miss W., that the one of them who died first should, if Divinely permitted, appear after her decease to the survivor. In 1874 my wife, who had not seen or heard anything of her former school-friend for some years, casually heard of her death. The news reminded her of her former agreement, and then, becoming nervous, she told me of it. I knew of my wife’s compact, but I had never seen a photograph of her friend, or heard any description of her. [Mr. Bellamy told the present writer, in conversation, that his mind had not been in the least dwelling on the compact.]

cipients. I have spoken before (Chap. XII., § 8, first note) of a form of hallucination, as I hold it, which consists in seeming to see oneself as a person outside one; and I have also pointed out (p. 85, note) that one of our informants who has had an experience of the sort is also one of the few persons who have given us evidence of what I have called *casual* agency, exercised in the midst of quite ordinary life. Now the fact that a person who has, so to speak, casually impressed herself, has at other times casually impressed others, is in itself of great interest; but it leads us on to the following still more interesting case, where the "double" was seen by its original and by others *at the same time*. The account is from Mrs. Hall, of The Yews, Gretton, near Kettering, and was received in December, 1883.

(333) "In the autumn of 1863, I was living with my husband and first baby, a child of 8 months, in a lone house, called Sibberton, near Wansford, Northamptonshire, which in by-gone days had been a church. As the weather became more wintry, a married cousin and her husband

"A night or two afterwards as I was sleeping with my wife, a fire brightly burning in the room and a candle alight, I suddenly awoke, and saw a lady sitting by the side of the bed where my wife was sleeping soundly. At once I sat up in the bed, and gazed so intently that even now I can recall her form and features. Had I the pencil and the brush of a Millais, I could transfer to canvas an exact likeness of the ghostly visitant. I remember that I was much struck, as I looked intently at her, with the careful arrangement of her coiffure, every single hair being most carefully brushed down. How long I sat and gazed I cannot say, but directly the apparition ceased to be, I got out of bed to see if any of my wife's garments had by any means optically deluded me. I found nothing in the line of vision but a bare wall. Hallucination on my part I rejected as out of the question, and I doubted not that I had really seen an apparition. Returning to bed, I lay till my wife some hours after awoke and then I gave her an account of her friend's appearance. I described her colour, form, &c., all of which exactly tallied with my wife's recollection of Miss W. Finally I asked, 'But was there any special point to strike one in her appearance?' 'Yes,' my wife promptly replied; 'we girls used to tease her at school for devoting so much time to the arrangement of her hair.' This was the very thing which I have said so much struck me. Such are the simple facts.

"I will only add that till 1874 I had never seen an apparition, and that I have not seen one since."

"ARTHUR BELLAMY."

We have also seen an account written by Mrs. Bellamy in May, 1879, which entirely agrees with the above, except that she "thinks it was a fortnight after the death" that the vision occurred, and that the light was "the dim light of a night-lamp." She says, "The description accorded in all points with my deceased friend." In conversation Mr. Bellamy described the form as seen in a very clear light (see Vol. i., pp. 550-1); and this may account for his idea that the room itself was lighted by fire and candle.

This experience, as I have said, may have been purely subjective; and identification of a person's appearance by mere description is generally to be regarded with great doubt. But in view of the circumstances, and especially of the fact that Mr. Bellamy has never had any other hallucination, two alternative hypotheses seem at least worth suggesting. (1) Believers in telepathic phantasms may suspect Mr. Bellamy's experience to have been conditioned by his wife's state of mind—possibly even by a dream, forgotten on waking, in which her friend figured. (2) Believers in the possibility of post-mortem communications, if they believe that this was one of them, might further suppose that Mr. Bellamy's experience depended on a psychical influence exercised in the first instance on Mrs. Bellamy, though acting below the level of her normal consciousness—which would make the case parallel to Nos. 242 and 355. To me, I confess, this appears a more reasonable supposition than that a direct influence (so to speak) missed its mark, and was exercised on Mr. Bellamy by a stranger who cared nothing about him.

I may mention that we have another first-hand case of just the same type, where the percipient was unaware of any contact, and was quite unoccupied with the thought of the dead person. She was, however, a young child at the time, and I therefore do not quote the account.

came on a visit. One night, when we were having supper, an apparition stood at the end of the sideboard. We four sat at the dining-table; and yet, with great inconsistency, I stood as this ghostly visitor again, in a spotted, light muslin summer dress, and without any terrible peculiarities of air or manner. We all four saw it, my husband having attracted our attention to it, saying, 'It is Sarah,' in a tone of recognition, meaning me. It at once disappeared. None of us felt any fear, it seemed too natural and familiar.

"The apparition seemed utterly apart from myself and my feelings, as a picture or statue. My three relatives, who, with me, saw the apparition, are all dead; they died in about the years 1868-69.

"SARAH JANE HALL."

The dress in which the figure appeared was not like any that Mrs. Hall had at the time, though she wore one like it nearly two years afterwards. Mrs. Hall has had other visual hallucinations, which were all connected with ill-health or nervous shock; one which occurred a few months before that here described had represented herself as if "laid out."

I now pass to auditory cases. I have spoken of the caution which these require;¹ but the following instances must, I think, have been more than mere misinterpretations of real sounds.

The first account is from a lady of unimpeachable veracity; and the account, though written in the third person, is first-hand.

"November, 1884.

(334) "Some 20 years ago, Miss G. [the narrator] was recovering from a severe illness, and it was of the utmost importance for her to have a

¹ Even the sound of the human voice—though ordinarily so distinctive—may be illusory. For example, we should hardly, I think, be justified in regarding the two following cases as other than joint illusions, due to some undiscovered source of sound in the house. Mr. Gascoigne Bevan, of the Bank House, Sudbury, writes, in 1884:—

"Some few years ago and since, I have been living in this house, and manager of the bank. I returned home one evening in the summer time with a friend. On entering by the garden door, we were *both* greeted with the sounds of children's laughter, peal after peal, all over the house. 'Why,' says my friend, 'I did not know you had children in the house, or I would not have come.' I don't know why I answered, but I did so: 'Hush, don't say anything; you will frighten Mrs. Springett, my housekeeper.' I ran all over the house, looking in *all* the rooms, in vain, for an explanation. I *know* there was no one in the house except Mrs. Springett, her old husband and an under servant."

[Mr. Bevan believes that the friend who shared this experience has recently died in Africa.]

Miss Twynam, of 1, Waterloo Place, Southampton, writes, on Nov. 12, 1885:—

"I had myself repeatedly heard the voice calling my name, 'Ellen,' at various intervals, extending over some months, and had mentioned the fact to the different members of the family, but never to my knowledge in the presence of the servants. I have always been laughed at, and told it was only my fancy, and no one then had heard it but myself. On one occasion, I and my sister were in the drawing-room, and my mother and aunt, who were both invalids, were in their respective bedrooms upstairs, on opposite sides of the house; while my brother was in another sitting-room downstairs, on the other side of the hall: and the servants were both in the kitchen, which was an underground one. I and my sister heard the voice distinctly call 'Ellen, Ellen!'—a clear, high, refined woman's voice, but with something strange and unusual about it. My sister at once noticed it, turning to me and saying, 'There, I have heard it myself this time.' I still, however, thought it might really be someone, so went to my mother, asking whether she had called. She said, 'No,' but she had heard someone calling me, and thought it was my aunt. I went to *her*, and she said exactly the same, only thought it was my mother. I then went to my brother. He said, 'No;' but had heard someone

good night, in order to wind her up for a journey to Edinburgh next day. All the house was sent to bed early, and the utmost quiet enjoined upon everybody. A devoted friend, whose name was Louisa, went to bed with her, in order to be close at hand if anything should be wanted. About an hour after she had lain down she was startled by a loud outcry, 'Louie, Louie!' as if someone was in urgent want of assistance. Miss G. thought that probably someone had slipped and was hanging over the banisters; she anxiously turned to her friend trying to rouse her. Her friend made no offer to rise, but said, in a very marked way, 'Did you hear that voice? It was my mother; I hear it constantly.' Next morning every inquiry was made; but no call whatever had been made."

I have already mentioned that the hearing of the name, in the tones of a familiar voice, is one of the commonest and most recurrent forms of subjective hallucination; but whatever view be taken of the origin of the friend's impression, we may reasonably suppose that it was through her that it was communicated to Miss G. *Yes, but not in the way*

The next example was sent to us by Mr. George Saxon, of Parklands, Bruton, Somersetshire, who completely confirms the narrative as far as he was concerned. The following is his wife's account:—

"February 26th, 1885.

(335) "On first coming to this house to reside, in September, 1879, myself and two servants were in the kitchen talking one evening at about 10.30; and we all three distinctly heard a voice coming from the next room, or the passage that leads from the kitchen to this room, saying three times, 'Are you coming?' On the first occasion I answered and said, 'I am coming, dear,' thinking it was my husband calling, whom I supposed to be in the next room. The voice again said the second time, 'Are you coming?' and one of the servants said, 'You had better go; master is calling.' The voice again said the third time, 'Are you

call quite plainly. I then went down to the servants, and asked whether they had heard anyone calling. They said, 'Yes;' they thought it was mistress. But there was nothing about them to lead me to think they were playing any trick, and they had never any idea that I had heard this voice before. The voice sounded to me as though it were above me, and yet very close to me, and it gave me a strange uncomfortable feeling. I do not think it was the servants, as they answered so naturally, as a matter of course, that it was their mistress who had called. Our house stood in a garden near the village, but I am sure it was no one from outside, as the voice was so decidedly *in* the house, and apparently close to us.

"ELLEN B. TWYNAM."

Miss Twynam's sister says:—

"I perfectly remember the occurrence alluded to by my sister. I distinctly heard the voice calling her name, and noticed at the time that it was very clear, and resembled a woman's voice, but with a strangely unnatural sound which attracted my attention. I remember turning to her and saying, 'I have heard it for myself this time,' as she had mentioned the fact of repeatedly hearing her name called, but I had never heard it, though other people had done so before; but on this occasion everybody in the house heard it at the same time. I have no doubt whatever that the voice came from no one in the house. "MARIA TWYNAM."

I have carefully questioned these informants, and believe that the account is accurate. But it seems possible to suppose that some peculiar sound in the house was interpreted in the way which Miss E. B. Twynam's description of her own experience had suggested.

It is curious that we have another case where an unaccountable sound, heard several times by two persons in the same house, was the call "Ellen, Ellen," which was the name of one of them. Perhaps there is something in the sound which renders it easily simulated.

coming?' I then went through the passage before mentioned, to the next room, where I thought to find my husband, there being no one else in the house except three children, who were upstairs fast asleep. On going through the passage into the next room, I found no one there, and no light, it being quite dark. I then returned to the kitchen and obtained a light, and went through the said room into the room beyond, where I found my husband, who was busy writing letters, and he had not called or spoken. This room he was in had the door shut. We all thought it very strange, and went up to see the children, who were all fast asleep. One of the servants before mentioned, I should say, had left my service and had only come down by train (10 miles) for the day, and was to return [arriving home at 8 p.m.] by the last train, which she missed and had to stay the night. She had a daughter-in-law expecting to be confined, to whom she was going back. She was an elderly person, had lost a son not long before, and used to see at times 'ghosts,' or what appeared human beings, but disappeared suddenly and mysteriously.

"CAROLINE AUGUSTA SAXON."

Mr. Saxon adds:—

"The house is quite an isolated one, standing in gardens away from a road, and about half-a-mile from the town. The doors and windows were closed. The voice was evidently within the house; and could not have come from anyone in the house. Our children's ages were respectively 9 years, 7 years, 5 years and 7 months. We were sure they were all asleep at the time, as we went up at once to see. I asked them the next day; besides, it was not the voice of the children, but seemed a low plaintive voice. Notwithstanding, my wife and the two servants thought it must have been myself calling from the next room, I being the only other being about."

I have examined the localities, and saw how natural it was that Mrs. Saxon should imagine her husband to be calling from the nearer room. She describes the voice as very distinct and startling. She has occasionally had the hallucination of hearing her own name called, when overtired; but never of anything else.

Here, as in the last example, we have to note a slight tendency to subjective hallucination, which in the servant's case may have been intensified by recent trouble; and, without absolutely excluding the hypothesis of telepathic influence from her daughter-in-law,¹ I still think it more probable that a purely subjective hallucination on her part, easily referable to her anxiety about her daughter-in-law's condition, was psychically transferred to her two companions.

The next example is from the Rev. W. Raymond, Rector of Ballyheigue, Co. Kerry. I need not repeat with regard to it the comments made on cases 330 and 331. Whatever view be taken as to the origin of the sound, it is impossible to suppose that it was by accident that the two identical impressions so exactly coincided.

¹ The *repetition* of the experience somewhat favours this hypothesis (see p. 105).

“December 18th, 1884.

(336) “About 30 years ago, Miss Mildred Nash, my mother’s aunt, died in my mother’s house, at the advanced age of 82 years. She had been blind for some years, and an orphan cousin of mine had been much in attendance on her. My aunt lived and died in a room on the ground floor in the front of our house, which was situated in a retired street of Tralee. A few days after her death, my cousin and I were sitting, on a summer evening, at the window of the room over the room in which my aunt had died. I heard distinctly the words ‘Rosy, Rosy’ (my cousin’s name), apparently from the room beneath, and in my aunt’s voice; then I heard my cousin answer to the call; she also heard the voice. I, struck with the strangeness of the circumstance, at once threw up the window to see if it were a voice from the street, but there was no one visible, and there could be no one there without being seen. I then searched the house all around, but there was nobody near except ourselves—my cousin and myself. The tale ends there; nothing afterwards happened in connection;—merely the unaccountable fact that two persons did independently hear such a voice as I have mentioned. I heard both the name called and the answer.

“WM. RAYMOND.”

Writing on January 9th, 1885, Mr. Raymond says:—

“I send you, as soon as I was able to get it, the enclosed statement in corroboration, sent me by my cousin. She mentioned an item that helped to fix the facts in her memory (and which shows the superstition of the people here), that her neighbours all said she should not have answered, but, as she says, no harm came of it. This was my only experience of auditory hallucination.”

The enclosed statement was as follows:—

“Tralee, January 8th, 1885.

“My cousin, Rev. William Raymond, has asked me if I remember about the voice we heard at the time of the death of old Miss Nash, his aunt. I do remember that a few days after her death he and I were sitting, one summer evening, in the room over the room where she died, that I heard my name called, apparently from that room and in her voice, and that I answered the call, and that we searched and could find no one about who could have spoken.

“ROSE RAYMOND.”

In answer to an inquiry, Miss Raymond states that this is her sole experience of an auditory hallucination.

It remains to illustrate the *musical* type of collective hallucination. The following account is from Mr. and Mrs. Sewell, of Eden Villas, Albert Park, Didsbury. The latter (writing on March 25th, 1885) tells us that in the spring of 1863, a little girl of theirs, called Lilly, was ill.

(337) “My husband came home about 3 o’clock, and, to please Lilly, said he would have his dinner in the bedroom with her. I sat beside the bed with one of Lilly’s hands in mine, my husband was eating his dinner, and one little boy was talking to Lilly, and all were quietly trying to amuse the patient, when our attention was roused by sounds of the music of an Æolian harp, which proceeded from a corner cupboard in one corner of

229.030.
Nash's pt.

the room. All was hushed, and I said, 'Lilly, do you hear that pretty music?' and she said, 'No,' at which I was much surprised, for she was a great lover of music. The sounds increased until the room was full of melody, when it gradually and slowly seemed to pass down the stairs and ceased. The servant, who was occupied in the kitchen, two stories below, heard the sounds, and our eldest daughter, who was going into the larder, stopped in the passage to listen and wonder where the music came from, and the servant called to her, 'Do you hear that music?' It was then a few moments past 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

"The next day (Sunday) my old nurse and aunt came up to see how Lilly was, and were, with my husband, all in the room with the child. I had gone down into the kitchen to prepare some little dainty milk-food for her, when the same sounds of Æolian music were heard by all three in the room, and I heard the same in the kitchen. Monday passed, but we had no repetition. On Tuesday, at the same hour, we [*i.e.*, Mr. and Mrs. Sewell] once more heard the same wailing Æolian music from the same part of the room; again it increased in volume, until the room was full of wailing melody; and again did the sounds appear to pass through the door, down the stairs, and out at the front door. Now, this music was heard three different days, at the same time each day, and not only by those in the room with the child, but by myself, my daughter, and the servant, two flights of stairs below the room the child was in; and on the second day by my aunt and nurse and the children, who were in the dining-room.

"One circumstance, I think, was very remarkable: the child herself, who had a perfect passion for music, never heard a sound. There cannot be any mistake in the sounds, for no instrument played by human hands can make the same sounds as the wailing Æolian harp. We had lived in the same house 6 years, and remained in it 12 years more, and we never heard similar music either before or after. "SARAH A. SEWELL."

Mr. Sewell says:—

"April, 1885.

"The only confirmation which is now available is that of myself. I can speak with all sincerity. I heard the sweet music identically with my wife. The music was heard on Saturday, 2nd of May, a little before 4 o'clock in the afternoon, also on the next day at about the same time, and also on the following Tuesday at about the same hour. Those who heard the music were my wife, myself, my wife's aunt, the nurse, our son Richard, aged 7; our son Thomas, aged 9 (the last four all dead), our eldest daughter, aged 11, and our servant, who shortly left us and went to Ireland to her husband, who was a soldier, and was soon lost sight of. Our eldest daughter is now in New York, and I have no doubt but that she will remember the circumstance. I am quite satisfied that the music heard was not produced by someone at a distance, for our house was then situated in a long garden, some 50 yards distant from the public road, and the adjoining house to ours was unoccupied at the time. The sound was not a muffled sound at all, but the soft, wild notes of an Æolian harp, which rose and fell distinctly, and increased gradually, until the room was full of sound, as loud as the full swell of an organ, and it rolled slowly down the stairs, dying softly on the ear in weird cadences. I am certain it was not produced by human fingers. "MATHEW SEWELL."

I have copied the following extract from a letter written to Mr. Sewell by his daughter, Mrs. Lee, and dated July 20th, 1885.

“ Williams Bridge, New York.

“ I do distinctly remember hearing the music before Lilly's death, and also remember the impression it made on us children at the time, the feeling of terror and fear we had, at not understanding where the music came from and what kind of music it was.”

[A personal interview with Mr. and Mrs. Sewell has made evident to me how uniquely impressive to them this incident was. The music appeared to issue from a particular corner of the room, which was not one formed by external walls ; and the nature of the sound makes it hard to explain as an objective effect, due to air or water ; while the fact that one person present, with sensitive ears, did not share the experience seems almost fatal to such an explanation. The sound lasted on each occasion not more than half a minute. The little girl died on the Tuesday evening. If the hallucination be connected with her abnormal condition, the incident (like case 335 above) would belong to the succeeding section.]

A further example of the musical class, with even more complete attestation, has on account of its length been placed in the Supplement (p. 639) : the following shorter specimen may be given here. The late Mrs. Yates, of 54, Columbia Square, E., wrote in 1884:—

(338) “ In 1870 I lost a dearly loved daughter, 21 years old ; she died at noonday, of aneurism. At night, my only other daughter was with me, when all at once we both assumed a listening attitude, and we both heard the sweetest of spiritual music, although it seemed so remote, my ears were hurt listening so intently. Till some hours after, my dear girl and I were afraid to inquire of each other had we heard it, for fear we were deluded, but we found both had been so privileged and blessed.”

*may be
correct
source*

To our request for Mr. Yates's testimony, Mrs. Yates replied :—

“ Mr. Yates perfectly well remembers how myself and the daughter who is now living were affected by hearing music that night, such as mortals never sang ; but I have to write for him, he being troubled by incapacity of his right hand.”

(Signed as correct) “ GEORGE YATES.”

The daughter wrote as follows, on Oct. 9, 1884 :—

“ 31, St. John's Street Road, Clerkenwell, E.C.

“ I can speak with certainty respecting the beautiful music my dear mother and I heard on the 26th November, 1870. I shall never forget it ; we were both afraid to speak, it was so exquisite. “ A. BEILBY.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Beilby adds :—

“ We were living at 3, Henry Street, Pentonville. The two windows in the room were shut tight and fastened ; and as near as I can remember, it must have been between 2 and 3 in the morning. The music lasted several minutes.” She further says that, when the sounds began, her mother exclaimed, “ Anne, do you hear that ? ”—so that her mother's statement is not quite exact ; but she confirms the fact that some hours passed before they ventured to describe their impressions to one another.

The foregoing instances may perhaps suffice to show that a purely psychical account of these joint experiences—as due either partly or wholly to a thought-transference between the percipients—is at all events possible; and that acceptance of the phenomena as genuine, *i.e.*, as percepts truly described, does not imply any materialistic theory of phantasmal beings who travel about through space (sometimes in their carriages) on their own account. And possibly a certain number of my readers may further agree with me in supposing some, at any rate, of these cases to have been in their inception purely subjective, and will not feel the need of invoking for them an unknown or *post-mortem* “agency,” however little disposed to rule the possibility of such agency out of court. I cannot, indeed, deny a certain force to an objection which Mr. Myers urges,¹ that we know of no instances where a hallucination which can be connected with insanity or other distinctly morbid conditions in the person impressed, and which is thus quite clearly proved to be purely subjective, has become collective in the way supposed. But then neither do we know of instances where a person in one of these morbid conditions has exercised any other form of telepathic influence. We have no instances of telepathic impressions of the deaths of dying lunatics. The ultimate conditions of telepathic agency are as little known to us as the ultimate conditions of telepathic percipience; and transient hallucinations of the sane, such as those of the preceding examples, differ so greatly in their nature and ostensible conditions from the types of hallucination to which Mr. Myers points as never transferred, that it seems rash to assume that they may not differ also in the particular point of transferability. At any rate, whatever the difficulties of that view, it is one that may be provisionally entertained by those who see equal difficulties in any other; and whatever my own surmises as to future discovery may be, in the present state of the evidence I feel as much bound here to press the theory of thought-transference, before admitting causes of an obscurer kind, as in a former chapter to press the theory of unconscious physical indications before admitting the reality of thought-transference.

The *degree* in which the infectious character may exist is very hard indeed to determine; for the majority of hallucinations (purely subjective and telepathic alike) occur to persons who are alone—silence and *recueillement* being apparently favourable conditions; and we

¹ See pp. 280-2.

have no means of knowing how many of these hallucinations might have been shared by some one else, if some one else had happened to be present at the time. All that can be said is that, taking the whole class of transient hallucinations of the sane, the cases where the experience has been shared by a second person appear to be more numerous than those where a second person has been present, awake, and rightly situated, and has not shared the experience. Nor, again, can I at all adequately explain *why* these phenomena should be a form of mental impression specially liable to spread to neighbouring minds. That those of them which are telepathically produced in the first instance should have a tendency to spread in this way may appear, perhaps, less remarkable, if we remember that a telepathic impulse, as such, seems sometimes to have very distinct and peculiar physiological effects; witness Mrs. Newnham's exhaustion (Vol. I., p. 64) in experiments where the ideas conveyed were in themselves of a quite unexciting sort. But as regards the transference in purely subjective cases, all I can suggest is that sensory hallucinations, and especially the occasional hallucinations of sane and healthy people, are to begin with and in themselves very peculiar things; and that a fresh peculiarity, meeting us in something that we do not completely see round or understand, is less staggering than if it met us in something of which we have held our knowledge to be complete. At any rate the fact, if admitted, that purely subjective hallucinations may spontaneously become collective, greatly simplifies the consideration of the collective cases whose origin is traceable to an external "agent." The appearance of an absent person's figure to several spectators at once has had in it something specially startling; and when associated with the idea of death, it has almost inevitably suggested a material or "etherial" spirit—an independent travelling ghost. But as soon as the experience is analysed, it is found to involve nothing new or antagonistic to scientific conceptions. In being connected with the absent person, it is merely on a par with other specimens of telepathy—*e.g.*, many of those cited in the preceding chapters: in being collective, it is merely on a par with other specimens of hallucination—*e.g.*, some of those already cited in this chapter. Still, though a telepathic impulse from an absent person may not be an essential condition, it may be, and I believe is, an exceptionally favourable condition, for a collective hallucination. And I now proceed to the final group of examples, of which that condition is the distinguishing mark.

§ 6. I will begin the list with the auditory class. The following account is from Mr. J. Wood Beilby, of Redbank Cottage, Elgin Road, Beechworth, Victoria.

“October 17th, 1883.

(339) “A young lady, a friend of my wife’s, staying with us in the bush, had gone some hours, on horseback, to our post-town—some eight miles distant—when my wife and I in the house, a servant-man and woman and my adopted son, a youth, in an outside kitchen, heard this young lady scream, and call out, ‘Oh, Johnnie! Johnnie!’—that being my boy’s name, he being a usual attendant to the fair equestrian. All simultaneously rushed out; but nothing further could be heard or seen of the exclaimant for nearly an hour, when she arrived, and informed us that at a spot between four and five miles distant she had to open a gate. Trying to do this without dismounting, she leaned over it from her side-saddle to undo a sort of hasp. Her horse took fright at something and bounded aside, leaving her, happily, detached from him, hanging over the gate. She said she shrieked for help, and fancied ‘Johnnie’ was behind, but got extricated—I forget how—and her horse caught. She remounted, and came on to us without injury but the fright. It was absolutely impossible her natural voice could have been heard over a forest country intervening for even one-third of the distance. The strange thing to me is that others, not so specially gifted with magnetic impressions as I am, should have simultaneously and distinctly heard the ejaculation. All instantly acted a reply, going out of the several houses which they were in at the time, and making for an entrance gate, expecting to find the lady in some difficulty close at hand; and all were astonished that she was not even in view upon an extensive plain, skirted by the forest-land she had to traverse.

“J. WOOD BEILBY.”

Mrs. Beilby corroborates as follows:—

“I perfectly recollect the voice being heard, as narrated above by my husband. I vouch for the accuracy of the narration.

“CATHERINE W. BEILBY.”

In another account, written on January 28th, 1886, and signed by Mr. and Mrs. Beilby, it is more clearly brought out that the young lady, Miss Snell, actually called out the name, “Johnnie, Johnnie.” The only point of difference between the two accounts is that the second, instead of saying that all four persons rushed out simultaneously, states that Mr. and Mrs. Beilby went out and called to the servants that Miss Snell had returned, and that “they said they heard her call, and immediately went to the gate of entrance to the homestead,” but found no one there.

Mr. Beilby further adds:—

“The homestead is isolated from any other residence, some 3 miles; and no one was about at the time, except the servants and the employers in separate but closely adjacent buildings.” He implies that he has had no other auditory hallucination.

The next account, which was first received by the Rev. W. Stainton Moses from an intimate friend of the agent’s, was revised

by his parents, the percipients, who have since again read it over and pronounced it correct.

“ 1881.

(340) “About two years ago W. L. left England for America. Nine months since, he married, and hoped to bring his wife home to see his mother, to whom he was tenderly attached. On February 4th, however, he was taken with sudden illness, which terminated fatally on the 12th, about 8 p.m. On that night, about three-quarters of an hour after the parents of W. L. had retired to rest in England, the mother heard the clear voice of her son speaking. Her husband *who also heard it*, asked his wife if it was she who was speaking. Neither of them had been asleep, and she replied, ‘No! Keep quiet!’ The voice continued, ‘As I cannot come to England, mother, I have come now to see you.’ At this time both parents believed their son to be in perfect health in America, and were daily expecting a letter to announce his return home. A note was made of this very startling occurrence; and when a fortnight since news of the son’s death arrived, it was found to correspond with the date on which the spirit-voice¹ had announced his presence in England. The widow said that the preparations for departure had nearly been completed, and that *her husband showed much anxiety to get to England and see his mother.*”

[Unfortunately the percipients in this case dislike the subject, and it has been thought better not to press them with further inquiries. Otherwise we should of course have ascertained whether or not they had ever had other hallucinations.]

The next account is from Commander T. W. Aylesbury (late of the Indian Navy), of Sutton, Surrey. The case, at first sight, may seem as if it belonged to the *reciprocal* class; but Commander Aylesbury’s vision did not include enough detail to justify us in regarding it as other than subjective, the scene being apparently such as he might naturally have conjured up.

“December, 1882.

(341) “The writer, when 13 years of age, was capsized in a boat, when landing on the Island of Bally, east of Java, and was nearly drowned. On coming to the surface, after being repeatedly submerged, the boy called his mother. This amused the boat’s crew, who spoke of it afterwards, and jeered him a good deal about it. Months after, on arrival in England, the boy went to his home, and while telling his mother of his narrow escape, he said, ‘While I was under water, I saw you all sitting in this room; you were working something white. I saw you all—mother, Emily, Eliza, and Ellen.’ His mother at once said, ‘Why yes, and I heard you cry out for me, and I sent Emily to look out of the window, for I remarked that something had happened to that poor boy.’ The time, owing to the difference of E. longitude, corresponded with the time when the voice was heard.”

Commander Aylesbury adds in another letter:—

“I saw their features (my mother’s and sisters’), the room and the

See p. 48, note.

furniture, particularly the old-fashioned Venetian blinds. My eldest sister was seated next to my mother."

Asked as to the time of the accident, Commander Aylesbury says :—

"I think the time must have been very early in the morning. I remember a boat capsized the day before, and washed up. The mate said we would go and bring her off in the morning, but the exact time I cannot remember. It was a terrible position, and the surf was awful. We were knocked end over end, and it was the most narrow escape I ever had—and I have had many ; but this one was so impressed on my mind with the circumstances—the remarks and jeers of the men,— 'Boy, what was you calling for your mother for? Do you think she could pull you out of Davey Jones' locker,' &c., with other language I cannot use."

The following is an extract from a letter written to Commander Aylesbury by one of his sisters, and forwarded to us, in 1883 :—

"I distinctly remember the incident you mention in your letter (the voice calling 'Mother') ; it made such an impression on my mind, I shall never forget it. We were sitting quietly at work one evening ; it was about 9 o'clock. I think it must have been late in the summer as we had left the street door open. We first heard a faint cry of 'Mother' ; we all looked up, and said to one another, 'Did you hear that? Someone cried out "Mother."' We had scarcely finished speaking, when the voice again called, 'Mother' twice in quick succession, the last cry a frightened, agonising cry. We all started up, and mother said to me, 'Go to the door and see what is the matter.' I ran directly into the street and stood some few minutes, but all was silent and not a person to be seen ; it was a lovely evening, not a breath of air. Mother was sadly upset about it. I remember she paced the room, and feared that something had happened to you. She wrote down the date the next day, and when you came home and told us how near you had been drowned, and the time of day, father said it would be about the time 9 o'clock would be with us. I know the date and the time corresponded."

[The difference of time at the two places is a little more than 7 hours ; consequently 9 in the evening in England would correspond with "very early in the morning" of the next day at the scene of the accident. But the incident happened too long ago for memory to be trusted as to the exactitude of the coincidence.]

In the next case, though the sound heard was apparently vocal, it was not articulate ; and it can scarcely be pronounced impossible that such an effect might be produced by bubbling air, or some other local cause. The coincidence, however, appears to have been very close, though perhaps not so absolutely precise as is alleged ; and the form of impression is not without analogy (see *e.g.*, case 288 above). The account is signed by one of the percipients, but is in the words of her son, Mr. W. R. Weyer, of 7, Willis Street, St. Paul's, Norwich.

"June, 1883.

(342) "At the time that this occurrence took place, my mother's brother

was lying in a dangerous condition, suffering from a complication of disorders, together with an old wound received in the Crimea some time previous; consequently at that time my parents' minds were in a great state of anxiety. It was on the night of July 6th, 1865; my parents were retiring to rest at a somewhat late hour, when they were both suddenly startled by a sound of three distinct sobs as (according to my mother's experience) of a person dying. My father immediately arose, procured a light, and a thorough search was made, but with no success. On again retiring, the sobs were again repeated, this time in a perfectly clear and distinct manner.¹ My mother then noted the time, which was then 10.50 p.m., remarking at the same time that we should hear bad news. After making another search they again retired to rest, the sobs being heard no more.

"On the next day my mother received a letter bearing the Chatham post-mark, stating that her brother, David Mackenzie Annison, had died at Chatham Hospital on the night of July the 5th, at 10.50, being the exact time that the sobs were heard by my parents.

"WILLIAM ROBT. WEYER."

[Signed as correct by Mrs. Weyer, the surviving witness]

"MARIA E. WEYER."

Mr. Weyer, the father, died a year after the occurrence. In answer to inquiries, Mr. W. R. Weyer adds:—

"My parents informed my cousin and aunt (who is now deceased) of the circumstance, before she received the letter; and my aunt, who is just dead, remembered the circumstance quite well. My grandmother often used to mention it. I have appealed to my cousin to write her recollection of the incident, but I cannot at present persuade her to do so."

In conversation Mrs. Weyer stated that there were no water-pipes near the room, and that the sound seemed startlingly near—close to the head of the bed. She is not at all predisposed to alarms or fancies, and has never had any other hallucination—unless we are to reckon as such a startling sound of knocks which others also heard, and for which no external cause could be discovered. The idea which she expressed that the sounds in the present case were premonitory of bad news, since it was not founded on any sufficient knowledge of the evidence for telepathic occurrences as facts in Nature, indicates, no doubt, an uncritical acceptance of marvels. But the only question for us is how far such a habit of mind may have affected the evidence to the facts; and my strong impression is that it has not appreciably affected it. We may regard it as probable, however, that the sobs were not described as like those "of a person dying" until after the fact of the death was realised.

The following is the result of an independent inquiry as to the time of death.

¹ As regards the repetition, see p. 105. As to the *three* sobs, in examining a large mass of evidence respecting abnormal phenomena (and especially second-hand accounts), one finds this number recurring with somewhat noticeable frequency—which at any rate suggests unconscious modification of the facts. Nor need we assume any specially superstitious habit of mind on the part of the witness, to find it natural that, at the points where memory is hazy, slight resulting errors should take lines which are (so to speak) marked out for them by literary or religious associations.

“ Melville Hospital, Chatham.

“ July 18th, 1885.

“ In reply to your letter asking to be informed of the exact hour of the death of David *Mackenzie* Annison, I beg to state that there was a *David* Annison, chief stoker, aged 38, admitted into this hospital 26th June, 1865, from H.M.S. ‘Cumberland.’ He was suffering from chronic liver disease and jaundice. He died at 11.35 p.m., on the 5th July, 1865, and his friends took his body away to Sheerness.

“ In case of a death in this establishment, the body is seen by the medical officer on duty, who *himself* notifies on the man’s ticket the hour and minute of his decease. It was from this document I gathered the information you required.

“ BELGRAVE NINNIS, M.D.

“ (Deputy Inspector-General.)”

With respect to this point, Mr. Weyer writes, on August 7th, 1885 :—

“ In reference to the mistake regarding the time, I have consulted my mother upon that point, and she asserts that she might possibly be mistaken, but of this fact she is *most positive*, viz., *that the time she noted on that night exactly corresponded with the time given in the message which arrived next day*; this, she says, there is no mistake about. My mother felt almost certain that the time was 10.50, but as it occurred so long ago she is not likely to have it on record; therefore she thinks that the medical official report would be the most reliable.”

The percipients here are described as having been in great anxiety. We have seen grounds for rejecting from the telepathic evidence instances where this condition has existed on the part of a single percipient (Vol. I., pp. 508-9); but where two are affected the case is different. For, even if the experience of one was purely subjective in origin, it would be extravagant to suppose that of the other to have taken place by accident at the same moment; so that there would at least have been a “psychical” phenomenon—a transferred hallucination. But in the present instance there is some reason for going beyond this, and supposing a telepathic origin to the experience. For the sort of sound heard is scarcely a likely one for anxiety to suggest; and, moreover, in no case could the hypothesis of a joint *rapport* of the agent with two percipients seem more in place than where the two are his near relatives, whose minds are already similarly and fully occupied with him.

I will add a couple of specimens of the non-vocal type. In the first, the hallucination presents a curiously close connection with the probable idea of the agent at the moment. The account is from Mrs. Paget, of Farnham, Surrey.

“ June 5th, 1884.

(343) “ A man-servant, who had lived with us from a child, and who was a real friend, fell into a consumption, and thinking that the climate

of Ventnor might prolong his life for some months, we sent him to St. Catharine's Home in September, 1880. On the 8th of October, I received a letter from the Sister-in-charge, saying that Arthur Dunn was decidedly worse, but that the doctor thought there was no immediate danger, and therefore she did not think I need go to Ventnor *at once*. I therefore wrote to say I would be there on the following Monday, when I hoped to be able to stay with him to the last. That morning I said to my girls, 'I really must remember to speak to the new servant about putting out the gas upstairs at half-past 10, for since poor Arthur left us, it has not been put out *punctually*, and even some nights the burner close to my bedroom and my eldest girl's dressing-room has been alight all night.'

"That same evening was very warm, and my daughter and myself both left our doors open, in order to be able to talk after we went upstairs (the gas-burner being *close* to our rooms). Whilst we were both saying our prayers, the clock struck half-past 10, and at that moment we heard a man's heavy step along the passage, which stopped at the gas-burner, and then we heard the footsteps retiring. Almost at the same moment my daughter and myself came to our respective doors and exclaimed, 'Why, the man did not put out the gas after all. How like his step sounded to poor Arthur's heavy tread.'

"The next morning I received a telegram from the Sister-in-charge at St. Catharine's Home, saying, 'All was over last night.' I went down to Ventnor at once to make arrangements, and in telling Sister Mary Martha how I grieved that I had not started for Ventnor before, she remarked, 'We did not think there was immediate danger, and his mind was wandering so much that day that he was hardly conscious. It was curious to see what form his wandering took, for, after he had been very silent for some hours, the clock struck half-past 10, when he raised himself in bed and said distinctly, 'The clock has struck, I *must* go and put out the gas,' and fell back and died immediately.

"I ought to mention that punctuality had been a perfect mania with him. He was never, as far as I can remember, three minutes late for anything he was ordered to do, and he was most devotedly attached to us and our home.

"FRANCES PAGET."

Miss Paget (now Mrs. P. Hanham) wrote as follows, on June 11, 1884:—

"I can only most emphatically confirm my mother's statement. I distinctly heard the 'footsteps' as described by her, and it happened at half-past 10 at night, the *exact* time, as we heard afterwards, that our poor man-servant died. I may mention that I questioned our new manservant in the morning as to whether he had not been upstairs on the previous night; but it turned out that he had forgotten the orders given him to turn out the gas, and had not been upstairs. The footsteps, as I remarked at the time, were exactly similar to those of poor Arthur Dunn, and you may judge of my surprise when, on my mother's return from the funeral, she told us about her conversation with the Sister, who was with him at the last, and his last words having been, 'The clock has struck, I must go and put out the gas.'

"In answer to your questions:—

(1) "The occurrence happened here, and it was on October 8th, 1880, as I have since found on referring to a diary.

(2) "Neither my mother nor myself ever remember to have had any hallucinations of any sort, before or since. "GERTRUDE F. PAGET."

[The diary, which I have seen, gives the date of the death only. Miss Paget's meaning was that this was fixed on their minds next day as having happened on October 8th, on which day—as they could not then be mistaken in recollecting—the sounds had been heard.]

To a suggestion that the steps might have been those of a heavy-footed housemaid, Mrs. Paget replied :—

"I can positively affirm that the housemaid did *not* come upstairs on the night of my servant's death ; for that point was inquired into at the time."

The Sister-in-charge at St. Catharine's Home, Ventnor, writes as follows, on March 6, 1885 :—

"Arthur Dunn died at 10.30 p.m. on the 8th of October, 1880. I was with him when he died ; he was only with us eight days.

"MATILDA S. S. S. M."

Mrs. Paget's account having been sent to Sister Matilda, she replied as follows, on March 9, 1885 :—

"Arthur John Dunn was only here eight days before his death. I nursed him, and was with him when he died on October 8th. I do not recollect what Mrs. Paget says at all ; all I can remember was that he was in bed three days ; his breathing was very laboured ; he had a weak heart ; he was not unconscious at all ; he was a very silent man, and seldom spoke, except to answer any question asked. Just before he died he asked me the time ; it was half-past 10 ; his words were : '*What is the time ?*' I do not think he spoke after. There was nothing about the gas. He could not hear any clock strike, for there is not one in the ward or near it. Sister Mary Martha was in charge of the house at the time, and I had the nursing of the men."

Sister Mary Martha writes from St. Margaret's, East Grinstead, on March 17, 1885 :—

"I regret that I am quite unable to recall any particulars of Arthur Dunn's death. I remember the young man perfectly well ; he was at the Home only about eight days, and died *almost suddenly*. He suffered from heart disease as well as consumption. He was a very nice fellow, and we all liked him much. Mrs. Paget, I remember, spoke in the highest terms of him. My *impression* is that his end was very sudden—too much so for any last words.

"SISTER MARY MARTHA."

[It will be observed that there are two discrepancies between Mrs. Paget's and the Sisters' account. The point as to the way in which the man ascertained the time—whether by hearing the clock strike or by inquiry of the Sister—is not in itself important : the point about his mention of the gas, though not vital, has more importance. I have thoroughly talked over the matter with Mrs. Paget and her daughter. Mrs. Paget is quite clear in her recollection of Sister Mary Martha's statement ; but she does not recollect having heard or realised *who* it was to whom the man made the remark. The daughter is equally clear about her mother's mention of this detail at the time. Had there been a consider-

able interval between Mrs. Paget's conversation with the Sister and her narration of it to someone else, it would not be hard to suppose that the incident of the man's asking the hour, combined with her own and her daughter's experience at that exact time, had gradually led to her imagining the crowning detail of his mentioning the gas; but that this detail, if it was not reported to her, should have got *immediately* impressed upon her mind as though it had been reported, seems decidedly less likely than that it has slipped from the memory of the Sisters, for whom it would have no special interest, since Mrs. Paget did not tell them what had occurred at home. And there is a further point which tells, I think, decidedly in favour of this view. On the supposition that the man made the remark about the gas, it is very easy to see how Mrs. Paget may have made the mistake about his hearing the clock strike; for the remark would become the fact of interest, and the manner in which the man ascertained the time would retain no significance. If, on the other hand, the only thing reported to Mrs. Paget had been that the man asked and was told what the time was, that would have served completely to stamp the coincidence, and to suggest the direction of the man's thoughts, and would thus have given a quite sufficient impressiveness and completeness to the story. Briefly, the introduction of the clock, on the first hypothesis, seems more easily comprehensible than the introduction of the gas, on the second.

Mrs. Paget showed me the scene of the incident. The gas burner is at the end of a long passage, just outside her and her daughter's rooms. The house is a very quiet one, standing in grounds far back from the road; and it is difficult to imagine any sort of real sound that could possibly have been mistaken for heavy steps twice traversing the length of the passage, the doors of both hearers (it will be remembered) being open. Mrs. Paget says, moreover, that Arthur Dunn's tread was decidedly peculiar. That the steps were not those of the man-servant for the time being was practically proved (apart from his own assertion next day) by the fact that the gas was not turned off; for he could have no possible duty in that corner of the house at night, except to turn it off; and there was no other man in the house. Mrs. Paget and her daughter both confirmed the statement that they have had no other hallucinations. They are far from being credulous or superstitious witnesses; but the strangeness of this incident made an extremely strong impression upon them.]

In the next case the coincidence seems again to have been close to within a very few minutes; but the form which the hallucination (if it was one) took had no special connection with anything that we can conceive to have been present to the agent's mind. Bells are, however, a not uncommon form of purely subjective impression.¹ And if the principle of telepathic hallucinations be granted, one would naturally expect that the rudimentary specimens of that class—specimens which do not suggest any conscious idea of the agent, but

¹ See Vol. i., p. 503, and above, p. 127, note.

are projected, as it were, blindly under the telepathic impulse—should follow the ordinary lines of hallucinations in general. The account is from the Misses Lafone, of Hanworth Park, Feltham.

“January, 1884.

(344) “My sister and I were both much astonished at hearing our church bell ring in a loud and hurried manner, at a few minutes before 7.30, one evening, when we knew no service was to take place. Our church is within 5 minutes’ walk across fields, and all the neighbouring churches a mile or more off. We talked together of the occurrence, and mentioned it at dinner, but did not connect it with anyone in particular. The next day we heard an aunt had died at 7.20 the evening before, but did not connect the two facts until a few days afterwards, when we made inquiries, and found no one had been in the church at the time we imagined the bell to be ringing. This took place 19th September, 1883. No one else in the house heard the bell.”

The *Times* obituary confirms Sept. 19, 1883, as the date of death.

In answer to inquiries, Miss Lafone adds :—

“There was no particular bond of sympathy between my aunt and my sister and myself, although we knew her very well. We were aware she was seriously ill, but being very much occupied with another subject the evening she died, had hardly thought of her at all. We are not conscious of ever before experiencing ‘auditory hallucinations.’

“MARY E. LAFONE.”

“March 18th, 1884.

“My sister’s account of the bells we heard is perfectly correct. We were dressing for dinner at 7.30, in different rooms, when I was attracted by the sound of the bells, as I supposed from our church, ringing in a most eccentric way, and having called to my sister found that she heard them too. We discussed the possibility of someone being shut in, as there was no service, and the sounds were too irregular and too quick to be tolling for a death. We mentioned the subject downstairs, and then forgot it, until having heard the following day that our aunt had died at 7.20, just at the time we were listening to the bells. We made inquiries as to whether anyone had been in the church at the time, but could not find that anyone had, or that the bells were heard by anyone besides ourselves.

“JENNY LAFONE.”

[I have been to Hanworth, and realised the relation of the house to the village church, and also to Feltham Church. There seems to be no possibility whatever that the sound heard could have proceeded from the latter, or any more distant edifice. Feltham Church lies more than a mile to the back of the house ; the intervening space is thickly clothed with trees ; and the Misses Lafone’s windows look out in the directly opposite direction. Miss Lafone does not recall that she has ever so much as heard the Feltham bell, even faintly ; whereas the sounds on this occasion appeared louder even than those which the neighbouring church-bell usually produced. It is extremely unlikely that this neighbouring bell should have been rung at this time (on a week-day evening when there is never any service), and in this eccentric way ; and it is even more

unlikely that, if so rung, it should have been unobserved by others. The result of my visit is that I find it all but impossible to doubt that the case was one of collective hallucination—whether connected with the death of the aunt or not is of course a different question.]

I now come to cases where the sense of sight was involved. And I may begin with a few specimens where the experiences of the several percipients were either not exactly simultaneous or not exactly similar, and where, therefore, the theory that they were severally derived from the agent receives some slight support. (Compare in this respect the auditory case, No. 36.)

In the following example the experience of the second percipient included an auditory as well as a visual impression, and was, moreover, separated by an interval of 3 hours from that of the first. The narrator is Mrs. Cox, who wrote from Summer Hill, Queenstown, Ireland.

“December 26th, 1883.

(345) “On the night of the 21st August, 1869, between the hours of 8 and 9 o’clock, I was sitting in my bedroom in my mother’s house at Devonport, my nephew, a boy aged seven years, being in bed in the next room, when I was startled by his suddenly running into my room, and exclaiming in a frightened tone, ‘Oh, auntie, I have just seen my father walking around my bed.’ I replied, ‘Nonsense, you must have been dreaming.’ He said, ‘No, I have not,’ and refused to return to the room. Finding that I was unable to persuade him to go back, I put him in my own bed. Between 10 and 11 I myself retired to rest. I think about an hour afterwards, on looking towards the fireplace, I distinctly saw, to my astonishment, the form of my brother seated in a chair, and what particularly struck me was the deathly pallor of his face. (My nephew was at this time fast asleep.) I was so frightened, knowing that at this time my brother was in Hong Kong, China, that I put my head under the bed clothes. Soon after this I plainly heard his voice calling me by name; my name was repeated three times. The next time I looked, he was gone. The following morning I told my mother and sister what had occurred, and said I should make a note of it, which I did. The next mail from China brought us the sad intelligence of my brother’s death, which took place on the 21st August, 1869, in the Harbour of Hong Kong, suddenly, [of heat-apoplexy].

“MINNIE COX.”

We have received from the Admiralty an official confirmation of the date of the death.

In answer to further inquiries, Mr. Cox (at present Secretary to the Naval Commander-in-Chief at Devonport) wrote:—

“February 21st, 1884.

“As my wife is too unwell to reply to your letter she has asked me to state with reference to your question on the subject of the appearance of her brother to her, that:—

“As she has no note now in her possession, and as her mother is

dead, she cannot be positive as to the hour at which her brother died. The circumstance happened about 15 years ago—both the persons she mentioned it to are dead. All that she can now state positively is that she now believes it must have been after midnight when she saw the appearance, but at the same time she is quite certain that her little nephew came into her room *before* midnight. She is sure that afterwards, when the news came from China, the time corresponded, but has nothing to prove it. I fear that she has not sufficient evidence, or in fact any evidence now ; but it is an old story she has often told me, and I have not the slightest doubt that she did see the appearance. “JAMES COX.”

In conversation Mrs. Cox told me that she was quite certain of having put down the date, and compared it with the date in the letter. She has never had the slightest hallucination on any other occasion. The child was not in the least given to frights, and had no dread of the dark.

[If the time either of Mrs. Cox's or of her nephew's impression coincided with that of the death, the first date in the account is of course given wrongly, as 9 p.m. in England would correspond with about 5 a.m. of the next day at Hong Kong. If the first date is right, then the percipients' experiences must have followed the death by some hours. It might be suggested that Mrs. Cox's experience was due to suggestion from her nephew. But it is scarcely probable that a person who has no tendency to hallucinations should evolve one from what she took to be the dream of a frightened child.]

In the next case, the difference between the several impressions was perhaps rather one of degree than of kind. The account is from Mr. T. N. Deane, of University Club, 3, Upper Merrion Street, Dublin, and was procured through the kindness of the Rev. J. N. Hoare, now vicar of Keswick.

“1882.

(346) “In the year 1851, on the 4th of June, I was in a large bedroom of a country house in the County Cork. The windows of the room faced the River Lee ; both were open. The air was sultry and still ; all the inmates of the house were out, with the exception of my wife and an intimate friend (now dead), who were with me in the room. We sat on three chairs near one of the open windows, and talked on ordinary subjects. The old-fashioned four-post bed occupied the side of the room to my right, and the only door (which was open) was on my left. We sat into the twilight, but there was still sufficient light to recognise each other, and see objects pretty clearly. A figure approached me from the side of the room occupied by the large bed, and apparently from the side of it, moved directly towards me, and placed its hand on my shoulder. It was a female figure, but I could not recognise the features. I followed it to the lobby, but did not see it again. I returned to my companions, and asked them had they seen it. They replied in the affirmative. I said, ‘If ever there was a ghost, that was one.’ That evening my mother was seized with fatal illness. Next morning I got a telegram stating that she was *in extremis*, and for hours before was asking for me to be sent for. On receipt of the telegram I started for Dublin, and was just in time to see my mother before her

death. The first person I met was Mr. Hoare's father [deceased], to whom I said, 'My mother will die! I saw her last night.' "THOS. N. DEANE."

We find from the obituary in the *Freeman's Journal* that Lady Deane died on June 5, 1851, at Dublin.

Mrs. Deane writes on March 7, 1883:—

"I must say I felt the presence more than saw it, and it certainly came up to where we (three friends) were sitting. All saw it or felt it; in fact, it was both, for I could describe it as a misty shadow passing through the chamber, and went out silently. Of course we did not turn round until we all three said, 'Was not there some one near the chair who is gone from the room?' Then one of our number got up and inquired had any one been in, and all were absent from where we were—some downstairs in other sitting-rooms reading, others in the garden, and the servants at tea in their kitchen; then it appeared doubly odd, and it seized hold of one's mind there had been an apparition or vision. We had been talking of the lady at the time she appeared to us. "HENRIETTA DEANE."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Deane says, "Neither my wife nor I ever saw anything of the kind before or since."

Here the vaguer form of Mrs. Deane's impression, as compared to that of her husband, seems a good example of rudimentary or arrested development (see p. 73, note).

The following case is one that would not have been included here, but for the favourable opinion which our colleague, Mr. Richard Hodgson, formed of the principal witness. The account was written down by Miss Atkinson, of Park Head, Jesmond Dene, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and is signed by Mrs. Reed, of 7, Miller's Lane, Byker Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne, the younger of the two percipients; the other is dead.

"July, 1884.

(347) "It was at Christmas time. Mr. and Mrs. Adams and their daughter Annie had been spending the evening with some friends, not far from home. Annie (a girl of 12 at the time), along with another girl, was sent home to fetch something that had been forgotten. On entering the kitchen, Annie said to the other girl, 'See, there's a man sitting by the fireside.' The other girl said there was nobody there. The two went upstairs to get what they had been sent for, when Annie said 'There's the man again.'¹ The other girl persisted that there was nobody there. Having got what was wanted, they returned to the friend's house. On coming home late at night, Mrs. Adams said to her husband—'There's my brother standing beside that house; don't you see him, all in white?' Mr. Adams did not see him. A day or two afterwards she received a letter to say that her brother was killed down the pit, the night and the hour corresponding with the time that Annie saw the man (as she said)

¹ For the feature of repetition in visual hallucinations, see cases 159, 160, 184, 213, 240, 503, 519, 540. In Vol. i., p. 414, second note, I mentioned an example in my collection of subjective cases, for which I am now allowed to name Mr. J. Champ, of High Street, Chelmsford, as my authority. What he saw (after a fatiguing march) was a grotesque, parti-coloured figure, about as wide as high, which appeared on the wall of the room, disappeared, and re-appeared after an interval of a few minutes.

sitting by her mother's hearth. Annie had never seen her uncle, as she had always travelled from place to place with the regiment, and had never been taken to the colliery village where her mother's family lived.

"This is a correct statement.

"ANNIE REED."

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mrs. Reed's uncle was crushed by a fall of stone in the Washington coal mine on December 29, 1862; which confirms the first words of the account.

Miss Atkinson tells us that Mrs. Adams, unlike her husband, was of a superstitious turn of mind. She adds on July 31, 1884;—

"I have been to see Mrs. Reed, but cannot say I have gained much information. She says that the figure she saw upstairs was the same as she had seen sitting by the fireside downstairs. She cannot give any definite information about the girl who was with her, except that her name was Sophie Arnup, and that she belonged to Norwich, where the incident occurred. Mrs. Reed does not know whether she is living or dead, or whether married. Mrs. Reed cannot remember that there were any differences noted when she and her mother talked about what they had seen. She mentioned about the man in white sitting by the fireside, as soon as she reached the friend's house where her mother was, and *before* her mother returned. She cannot remember any details about face or dress, except that the dress was white; she was too frightened to observe carefully, and I am glad to find she is too truthful to set her imagination to work, and fancy she remembers what she does not. This is the *only* hallucination that she ever had.

"E. E. ATKINSON."

Mr. Hodgson writes in September, 1884:—

"I have talked with Mr. Adams [now resident at 144, High Street, Jarrow-on-Tyne], who told me the story as given above. The pit where the brother was killed was in the Durham district; the figure was seen at Norwich. I have also seen Mrs. Reed, who first saw the figure, and who also told the story as given above. She impressed me as being exceptionally truthful."

[We might conceive that Mrs. Adams' hallucination was due to apprehensions caused by her daughter's account. But it will be observed that there had been nothing in the daughter's account to suggest Mrs. Adams' brother; the point therefore that Mrs. Adams mentioned her brother (which there is no reason to doubt) is important. And even if we suppose that she was given to apprehensions about this relative, which may have taken a superstitious colour, this would not explain the other hallucination, unique in her daughter's experience, occurring on the same evening. That the impressions were hallucinations and not illusions, is strongly indicated by the fact that neither of them was shared by a second person whose attention was drawn to the appearance (p. 105, second note).]

In the remaining visual cases, the impression seems to have been distinct and identical to all the percipients. I will begin with a case where it is a question whether a distant agent was or was not the source of the phenomenon; but where the flashing of the hallucination from one of the percipients to the other seems specially well

illustrated, since the figure which appeared was one which the second percipient had never seen in the flesh. The account is first-hand, though written in the third person. It is from Mrs. Elgee, of 18, Woburn Road, Bedford.

“March 1st, 1885.

(348) “In the month of November, 1864, being detained in Cairo, on my way out to India, the following curious circumstance occurred to me :—

“Owing to an unusual influx of travellers, I, with the young lady under my charge (whom we will call D.) and some other passengers of the outward-bound mail to India, had to take up our abode in a somewhat unfrequented hotel. The room shared by Miss D. and myself was large, lofty, and gloomy; the furniture of the scantiest, consisting of two small beds, placed nearly in the middle of the room and not touching the walls at all, two or three rush-bottomed chairs, a very small washing-stand, and a large old-fashioned sofa of the settee-sort, which was placed against one-half of the large folding-doors which gave entrance to the room. This settee was far too heavy to be removed, unless by two or three people. The other half of the door was used for entrance, and faced the two beds. Feeling rather desolate and strange, and Miss D. being a nervous person, I locked the door, and, taking out the key, put it under my pillow; but on Miss D. remarking that there might be a duplicate which could open the door from outside, I put a chair against the door, with my travelling-bag on it, so arranged that, on any pressure outside, one or both must fall on the bare floor, and make noise enough to rouse me. We then proceeded to retire to bed, the one I had chosen being near the only window in the room, which opened with two glazed doors, almost to the floor. These doors, on account of the heat, I left open, first assuring myself that no communication from the outside could be obtained. The window led on to a small balcony, which was isolated, and was three stories above the ground.

“I suddenly woke from a sound sleep with the impression that somebody had called me, and, sitting up in bed, to my unbounded astonishment, by the clear light of early dawn coming in through the large window before-mentioned, I beheld the figure of an old and very valued friend whom I knew to be in England. He appeared as if most eager to speak to me, and I addressed him with, ‘Good gracious! how did you come here?’ So clear was the figure, that I noted every detail of his dress, even to three onyx shirt studs which he always wore. He seemed to come a step nearer to me, when he suddenly pointed across the room, and on my looking round, I saw Miss D. sitting up in her bed, gazing at the figure with every expression of terror. On looking back, my friend seemed to shake his head, and retreated step by step, slowly, till he seemed to sink through that portion of the door where the settee stood. I never knew what happened to me after this; but my next remembrance is of bright sunshine pouring through the window. Gradually the remembrance of what had happened came back to me, and the question arose in my mind, had I been dreaming, or had I seen a visitant from another world?—the bodily presence of my friend being utterly impossible.

dreamed
Suggested
D's room
impair
n.c.

Remembering that Miss D. had seemed aware of the figure as well as myself, I determined to allow the test of my dream or vision to be whatever she said to me upon the subject, I intending to say nothing to her unless she spoke to me. As she seemed still asleep, I got out of bed, examined the door carefully, and found the chair and my bag untouched, and the key under my pillow; the settee had not been touched, nor had that portion of the door against which it was placed any appearance of being opened for years.

“Presently, on Miss D. waking up, she looked about the room, and, noticing the chair and bag, made some remark as to their not having been much use. I said, ‘What do you mean?’ and then she said, ‘Why, that man who was in the room this morning must have got in somehow.’ She then proceeded to describe to me exactly what I myself had seen. Without giving any satisfactory answer as to what I had seen, I made her rather angry by affecting to treat the matter as a fancy on her part, and showed her the key still under my pillow, and the chair and bag untouched. I then asked her, if she was so sure that she had seen somebody in the room, did not she know who it was? ‘No,’ said she, ‘I have never seen him before, nor anyone like him.’ I said, ‘Have you ever seen a photograph of him?’ She said, ‘No.’ This lady never was told what I saw, and yet described exactly to a third person what we both had seen.

“Of course, I was under the impression my friend was dead. Such, however, was not the case; and I met him some four years later, when, without telling him anything of my experience in Cairo, I asked him, in a joking way, could he remember what he was doing on a certain night in November, 1864. ‘Well,’ he said, ‘you require me to have a good memory;’ but after a little reflection he replied, ‘Why that was the time I was so harassed with trying to decide for or against the appointment which was offered me, and I so much wished you could have been with me to talk the matter over. I sat over the fire quite late, trying to think what you would have advised me to do.’ A little cross-questioning and comparing of dates brought out the curious fact that, allowing for the difference of time between England and Cairo, his meditations over the fire and my experience were simultaneous. Having told him the circumstances above narrated, I asked him had he been aware of any peculiar or unusual sensation. He said none, only that he had wanted to see me very much.

“E. H. ELGEE.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Elgee says:—

“I fear it is quite impossible to get any information from Miss D. She married soon after we reached India, and I never met her since, nor do I know where she is, if alive. I quite understand the value of her corroboration; and at the time she told the whole circumstance to a fellow-traveller, who repeated it to me, and her story and mine agreed in every particular, save that to her the visitant was a complete stranger; and her tale was quite unbiassed by mine, as I always treated hers as a fancy, and *never* acknowledged I had been aware of anything unusual having taken place in our room at Cairo. I never have seen, or fancied I saw, any one before or since.

“My visitant, also, is dead, or he would, I know, have added his testimony, small as it was, to mine. He was a very calm, quiet, clever, scientific man, not given to vain fancies on any subject, and certainly was not aware of any desire of appearing to me.”

[This seems at any rate an interesting example of collective hallucination; though as regards its supposed origination in the thoughts of Mrs. Elgee's friend in England, one may doubt whether, after a lapse of 4 years, complete certainty as to the identity of dates was attainable. If there has been an error on this point, the case would properly belong to the preceding section.]

The next account (which has been very slightly condensed) was written down for us, in 1883, by the late Miss Katherine M. Weld, one of the two percipients, at the request of Mr. James Britten, of Isleworth. It proves to be identical with a former account, as to which Miss Weld wrote to Mr. Wilfrid Ward, of Sherborne House, Basingstoke, on May 19, 1883, as follows:—

“The account was written about 15 years ago; it was an account which appeared in a book and in the newspapers at that time, and which I, at the request of friends, revised and corrected. I believe every word of the account to be perfectly true, as such things become impressed on one's mind; but at the same time it must be remembered that the account was not written at the time, but many years afterwards. Therefore I can only say that as far as I remember every detail is exact.”

“The Lodge, Lymington.

(349) “Philip Weld was the youngest son of Mr. James Weld, of Archers Lodge, near Southampton, and a nephew of the late Cardinal Weld. He was sent by his father, in 1842, to St. Edmund's College, near Ware, in Hertfordshire, for his education. He was a well conducted, amiable boy, and much beloved by his masters and fellow-students. In the afternoon of April 16th, 1845, Philip, accompanied by one of the masters and some of his companions, went to boat on the river, which was a sport he enjoyed much. When one of the masters remarked that it was time to return to the college, Philip begged to have one row more; the master consented and they rowed to the accustomed turning point. On arriving there, in turning the boat, Philip accidentally fell out into a very deep part of the river, and, notwithstanding every effort that was made to save him, was drowned.

“His corpse was brought back to the college, and the Very Rev. Dr. Cox (the president) was immensely shocked and grieved. He made up his mind to go himself to Mr. Weld, at Southampton. He set off the same afternoon, and passing through London, reached Southampton the next day, and drove from thence to Archers Lodge, the residence of Mr. Weld; but before entering the grounds he saw Mr. Weld at a short distance from his gate, walking towards the town. Dr. Cox immediately stopped the carriage, alighted, and was about to address Mr. Weld, when he prevented him by saying:—

“‘You need not say one word, for I know that Philip is dead.

Yesterday afternoon I was walking with my daughter, Katherine, and we suddenly saw him. He was standing on the path, on the opposite side of the turnpike road, between two persons, one of whom was a youth dressed in a black robe. My daughter was the first to perceive them and exclaimed, "Oh, papa! did you ever see anything so like Philip as that is?" "Like him," I answered, "why it is he." Strange to say, my daughter thought nothing of the circumstance, beyond that we had seen an extraordinary likeness of her brother. We walked on towards these three figures. Philip was looking, with a smiling, happy expression of countenance, at the young man in a black robe, who was shorter than himself. Suddenly they all seemed to me to have vanished; I saw nothing but a countryman, whom I had before seen *through* the three figures, which gave me the impression that they were spirits. I, however, said nothing to anyone, as I was fearful of alarming my wife. I looked out anxiously for the post the following morning. To my delight, no letter came. I forgot that letters from Ware came in the afternoon, and my fears were quieted, and I thought no more of the extraordinary circumstance until I saw you in the carriage outside my gate. Then everything returned to my mind, and I could not feel a doubt that you came to tell me of the death of my dear boy.'

"The reader may imagine how inexpressibly astonished Dr. Cox was at these words. He asked Mr. Weld if he had ever before seen the young man in the black robe, at whom Philip was looking with such a happy smile. Mr. Weld answered that he had never before seen him, but that his countenance was so indelibly impressed on his mind that he was certain he should know him at once anywhere. Dr. Cox then related to the afflicted father all the circumstances of his son's death, which had taken place at the very hour in which he appeared to his father and sister. Mr. Weld went to the funeral of his son, and as he left the church, after the sad ceremony, looked round to see if any of the religious at all resembled the young man he had seen with Philip, but he could not trace the slightest likeness in any of them. About four months after, he and his family paid a visit to his brother, Mr. George Weld, at Seagram Hall, in Lancashire. One day he walked with his daughter Katherine to the neighbouring village of Chipping, and after attending a service at the church called on the priest. It was a little time before the rev. father was at leisure to come to them, and they amused themselves meantime by examining the prints hanging on the walls of the room. Suddenly Mr. Weld stopped before a picture which had no name, that you could see, written under it (as the frame covered the bottom), and exclaimed '*That* is the person whom I saw with Philip; I do not know whose likeness this print is, but I am *certain* that it was *that* person whom I saw with Philip.' The priest entered the room a few moments afterwards, and was immediately questioned by Mr. Weld concerning the print. He answered that it was a print of St. Stanislaus Kostka, and supposed to be a very good likeness of the young saint.

"Mr. Weld was much moved at hearing this; for St. Stanislaus was a Jesuit, who died when quite young, and Mr. Weld's father having been a great benefactor to that Order, his family were supposed to be under the particular protection of the Jesuit saints; also, Philip had been led of late, by various circumstances, to a particular devotion to St. Stanislaus.

Moreover, St. Stanislaus is supposed to be the special advocate of drowned men, as is mentioned in his life. The rev. father instantly presented the picture to Mr. Weld, who, of course, received it with the greatest veneration, and kept it until his death. His wife valued it equally, and at her death it passed into the possession of the daughter [the narrator], who saw the apparition at the same time he did, and it is now in her possession."

In answer to some questions put by Mr. Ward, Miss Weld wrote on June 20th, 1883 :—

"I will repeat the questions you ask, to make the answers more clear.

"Did you as well as your father, think the disappearance strange?"—No; I thought no more about it. ||

"Did your father, before Dr. Cox spoke to him, look upon the apparition as significant of some mishap to his son?—Yes; he thought much about it, and was very anxious for the arrival of the letters the next morning; but he did not speak of the matter until afterwards. He had frightened my mother so much on a former occasion that he had promised never to speak of such things again."

Miss Weld adds in another letter :—

"When I saw Philip, I thought no more of it than one does in seeing a great and unexpected likeness in a stranger to some absent friend. The matter passed out of my mind so completely that I never felt a sensation of uneasiness. I did not remember the circumstance until the arrival of Dr. Cox, and the announcement of my brother's death. I saw that two persons were walking with the young lad who so closely resembled my brother. He looked happy and smiling; but I neither remarked their countenance nor dress; consequently I did not recognise the print in the parlour of the priest."

In answer to an inquiry as to whether this was her only experience of a sensory hallucination, Miss Weld adds: "I never before or since the event have seen anything from the other world."¹

The apparition of St. Stanislaus is quite consistent with the telepathic hypothesis, since we can conceive that the idea of his favourite saint may have been actually present to the mind of the drowning boy; but we have no explanation of the *third* phantasmal figure. This, from its irrelevance, is an unlikely feature to have crept into

¹ See p. 48, note.

The following version of the same incident, which we have received from a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, is useful as illustrating the slight inaccuracies which may creep into a narrative, without the least affecting the essential point :—

"I was mentioning this [*i.e.*, a similar case] to Baron French, or rather we were talking over the incidents connected with it, when he told me of a strange occurrence which happened at the school where he was, near Ware, in England, a Catholic college,—president, a Dr. Cox. There was a boy there of the name of Weld, a very well-known Catholic family. This boy was accidentally drowned. The father and mother were at the time at Southampton, and on the day in question were walking on the quay near the shipping. They suddenly saw the said boy approaching, and hurried to meet him, but immediately he appeared to fade away, so that they could see the masts of the ships, and through what had seemed to be his body. The next day, or the day following, Dr. Cox called on them, when Mr. Weld said, 'I know why you are here, it is to tell me that my son is dead. I saw him yesterday, and knew then that he had departed.'"

the memory, if not really observed; but it also makes the hypothesis of mistaken identity less improbable than it would otherwise be. As against that hypothesis we have the fact that the figures were seen in daylight, only a few yards off; that their disappearance seems to have been strangely sudden; and that, if the narrator's memory may be trusted as to Mr. Weld's spontaneous recognition of the picture, the mistake on his part would have been a *double* one. Moreover it must be observed that even if the case was one of mistaken identity—of illusion and not hallucination—the *coincidence* remains to be accounted for. If we suppose—as according to the account I think we may—that the eyes of the two percipients were independently deluded, and that Mr. Weld's delusion was not merely conjured up by his daughter's remark, we cannot ignore the improbability of two persons making a mistake of the sort on the very afternoon that the relative whom they seem to see is drowned. How prodigious this improbability is may be realised from a simple computation. Let us suppose—surely a liberal estimate—that it is a common thing, which one may suppose to have happened to each of the percipients, to make in the course of life 50 equally remarkable mistakes of identity, in an equally good light and when equally near to the figure observed; and also that the probability that one particular relative of most familiar aspect will be the subject of the mistake on any one of these occasions amounts to $\frac{1}{20}$ —which is again an extravagant allowance. Let us further suppose that the adult life of each percipient amounted to 35 years, or 12,775 days. Then, for each percipient, the probability of making one of the mistakes of identity on the particular day that the subject of the mistake dies is $\frac{50}{20 \times 12775}$; and the probability of the supposed combination of coincident mistakes is $\frac{1}{5110^2}$. In other words, the odds against the occurrence by accident of the incident above related are more than 26 millions to 1. If, therefore, the experiences were *illusions*, they may fairly be supposed to have been *telepathic* illusions (see pp. 62-3.)

We owe the next account in the first instance to Mrs. Willink, of Lindale Parsonage, Grange-over-Sands. The three first-hand witnesses all appear to be persons of good sense and of some education. Mrs. Willink writes, on Sept. 9, 1884:—

(350) “One night (Friday) my nurse, Jane, came to tell me that they had been startled by seeing a ghastly face at the kitchen window. The servants had been annoyed for some time previously by some young men

coming to the kitchen window, and making a noise on the glass, and trying to look in. The flower bed under the window had been freshly dug up and tidied, and they were hoping the visits had ceased. The dog, whose kennel was close to the window, and who had been put on a long chain to keep away these visitors, began to howl, and Helen (now Mrs. Robinson), who was sitting so as to see through the edge of the blind, looked up, and seeing a ghastly face, which she recognised as Mrs. Robinson's, told the others, who got up and drew the blind on one side, and so saw the face distinctly. Their account was that it gradually faded away below the bottom of the window. Jane and Aggie then went to the door, but though the dog continued howling (as he always does when a death in the village takes place), they could see nothing.

"I doubt the accuracy of the statement that the apparition looked at Helen rather than at the others; she sat where she could see through the space between the blind and the edge of the window, so naturally saw it first. Jane had never seen Mrs. Robinson, but some time after, on looking through a photograph-book in the village, she recognised the face, and was then told to whom it belonged. When she told me on the Friday evening of what they had seen, I rather pooch-pooched the story, as I found that the dog's howling was beginning to make them always nervous; and it was not until after service on Sunday that I was told how Mrs. Robinson had been persuaded to go to Leeds to the hospital there, and to undergo an operation, under which she died on Friday afternoon, I think, between 2 and 3. The appearance would be between 8 and 9. Mrs. Robinson had been servant to the clergyman here before she married; she had been away from the village some time before her death; was always an invalid, but none of us knew of her being more ill than usual.

"MARGARET WILLINK."

We learn from the clerk at Finsthwaite, where Mrs. Robinson was buried, that she died at the Leeds Infirmary on March 25th, 1882, and a neighbour thinks that the hour was between 8 and 9 in the morning. Friday was the 24th, not the 25th; and the coincidence was thus not so close as Mrs. Willink supposes; but the interval probably did not exceed 12 hours.

Mary Jane Farrand says:—

"It was a Friday evening, of the exact time I am not sure, but it was between half-past 8 and 9 o'clock. The other two maids, with myself, were sitting at supper in the kitchen, close to the window, when we all became conscious of being watched by a woman from the outside, whom the other two immediately recognised as a person whom they both knew as Mrs. Robinson. Before her marriage, she lived at the parsonage for some time as housemaid. She looked intently upon each one, and then turned her face quite to the cook, looking slightly reproachful, then pleadingly. They asked one of the other where she could be staying, and they said it was strange for her to be out (as it rained heavily) without her bonnet. One was just about to go and ask her in, when we saw a great change come over the face, and it looked like that of a corpse, then disappeared altogether. I never saw the person previously, or remember ever hearing of her, however indirectly. The following Sunday morning I heard that she was dead from Mrs. Willink. The cook, whom we called

Nell, was married to John Robinson about two years afterwards. As we sat at the table I had such an impression of the face, eyes, and front of the hair as to be able to recognise the photograph a few months afterwards, without the least trouble, or being told. "MARY JANE FARRAND."

A. Nicholson (now Mrs. Capstick, of Silverdale, Carnforth,) writes to Mary Jane Farrand, on September 4th, 1884 :—

"Woodwell.

"In answer to your letter about the face at the window, I cannot remember much about it, except that we were sitting at supper, and Nell happened to look up at the window, and said some one was looking in, then told us to come and look. It was like the face of a skeleton, and we looked, and it was a very thin face, with large staring eyes. We still thought it was some one till you and I went to the door, but could see nothing. Nell was in the kitchen, and it never moved, but was still there when we got back. It seemed to gradually fade out of sight. I don't remember who passed the remark that it was like Mrs. Robinson.

"A. NICHOLSON."

In conversation, Mrs. Capstick stated that she has never had any other experience of a hallucination.

Mrs. Willink writes, on September 18th, 1884 :—

"In answer to your question as to when the servants told me it was Mrs. Robinson's face they saw, as far as I recollect it was that same evening. Helen knew (as we all did) that Mrs. Robinson was ill, and had been so for years with an internal complaint, from which she never could recover ; but she did *not* know that she was any worse than she had been before she left the village some months before.

"They went out next morning to look for footmarks on the flower bed, which would have been disturbed by any one standing at the window, but there were no traces of any."

In answer to inquiries, Mary Jane Farrand writes, on September 24th, 1884 :—

"When I recognised Mrs. Robinson's photograph I was staying at Arnside with Mrs. Willink's children, and went to visit a person who had lived near Lindale and had not long been married, and she it was who when showing me the different things in her house, quite by chance took up her album, and showed me the photos of her friends, amongst them Mrs. Robinson. I cannot quite remember whether or not I told her that I recognised the face ; for it seems so long ago to remember each fact, and I should not like to assert what I did not feel confident about, but you certainly may write to her to ask her.

"Never before had I seen anything of the kind, although I had heard of similar events, but was greatly wanting in faith with regard to such things happening, and thought it but a fancy in others, until I saw Mrs. Robinson [*i.e.*, the photograph]."

She mentions, however, that she has had two subjective hallucinations, which fell within a few days of one another—one representing Mrs. Willink, and the other a fellow-servant.

Mrs. Jackson Thompson, of Ashmeadow Lodge, Arnside, Grange-over-Sands, writes, in February, 1886 :—

"The only remark I remember Mary Jane Farrand making on the late Mrs. John Robinson's photograph was that it resembled the face which appeared at the Lindale Parsonage kitchen window.

"CHARLOTTE THOMPSON."

[The evidence of "Nell" (now Mrs. Robinson), the third witness, will be found in the "Additions and Corrections" at the beginning of this volume.]

The next account is from Mrs. Bennett, of Edward Street, Stone.

"March, 1882.

(351) "My daughter, Annie, and I had been drinking tea with the late Mrs. Smith and Miss Moore, and talking about their brother Preston being very ill and not expected to recover, and were returning home in the evening, when between the little wicket which opens out of the Vicarage field and Mrs. Newbold's house we met the identical man in face, form, and figure, dressed as he was always wont; slouched hat, old frock coat, open in front, knee-breeches and gaiters, with a long stick. He passed so near us that we shrank aside to make way for him. As soon as we got to Mrs. Newbold's she exclaimed, 'So Preston Moore is dead!' when we both answered in a breath, 'Oh, no, we have just seen him!'

"We found, in fact, that he had died about half an hour before he appeared to us.

"J. BENNETT."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Bennett adds, on Dec. 19, 1883:—

"We cannot call to mind anyone at all resembling the individual in question; his appearance, dress and gait were utterly unlike anyone else residing in or about the neighbourhood."

We learn from the Rev. A. J. Wright, Vicar of Stone, that the death occurred on April 13th, 1860.

The Rev. Samuel Plant writes to us from Weston Vicarage, Stafford:—

"July 8th, 1885.

"I know very well the lady who, with her daughter, saw the apparition of Moore on the day of his death, and I have every reason to believe that she would not deviate from the truth in any respect. I have several times heard her account of it."

Mrs. Sidgwick writes, on December 17, 1883:—

"This afternoon Professor Sidgwick and I called on Mrs. Bennett. She told us the story as in her letter, and her daughter, afterwards called in, confirmed it. They do not remember when it happened, probably 12 or more years ago. She remembers distinctly, and so does her daughter, that it was in the summer, and that it was light enough to see things quite distinctly—though they are not sure of the hour.¹ They had been having tea with Mrs. Smith (Preston Moore's sister, a farmer's widow, retired and with means), and were on their way to call on Mrs. Newbold, now dead. About 3 yards from Mrs. Newbold's gate they saw Preston Moore coming towards them; they came round a slight bend in the road, and saw him first (Mrs. Bennett said), about the distance across Edward Street from them. He and they were both walking on the road close to the

¹ This statement is not incompatible with the fact that the season was really the middle of April; but it will be seen that the "12 or more years" are really more than 23.

causeway, and they got on to the causeway and let him pass. He did not greet them in any way, but though he did generally touch his hat, and say 'Good-day,' he did not then. His not doing so did not seem to them odd; the only thing that did was that a man who they had just heard was not expected to recover should be out at all. Mrs. Bennett has often wondered since that she did not turn her head to look after him, but she did not; and they do not remember saying anything to each other about him, during the few seconds that elapsed before they got to Mrs. Newbold's door. It was a natural enough place to meet him. There is no doubt that they both saw him, and that neither doubted at the time that what they saw was Preston Moore in the flesh. They say he was a peculiar-looking man—very plain, and with an eye chronically inflamed; wore habitually a white hat on one side of his head, a loose shabby long coat, open down the front, and carried a long, hooked, heavy stick; and all these marks they seem to recognise him by. They took no particular interest in him, just knew him. There was something forbidding about him, and he was very odd; in fact I suppose mad at times. The people called him 'moonstruck;' his sister, Miss Moore, was odd too. He seems to have had a sort of interest in Mrs. Bennett, for once he brought her pansies, stolen from a neighbouring gentleman's garden, and another time cauliflowers—equally illegitimately acquired. But he used to take stolen gifts to others in the same way. Both Mrs. and Miss Bennett disclaim being superstitious or nervous, and neither has had any other visual hallucination. Mrs. Bennett has had an auditory hallucination of music, and also what may have been a hallucination of raps and noises."

[In this case, we certainly cannot suppose that a purely subjective hallucination was independently and simultaneously caused in both percipients by their previous talk about the man, in whom they were not specially interested. The alternative is, therefore, between telepathy and mistaken identity. It was remarked in a former case that recollections as to details of appearance are often untrustworthy, as it is easy to imagine that one has distinctly seen some familiar figure, when in reality one has assumed its presence on the strength of the slightest and most general glance. But this criticism scarcely applies here. Preston Moore was the last person whom the percipients would at that moment have expected to meet out of doors; and they were, therefore, very unlikely to assume that the figure was he, without looking at him attentively.]

The following case is from Mr. S. S. Falkinburg, of Uniontown, Ky., U.S.A., decorator and house painter.

"Sept. 12th, 1884.

(352) "The following circumstance is impressed upon my mind in a manner which will preclude its ever being forgotten by me or the members of my family interested. My little son, Arthur, who was then five years old, and the pet of his grandpapa, was playing on the floor, when I entered the house a quarter to 7 o'clock, Friday evening, July 11th, 1879. I was very tired, having been receiving and paying for staves all day, and it being an exceedingly sultry evening, I lay down by Artie on the carpet, and entered into conversation with my wife—not, however, in regard to my parents. Artie, as usually was the case, came and lay down with his little head upon my left arm, when all at once he exclaimed, 'Papa!

papa! Grandpa!’ I cast my eyes towards the ceiling, or opened my eyes, I am not sure which, when, between me and the joists (it was an old-fashioned log-cabin), I saw the face of my father as plainly as ever I saw him in my life.¹ He appeared to me to be very pale, and looked *sad*, as I had seen him upon my last visit to him three months previous. I immediately spoke to my wife, who was sitting within a few feet of me, and said, ‘Clara, there is something wrong at home; father is either dead or very sick.’ She tried to persuade me that it was my imagination, but I could not help feeling that something was wrong. Being very tired, we soon after retired, and about 10 o’clock Artie woke me up repeating, ‘Papa, grandpa is here.’ I looked, and believe, if I remember right, got up, at any rate to get the child warm, as he complained of coldness,² and it was very sultry weather. Next morning I expressed my determination to go at once to Indianapolis. My wife made light of it and over-persuaded me, and I did not go until Monday morning, and upon arriving at home (my father’s), I found that he had been buried the day before, Sunday, July 13th.

“Now comes the mysterious part to me. After I had told my mother and brother of my vision, or whatever it may have been, they told me the following:—

“On the morning of the 11th July, the day of his death, he arose early and expressed himself as feeling unusually well, and ate a hearty breakfast. He took the Bible (he was a Methodist minister), and went and remained until near noon. He ate a hearty dinner, and went to the front gate, and, looking up and down the street, remarked that he could not, or at least would not be disappointed, some one was surely coming. During the afternoon and evening he seemed restless, and went to the gate, looking down street, frequently. At last, about time for supper, he mentioned my name, and expressed his conviction that God, in His own good time, would answer his prayers in my behalf, I being at that time very wild. Mother going into the kitchen to prepare supper, he followed her and continued talking to her about myself and family, and especially Arthur, my son. Supper being over, he moved his chair near the door, and was conversing about me at the time he died. The last words were about me, and were spoken, by mother’s clock, 14 minutes of 7. He did not fall, but just quit talking and was dead.

“In answer to my inquiries, my son Arthur says he remembers the circumstances, and the impression he received upon that occasion is ineffaceable.

“SAMUEL S. FALKINBURG.”

We have procured a certificate of death from the Indianapolis Board of Health, which confirms the date given.

Mrs. Falkinburg writes to us, on Sept. 12, 1884:—

“In answer to your request, I will say that I cheerfully give my recollection of the circumstance to which you refer.

“We were living in Brown County, Indiana, 50 miles south of Indianapolis, in the summer of 1879. My husband (Mr. S. S. Falkinburg) was in the employ of one John Ayers, buying staves.

¹ For phantasms seen in positions which would in reality be impossible compare cases 203, 204, and 205.

² See p. 37, note.

'On the evening of July 11th, about 6.30 o'clock, he came into the room where I was sitting, and lay down on the carpet with my little boy Arthur, complaining of being very tired and warm. Entering into conversation on some unimportant matter, Arthur went to him and lay down by his side. In a few moments my notice was attracted by hearing Arthur exclaim: 'Oh, papa, grandpa, grandpa, papa,' at the same time pointing with his little hand toward the ceiling. I looked in the direction he was pointing, but saw nothing. My husband, however, said: 'Clara, there is something wrong at home; father is either dead or very sick.' I tried to laugh him out of what I thought an idle fancy; but he insisted that he saw the face of his father looking at him from near the ceiling, and Arthur said, 'Grandpa was come, for he saw him.' That night we were awakened by Artie again calling his papa to see 'grandpa.'

"A short time after my husband started (Monday) to go to Indianapolis, I received a letter calling him to the burial of his father; and some time after, in conversation with his mother, it transpired that the time he and Artie saw the vision was within two or three minutes of the time his father died.

"CLARA T. FALKINBURG."

Asked whether this was his sole experience of a visual hallucination, Mr. Falkinburg replied that it was. Occasionally, however, since that time, he has had auditory impressions suggestive of his father's presence.

Here it may perhaps be suggested that Mr. Falkinburg's hallucination was due to the child's remark. But I know of no evidence to support such a hypothesis. Where sensory hallucinations have been traceable to verbal suggestion, as I have already mentioned, (p. 188), there has either been a previous abnormal dominance of one person by another, or the effect has been worked up among a considerable number of people, in an atmosphere of emotion and excitement. Till evidence is brought, we must, I think, decline to credit the words of a child of five with such magic sway over its father's mind as is exercised by a practised mesmerist over the "subject" whose will he has annulled, or as causes the visions of a hysterical fanatic to spread to her like-minded companions.

The next case is from Mrs. Fairman, of 43, Clifton Hill, N.W. She has given us in confidence the names of the persons concerned, who are all dead. The first account sent to us was written on December 29, 1884; but I quote the following slightly fuller one, which was sent after a search had been made for the letter therein mentioned. The sentence between brackets is taken from the former account.

"December 4th, 1885.

(353) "I much regret that the search I have made through my sister's letters has proved useless. You see, the letter relating to the circumstance was addressed to my mother, and has been destroyed long ago. In that letter, my sister related the circumstance of both herself and her husband

seeing what he imagined to be his brother—the exact likeness to him being apparent—passing the breakfast-room window; so much so that he spontaneously jumped up to go to the hall to meet him, but on arriving did not see him. (They were at the time—as nearly as I can remember, in 1844—living in the Highlands, and he had parted from his brother, who was living in Nottinghamshire, on very unfriendly terms.) After a fruitless search in the grounds, he awaited the arrival of the post-bag, which contained a letter requesting him to start at once: his brother, whom he had not seen for 15 years, being in a dying state. He did so; and found on arrival that he died at the *exact* time he had seen him pass the window. It was on his immediate departure that Mrs.— wrote home to us, and before she had received tidings from her husband of his brother's death. He repeated this statement to me some few years after, and said how convinced he was at the time that his brother had arrived, and how kind he considered it that he should make the first advances towards a reconciliation.

“CATHERINE A. FAIRMAN.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on May 2, 1841, the cause being “effusion on the brain.”

In answer to an inquiry whether she is certain that her sister saw the figure, Mrs. Fairman replies:—

“I feel sure that my sister saw a figure pass the window at the same time as her husband did; but as she had never seen her brother-in-law, she could not say, ‘There’s Edward.’ I remember perfectly her letter at the time mentioning that she saw a *someone* go by.”

[In conversation, Mrs. Fairman told me that she saw, immediately on its arrival, the account written to her mother by her sister on the day of the occurrence; and if this was so, her evidence is that of a person who was made aware of the percipient's experience before the event with which it corresponded was known (Vol. I., p. 148). But after an interval of more than 40 years, no memory can be trusted as to details of this sort. Nor, taking the evidence as it stands, can the hypothesis of mistaken identity be absolutely excluded. Still a mistake of the kind is far more unlikely in a country place—where the aspect of persons who come to the house is usually familiar, and where the sudden disappearance of an approaching visitor would be very unlikely—than in a crowded street. See also above, pp. 62-3.]

The next account is from the late Surgeon-Major Armand Leslie, and was first published in the *Daily Telegraph*. That newspaper, during the autumn of 1881, contained a good deal of correspondence of this sort; and Dr. Leslie was one of the few contributors who had the good sense and courage to sign his name, and thus to make his record available as evidence. We have ascertained from four different sources that he used to live at 5, Tavistock Place, W.C. He afterwards served through the Russo-Turkish war with the Turkish army; was one of the twelve doctors sent out to Egypt at the time of the cholera; was chief of the medical department of Baker's staff;

and was killed at the battle of Teb. Unfortunately, we failed to identify him till too late, and I can only quote the account as originally given. Confirmation might perhaps be obtained from his family, but our efforts to trace them have been, so far, unavailing. Not having communicated with the narrator, we cannot vouch for the *bona fides* of the account, the very startling incidents of which, and especially the detail of the goloshes, are suggestive of a hoax; and I therefore do not give the case an evidential number. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that a medical man of repute, even if he took the trouble to invent such a story, would allow his name to appear as the authority for it in a prominent newspaper. If the story was invented, its final sentence, which introduces the writer's true place of residence, is a clever touch of realism, and the point made at the end of the second paragraph is a master-stroke.

“October, 1881.

“In the latter part of the summer of '78, between half-past 3 and 4 in the morning, I was leisurely walking home from the house of a sick friend. A middle-aged woman, apparently a nurse, was slowly following, going in the same direction. We crossed Tavistock Square together, and emerged simultaneously into Tavistock Place. The streets and square were deserted, the morning bright and calm, my health excellent, nor did I suffer from anxiety or fatigue.

“The following scene was now enacted: A man suddenly appeared, striding up Tavistock Place, coming towards me, and going in a direction opposite to mine. When first seen, he was standing exactly in front of my own door. Young, and ghastly pale, he was dressed in evening clothes, evidently made by a foreign tailor. Tall and slim, he walked with long measured strides, noiselessly, without a sound¹—a tall white hat, covered thickly with black crape, and an eye-glass, completed the costume of this strange form. The moonbeams,² falling on the corpse-like features, revealed a face well known to me—that of a friend and relative. The sole and only other person in the street, beyond myself and this being, was the woman already alluded to. She stopped abruptly, as if spellbound, then rushing towards the man, she gazed intently and with horror unmistakeable on his face, which was now upturned towards the heavens, and smiling ghastly. She indulged in her strange contemplation but during very few seconds, and with extraordinary and unexpected speed for her age and weight, she ran away with a terrific shriek and yells. This woman never have I seen or heard of since, and but for her presence I could have explained the incident—called it, say, subjection of the mental powers to the domination of physical reflex action—and the man's presence would have been termed a false impression on the retina.

“A week after the above event, news of this very friend's death

¹ As regards this point, see p. 68, note.

² The “moonbeams” and the “morning bright and calm” do not go well together; and I certainly shall not argue that a hoaxer would have been careful to avoid the discrepancy.

reached me. It had occurred on the morning in question. From the family I ascertained that, according to the rites of the Greek Church, and to the custom of the country he had resided in, he was buried in his evening clothes, made abroad by a foreign tailor, and, strange to say, he wore goloshes or indiarubber shoes over his boots, according also to the custom of the country he died in; these deaden completely the sound of the heaviest footstep. I never had seen my friend wear an eye-glass. He did so, however, whilst abroad, and began the practice some months before his death. When in England he lived in Tavistock Place, and occupied my rooms during my absence.

“ARMAND LESLIE.”

[Supposing this to be a genuine case, it is still highly probable that some of the detail of the apparition was read back into it, after the real facts were known.]

The lady who sends us the following narrative occupies a position of great responsibility, and desires that her name may not be published; but it may be given to inquirers.

“1883.

(354) “When I was eight months old, my mother’s younger sister, Mercy Cox, came to reside with us, and to take charge of me. My father’s position at the Belgian Court, as portrait painter, obliged him to be much abroad, and I was left almost wholly to the care of my very beautiful aunt. The affection that subsisted between us amounted almost to idolatry, and my poor mother wept many bitter tears when she came home, to see how little I cared for anyone else. My aunt took cold, and for three years lingered in decline. I was a quick child, and could read well and even play prettily, so that I was her constant companion day and night. Our doctor, Mr. Field, of the Charter House, greatly disapproved of this close contact, and urged my parents to send me quite away. This was a difficult feat to accomplish, the bare mention of the thing throwing my aunt into faintings. At last Mr. Cumberland (the theatrical publisher) suggested that I should join his two daughters, Caroline, aged 16, and Lavinia, younger, at Mrs. Hewetson’s, the widow of a clergyman resident at Stourpaine, in Dorsetshire, who only took four young ladies. This was represented to my aunt as something so wonderfully nice and advantageous to me, that she consented to part with me. My portrait was painted, and placed by her bed, and I remember how constantly she talked to me about our separation. She knew she should be dead before the year of my absence would be ended. She talked to me of this, and of how soon I should forget her; but she vehemently protested that she would come to me there. Sometimes it was to be as an applemoan for me to buy fruit of, sometimes as a maid wanting a place, always *she* would know *me*, but I should not know her, till I cried and implored to know her.

“I was but nine when they sent me away, and coach travelling was very // slow in those days. Letters, too, were dear, and I very rarely had one. My parents had sickness and troubles, and they believed the reports that I was well and happy, but I was a very miserable, ill-treated little girl. One morning, at break of day—it was New Year’s Day—I was sleeping beside Lavinia. We two shared one little white tester bed, with curtains, while Caroline—upon whom I looked with awe, she being 16, slept in

another similar bed at the other end of a long narrow room, the beds being placed so that the feet faced each other, and two white curtains hung down at the sides of the head. This New Year's morning, I was roughly waked by Lavinia shaking me and exclaiming, 'Oh look there! there's your aunt in bed with Caroline.' Seeing two persons asleep in the bed, I jumped out, and ran to the right side of it. There lay my aunt, a little on her right side, fast asleep, with her mouth a little open. I recognised her worked night-gown and cap. I stood bewildered, with a childish sort of wonder as to when she could have come; it must have been after I went to bed at night. Lavinia's cries awakened Caroline, who as soon as she could understand, caught the curtains on each side and pulled them together over her. I tore them open, but only Caroline lay there, almost fainting from fright. This lady, Miss Cumberland, afterwards became Mrs. Part, wife of a celebrated doctor at Camden Terrace, [and now deceased.]

"I never talked of what had occurred, but one day, after I had long returned home, I said to my mother, 'Do you know, mamma, I saw auntie when I was at school?' This led to an explanation, but my mother, instead of commenting upon it, went and fetched her mother, saying to her, 'Listen to what this child says.' Young as I was, I saw they were greatly shocked, but they would tell me nothing except that when I was older I should know all. The day came when I learned that my dear aunt suffered dreadfully from the noise of St. Bride's bells, ringing in the New Year. My father tried to get them stopped, but could not. Towards morning she became insensible; my mother and grandmother seated on either side of her, and holding her hands, she awoke and said to my mother, 'Now I shall die happy, Anna, I have seen my dear child.' They were her last words. "D. E. W."

No general register of deaths was kept at the time of the incident here related; and we have exhausted every means to discover a notice of the death, without success. But we have procured a certificate of Mercy Cox's burial, which took place on January 11, 1829. This is quite compatible with the statement that the death was on January 1 (though such an interval, even in winter, is no doubt unusual), as the lady was buried in a family vault, and probably a lead coffin had to be made. January 1 would be, at the very least, a day of very critical illness. As to the date of the apparition, the marked character of New Year's Day decidedly favours the probability that Miss W.'s memory is correct.

In answer to inquiries, Miss W. says:—

"I was born in 1819. The death of my aunt took place in 1829. Though to my most intimate friends—as Sir Philip Crampton, the late Earl and Countesses (2) of Dunraven,¹ I have often mentioned the event, (and to Judge Halliburton,) I think I never wrote it fully except for Lord Dunraven and his mother, in 1850, who were very desirous to publish it, but I declined. I think that a great reason I have always had for not talking of it was the awe with which it inspired my mother, and her strict commands that 'I should not mention it to anybody.' Then, too, I went to school and lost sight of Lavinia Cumberland, and I shrank from the comments of strangers."

¹ The present Lord Dunraven tells us that he does not remember to have heard his father mention the circumstance.

In conversation Miss W. added that she had never experienced any other hallucination ; also that the Cumberland girls had visited her home, and seen her aunt—which accounts for Lavinia's recognition of the figure.

[We learn, through a relative of Miss Lavinia Cumberland (now Mrs. Monarch, of 16, Regent's Park Road, N.W.), that she herself does not recall the incident ; but that she remembers several times hearing her sister, Mrs. Part, speak of a "ghost case" in which they had both been somehow concerned.]

68.

This case, depending on the narrator's memory at 31 of what occurred when she was under 10, is not, of course, a strong one evidentially. But the very fact that the experience recorded is of so striking a kind makes it more probable that it was remembered than that it was unconsciously invented. The very odd detail of Lavinia's being the first to see the figure seems peculiarly unlikely to have been wrongly imagined afterwards ; for it is a feature that would have had no natural part in any sentimental idea of the child's about her aunt's visiting her, and could only tend to detract in her mind from the emotional significance of the visit. We have, moreover, the tolerably complete assurance that the incident deeply impressed our informant's mother at the time ; for this attitude of a third person, and the injunction of silence to which it led, are even more unlikely?? than the original experience to have been the product of the child's fancy. It must, however, be observed that the second hallucination may have been due to Lavinia's verbal suggestion ; and that the minute details of the appearance (which could hardly have been so suggested) may have been subsequently imagined. It is possible, therefore, that the case, though telepathic, may not have been truly collective. It cannot with any certainty be reckoned as *reciprocal*, as there is no evidence that the aunt's "seeing of her dear child" was more than a dream or a subjective impression (see p. 156).

In Dr. Leslie's case (supposing the account to be substantially true) ^{He knows it!} one of the percipients was presumably a total stranger to the agent. In No. 354, the one of the two persons present who was *least* intimately connected with the agent was the *first* to see the phantasm ; but equally in this as in the former case, I should regard her experience as dependent on the presence of the more nearly connected person (see § 7 below). In the next example there is a yet further step ; and of the two persons present, one of whom was son, and the other a stranger, to the agent, the stranger alone saw the

phantasm, though both seem to have shared in a singular auditory experience which they connected with it. The incident thus closely resembles that described in case 242, where the phantasm appeared not to the dying man's sister, but to a servant who was with her. The narrative was copied by the present writer from a note-book of the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, formerly of Manchester, and now of Rhyl.

(355) "On August 13th, 1879, I sailed to Hamburg with Captain Ayre, of the ss. 'Berlin,' of Goole, who related to me that, about 25 years before, he was staying with a friend named Hunt, at a small farmhouse at Arming Grange, about 2½ miles from Goole. On a summer evening, about 9 o'clock, Captain Ayre and his companion went to their bedroom, when they both heard a noise at the side of the house, and both went to the window to see what was the matter. The captain distinctly saw a man walking outside, but Hunt could see nothing there, though he had heard the tramp of feet as well as the captain. Being astonished that Hunt could not see the man, Captain Ayre proceeded to describe him. He was a man of short stature, with a stoop, and wore knee breeches, a red-fronted waistcoat with sleeves, and a little black hat. Hunt instantly identified the description as answering exactly to his own father. Captain Ayre assured me he had never seen Hunt's father. After this the men went to bed, and both now heard a noise as if the end of the bedstead had been wrenched, which continued until about midnight, when Hunt's brother arrived on horseback from Gilberdyke with the news of their father's death, which occurred about three hours earlier that evening. The noises then ceased."

Mr. Macdonald adds :—

"This was taken down by me in pencil from Captain Ayre's own lips, and transcribed when I returned from the voyage. The pencil account was read over to Captain Ayre, and pronounced by him to be perfectly correct. I cross-examined him carefully on every point. He specially described the lonely position of the house, and the unlikelihood of any stranger moving about in the vicinity or creating a disturbance in the bedroom.

"JAMES ALEX. MACDONALD."

This account was sent to Captain Ayre, who replied :—

"SS. 'Dresden,' Goole,

November 4th, 1884.

"I have carefully read over the narrative, as given by the Rev. Mr. Macdonald ; but it is so accurate in every detail that I fail to be able to add anything thereto.

"CHAS. AYRE."

[Our efforts to trace Mr. Hunt have been unsuccessful. Captain Ayre has not heard of him for some time.]

In the next case the agent was not dying, but was in a somewhat alarming fainting-fit. We have had several other similar cases (*e.g.*, Nos. 20 and 110); they recall what was said above (p. 26) as to the number of the death-cases where the mode of death has been drowning. The narrator is Mr. H. G. Barwell, of 33, Surrey Street, Norwich.

"1883.

(356) "During the last week of July, 1882, Mr. and Mrs. W. and family had settled themselves comfortably in a house they had hired at the Lizard, Cornwall; and a few days later Mr. Cox, an amateur artist from Liverpool, joined them. Mr. Barwell arranged to meet Mr. Earle, an artist residing in London (both of whose names are appended), on Monday, 7th August, 1882, dine with him and together take the night mail at Paddington, booking for Penryn, Cornwall, the station from whence conveyances take passengers to Helston, and thence to the Lizard, whither they were going to join Mr. W. and family, as on many former occasions.

"Barwell and Earle therefore started according to arrangement by the 8.10 p.m. mail train from Paddington, on the evening of Bank Holiday, Monday, 7th August, 1882. They travelled all night; the train on arrival at Penryn was a little more than 15 minutes late, reaching there on Tuesday morning, 8th August, 1882, at 7.23 a.m. No other passengers alighted there from that train. They had some difficulty in getting a porter to convey their luggage to the omnibus standing at the station, the driver of which announced that if they could not come at once, he must start without them. Passengers were nothing to him, he had to take charge of and deliver the mail bags at various villages on his route. They roused up the porter and insisted on his attention; in the meantime their train had departed and another train, from Falmouth to London, ran into the station (due 7.24 a.m.) Their luggage was being placed on the omnibus; Earle had already climbed to his seat next the driver, and Barwell, having now seen all their luggage safely deposited on the vehicle, was climbing up next him, when Earle exclaimed: 'Why, look there!' And on Barwell looking up, he saw in the train, just leaving the station for London, their friend W. from the Lizard, waving his hand to them while eagerly stretching his head out of the window to ascertain, apparently, if they had arrived. They both cordially returned the salute and the train disappeared round a curve, W. still looking out of the window waving his hand.

"The two friends now made various conjectures as to the why and wherefore of W.'s departure on the very morning of their arrival; they considered it very disappointing that he should thus be obliged to leave, on the day our friendly party was about to be reunited. Earle was greatly depressed about it, and wished to leave all further discussion on the subject until they should ascertain from Mrs. W. the cause for his leaving the Lizard just before their arrival. Amongst the surmises which they made for W. being in the train which came from Falmouth, and not from the Lizard where he was staying, was this; that he had probably received at the Lizard, on Monday, the 7th August, a telegram requiring his immediate attendance in London or elsewhere, and that to prevent a very early start by trap on Tuesday morning from the Lizard to catch the 7.30 a.m. train to London at Penryn, he had made use of a return Bank Holiday excursion steamer from Falmouth to the Lizard; sleeping at Falmouth, and starting by train from there at 7.15 a.m. for London, namely, the train they saw him in.

"They arrived in due course at Helston, had breakfast, and sauntered about the old town til. the next coach started for the Lizard at 11 o'clock a.m. On nearing the Lizard, they were anxiously on the look-out for the

children of Mrs. W., to receive their usual hearty and sincere welcome on arrival of the coach, and to learn from them where their respective domiciles in the village had been chosen. The coach arrived, but none of the W. family were to be seen.

“The luggage was taken off the coach and left on the village green in front of the hotel, till information could be obtained as to where rooms had been engaged. The two friends strolled away, but soon met W.’s two boys, who on being asked why their father had gone away, seemed somewhat surprised at the question, and replied that their father was lying ill at his lodgings, and that their mother was also at home and very anxious about him. The boys accompanied Earle and Barwell to their father’s house in the village, when Mrs. W. came out and greeted them cordially, telling them briefly that Mr. W. had had a serious fainting fit that morning, and that she was watching him with considerable anxiety.

“Mr. Cox now came in from his morning’s work, and after the exchange of salutations with Earle and Barwell, related to them the following details of Mr. W.’s fainting fit: That he, Mr. W., and his two boys started from the Lizard village to Housel Cove to bathe, at 7 o’clock that morning, a distance a little over half a mile. When W. came out of the sea, and was leaning against a rock, in a sitting posture, he fainted quite away. Cox was dreadfully shocked and alarmed, for at one time he could discover no action of the heart, and he feared he might be dead or dying. He used all the means he could think of, and placed W. in a more recumbent position, which seemed a more favourable one, for pulsation was then discernible, and W. partially recovered, but was too weak to move for a long time. Mrs. W. was fetched, and then breakfast was taken down to the Cove, and when vitality and strength had sufficiently returned to enable W. to climb the steep ascent with assistance, they started home.

“The fainting of W. occurred at 7.30 a.m. at Housel Cove, the Lizard, at the precise time when Earle and Barwell saw W. waving his hand to them from the train at Penryn.

“The question has been put to Mr. W. whether he thought of or saw Earle or Barwell, either just before or during his seizure, but he remembers nothing of the kind.

“(Signed) { “CHARLES EARLE, 9, Duke street, Portland Place,
London.
“H. G. BARWELL, Surrey Street, Norwich.
“CHARLES H. COX, Shrewsbury Road, N., Birkenhead.”

In reply to inquiries, Mr. Barwell says, “Both Earle and I have very good sight. My impression is that the person I saw looking from the train window wore a soft, flexible, round hat.” He can recall no other experience of hallucination, except one which occurred many years ago, at a time when he was not yet fully recovered from a severe fever.

Mr. Cox writes, on January 2nd, 1885 :—

“I was at the Lizard, in Cornwall, when my friends, Earle and Barwell, saw (as they believed) the ‘double’ of my friend W., whom, at the time, I was instrumental in bringing round after his attack of illness. My part in the affair was simply resuscitating Mr. W. from a very serious condition.
“C. H. Cox.”

[Here, again, mistaken identity must be recognised as a possibility; ¹¹ but there are several points which combine to make it improbable. The fact which the appearance forced on the minds of the two friends—namely, W.'s departure—was so little in accordance with their expectations that it distinctly surprised them; they were thus in a wholly different attitude from that (say) of awaiting a friend's arrival, when the senses are on the alert for anything at all resembling him. Again, the figure seen seems to have given unmistakeable signs of friendly recognition; so that we should not only have to suppose that the percipients mistook *someone* for their friend, but that they mistook for him someone who was known to them, or at any rate to one of them—clearly a much more unlikely occurrence. It will be observed, moreover, that the difficulties of assuming a mistake as to identity are immensely increased where two persons with good sight would have had to share in it (see p. 244). Still, it is conceivable—though scarcely compatible with the account—that the first sign of recognition was given by Mr. Earle; and that a stranger, seeing this sign, returned it, either in joke, or imagining that the giver of it must be some one that he had known and ought to recognise.]

I will conclude with a case which is probably the best-known specimen of the sort on record, and on that very account may naturally be mistrusted, as having "won its way to the mythical." The following presentation of it is, however, very much more complete than any that has yet been published, and is of a better quality than is often procurable for so remote an incident. It is true that, of the two percipients, we have the evidence of one only at second-hand, and of the other at third-hand; but we have the first-hand evidence of a person who was informed of their experience immediately on its occurrence, and long before the news of the agent's death arrived.

(357) The following memorandum made by General Birch Reynardson, of the account given him by one of the percipients, was sent to us by Mr. Wm. Wynyard, of Northend House, Hursley, Winchester. He believed the original document to be in the library of Mr. Chas. Reynardson, of Holywell Hall, Stamford, who, however, has looked for it without success. A copy¹ was made on June 20, 1864, by Mr. Wynyard's father, General E. B. Wynyard (a brother of George Wynyard, the co-percipient,) who says that the writer of the memorandum put it on paper as soon as he had an opportunity after the conversation recorded therein. General E. B. Wynyard has headed the paper:—

"Memorandum of a conversation between the late General Birch Reynardson, and Colonel, afterwards Sir John, Sherbrooke."

"In the month of November, Sir John Sherbrooke and General Wyn-

¹ This copy was enclosed in a letter to Colonel F. Clinton, of Clinton Ashley, Lyminster, Hants. We have not actually inspected it; but Colonel Clinton's daughter transcribed it for General E. B. Wynyard's son, Mr. W. W. Wynyard, who kindly sent us the book in which he in turn had copied it. It is curious that General E. B. Wynyard seems never to have heard the narrative first-hand from his brother.

yard¹ were sitting before dinner (between 5 and 6 o'clock) in their barrack-room at Sydney Cove, in America. It was dusky, and a candle placed on the table at a little distance. A figure, dressed in plain clothes and a good round hat² on, passed gently between the above people and the fire. While passing, Sir J. Sherbrooke exclaimed, 'God bless my soul, who's that?' Almost at the same moment Colonel W. said, 'That's my brother, John Wynyard,³ and I am quite certain he is dead.' Colonel W. was much agitated, and cried and sobbed a great deal. Sir John said, 'The fellow has got a devilish good hat, I wish I had it.'⁴ They immediately got up (Sir John was on crutches, having broken his leg), took a candle, and went into the bedroom, into which the figure had entered: they searched the bed and every corner of the room to no effect; the windows were fastened up with mortar. Mr. Stuart, the paymaster of the regiment, noted the circumstance at the time. Sir John told me that Colonel W. for two or three days was a good deal distressed and uneasy, but remained most perfectly convinced of the death of his brother.

"They received no communication from England for about five months, when a letter from Mr. Rush,⁵ the surgeon, announced the death of John Wynyard at the moment, as near as could be ascertained, when the figure appeared. In addition to this extraordinary circumstance, Sir John told me that two and a-half years afterwards he was walking with Lilly Wynyard⁶ in London, and seeing somebody on the other side of the way, he recognised, he thought, the person who had appeared to him and Colonel Wynyard in America. Lilly Wynyard said that the person he pointed out was a Mr. Eyre;⁷ that he had always been considered so like John Wynyard that they were frequently mistaken for each other; and that money had actually been paid to this Mr. Eyre in mistake."

The following account appeared in *Notes and Queries* for July 2nd, 1859, in a letter signed "Eric."

"On the 23rd of October, 1823, a party of distinguished *big-wigs* were dining with the late Chief Justice Sewell, at his house on the esplanade in Quebec, when the story in question became a subject of conversation. Among the guests was Sir John Harvey, Adjutant-General of the forces in Canada, who stated that there was then in the garrison an officer who knew all the circumstances, and who, probably, would not object to answer a few queries about them. Sir John immediately wrote five queries, leaving a space opposite to each one for an answer, and sent them to Colonel Gore, who, if my memory serves me rightly, was at the head of

¹ Note by Mr. W. Wynyard. "Colonel W. and Colonel S., then serving in the 23rd [?] 33rd] Regiment as Captains. (?) Oct. 15th, 1785." We learn from General Edward Wynyard, another son of General E. B. Wynyard, that George Wynyard died in 1809, as Lieut-Colonel.

² I cannot help thinking that this article of apparel may be the progenitor of the very suspicious hat of the Warren Hastings legend, criticised in Vol. i., p. 152. The two narratives have been probably often told in juxtaposition.

³ General Edward Wynyard tells us that John Wynyard was a subaltern in the 3rd Guards.

⁴ Note by the Rev. J. Birch Reynardson, son of the writer of the memorandum, and brother-in-law of Mr. W. Wynyard. "He told my father that he made this remark, as hats were not to be got there, and theirs were worn out."

⁵ Note by Mr. W. Wynyard. "Surgeon of the Coldstream Guards."

⁶ Note by Mr. W. Wynyard. "L. W. was brother of Colonel W., and died in the West Indies, Adjutant of the 20th Regiment."

⁷ Note by Mr. W. Wynyard. "(?) Hay."

either the Ordnance or the Royal Engineer department. The following is a copy of both the queries and the answers, which were returned to Sir John before he and the other guests had left the Chief Justice's house:—

“ ‘ My dear Gore,

“ ‘ Do me the favour to answer the following :—

‘ *Queries.*

“ ‘ 1. Was you with the 33rd Regiment when Captains Wynyard and Sherbrooke believed that they saw the apparition of the brother of the former officer pass through the room in which they were sitting?

“ ‘ 2. Was you not one of the first persons who entered the room, and assisted in the search for the ghost?

“ ‘ 3. Was you not the person who made a memorandum in writing of the circumstances, by which the singular fact of the death of Wynyard's brother, at or about the time when the apparition was seen, was established?

“ ‘ 4. With the exception of Sir J. Sherbrooke, do you not consider yourself almost the only surviving evidence of this extraordinary occurrence?

“ ‘ 5. When, where, and in what kind of building did it take place?

“ ‘ Thursday morning,

“ ‘ 23rd October, 1823.’

‘ (Signed) J. HARVEY.

‘ *Answers.*

“ ‘ 1. Yes, I was. It occurred at Sydney, in the Island of Cape Breton, in the latter end of 1785 or 6, between 8 and 9 in the evening. We were then blocked up by the ice, and had no communication with any other part of the world.

‘ R.G.

“ ‘ 2. Yes. The ghost passed them as they were sitting before the fire at coffee, and went into G. Wynyard's bed-closet, the window of which was putted (*sic*) down.¹

‘ R.G.

“ ‘ 3. I did not make the memorandum in writing myself, but I suggested it the next day to Sherbrooke, and he made the memorandum. I remembered the date, and on the 6th June our first letters from England brought the account of John Wynyard's death on the very night they saw his apparition.

‘ R.G.

“ ‘ 4. I believe all are dead, except Colonel Yorke, who then commanded the regiment, and is Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower,—and I believe Jones Panton, then an ensign in the regiment.

‘ R.G.

“ ‘ 5. It was in the new barracks at Sydney, built the preceding summer, one of the first erections in the settlement.

‘ (Signed) RALPH GORE.

“ ‘ Sherbrooke had never seen John Wynyard alive; but soon after returning to England, the following year, when walking in Bond Street with Wm. Wynyard, late D. A. General, and just after telling him the story of the ghost, [he] exclaimed “*My God!*” and pointed out a person—a gentleman—as [being] exactly like the apparition in person and dress. This gentleman was so like J. Wynyard as often to be spoken to for him, and affected to dress like him. I think his name was Hayman.

“ ‘ I have heard Wm. Wynyard mention the above circumstance, and declare that he *then believed* the story of the ghost. ‘ (Signed) R.G.’

“ ‘ The above is taken from a copy made from the original queries and

¹ “ Query, *puttied* down, to exclude the cold? ”

answers, and given to me, only a few weeks after the date affixed to the queries; and to it is added, in the handwriting of the copyist, the following:—

“A true copy from the original. The queries are written in black ink in the handwriting of Sir John Harvey, Deputy Adjutant-General of British America, and signed by him; the answers are in red ink, written and signed by Colonel Gore. The original paper belongs to Chief Justice Sewell. Sir J. Sherbrooke was lately Governor-General of Lower Canada.¹ It is said that Sir John Sherbrooke could not bear to hear the subject spoken of.”

“The copyist was a near relative of the Chief Justice, and died in 1832. He was one of my most intimate friends.”

[There is a discrepancy between Colonel Gore's and Sir J. Sherbrooke's accounts, as to which of the Wynyard brothers accompanied Sir J. Sherbrooke in Bond Street. The detail as to the Bond Street incident following immediately on a narration of the story looks like an unfortunate addition, the only effect of which is to inspire distrust, probably quite undeserved, of the rest of the statement.]

It is much to be regretted that the gentleman who sent this account to *Notes and Queries* did not sign his name. It is, however, highly improbable that Colonel Gore's statements are forgeries; and we are justified, I think, in regarding them as genuine by the following account, received from a niece of his, Miss Langmead, of Belmont, Torre, Torquay.

“September 3rd, 1883.

“Colonel Gore, of the 33rd, married my mother's sister, and he narrated the story to my mother and to my elder sister himself, most emphatically. I have heard it from them both, over and over again, and my sister wrote the account some years ago. She heard Colonel Gore tell it more than once, and always with strong feeling, which impressed every word on her memory. I have not got her paper now, but I knew it perfectly by heart. I have often heard my sister say that no one who heard Colonel Gore tell the story could doubt the powerful impression made on him at any rate.

“There were other little particulars, such as the impossibility of hiding in the barrack rooms, which were two above and two below, and so slightly built that every sound was heard, but I have not enlarged more than I could help. The story has been printed with variations in many books of collected ghost-stories, but not always correctly. It is usually said that it was a twin brother who was met in Bond Street, but that was not the case.

“It was in the time of the American war, and some of our troops were in winter quarters at Cape Breton. The weather was very severe and the harbour frozen over. The ships expected from England had not arrived, and the supplies had run short, especially the allowance of wine. Four officers, afterwards entitled General [mistake for Colonel] Wynyard, Sir John Sherbrooke, Sir Hildebrand Oakes, and Colonel Gore, of the 23rd [? 33rd] Regiment, were in barracks at the top of a steep ascent, guarded by a sentry below. They had dined together and then separated, two of them being engaged upstairs in looking over maps and plans of the seat

¹ “From July, 1816, to July, 1818.”

of war. The other two, General Wynyard and Sir J. Sherbrooke, remained in the inner room.

“Suddenly an exclamation from General Wynyard startled the two above, who ran downstairs, expecting that the ice had broken and the looked-for ships arrived. They found Sir J. Sherbrooke alone, standing amazed, and in answer to their eager inquiry as to what had happened, he said that a gentleman, a stranger to him, had come in at the door, looked fixedly at General W., and passed into the inner room. General W. exclaimed aloud, ‘Good God, my brother Jack!’ and followed him into the bedroom, from which there was no outlet. He presently returned, much agitated, having found no one. Colonel Gore took out his watch and marked the time, while another of the party ran down to the sentinel, who declared no person had passed. Sir J. Sherbrooke described the figure as dressed in a hunting costume, such as he had never seen, with a hunting-whip in his hand. Days went on, the ice broke up, news came from England to General W. of his brother’s death, who was killed in the hunting-field at the very time in which the figure appeared in the barrack-room. Papers also came out, containing the fashions, one being the hunting suit with a particularly shaped boot, such as the figure had worn. After the peace, and the troops had returned to England, Sir John Sherbrooke was walking through Bond Street with Colonel Gore, when he stopped and said, pointing to a man who was coming towards him, ‘There is the figure I saw at Cape Breton.’ Colonel Gore replied, ‘That man was called Jack Wynyard’s double, he was so very like him.’

“Before Sir J. Sherbrooke’s death, long afterwards, he was asked by a friend what he then thought of the apparition at Cape Breton. He replied that he could not explain it, but that every detail was true.

“M. F. L.”

[Here the hunting-dress, and the corresponding detail about the hunting-field, may almost certainly be referred to a transformative process in Colonel Gore’s mind. The peculiar boot may probably be a degenerate representative of the spruce hat in Sir J. Sherbrooke’s account. It would further be a very natural mistake on the part of Colonel Gore’s niece to imagine that *he* was Sherbrooke’s companion in the walk in Bond Street.]

Next come two items of evidence, for which George Wynyard, the co-percipient, was the original authority.

General Edward Wynyard, of 5, Portman Street, W., writing to us on April 7, 1885, tells us that the incident was narrated to him by his aunt, Mrs. Wright, who “had often heard the story” from her brother, George Wynyard. He observes that her narrative corresponded in nearly every particular with the account given in *Chambers’ Book of Days*, Vol. II., p. 448. The said account (the authority for which is not given, save in so far that a relative of George Wynyard had pronounced it substantially true,) agrees in the essential points with Colonel Gore’s;¹ but differs in stating that the subsequent recognition took place when Sherbrooke was

¹ Miss Browne wrote to us on Jan. 18, 1884, from Farnham Castle, Surrey, to the effect that she too had heard the incident described by Mrs. Wright, and also by “General Sir George Nugent, who was in the garrison at the time”; and that the details were very similar to those in Miss Langmead’s account.

walking with *two* gentlemen, in *Piccadilly*, and that he actually *accosted* the gentleman, who told him that he was Wynyard's *twin-brother*. These are precisely the sort of inaccuracies most likely to creep into a story in its passage from mouth to mouth.

The Rev. O. H. Cary, of Tresham Vicarage, Chudleigh, wrote to our friend, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, on April 3, 1882 :—

“The story, as my mother, who heard it from Wynyard himself, used to tell it, was as follows :—General Sherbrooke and Mr. (or General) Wynyard were sitting together in a hut in Canada (or Nova Scotia or elsewhere in North America) when a figure entered the tent and passed through into an inner apartment, whence there was no means of exit except where they were sitting. Wynyard recognised the figure as that of his brother, but thought someone was playing practical jokes, as he knew his brother to be in England at the time. On searching the inner room the figure was found to have disappeared.

“They had both seen the figure. The brother died at that time. Some years afterwards, the same two officers were walking together in London, when Sherbrooke saw a man on the opposite side of the street, and said, ‘Look, there is the man that we saw in the tent.’ Wynyard replied, ‘No, that is not my brother, but he is so like him that my brother was once arrested for debt in mistake for him.’”

[Here again we have characteristic illustrations of the way in which narratives become modified in transmission. “The same two officers” is of course neater and easier to remember than “one of the same officers and a brother of the other”; and the “arrest for debt” seems to be an oddly inverted reminiscence of the detail mentioned by Sir J. Sherbrooke, that “money had been paid to one in mistake” for the other.]

In conclusion, the following letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of October 20, 1881 :—

“SIR,—In reference to the circumstances related as occurring in Sir John Sherbrooke's tent, in North America, permit me to add that I heard an exactly similar account of it in Dublin about the year 1837, by General D'Aguilar, then on the staff, and who, I think, had been one of the occupants of the tent.¹ Colonel ‘Wynyard's’ name, who was on the Dublin staff at the time, was also mentioned.—Yours truly,

“G. CRICHTON, M.D.”

§ 7. The cases of the preceding section, and of § 2, though not evidentially among the strongest in our collection, are sufficient, I think, to establish a strong presumption for the genuineness of this collective type of telepathic hallucination. But the establishment of facts, in “psychical” as in other departments of Nature, may far outstrip our power of satisfactorily accounting for them; and such account as I can render of these phenomena is here put forward rather as a suggestion or adumbration than as a final view.

¹ This does not appear in any other account. Complete information as to various details could only be obtained by a search in the archives of the War Office. It is hoped that in course of time this search may be authorised.

To begin with, it would, I think, be irrational not to recognise a special significance in the fact that in all the cases of § 6, and most of those of § 5, the several percipients were *together*: to that extent, at all events, conditions of place seem to enter vitally into the phenomena. But there is nothing in this that need drive us for a moment off idealistic or "psychical" ground. I have spoken often, throughout the book, of a *rapport* between the parties concerned in a psychical transference—meaning by the word simply some pre-existing psychical approximation which conditions the transference. The *rapport* has usually been that of kinship or affection. But I regard these collective cases as strongly indicative of a *rapport* of a different sort—consisting not in old-established sympathy, but in similarity of immediate mental occupation. I suspect that such a *rapport* might be induced by a common environment—by partnership in that particular piece of the "life of relation" within which the hallucination happens to fall. That is to say, I should regard the fact that B's hallucination spreads to C, when B and C are in the same place, as possibly largely due to the fact that a very important part of the contents of B's and C's minds is—and has been for some hours, minutes, or moments preceding—identical. The local condition would be, not any physical presence or centre of influence in the circle of space outside them, but the community of scene, and of other objective impressions, in the two parallel currents of ideas which are their real two existences.¹ It must be remembered that we have no *à priori* means of knowing what the mental conditions that favour telepathy are likely to be. And I venture to think that if, by some process of psychical chemistry, the elements and affinities of different minds at particular moments could be analysed and estimated, mere community of scene and of immediate sensory impression might count for more—might prove, that is, to involve a larger amount of real correspondence or identity—than the external and accidental character of such passing experience might have led us to expect.

But this idea, if tenable, seems capable of being extended. If community of environment opens a channel of supersensuous communication between B and C, we come to conceive a greater fluidity (so to speak) in the directions of telepathic transference than the

¹ A similar explanation may be suggested for the fact that thought-transference experiments rarely succeed when agent and percipient are so far withdrawn from one another as to have quite different environments. This fact would otherwise seem explicable only by some hypothesis of "brain-waves" diminishing in strength with the increase of the distance between the parties—a hypothesis which has the disadvantage of being quite inapplicable to many of the facts of spontaneous telepathy (Vol. i., p. 112).

more usual cases of a distant agent and a single percipient could reveal. And this brings me to what I suspect to be a more correct account of the collective telepathic cases that have been passed in review.

In the earlier part of this chapter, I consulted clearness by keeping separate the hypothesis (1) of joint and independent affection of B and C by A, and the hypothesis (2) of C's affection by B who alone is directly affected by A. Now looking back at these hypotheses in the light of the evidence, the objections (see § 2) to the assumption of independent psychical affection of B and C by A come back on us with only increased force. As long as telepathic hallucinations are rare, and lead by their rarity to the conclusion that they generally require not only an abnormal condition of the agent, but specific susceptibility in the percipient, nothing can make it seem otherwise than astonishing that two closely similar specimens of them, in connection with the same agent, should independently concern two percipients at the same moment. One might admit such an astonishing coincidence once or twice—I have suggested its application to a few cases in § 2 above;¹ but it seems impossible to lay it down as a *principle* of explanation, by which any number of collective hallucinations may be accounted for. No view which shrinks from assuming a local and physical presence of A, and at the same time rejects every sort of direct transference between B and C, can avoid this difficulty; and the consideration seems to me of such weight as to exclude hypothesis (1) in the form stated. I feel absolutely driven to suppose that where C's experience resembles B's, it is *in some direct way* connected with B's; this is the only alternative that I can see to admitting a physical basis to the percept. But this does not necessarily imply the adoption of hypothesis (2) in its crudest and most obvious form; the "direct way" need not, I conceive, be a transfer between B and C wholly unconnected with A—a transfer, that is to say, which must have equally taken place had B's hallucination been purely subjective. Though the evidence in § 5 above inclines me strongly to the opinion that sensory hallucinations, as such, are transferable things, I do not believe this to be the complete explanation of the later telepathic cases. And I now venture to suggest that with slight modification the two hypotheses—of joint affection by A, and of direct transference between B and C

¹ In all of these, however, where the two percipients were near together and had been sharing the same life, I think it probable that the experiences were not truly independent.

—may be amalgamated ; and that the amalgamation is really more probable than either hypothesis in its isolated form.

Where A, the distant agent, is in *rapport* both with B and C, it is possible to suppose that B and C are jointly and independently impressed by A, though the particular form—the hallucination—in which they simultaneously embody their impression is still an effect of B's mind on C's, or of C's on B's. The joint impression from A may be conceived as having in itself a tendency to facilitate this further effect—that is to say, psychical communication between B and C may find a readier and wider channel at the exceptional moments when they are attuned by a common telepathic influence than, *e.g.*, when one of them is staring at a card and the other is endeavouring to guess it. But even for these cases, I think it so dangerous, in view of the apparent rarity of “psychical” affections, to assume any sort of *independent* psychical affection of different minds at the same moment, that I should prefer to regard A's influence on C as derived through B. And this certainly commends itself as the process where C is a stranger to A, or not a person whom it would have seemed natural that A's vicissitudes should in any way affect.¹ In such cases I conceive that, while C's experience depends on B's presence or existence, and even probably on the form of B's experience when the two are similar, yet A's influence may really and truly extend to C ; that in fact there is a *rapport* between A and C, established *ad hoc* by the *rapport* of both of them with B. B would be thus not the instigator, or not solely the instigator, but the *channel*, of C's percipience—the assumption being that a mind in which B holds a prominent place, such as C's, may be abnormally susceptible to an influence which abnormally impresses B. Especially would this conception relieve the difficulty of such extreme cases as Nos. 242 and 355, above ; where B's part in the occurrence was to all appearance suppressed, and C, a stranger to A, was the sole percipient.² We can scarcely doubt that the presence of B, the near relative of the supposed agent, was a condition of C's percipience ; while at the same time it seems absurd to suppose that B infects C with a sensory hallucination which he himself does not experience. We seem driven, then, to regard B as a mere channel of influence ; and *that* is a part which there is no absurdity in supposing to be played unconsciously. For

¹ *E.g.*, cases 169, 264, 279, 339, 348, 350, 353, 354, 357.

² See also case 307, where A's bond, such as it was, was with B and not with C ; and compare case 311.

the better established facts of telepathy have familiarised us with both unconscious reception and unconscious propagation of telepathic impulses; and however unexpected, it is at least quite conceivable that the two events should take place as part of a single process—which is all that the transmission of an impulse from A to C through the unwitting B implies.

The above view, of *rapport* through community of mental occupation, may likewise afford some explanation of the otherwise puzzling cases where the telepathic influence exercised by A seems itself to have depended rather on *local* than on personal reasons; as in case 29 in Chap. V., where the agent's form was seen by a person only slightly connected with her, in a spot in which she was known to have been considerably interested;¹ or in cases where the actual percipient had little or no connection with the agent, but was situated in a place where the agent might naturally conceive some other and nearly-connected person to be;² or in cases where a dying person's form is alleged to have been seen by strangers in that person's old home;³ or in a converse case in Chap. III. of the Supplement, § 3—Miss G.'s veridical dream of the death of a comparative stranger in her own old home. It is not necessary that two persons should know one another, for certain daily scenes and local impressions to be deeply stamped in common on their two minds; and in this way locality might constitute an ideal bond between A and B who are apart, as we conceived that it might do between B and C who are together.

An even further extension could be given to this idea, if we admit the supposition that A's own susceptibility may be quickened, in the way that was so strongly suggested by some of the reciprocal cases in the preceding chapter. I there pointed out (pp. 161-2 and 164) the indications afforded of a special sort of clairvoyance; *telepathic*, in the sense that it depends on B's living presence in the scene which A perceives; but *independent* in the sense that B and his surroundings are perceived while B's own state is not critical but normal—the abnormality of state being confined to A, whose extension of faculty in trance or at death makes him percipient of B, as well as the agent of B's percipience. A view akin to this has been developed by Mr. Myers, in the Note that follows a few pages further on; and the

¹ It is probable that a local explanation would apply to cases 239, 248, 313, 343, 350, 589.

² *E.g.*, Nos. 192, 225, 660, as well as No. 242 just mentioned; and compare No. 307.

³ *E.g.*, case 666.

temptation to apply it to the collective cases is considerable, since it enables us to conceive the scene, and the sense of being present there, as common to the minds of A, B, and C alike; and so far as such community is a favourable condition for telepathic affection, it would explain A's power to affect the other two.¹ To some joint hallucinations, however, (*e.g.*, cases 327, 328, 329, and perhaps 348, where A, the original of the phantasm, has been in a normal waking state at the time, such an explanation seems quite irrelevant; and its admissibility elsewhere must, I think, depend on our obtaining more proof than we yet have of A's reciprocal percipience, in collective cases which are clearly due to his agency. The reciprocal type having seemed, on the evidence, to be a rare if not a doubtful one, we ought to be doubly cautious of making it the ground of explanation for further and more perplexing phenomena.

¹ I do not think—herein differing from Mr. Myers—that the mere fact of A's clairvoyant perception of the scene, even if established, would account for the similarity and simultaneity of the two resulting affections, so as to enable us to dispense with the hypothesis of a direct dependence of one of them on the other. Strong evidence seems needed, before we can assume the particular mental events involved in A's clairvoyant perception to be more calculated than any other abnormal events of his experience—such as simply dying in his bed at home—to impose a particular hallucination on several minds at once. However much his clairvoyant perception of B and C and their surroundings may be supposed to facilitate his impressing them, why should the two independent impressions, which according to telepathic analogy might take many different forms, be projected by B and C in the same form?

While therefore I can accept, for certain cases at any rate, Mr. Myers' description of the appearance of A to B as proximately dependent on A's "perception of his own presence" in, or his "psychical translation" to, the scene where his phantasm is observed—for this is practically identical with the suggestion made above (p. 162) that an "extension of A's susceptibility in a certain direction has involved the power to act abnormally in the same direction"—I cannot go on to admit that it is "a subsidiary question," depending on varying degrees of susceptibility to telepathic impressions, whether the phantasm is seen by B only, or by a whole group of persons. To do this would seem to me to be transferring to the terms "perception of presence" and "psychical translation" some of the connotation of *physical* presence and translation.

Mr. Myers would obviate this objection by the further supposition that the aspect of A which B and C perceive is derived in detail from *his* mind and not *theirs*—which would no doubt be a convenient way of accounting for the similarity of their hallucinations. But in the first place, I fail to see any ground for connecting this supposition (as Mr. Myers connects it) with the previous hypothesis of A's clairvoyant presence at the place where B and C are. The supposed derivation would clearly have to be from an unconscious or sub-conscious part of A's mind; for there is no more reason for supposing his conscious thoughts to be concentrated on his own aspect when he is clairvoyantly perceiving a scene, than when he is consciously lying in bed and perceiving his normal surroundings in a normal way. And so far as any conscious occupation of the mind may be supposed to throw into abeyance any assumed mental activities of a more latent kind, one would expect that A's interest in the friend or friends whom he is psychically visiting would be specially calculated to thrust into the background his sub-conscious sense of his own aspect; so that the difficulties (Chap. iii., § 9, and Chap. xii., § 8) which in any case are involved in the hypothesis that A's mind transfers to B the detailed image of his aspect, are rather increased than relieved by supposing him clairvoyant at the time.

And, in the second place, this hypothesis of detailed derivation from the agent's mind, as applied to collective cases, seems to me in itself open to grave doubt. We have encountered, no doubt, an important group of cases (Chap. xii., § 8) in which certain details of a phantasmal appearance did seem to be literally derived from the agent's mind, and not simply projected by the percipient from his own resources. But those who admit the psychological continuity of dreams and hallucinations on which I have laid so much stress, and who have marked at every stage the ways in which the

And indeed any conjectural explanations of these more outlying telepathic phenomena have, I am well aware, an air of rashness and unsoundness. This may very likely be due to their being really rash and unsound; but it may also possibly be due to the fact that our view of the field before us is still very partial and dim. The duty of caution in all evidential matters does not exclude the duty of keeping the mind open to new conceptions on this threshold of new knowledge, and not allowing any hypothesis that has provisionally commended itself to become a rigid barrier, within which further facts must be forced or else disallowed. And if our central thesis stands—if “psychical” transferences from mind to mind be admitted as *in rerum naturâ*—the rashness, I think, would be in attempting to set a limit to the possible implications of this admission. Its tendency, at any rate, is to give a tangible meaning to that solidarity of life which Idealism proclaims; to lead us to regard individual minds, not as isolated units, but as all in potential unity—as entering into a scheme whose relation to the telergic influence somewhat resembles that of the physical world to electricity. And in such a scheme we need not be surprised if the manifestations of action and affinity between the parts are as sudden and shifting, and to the superficial view as isolated, as in the physical world those of electrical relations between different pieces of matter. But a far larger basis of well-attested cases is, no doubt, needed before reflections of this sort can be profitably pursued; and I will not further run the risk of inverting the relation of speculation to evidence which it has been throughout my endeavour to maintain.

percipient's mind seems independently to react upon and develop the telepathic impression, may incline to regard these literal representations as the exception rather than the rule; and may hesitate to extend the hypothesis of visual images transferred (so to speak) in a full-fledged condition, to cases where the percept included nothing that the percipient's memory or imagination might not well have supplied. Moreover, in some of the collective cases themselves, the evidence of *dissimilarity* in the percepts seem sufficient to show that the percipient minds were no mere *tabulae rasæ* for a foreign image. But a much more important observation with respect to the “collective” evidence here presented is this—that (putting aside the second-hand record, No. 670, where the description of details cannot be safely relied on) *in not a single case* have any such special features of dress or aspect as must perforce be derived from the mind of the distant A been simultaneously perceived by B and C. It is only in case 653, and in the dubious narrative quoted on p. 252, that such features are alleged to have been perceived even by B; and there is no proof whatever that C on those occasions was aware of them. This, in my view, is just what was to be expected. For if it is indicated, as the general result of the telepathic evidence, that the most dominant form of agency and the most definite and detailed form of transfer are extreme rather than normal forms, it would scarcely be conceivable that in case after case a *double* exhibition of them should occur, and A's sub-conscious sense of his own aspect, by two independent manifestations, be reflected in a faithful picture of him before the eyes of two persons at once.

CONCLUSION.

§ 1. IN bringing to a close the principal division of this work—the presentation of the case for spontaneous telepathy as supported by a considerable body of first-hand records—it will scarcely, I think, be necessary to attempt anything like a summary of the foregoing chapters. It is indeed impossible effectively to summarise facts the whole force of which lies in their cumulation. One point only I would once again emphasise—the one with which I started—to wit, that radical connection between *experimental* and *spontaneous* telepathy, the importance of which in my own view I may best express by saying that I am unable even to guess what effect the body of testimony to the latter class of cases would have on me, were I not convinced of the reality of the former. This being understood, so far as the evidential position of the subject admits of a brief connected statement, I have endeavoured to state it in the closing pages of the fourth chapter. Neither there nor subsequently have I extenuated the evidential shortcomings of many of the spontaneous cases ; but for the evidence taken as a whole, it may be claimed that it resembles not so much a shifting shadow, which may be left to individual taste or temperament to interpret, as a solid mass seen in twilight, which it may be easy indeed to avoid stumbling over, but only by resolutely walking away from it. The temptation to walk away from it—to dismiss it with a hasty glance—will be very strong. The matter presented is from a literary point of view monotonously dull, from a scientific point of view confusingly inexact : the study of it in detail is hard work, while at the same time it is work which affords none of the stimulus of high intellectual activity. Yet it is only by detailed study that my colleagues and I have arrived at our own view ; and so far are we from putting ourselves into antagonism to the sceptical attitude of Science, that we should regard any conclusion formed without such study as premature. On this still dubious territory, a

number of direct and independent attestations, which would be utterly superfluous elsewhere, will be—or ought to be—demanded; and others will need, as we have done, to have the true nature and amount of the evidence far more distinctly brought home to them than is necessary in realms already mastered by specialists to whose *dicta* they may defer.

But in point of fact, the dulness of the work in detail scarcely needs apology; for it would never be specially remarked except in connection with that totally unscientific view on which I commented at the very opening of the treatise. The whole subject of psychical influences has been mixed up in the public mind with ideas of the supernatural or uncanny—with nervous thrills and spurious excitements. When such associations are carefully excluded, the details of the inquiry cannot be expected to have *more*, and may perhaps have not much *less*, attraction than those of the recognised physical sciences. And so far as the unexciting character of the present collection—poor in thrills, but tolerably rich in verified dates—tends to make this sober view prevail, it will be a direct advantage. For, exactly like the physical sciences, the research has to go on, methodically, not sensationally; and it has only just begun to be methodised. The present instalment of facts, though probably solid enough to surfeit those who are not troubled by *à priori* difficulties, and to repel the mere seeker after marvels, cannot be expected to convince every reasonable searcher after truth; and no one (as I have remarked before) can fix the precise amount of testimony which a candid mind is bound to regard as adequate. And we accept this view of the position rather as an incentive than as a discouragement. For we are fortified by the belief that it is not so much the necessary material, as the combined effort to render it available, that has hitherto been lacking. Even the record now presented, as I have pointed out, is drawn from the comparatively small number of persons who have heard of our existence, and much of it from the limited circle of our own acquaintance. We are justified, therefore, in regarding the area hitherto explored as but a corner of a very much larger field, which may be gradually swept; and the very flaws in the present collection will have had their use, if they direct attention to the true standard of evidential requirements, and if through them future telepathic incidents stand a better chance of being caught at the critical moment, while the opportunities for investigation are complete.

§ 2. The commoner difficulties which hamper progress may, moreover, be expected largely to disappear, as time goes on. As the idea of Telepathy becomes understood, the difference will be more and more realised between facts which make for it and facts which do not; aid towards the establishment of some strong item of proof will not so often be refused on the ground that no proof is needed—that everybody has had presentiments fulfilled, or has occasionally guessed what his friend was thinking of; and efforts will be more profitably directed through the mere existence of a scheme into which the results may fall. And further, a rational public spirit in the matter may be trusted to develop. The reluctance to give any prominence to what are often legitimately regarded as very private experiences will gradually give way, when it is recognised that the significance of each item of evidence, even as matter for private contemplation, depends on the combination of many items; and among those who take this wider view, fewer will shrink from the direct attestation which alone can ensure the result that they profess to desire, and which they would readily give to any other sort of fact in heaven or earth that they truly believed in. As for the merely negative difficulties—the general grounds of objection to our work—we see them already diminishing from the mere spirit of the age. The set of that spirit is very observably towards a wider tolerance—a distrust of finalities and restrictions, by whatever party imposed, and a faith in free inquiry, wherever it may lead. Men are already ceasing to argue that the alleged facts *did* not happen because they *could* not happen; or that telepathy is perhaps not true, and, therefore, if true, is not important; or that the recognised paths of labour, along which steady progress is being made and may still be made to an unpredictable extent, are so various and abundant that it is mere trifling to desert them for a dubious track, where progress, even could it be supposed possible, would still be a useless anachronism.

§ 3. But though “psychical research” is certain in time to surmount ridicule and prejudice, and to clear for itself a firm path between easy credulity on the one side and easy incredulity on the other, the rate of its advance must depend on the amount of sympathy and support that it can command from the general mass of educated men and women. In no department should the democratic spirit of modern science find so free a scope: it is for the public here to be, not—as in anthropological researches—the passive material of investigation, but the active partici-

pators in it. We acknowledge with warm gratitude the amount of patient assistance that we have received—how patient and forbearing in many instances, none can judge who have not tried, as private individuals, to conduct a system of strict cross-examination on a wide scale. But unless this assistance is largely supplemented, our undertaking can scarcely hold its ground. Its interest must not for a moment be supposed to be of the merely curious sort, sufficiently illustrated in a loose batch of more or less surprising facts; indeed, so far as the facts excite surprise, it is a proof that the work is only beginning. If the natural system includes telepathy, Nature has certainly not exhausted herself in our few hundreds of instances: that these facts should be genuine would be almost inconceivable if she had not plenty more like them in reserve. And here is the practically interesting point; for, till the general fact is universally admitted, the several items of proof must ever tend to lose their effect as they recede further into the past. This peculiarity of the subject cannot be gainsaid, and must be boldly faced. For aught I can tell, the hundreds of instances may have to be made thousands. If the phenomena cannot be commanded at will, the stricter must be the search for them: if they are exceptionally transient and elusive, all the greater is the importance of strong contemporary evidence. The experimental work needs to be, and easily might be, enormously extended: for many a year to come the spontaneous phenomena must be as diligently watched for and recorded as if each case stood alone in its generation. And whatever the defects of the present attempt, so far as it supplies an impulse or lends an aid in either of these directions, it will not have failed in its object.

_ I should be glad to extend my statistics of sensory hallucinations in general, by canvassing another known number of persons taken at random. (See Chap. XIII.) Readers who may feel disposed to help me in this matter, and who will write to 14, Dean's Yard, S.W., will receive the necessary forms and instructions. But apart from a special census, I should be grateful for accounts of such phenomena from any persons who have themselves had experience of them. The assurance that they are not things to be troubled about, and are compatible with perfect bodily and mental health, may perhaps remove any disinclination that might be felt to recording instances. The names of informants will, of course, be held private.

NOTE, BY MR. MYERS, ON A SUGGESTED MODE
OF PSYCHICAL INTERACTION.

§ 1. It is with some hesitation that I lay before the public the speculations contained in the following essay. They may seem, I fear, both over-bold and over-complex ; and even the reader who follows them with a provisional adhesion will find that if he gains in width, he will lose in clearness of vision ; while the conception of telepathy as a relatively-simple mode of colligating certain obscure phenomena will give place to a view in which the old problems loom larger than ever, though, perhaps, with some inter-relations made manifest which have not hitherto been observed.

But in reply to the objection of rashness I must ask my readers to distinguish between results unanimously arrived at, on the strength of definite experiment and explicit testimony, by a group of painstaking persons, and the speculations of one of their number, to which the rest stand uncommitted, and which he offers tentatively, as the mere preliminaries of what may in time become a surer view. And to the objection of complexity I answer that my hypothesis is free at least from the one unpardonable sin of hypotheses : it is not certainly unverifiable,—at least it may prompt experiment and direct observation.

I shall assume in the following pages that the reader has already mastered the general drift and purport of these volumes. And, perhaps, I can best introduce my own view by dwelling first on a difficulty in our recorded evidence which drove my own mind to seek for some wider solution.

§ 2. The reader, then, is aware that veridical phantasms—sounds or sights, that is to say, coincident with some death or crisis—have been treated in this work on the analogy of experimental thought-transference, as probably being in effect the externalisation of a telepathic impression,—the hallucinatory forms in which a feeling or idea transferred from the mind of a distant person embodies itself to the percipient's senses. In dealing with the simpler forms of phantasmal sight, sound, or other impression, this analogy seemed to hold good ; and we found, moreover, enough of

parallelism between telepathic hallucinations and the apparently casual and meaningless hallucinations of sane persons to suggest that telepathic phantasms were at least shaped by the percipient's mind, in the same manner as those delusive phantasms which the mind not only shapes, but presumably originates altogether.

All this, however, referred to phantasms perceived by one person only. On such a theory one would hardly expect that a phantasm would ever be perceptible to several persons at once; but rather that strangers in the company of the percipient would neither hear nor see anything,—would not be involved, at any rate, by mere local proximity in that message between according minds.

It was plain, however, that this question could not be answered *à priori*. It needed what had not hitherto been forthcoming, namely, a collection of observed instances large enough to allow of a tolerably wide induction. And the collection offered in these volumes—though it might with advantage be tenfold larger—does in fact offer some interesting statistical results which bear on this problem.

In the first place, it is noticeable that the great majority of phantasms occur to a percipient who is *alone*. And this fact accords well with our view that the subsidence of ordinary stimuli facilitates the development of the telepathic impression.

But when we come to the small residue of cases where several persons have been together when the phantasm occurred, we find a result equally unexpected and perplexing. For it will be found that in nearly two cases out of three the phantasm is perceived by all or most of the persons so situated that they would have perceived it had it been an objective reality. In about one case out of three it is perceived by one only of the persons present. And, as a further complication, when perceived by more persons than one, it is sometimes perceived more fully by some than by others;—both heard and seen, perhaps, by one, and only *heard* by another.

§3. Now this result seems at first sight equally inconsistent with the theory of the telepathic impulse as generating these hallucinations, and with the crude popular credence which attributes to “ghosts” some sort of tenuous materiality. For in the one case we might expect that the phantasm would rarely be perceptible to more than one person; in the other case that it would always be perceptible to all the persons present. The popular view—to take that first—lies so far outside the pale of any recognised scientific conceptions that strong evidence indeed would be needed to reconcile us to it. We are sometimes asked to believe that this body of ours—with its digestive system, &c., and all its traces of physical evolution—is interpenetrated with a “meta-

organism" of identical shape and structure, and capable sometimes of detaching itself from the solid flesh and producing measurable effects on the material world. Now that material effects should be produced by something which (like our own will), is only cognisable by us on its psychical side is not in itself an absurd supposition, though we have little evidence which goes to support it. But this hypothesis of a connate molecular "meta-organism" is at once grotesque and entirely insufficient. For it is precisely against this form of the ghost-hypothesis that the difficulty as to the *ghosts of clothes* has overwhelming weight. The apparition that stands before us, on this theory, is an objective thing; it has grown with our friend's growth, it is organic with his deathless vitality. Are, then, his dead habiliments alive also in the spirit? or how has the meta-organism accreted to itself a meta-coat and meta-trousers?

§ 4. But if we thus rule out of court the crudest explanation of a collectively-witnessed apparition, our next attempt must plainly be to explain it on the lines of telepathy, by extending in some way our hypothesis of a phantasmogenetic impulse conveyed directly from mind to mind. Now if A's phantom is witnessed by B and C together—and witnessed, as we are assuming throughout, without intimation thereof from one to the other by look or word—then it might seem simplest to assume that a separate telepathic impression passed from A to B, and from A to C, and was externalised by each of the percipients as a phantom of his own shaping. It has been shown, however, in Chap. XVIII., that the recorded cases will not always admit of this hypothesis. C is sometimes a stranger to A, and it is almost impossible to suppose that, had it not been for B's presence, he would have witnessed the phantom at all. In this difficulty, Mr. Gurney inclines to the view that in such a case the telepathic impression is primarily communicated from A to B, and gives rise to a hallucination in B's mind; and that this hallucination is then telepathically communicated from B to the other person or persons present. And this explanation, if we can accept it, seems to have the advantage of introducing as little as possible of fresh hypothesis into the psychic field.

§ 5. I do not, however, think that the evidence warrants us in pushing our theory quite so far in this direction. I do not feel justified in assuming that a mere hallucination—telepathically originated in the mind of B, the primary percipient—will be thus readily communicable, by a fresh telepathic transfer, to the minds of other persons in local proximity. Hallucinations, however caused, are in themselves a tolerably distinct class of phenomena; and, since we know of several kinds that are *not* telepathic

in origin, we shall do well to inquire whether these have shown themselves communicable from the *halluciné* to his neighbours, without speech or suggestion of any kind. And it so happens that a good deal of competent observation has already been directed to this point. *Folie à deux*—the communicability of insane delusions—has been for the last quarter of a century a favourite topic of medical discussion.¹ Now in order that *folie à deux* should present a true parallel to the suggested infectiousness of telepathic hallucinations, which we are here discussing, it would be necessary to find cases where some vision or voice had been propagated from one mind to another without any verbal suggestion whatever. No such case, so far as I can find, is anywhere recorded; and no such case is reported to me by medical friends.² The nearest case is that of the Lochin family (see the first note below), but there the attack of hallucinations was plainly of *toxic* origin, and though it ran much the same course with each of the poisoned persons, there is even here no proof that any one of them *caught* a definite hallucination from his neighbour's mind.

§ 6. It may, however, be suggested that medical writers, not being alive to the possibility of an unsuggested, or telepathic, infection, may have neglected to observe it, and that therefore some part of the infection for which they assume speech as of course the medium may in reality have taken place *without* speech, by telepathic transfer. To meet this point, let us consider what are the habitual conditions of the *contagion du délire*,³ as the French somewhat loosely term it.

According to Lasègue and Falret (with whom the other authorities virtually concur), the person thus infected (if not already a lunatic) must be inferior in intelligence to the original lunatic, must generally be a woman or a child, and must live long with the lunatic, apart from external influences. Moreover, the character of the delusion must itself be more or

¹ Besides some references given by Mr. Gurney, Vol. i., p. 458, see Brunet (*Ann. Méd.-Psych.*, 1875, Vol. xiv., pp. 337-357), and the specially interesting case of the Lochin family (*Ann. Méd.-Psych.*, 1882, Vol. ii.), reported by Dr. Reverchon; "*Les uns voient des fantômes, des chats noirs et blancs, des serpents; ils les montrent aux autres effarés.*" See also Dr. Savage's "Cases of Contagiousness of Delusions" (*Journal of Mental Science*, 1880-1, Vol. xxvi., p. 563), and Dr. Kiernam (*Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, October, 1880), for the communication of ideas of grandeur in asylums. I omit many minor references. In Dr. Jaccoud's *Dict. encycl. des sciences médicales* the reader is significantly referred from *Folie à deux* to *Persecutions*—the character of the great majority of these cases being thus indicated. On the whole, Lasègue and Falret's essay (*Œuvres de Lasègue*, Vol. i., p. 732) summarises the subject very completely. The latest work, Chpolsianski's *Analogies entre la folie à deux et la suicide à deux*, (Paris, 1885,) accords with what has been here said.

² Dr. Lockhart Robertson has kindly made inquiry for me from some specialist friends; and neither he nor they are cognisant of any such case. Nor are the authorities at Bethlem; as, indeed, Dr. Savage's essay, above referred to, plainly indicates.

³ The word *contagion* reminds us of the old stories of second-sight, communicable by the touch of the seer (see p. 189, note).

less reasonable; it must rest on real facts in the past, or intelligible fears or hopes for the future. The idea that a legacy has accrued, the idea that neighbours are malignant, is gradually instilled into a sane mind by the constant repetition of an untrue, but not conspicuously-absurd assertion. But even where this delusion includes some sensory elements, I can find, as I have already said, no evidence that any hallucinatory sight or sound has ever been described independently by two persons as occurring at the same moment. If, then, with all the predisposition that close relationship can give, with all the dominance of the hallucination in the affected mind, not even one other person seems ever to be telepathically impressed thereby, we may hesitate to assume that a veridical hallucination should be capable of telepathic transference to several bystanders.

Neither in *duration* nor in apparent *intensity* can the veridical hallucination claim to equal some of the morbid varieties. There are instances where the same illusory figure has persisted for months or years. Take, for instance, "Mr. Gabbage"—the persistent visionary tyrant of an unhappy American gentleman, who was, at any rate at first, in a state of undoubted sanity.¹ Constantly though he appeared, distinctly though he spoke, "Mr. Gabbage" was never seen or heard by anyone save the original sufferer.

Again, it is probable that no other hallucinations can rival in sheer intensity those which sometimes accompany the onset of an epileptiform attack. When the patient rushes furious through the room, which he sees full of flames, striking at the imaginary demons who bar his passage, then surely, if ever, the phantasies of the tumultuous brain might be expected to imprint themselves on the bystander. But although the shock of witnessing an epileptic fit will sometimes bring on a similar fit in patients thereto disposed, there is, I believe, no evidence whatever that the specific hallucination of the first sufferer ever communicates itself either to stable or to unstable brains.

Once more; there is a species of hallucination somewhat akin to telepathic hallucinations—nay, which is itself sometimes induced telepathically. I mean the hallucinations generated by the mesmeriser in the mind of his subject. Popular credence, as Mr. Gurney and I have elsewhere shown,² has much exaggerated the mesmerist's power of influencing his subject without verbal suggestion. But in a few cases—Mr. H. S. Thompson's and Dr. Pierre Janet's,³ for instance—an effect seems to have

¹ See M. Ribot's comments on this case of M. Ball's, *Maladies de la Personnalité*, p. 111.

² *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., Vol. iii., p. 416.

³ See the Additional Chapter at the end of this volume. In the strange and remote case of Councillor Wesermann (Vol. i., p. 102) it is not clear whether the distant "willer" was thinking at the time of *both* the persons to whom the phantasm of his creating appeared.

been produced on a subject at a distance without previous suggestion ; an action prompted or a hallucination provoked. Now, in no one instance does it appear that the effect thus telepathically produced has extended itself from the immediate subject to any other person.

§ 7. The analogies of morbid and of mesmeric hallucination are, then, as it seems, decidedly against its communicability. But these analogies are not in themselves conclusive. Apart from the distinctively morbid hallucinations of madness or epilepsy—on which physicians have almost exclusively dwelt—there are occasional cases of isolated hallucinations occurring in the experience of sane and healthy persons. It may be said that *these* afford a closer parallel to our telepathic hallucinations. If it can be shown that *these* are communicable, there will be some presumption that our veridical phantoms may be propagated by psychical infection too.

Now, Mr. Gurney has made a collection, far larger than had been previously attempted, of these casual hallucinations of the sane. His collection of nearly 600 cases of this kind (exclusive, of course, of the telepathic evidence in this book), when analysed with care, affords a basis of induction on which a few broad conclusions, at least, may safely be founded. All, however, that I mean to do here is to take one obvious empirical division. Some of these casual hallucinations resemble veridical hallucinations and some do not. In this latter class are included a number of purely fantastic or truncated visions of human or animal forms or faces, and visions of inanimate objects, patterns, &c. In the former class come visions of persons known or unknown, voices, lights, &c.

Now it appears that the great majority of these casual hallucinations are witnessed by one person only, other persons, if present, perceiving nothing. But there are cases in which several persons have shared the impression, and some of these cases Mr. Gurney has set forth in Chap. XVIII. What lessons do they teach ?

The most important characteristic that I see in them is this. They all of them belong to that class of casual hallucinations which at any rate *resemble* the telepathic cases. There are no collective hallucinations of truncated forms, of definite inanimate objects, or of patterns. They all represent persons known or unknown, lights, or voices.

I will defer for the moment the consideration of some of these figures or voices which are referred to dead persons. Taking those only which are conceivably, though not provably, referable to persons living or in the act of death, it seems to me that we have here just that kind of fringe of ambiguous cases which we should expect to find surrounding the cases where some distant agency is more clearly proved.

For if such a phenomenon as telepathy, such a cause or agency as

telergy, exists at all, we may surely suppose that it exists in many forms, and manifests itself in many operations, of which we have not at present any inkling whatever. While we may be able to reach a substantial agreement as to what phenomena may be regarded as almost certainly due to telepathy, we have no means at present of deciding positively what phenomena are *not* so due.

This, therefore, is a case where the evidential and the theoretical treatment of our subject cannot be made precisely to coincide. Mr. Gurney's primary object has been, and rightly, to treat the evidential case for telepathy with scrupulous fairness, to allow to chance-coincidence or to mere subjective hallucination every incident which cannot establish a strong claim to a supernormal character. So long as we are arguing the question whether telepathy exists or no, this rigid method is plainly needful. We must rest our argument on instances for which, taken cumulatively, any explanation except telepathy is conspicuously improbable.

But supposing the evidential point established, and that it is now not the mere existence, but the nature and limits, of telepathy which we are seeking to determine, we shall need to scrutinize our narratives in a somewhat different way. We shall have to consider not only whether there is *overwhelming* probability that any given case is telepathic, but also whether there is *sufficient* probability to oblige us to keep that explanation in view, and to refrain from using the case in support of other theories. Thus (to make my meaning clearer by an analogy) if it were our business to prove the existence of volcanic islets, we should not be entitled to base that proof on such doubtful instances as the much-debated islets of St. Paul. But, the existence of volcanic islets once established, we must not hastily exclude this dubious case from our category, or we may find that we are committing ourselves to a far more questionable theory—that of a lost Atlantis. Now the cases cited by Mr. Gurney as probably mere subjective hallucinations shared by several persons are assuredly not cases from which any argument for the operation of distant agency could be drawn. But if such agency be once admitted as a *vera causa*, it seems to me to be safer to ascribe these cases to its untraced and, so to say, casual operation, than to support by them a theory of collective hallucination which may easily be—and in other hands has been—pushed to a point at which it comes into real collision with ordinary experience, and needlessly confuses the canons of testimony.

We must remember that these phantasms do not occur to please us, or to satisfy our expectations, but rather (so far as we can tell) in accordance with some law affecting the psychical energies of the dying person. We need not, therefore, assume that our phantasmal visitors will always be

familiar or interesting figures. It is quite conceivable that persons may appear to us whom we have wholly forgotten ; and in fact in some of the cases in this book the identification of the figure has only followed upon subsequent information and reflection. Again, if, as certain cases seem to indicate, *locality* goes for a great deal in attracting or manifesting the phantasm, then figures may appear to us which we have never seen, but which represent some dying person who is attached to the house in which we live. And suggestions such as these, though at present merely speculative, seem to me to form an explanation of Mr. Gurney's cases less violent than that which calls on us to suppose that a mere casual subjective hallucination has a self-propagating power which hallucinations of an intenser and more lasting order do not appear to possess.

§ 8. Another class of cases which Mr. Gurney has advanced as illustrating the transferability of hallucinations consists of the occurrence to two or more persons of phantasms ostensibly connecting themselves with some person who is actually dead. I do not wish here to give any positive opinion as to the origin of such appearances. The question of phantasms of the *dead* introduces a whole series of evidential and metaphysical difficulties with which I am not here prepared to deal. But since we have expressly excluded such problems from the scope of this work, have expressly stated that our evidence is at present insufficient to guide us to a distinct opinion thereon, I cannot admit that any selection from these narratives can at present add force to the contention that *purely illusory* hallucinations, corresponding in no way to any reality outside the primary percipient, are readily communicable to the other persons present.

Since, then, an inquiry so widely-reaching as Mr. Gurney's collection of hallucinations has failed, in my view, to produce any clear cases of the communicability of illusory (or *falsidical*) hallucinations with which to supply the absence of any evidence thereof in previous records, I am driven to doubt whether such communicability can be safely assumed as a probable explanation of our cases where a veridical phantasm has been seen or heard by several persons at the same time.

§ 9. And having thus criticised my colleague's suggestions, I feel bound to produce a theory of my own, which, though confessedly unproven, may have the advantage of directing attention towards what seems to me the *nodus* of our present inquiry, and of suggesting experiments which may help us to a truer solution. I begin by following a clue which suggests itself at a very early stage of the experimental investigation.

Take the simplest possible case of thought-transference. A thinks of the word "cat" and B divines it. Now, here our habit is to call A the

agent and B the percipient ; terms which are practically the simplest, but which may have seemed to imply that all the *activity* involved in the phenomenon lay in A's tension of thought in keeping "cat" before his mind, and that B's *rôle* was a mere passive waiting for the telepathic impulse which carries the word or idea from A's mind into his own. And as we extend our series from the trivial experimental instances to the massive spontaneous instances of telepathy, we find the exhibition of energy on the agent's part—the receptive tranquillity on the percipient's part—becoming more and more conspicuous. When A, for example, is dying in battle, and B is asleep and dreams that he sees A dying, the psychical activity of the one, the psychical passivity of the other, seem to reach their maximum.

Let us try, however, to look a little deeper beneath the surface. When A thinks of *cat* and B guesses the word "out of A's mind," without the help of speech or gesture, then B, whether passive or not, is at any rate playing the part which requires the rarer qualifications. In a sense, no doubt, he is merely *perceiving*, but I need not say that perception itself is a form of activity. If we perceive more things than an oyster perceives, it is not because we are more passive than the oyster, but more active ; because activities of our ancestors' and our own have developed in us eyes which now discern distant objects with an effort so slight that we are scarcely aware of it. Similarly with the telepathic experiment. When B discerns the word *cat*, which most of us, with only his opportunities, could not discern by any amount of waiting and passivity, we must surely conclude that B is exercising some kind of capacity which we cannot exercise. This power, plainly, is not of what we term a *voluntary* kind ; it is not guided by B's normal or primary stream of consciousness. But (as I have tried elsewhere to show) there is reason to suppose that our normal consciousness represents no more than a *slice* of our whole being. We all know that there exist *sub-conscious* and *unconscious* operations of many kinds ; both organic, as secretion, circulation, &c., which are in a sense below the operations to which our minds attend ; and also mental, as the recall of names, the development of ideas, &c., which are on much the same level as the operations to which our minds attend, but which for various reasons remain in the background of our mental prospect. Well, besides these *sub-conscious* and *unconscious* operations, I believe that *super-conscious* operations also are going on within us ; operations, that is to say, which transcend the limitations of ordinary faculties of cognition, and which yet remain—not *below the threshold*—but rather *above the upper horizon* of consciousness, and illumine our normal experience only in transient and clouded gleams.

This is not the place to marshal the arguments which support this

thesis. But the thesis itself seems almost implied in the very conception of thought-transference. For in thought-transference we have two psychical phenomena, connected by an unknown chain of causation, which is certainly supernatural in character, and which contains at least some unconscious links.

§ 10. Let us, then, pursue this notion of some supernatural activity on the percipient's part. Let us treat it in the same way as we have treated the notion of the supernatural activity of the agent. We have credited the agent, A, in the "cat" experiment, with a certain power of impressing his thought on other minds. And we have proceeded to inquire how far—in voluntary experiment or in spontaneous emergence—this power can be found to go,—how complex the transmitted image may be. So far as voluntary experiment went, the answer has been somewhat doubtful, for self-transmissive projections of a hallucinatory image of oneself—such as those recorded in Vol. I., Chap. III.—have always, as it would seem, taken place during the agent's trance or slumber. The spontaneous cases, on the other hand, have been very numerous; cases, that is to say, where A, undergoing some shock or crisis, acts psychically in such a manner as to impress his presence on the minds of distant men.

Let us, then, ask similar questions with regard to the supernatural activity of the *percipient*. We have seen him thus far divining a word on which the agent's thought was concentrated, guessing a card on which the agent's eyes were fixed. Are there cases, experimental or spontaneous, where we find him doing more than this? sharing not a single idea only but a whole complex of ideas and perceptions in another man's mind? or supernaturally recognising an object on which no "agent's" eyes are looking? The answer to these questions would involve the whole evidence for induced or spontaneous *clairvoyance*. For the word *clairvoyance* may be used to indicate many forms of supersensory perception; of which one is what we may call *telepathic* clairvoyance, where the clairvoyant seems to be seeing with the eyes, perceiving with the senses, recalling with the memory, of another person; and another is what we may call *independent* clairvoyance, where the clairvoyant seems to visit scenes, or to discern objects, without needing that those scenes or objects should form part of the perception or memory of any known mind.

The topic of *clairvoyance*, though unavoidable in the present discussion, is open to serious objections from which *telepathy*, in our view, is free. For we have not ourselves succeeded in making any experiments which corroborate that induction of clairvoyance in sensitive subjects which many writers have alleged. And the light which our new knowledge

of telepathy throws on that testimony must doubtless modify it greatly—must reduce the scattered testimony which exists for *independent* clairvoyance to a bulk much smaller than its advocates have claimed. But, nevertheless, speaking not for my colleagues but for myself, I do consider the evidence for clairvoyance, both telepathic and independent, both induced and spontaneous, to be adequate to justify belief;¹ and, holding this view, I feel bound to take clairvoyance into account in any theoretic discussion of supernormal phenomena.

§ 11. And if we thus take into account the evidence for clairvoyance, we find a stream of new light let in on our conception of the *modus operandi* of telepathic perception. For it is a characteristic of the clairvoyant power that it is generally exercised when the normal powers of sensory percipience are in abeyance, during natural somnambulism, during morbid conditions of trance, or during the sleep-waking state induced by mesmeric passes. It seems as though this supersensory faculty assumed activity in an inverse ratio to the activities of common life.

Nor is this the only instructive analogy which the records of clairvoyance suggest. The mesmeric process, which appears to be the most effective way of inducing the clairvoyant state, does not consist of a mere inhibition of ordinary psychical activities. Whatever may be its true nature, it involves, at any rate, a *rapport* between the operator and the subject, a specialised relation between two minds, which sometimes seems to serve as the starting-point for a supernormal percipience on the part of the mesmerised subject which presently transcends the scope or content of the interrogator's mind altogether.

Let us return, then, to the consideration of our veridical hallucinations, bearing in mind these two peculiarities of clairvoyant perception; its exercise in apparently inverse ratio to the activity of normal faculties, and its capacity for being stimulated or evoked by some kind of psychical influence directed towards the clairvoyant subject from another mind.

§ 12. And we shall, perhaps, first observe how much of illumination is thus cast upon a large and perplexing class of telepathic dreams, those, namely, in which B is made aware of A's state, not as if by an entry of A's phantom into his bedchamber, but as if by an excursion of his own into the room where A is actually dying.

Dreams, as Mr. Gurney has amply explained, form only a very subsidiary part of the evidential case which we put forward. Taken alone,

¹ In the present state of the subject, I hold that a writer avowing such belief is bound to show cause for his apparent credulity; and this I shall hope to do on the earliest practicable occasion.

they could hardly prove telepathy ; rather they are themselves shown to be telepathic by the analogies of the more cogent evidence drawn from waking hours. But though evidentially a minor branch of our subject, they are, nevertheless, among the most *instructive* of psychical phenomena. They show us phantasms in the making ; they initiate us into sub-conscious processes of which waking hallucinations are, as it were, the final output or manufactured result.

But when we come to scrutinize the details of veridical dreams we find that amongst many where fantastic elements are commingled with the true, as though a central conception were embodying itself in the imagery which it found readiest to hand, there are some dreams where the scene seems to be described without such admixture, and much as it might have appeared to a real spectator.

Dr. A. K. Young's dream (case 142) is closely analogous to a case of so-called "travelling clairvoyance." Locality, personages, and actions seem to have been completely realised, and the violent blows delivered by Dr. Young as he lay asleep in bed are the precise parallel of the shivering, sweating, &c., frequently recorded of clairvoyants who are witnessing distant scenes of heat or cold. Noteworthy in the same sense is Mrs. Green's dream (case 138), where it seems as though the link of kinship, though without personal acquaintance, had directed the sleeper's clairvoyant vision to the scene of sudden death. In these cases it seems to me that to talk of the drowning women as the *agents* who affected Mrs. Green, the wounded tenant as the *agent* who affected Dr. A. K. Young, tends to obscure the real nature of the occurrence ; the deeper view being that the so-called percipient was in fact the agent or active personage, too ; and that the concurrent crisis of danger or death did but determine the direction, or the remembrance, of activities which the sleeper's unconscious self was exercising in the abeyance of waking function.

And if we follow up this hint, we shall note that in most cases where even a waking percipient is conscious of a distant scene, the sensation is accompanied by something like a momentary abstractedness, or even actual somnolence.¹ In Canon Warburton's case (No. 108) the sudden perception of a distant crisis, apparently occurring at that moment, wakes the sleeper from his doze. And if the various expressions used by the percipients of these clairvoyantly witnessed scenes, whether we have classed them as awake or asleep at the time, be compared together, we shall find that they agree in describing the experience as something unlike either dream-presence or waking presence in the suddenly-revealed locality, as giving a

¹ See, for instance, cases 24, 63, 109.

sense of a translation of the centre of consciousness, of a psychical excursion into a definite region of space.

Such expressions need imply nothing more than the manner in which this sudden extension of the psychical purview represents itself in the forms of ordinary thought. But they may aid in putting us on the track of a question which is, in my view, of profound importance. Is there evidence of any percipience on the part of others which corresponds to the clairvoyant's own sense of presence and action in the scene which is common to his mind and theirs? Readers of Chap. XVII. will have perceived that there *is* such evidence; and although the cases there given are not numerous, there are reasons (as I hope presently to show) why but a very small fraction of such experiences is ever likely to come to our knowledge.

Meantime, we must observe that in these reciprocal cases the condition and sensations of the percipient, who thus becomes an agent also—the clairvoyant who is himself discerned as a phantom in the scene where he conceives himself to be—are precisely similar to the condition and sensations of the clairvoyant whose vision affects no second person. Our agent, too, is in a fit of abstraction, or dreaming, or plunged in stupor as death draws nigh, when he produces on others the impression correlative to the impression which is being produced on himself.

§ 13. *Correspondently with clairvoyant perception there may be phantasmogenetic efficacy*;—this, as it seems to me, is a sound induction from our recorded cases, and an induction which, if thoroughly grasped, will modify profoundly our comprehension and classification of the evidence before us. For, speaking broadly, our “phantasms of the living” will consequently tend to arrange themselves into two main classes, classes which are themselves linked in more ways than one; namely, the class in which the phantasm may be considered as the emergence or externalisation, in and by the percipient's mind, of an impression transmitted from a distant agent, and the class in which the phantasm may be considered as corresponding to the conception in the mind of a clairvoyant percipient,—who is thus also an agent,—of his own presence and action in a scene which he shares with the persons who are corporeally present therein.

§ 14. And thus we have reached a point at which what seemed the unique difficulty involved in collective hallucinations is not indeed *explained*, but is seen as merely a special case which we can subsume under a higher generalisation. What I mean is this; that if the appearance, say, of Mr. Newnham to Mrs. Newnham (case 35) or of Mrs. Smith to her friend (case 306) is held proximately to depend on their own perception of their

own presence in the scene where their phantasm is observed, it becomes then a subsidiary question whether only one, or some, or the whole group of the persons of whose consciousness that scene forms a part, perceive such phantasm or no. And this subsidiary question, again, resolves itself into a special case of the larger question which meets us throughout the whole inquiry,—the question as to the causes of varying idiosyncratic receptiveness of phantasmal impressions. There will be no need to assume, as Mr. Gurney is inclined to do, a direct infection of hallucination from one primary percipient to neighbouring minds. Still less shall we need to explain such cases as Nos. 242 and 355 by the strange hypothesis that an idea, partly or altogether latent and undeveloped in the mind of the primary percipient, did nevertheless propagate itself from thence and emerge into full externalisation for a person to whom the distant agent was wholly unknown. For we shall be able to conceive it as possible that all the persons in the room may be equally favourably situated for the discernment of that phantasmal correlate which represents or accompanies, in some way unknown to us, the clairvoyant percipience of the distant and dying man.

§ 15. At the cost of some cumbrousness of language, I have been careful to express my hypothesis in exclusively psychical—as opposed to physical—terms. I desire that the reader should clearly distinguish it from any view which implies a material or objective presence, of however tenuous a kind. I shall not, indeed, commit myself to the assertion that any such presence is impossible; or that there may not be some intermediate view between what seems to me the gross conception of a molecular *meta-organism*, already alluded to, and the purely psychical agency which is all that I postulate here. The line between the “material” and the “immaterial,” as these words are commonly used, means little more than the line between the phenomena which our senses or our instruments can detect or register, and the phenomena which they can *not*. And the whole problem of the relation of the psychical to the physical—of thought and will to space and matter—is forced upon our attention with startling vividness from the very beginning of this inquiry. At every step we find that familiar speculative difficulties assume a new reality; and that dilemmas which the metaphysician can evade, and the physicist ignore, present to the psychical researcher an imperative choice of one or the other horn.

In the present discussion, however, such difficulties can still be postponed. I shall confine myself to pointing out that since some even of the phantasms which are perceived by more than one person escape the perception of one or more of the bystanders, they cannot be objective in

any ordinary sense. And while they are regarded as entirely psychical incidents, the differentia of the view here advanced is still, I think, sufficiently plain. I treat the respective hallucinations of each member of the affected group as each and all directly generated by a conception in a distant mind—a conception which presents itself to that mind as though its centre of activity were translated to the scene where the group are sitting, and which presents itself to each member of that group as though their hallucinations did not come to them incoherently or independently, but were diffused from a “radiant point,” or phantasmogenetic focus, corresponding with that region of space where the distant agent conceives himself to be exercising his supernormal perception.

§ 16. This view is at any rate definite enough to suggest certain experiments which might test its probability in comparison with the view which assumes one primary percipient and a transference of hallucination, as though by a second telepathic process, from that primary percipient to his neighbours in space.

The most important experiment would be one which there is perhaps small chance of making; for it depends on the coolness and preparedness of several persons collectively witnessing a veridical hallucination. It might, for instance, have been carried out by Mrs. Elgee and Miss D. in the case (No. 348) which Mr. Gurney cites as one where “the flashing of the hallucination from one of the percipients to the other seems specially well illustrated, since the figure which appeared was one which the second percipient had never seen in the flesh.” In that case we have no independent account from Miss D., and the details are insufficient to show the relation between the hallucinations of the two persons. But let us assume, for the sake of argument, that a similar incident occurs to persons prepared to analyse it; that A’s phantom appears to B, who knows him, and also to C, who is in the room with B, but never saw A.

I will arrange an account of the imaginary scene in two ways; first, so as to illustrate Mr. Gurney’s “flashing of the hallucination from one of the percipients to the other”; and, secondly, so as to illustrate my own view of the diffusion of the hallucination to both minds similarly, in a manner conditioned by the agent’s conception of himself as present in a scene in which the two percipients are sitting.

(1) B sees the figure *first*, and thus develops the hallucinatory figure of A, clothing it with the dress in which he has most frequently seen A. C discerns the figure after B has done so, and either more vaguely or in the same garb in which B discerns it, or with peculiarities which may be traced to

C's own mind; at any rate, not introducing true points of resemblance to A, which have *not* been observed by B. Moreover, if B's hallucination represents A as facing him, C's hallucination takes a similar attitude, although C may be so placed with reference to the figure that, had it been A *in propria personâ*, C would have seen, not A's full face, but his profile or back. There is no distinct agreement between B and C as to the point of space which the phantom seemed to occupy, or as to its successive movements, or the time and mode of its disappearance. Such details as these, if occurring in the manner here suggested, would favour the supposition that C's hallucination was not the result of any direct transfer from A, but rather of a transfer from B of the hallucination to which B's mind had given shape.

(2) Now let us suppose that these little incidents occur in just the opposite manner. C perceives the phantom before B does, and perceives it with characteristic details of garb and appearance, some of which B fails to note. Moreover, when B and C are so placed that C would see the phantom's back, and B the phantom's face, were the phantom a real person in the place where B sees it, then they do see different aspects of the phantom accordingly. And they agree as to every detail of its garb, so far as observed, and as to its apparent position in space, its movements, and the mode of its disappearance. If the details of the hallucination were found to follow this type, there would seem to be strong reason for supposing that the impression on C's mind was not (so to say) reflected from B's, but that both alike corresponded to a more or less detailed, definite, and persistent conception on A's own part of his presence and action in the scene where his friend and the stranger were sitting. In that case the manner or distinctness with which the phantom was discerned by B and C respectively would depend on their relative power of supernormal percipience,—their psychical permeability,—though it will still be presumable that B's previous *rapport* with A, which has probably determined the direction which A's clairvoyant perception has taken, may also predispose or enable B to discern the phantom on some occasions when C cannot do so. On the other hand, if C's power of supernormal percipience greatly exceed B's, C may discern the phantom, though of a stranger, when B fails to discern it, though of a friend, as in cases 242 and 355, above mentioned.

§ 17. The occasions on which such observations as these are possible are likely to be almost as rare as eclipses. But, in the meantime, we may, at any rate, practise (so to say) with smoked glass. We have now the means of actually producing hallucinations at will in certain subjects by hypnotic suggestion, and a careful arrangement of conditions may throw

light on the modes of communicability of hallucination from one mind to another.

I will take first the simplest case, and will suppose that I am communicating a hallucination to several hypnotised subjects by direct suggestion. I say to the first: "There is a playbill on the wall; write down the name of the play advertised, but do not show it to anyone." He sees the imaginary playbill at my suggestion, and his own mind supplies the title of the play—say *Hamlet*. I simultaneously, or just afterwards, make the same suggestion to other subjects. Now if all of them see *Hamlet* advertised, the special form in which the first subject shaped his hallucination has probably influenced the rest. Even if they see *Othello*, *Macbeth*, &c., there has perhaps been a communication of the idea of Shakespeare. But if they see *Our Boys*, *The Private Secretary*, &c., then the specific form which the first subject's hallucination assumed has not exercised a shaping power over the impulses to hallucination which I have communicated to the other subjects.

Again, take a case of *deferred* hallucination, as when Professor Beaunis of Nancy told Mdlle. A., in the hypnotic trance, that she would see him call on her on January 1st at 10 a.m. Let a similar anticipatory idea be again impressed on Mdlle. A, and let it be provided that other persons, known to be susceptible, shall be in Mdlle. A's company when the hallucination falls due. It can then be seen whether they "catch it from her," so to say, by telepathic infection. Or if they fail to do so, the transference might be facilitated as follows. Mdlle. A might be led to expect Professor Beaunis' visit in a special dress, carefully impressed on her. The others might simply be told that the Professor would call at the hour determined. It might then be seen whether the hallucination which had been suggested to them in a comparatively vague form were rendered definite by infection from Mdlle. A's clearer perception of the phantasmal visitant, so that all alike saw him in the dress announced to Mdlle. A.

The subjects on whom such experiments as these can be attempted with success are at present few in number, and almost exclusively French. But the methodical zeal with which a group of French physicians are now pursuing this form of research renders it likely that fresh light will soon be shed on the genesis and development of hallucinatory percepts. Such theorising, therefore, as I am here attempting need not be premature, if it serves to suggest experiment, and to guide observation.

§ 18. But those who have followed me thus far will find that a further reflection is here naturally suggested. If in cases of *collective* hallucination we have seen reason to conjecture that there has been, not a mere series of

telepathic transferences of impression, but a presentation as a quasi-percept to several minds of a distant agent's conception of himself as present among them by a kind of psychical translation, then we can hardly suppose that this explanation is applicable to collective cases alone. The accident that some indifferent person shared with the primary friend the perception of the phantasm may enlighten us as to the mode in which that phantasm was generated, but cannot have itself determined that mode. Can we decide, then, for which of the apparitions seen by one person only our newly-suggested method of origination may most plausibly be invoked?

Much, I think, might be learnt from reviewing the whole series of our phantasms, while keeping in view the analogy of the alleged cases of experimental clairvoyance in the same way as the analogy of experimental telepathy has been kept in view in the preceding chapters. But such a task must be postponed till the evidence for clairvoyance itself shall have been subjected to a searching analysis. All that I can attempt here is to draw attention to two problems, already repeatedly touched on by Mr. Gurney, but capable of being discussed with profit from several points of view. I speak of the apparent garb and symbolism of phantasms, and of their attraction to special localities.

§ 19. The question of the clothes of ghosts—or the ghosts of clothes—is one which presents the relation between the material and the immaterial under a specially grotesque aspect. Theories which attribute any kind of materiality to the “White Lady” or “Grey Lady” herself, are apt to get inextricably entangled in her shadowy muslin. And apart from any definite theorising, the frock-coat or the flowered dressing-gown of the “spiritual visitant,” has seemed to many minds to destroy his dignity and interest—to be painfully incongruous with pure existences and a noumenal world. On the other hand, I need hardly, at this point, explain that on the hypothesis advanced in this book, this very mundaneness of the apparition is precisely what was to be expected. For veridical hallucinations—like morbid hallucinations, though in a different sense—are the outcome of human minds; the form in which my friend's phantasm presents itself to me has been stamped thereon either by my friend's mind or my own. And it therefore would be strange if I phantasmally saw the dying man uncloded,—as I have never seen him in life; if he, in his last moments, pictured himself as he has never hitherto pictured himself in colloquy with his friends.

But granting the almost unavoidable supposition that the phantom will appear clothed—and clothed in some such way as either agent's or percipient's mind can suggest—questions remain which are among the most

important and the most difficult with which we have to deal. The clothes of apparitions are like the cartouches of Egyptian kings—they are hieroglyphs, in part seemingly arbitrary, in part obviously symbolical, which we must compare and decipher before we can arrange our processional figures by date and dynasty. For the most part these phantoms remain but for a moment, and are gone without speech or action before their astonished spectator has recovered from the shock of their approach. Sometimes their faces present some change or particularity, as of hair or beard, of pallor or injury, which in some degree identifies the moment of time, past or present, which that phantasmal visage tends to reproduce. But often such traces fail us. The witness gazes, not on some scarred and mangled form—*Priamiden laniatum corpore toto*—but on the unchanged aspect of a familiar friend. For most observers such recognition is enough, as it is enough for the devout worshipper to recognise in a picture the Madonna's face. Too soon the vision disappears—*iterum crudelia retro Fata vocant*—and what is left is the shock of loss, the memory of consolation. It is from no want of sympathy with those primary emotions that we must urge on the readers of this book the imperative need, should occasion be offered to them, of a minuter and calmer observation. Every detail of the phantasmal appearance has some meaning; and the points which the spectator accepts as subordinate and unimpressive may contain clues sought elsewhere in vain. Thus—to come at once to my present purpose—it is usual for a witness to say “he appeared to me in the dress he habitually wore, and in which I knew him.” In one sense these two clauses mean the same thing. But which of them is the really effective one? If A's phantom wears a black coat, is that because A wore a black coat, or because B was accustomed to see him in one? If A had taken to wearing a brown coat since B saw him in the flesh, would A's phantom wear to B's eyes a black coat or a brown? Or would the dress which A actually wore at the moment of death dominate, as it were, and supplant phantasmally the costumes of his ordinary days?

Those who have followed the cases cited in this book, and Mr. Gurney's comments thereon, will know that the answer to these questions is neither uniform nor clear. It is seldom that we can trust the percipient's memory of the details of his vision, and even when these details have been carefully noted their lesson is not easy to decipher.

We have, of course, as a starting point, the known fact that a man may have a purely subjective hallucination, and may clothe it in almost any fashion,—introducing items of dress which have never been consciously familiar to his mind. We may naturally begin, then, by assuming that, unless evidence to the contrary be forthcoming, it is from the percipient's mind that the dress or other imagery of the phantom is

drawn. Let us see whether there are any cases where this seems clearly indicated by the particulars of the dress itself.

Suppose that the dying A appears to B, habited in hat and coat, though in point of fact he is in bed at the time. Must we not here say that B's mind has furnished the setting of the figure, and that nothing beyond the mere impression of a personality comes from A himself?

No; this deduction would be insecure. For it assumes that if the agent projects a developed phantom of himself,—a conception of himself, that is to say, which B's mind externalises as a phantom,—he will necessarily project it as though clad in the garments which he is wearing at the time. But we have no grounds for assuming this. Just as B may imagine A as wearing a familiar greatcoat, so may A imagine himself as wearing that coat, whatever be his actual dress at the time.

Suppose that we dream of calling on a friend. In most cases we dream of ourselves as in ordinary walking attire. It is only rarely that we dream of entering a drawing-room *in tiefem nêgligé*, as the Germans put it,—an obscure sense of one's actual condition entering, with disastrous incoherence, into the feebly co-ordinated story of one's dream.

Now, if we are comparing these veridical hallucinations to objectified dreams, we must at least allow for the chance of the dream being the agent's own; we must not assume that it is always—so to say—*dreamt for him* by the person to whom he appears. Whatever the agent's actual dress at the time, all the cases where he appears merely in his usual costume must be set aside as neutral. We cannot press them to prove the origin of the figure in either the one or the other mind.

Is there, then, any feature to which we can point as undoubtedly due to the workings of the *percipient's* mind? anything in the associations of the dress? or in the special symbolism of the apparition? It is plain that *associations* attaching to A's dress must be common to A as well as to B. Suppose that B saw the dying A habited in a coat which A wore at B's wedding, or at some other epochal moment in B's life. It must still be remembered that that same moment was epochal to A also, in so far as his relation to B was concerned, and that its conscious or unconscious memory may influence A's conception of himself as bidding B a last farewell. Similarly, a man who recalls his acts of homage to Royalty vaguely feels himself in Court dress; a man who imagines himself talking to a hunting acquaintance has a slight sense—what is called a "phantom" sense—of being on horseback.

And this ambiguity, I think, attaches to the few cases in which, as Mr. Gurney urges, the "ghosts of *old* clothes," in which the phantom appears, indicate the percipient's memory as the source of that investiture.

In Colonel and Mrs. Bolland's case (201), a scrutiny of the dates and facts given will show that we have no reason to regard Ramsay's clothes as *old*,—as otherwise than still the suit in which he would be likely to imagine himself as calling on a former mistress. In case 200, a brother delirious in Australia, and fancying himself at home, appears to his sister on the lawn, "dressed as he usually was when he came home from London, not as he was when he left home, nor as he could be in Australia, nor as I had ever seen him when walking in the garden." Surely all that this dress implied was the idea of a traveller's *home-coming*, which was at any rate the dominant one in the brother's ravings. Had it been his wonted garden costume, then to my mind the dress, though still ambiguous, would have looked more probably referable to the sister's shaping imagination.

In a third and fourth case, (No. 202, and p. 546, second note,) there is an admixture of unexplained grotesqueness, (the lady in a carriage, the boy "enclosed, as it were, in a dark cellar"), which seems to remove these cases into the category next to be considered, namely, where the phantasmal figure is accompanied by *symbolism*, whose origin we have to ascribe to one or the other mind. Such symbolism, as Mr. Gurney has pointed out, is usually referable to some "mental habit or tradition," which is probably common to both the minds concerned. One can, of course, imagine a case where the symbolism should be such as the *percipient's* mind alone would be likely to think of; as if, for instance, the "thousands of angels as tight as they could be packed," which (in case 207) are seen surrounding a departed Christian friend, had formed the symbolic escort of a pronounced Agnostic.

§ 20. But in default of such narratives as this, the cases where the influence of the percipient's idiosyncrasy seems most marked are those where the same percipient has a recurrent symbolical dream, coincident on each occasion with a death or other marked occurrence. We have a few such cases, but in the most remarkable of them (No. 131) the form of the dream is not exactly idiosyncratic, but rather takes on a form with which students of folk-lore are already familiar. The traditions of folk-lore, it may be remarked, form a kind of *endemic symbolism*, in which both morbid and veridical hallucinations tend to clothe themselves. In some cases we have found a community of Celtic fishermen, or the like, so deeply impregnated with traditions of this kind that we cannot accept their accounts of corpse-candles, &c., though supported by apparent coincidences of fact, as of real evidential value. We are obliged, that is to say, to treat such a community as subject to casual hallucinations, which detract from the importance of such coincidences with objective fact as do from time to time occur. It is

only in some of the remoter regions of Wales and Scotland that we have found superstitions of this sort active and definite. But the tendency to the recurrence of some special symbolism—symbolism of which the percipient may never remember to have heard—among the dreams of educated persons, reminds us sometimes of the sporadic endemicity of certain traditions of folk-lore, of which this very tendency may be itself the proximate cause.

In our present collection, however, we have included very little of such symbolism, and to what there *is* we can assign no certain origin in agent's or percipient's mind.

§ 21. On the whole, then, it seems that we have few indications in the dress or other surroundings of fully-developed veridical phantoms which point conclusively to an origin in the *percipient's* mind. Are there instances, on the other hand, which yield the *reverse* indication? that is, where the dress or imagery seems manifestly traceable to the mind of the *agent* himself?

Such indication may conceivably be given in two main ways. The agent's dress or aspect at the moment may be phantasmally reproduced; or there may be symbolism, not vague or traditional in character, but plainly adapted to communicate some information known to the agent alone.

Of the first of these classes the reader will have observed a good many examples. There are, first of all, the phantoms in night-dress. In one or two cases (*e.g.*, No. 563,) these are apparitions of persons whom the percipient knows to be dying, and the white dress might, therefore, be suggested by the percipient's mind. But in other cases (see especially No. 214) there is no expectation of the agent's death, and the dress astonishes the percipient by its incongruity.

Still more remarkable are the cases where the dying man appears in a dress which he is actually wearing at the moment, although it is not such as is usually associated with death-beds. The case of Dr. Bowstead (No. 212), commented on by Mr. Gurney, may serve as a type of this class. In such a case as that (to anyone who believes that more than mere chance is involved), it must surely seem more probable that the dress of the phantom was the creation of the dying man's mind rather than of the mind of the boy to whom that phantom appeared. And it is observable that while such evidence as points to the percipient's part in shaping these figures is indirect and inferential, the evidence which points to their full-blown projection from the agent's mind is often as direct and unmistakeable as any evidence on such a point can be expected to be.

§ 22. Next as regards the symbolism which accompanies the figure. The commonest case of symbolism—if such it is to be called—consists in the wet clothes of the apparition of a drowned man. There is possibly something in death by asphyxiation which (as it seems to revive past memories with unusual vividness) predisposes also to telepathic action. At any rate, we have a good many of such cases, and there seems almost always to be some specific indication of the manner of death. “Dripping with water,” “his hair wet,” “pale, sad, and wet,” “looking half-drowned,” such are the phrases which recur. The distinctive mark here is very simple—it may be said to be nothing more than a translation into visibility of the idea “He is drowning.” We might, therefore, suppose that it had perhaps originated in the percipient’s mind. But this view is rendered less plausible by the cases where the apparition presents more detailed marks of accident, change, or disease, as the wound on the chest in case 210, the trembling and pallor in case 527, the grey hair in case 194, and the complex and partly symbolical aspect of the phantom in case 25. It is worth remarking that “N. J. S.” (case 28), who looked carefully at the details of his apparition, is of opinion that the walking-stick which his friend held (but which “N. J. S.” never remembered to have seen him using) was symbolical, and meant to imply departure and a farewell. The case (No. 514) of the lady seen with a lock of hair cut off and a “peculiar light upon her,” presents a somewhat similar mixture of true reproduction and symbolism; and the extraordinary narrative of Sengireef (No. 449), which throughout resembles an extravagant dream, shows that the phantom presented some details (of beard, &c.) which were true and unknown to the percipient. My view in that instance is that the dream in reality was not Madame Aksakoff’s, but Sengireef’s; that its insane strangeness was the reflection of the confused clairvoyance of a delirious monomaniac. With this last case I should compare No. 349: the difference being that here, instead of the sombre wildness of the fanatic, we have the devout aspiration of the Catholic boy. I should explain, that is to say, the figure of St. Stanislaus as the reflected embodiment of a dying dream.

I have said enough, perhaps, to enable the reader to form his own judgment on this point from the cases recorded in these volumes. On the one hand, if he accepts our general argument as to the connection of purely subjective and veridical hallucinations, he will recognise that there is a certain *à priori* likelihood that the details of the hallucination will be found to emanate from the *percipient’s* mind. And he may be disposed to follow Mr. Gurney in classing dubious cases by this presumption; in ranking as exceptional the narratives where the details seem plainly derived from the mind of the *agent*. If, on the other hand, he views the cases which I have mentioned (and many others which resemble them) in

the light in which I have tried to place them, he may recognise that when the apparition does present any distinct details, these are almost always such as the agent's mind might most naturally have supplied; and that this fact suggests a doubt as to whether there may not be something more than a simple telepathic impulse involved;—whether the obscurer agency of clairvoyance must not here be invoked;—an analogy suggesting that certain modes of supernormal percipience and self-realisation in a distant scene may produce upon the persons placed in that scene an impression as of the actual presence of the clairvoyant among them, in a manner corresponding to his own momentary conception of himself.

§ 23. Connected, in a certain way, with the symbolism of which we have been speaking, is another point of interest in these phantasmal appearances. I mean the difficulty which is sometimes felt in recognising them.

To begin with, it is no doubt possible to suppose that the percipient's mind builds up the hallucination, so to say, from some unconscious stratum, so that the conscious self does not at the first moment understand the figure presented. This would be a form of gradual development of the quasi-percept which could be paralleled both from ordinary dreams and from automatic writing. I cannot, indeed, find that purely subjective hallucinations ever develop themselves in this way. Yet I should myself see no real difficulty in applying this explanation even to cases where the recognition wholly fails at the time, and is only effected afterwards by conscious reflection. Such a case would resemble the anagrams which an automatic writer will sometimes commit to paper,¹ without understanding at the time what are the words which his unconscious self has thus concealed in a meaningless group of letters.

But, nevertheless, some of the recorded particulars seem to point to the simpler explanation—namely, that the phantom's details were developed independently of the percipient's mind, and that the figure merely failed in making itself known to him. Sometimes, for example, the percipient looks attentively at the figure, but mistakes it for some one who resembles the person whom the figure is afterwards found to represent.² Sometimes the phantom which the percipient fails to recognise represents a person whom he might equally have failed to recognise in the flesh.³ Sometimes a call is *repeated*, as if in insistent appeal.⁴ And there are a few cases,—we could not expect many,—where a percipient has seen a figure wholly unknown to him, but which he has afterwards been able to identify by circumstantial evidence. Such are cases 544 and 215. Under

¹ See *Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. ii., p. 226, &c.

² See cases 170 and 171.

³ See cases 189 and 241.

⁴ See especially case 508.

this category, too, comes the singular apparition detailed in case 30, whatever explanation we may prefer to give to it.

Cases like these incline me to think that we are still in danger of an old error in a modified form,—the error of attributing too much importance to the person who sees the phantom, because his account of the matter is the only one which we can get. We are, indeed, no longer affected by the crude emotional form of this mistake,—as when the percipient considers the apparition to be a breach of natural laws permitted expressly in favour of himself. But our own conception of the apparition as the result of a telepathic transference of impression from the one to the other mind is apt, I think, to obscure the possibility of generative causes quite apart from any pre-existing *rapport* between the two persons.

§ 24. Thus, to proceed to the next point which I had selected for notice, it seems to me that the attraction which determines the phantasmal presence is sometimes *local* rather than *personal*. This apparent influence of a certain locality may be observed in several different stages. In some cases the phantasmal visitor appears to an acquaintance with whom he has some slight link, and who is also in a spot to which the dying man is attached. Here the telepathic impulse may have been facilitated by the familiar locality. But in a few cases, as already mentioned, the dying man appears to persons with whom he is in no way acquainted. And I believe that in every clear instance of this kind there has been a local attraction, a reason which draws the dying person to that house or field, irrespective of the living persons who may be there at the moment.

Case 666 is a good example of what I mean.¹ But at the same time it warns me to press my argument no further. For just as in certain dreams, already mentioned, we discerned the point of contact between thought-transference and clairvoyance, so in this appearance, (as it may seem to have been,) of a dying person to the casual inhabitants of her former home we have the point of contact between the topic of this work and the evidence which bears on the *haunting* of particular spots. To the clairvoyance, when thus confronted with it, I felt able to express a distinct adhesion. But as to the haunting I have no equally clear opinion.

Now it is probable that what appears to us as local attraction may sometimes be a mere phase of psychical *rapport*. To explain my meaning,

¹ See also case 29, where the phantom would appear to have been more probably interested in a tomb round which the dying person's eccentric thoughts had so often revolved, than in the ex-gardener who chanced to pass through the familiar churchyard; and case 211, where the dying man seems to have been wishing to see Mr. L., in whose drawin-groom the phantom appeared, not Miss L., who chanced to be present there. Case 192 is similar.

let us assume that all minds whatsoever are telepathically connected, in such a manner that the existence of any given conception in any mind throws that mind into connection with every other mind in which that conception exists at the moment. Let us further suppose that at the hour of death this faint potential *rapport* is quickened in the same way as the more permanent and individual forms of *rapport* with which we have mainly had to deal. Then when a man dies *et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos*, this remembrance of his early home may bring him into telepathic relation with the stranger now living there, and that stranger may discern the dying man's phantom merely because the two minds are simultaneously occupied with an identical conception.

This view, which is practically held by Mr. Gurney, seems to me to express what is probably some part of the truth. I conceive that, if telepathy be a fact, something of diffused telepathic percolation is probably always taking place. This at least is what the analogy of the limitless and continuous action of physical forces would suggest. If I lift my little finger I affect, like Zeno's sage, the whole universe by my act. I apply a *vis a tergo* to atoms which, for aught I know, may send my push rolling on to the Pleiades. Or again, the heat, part of which I can by an effort concentrate on an apple in my hand, is in fact radiating continuously from all my organism, and fastest in the direction of readiest conduction. And similarly it is not unreasonable to suppose that the same telergy which is directed in a moment of crisis towards a man's dearest friend, may be radiating from him always towards all other minds, and chiefly towards the minds which have most in common with his own.

Yet it seems to me that this is not enough wholly to explain our cases of local attraction. Before we can assume that any perceptible telepathic impact can follow the lines of so transitory and contingent a *rapport* as that implied, for instance, by Mr. Bard's presence in Hinxton Churchyard, in case 29, we ought, I think, to have some case where a phantom has appeared to B without previous acquaintance, on the ground of some community of ideas and interest between the two, unconnected with any special locality. Now, so far as I know, there is not, among our cases recognised as telepathic, a single incident of this kind.

§ 25. Here, then, we are again met by this perplexing problem of the relation of psychical operations to space; and although, as already said, I shall avoid any attempt at its discussion in this work, the reader will probably recognise that some such hypothesis as that of an independent clairvoyant perception of the dying man's, reflected in a correspondingly-localised hallucination for other minds, is strongly suggested by such narratives as these.

There is, however, an obvious difficulty in this view which must be discussed before we go further. I have spoken repeatedly of acts of clairvoyant percipience on the dying man's part, corresponding to the location and movement of the apparition which the distant friend discerns. But where is the evidence of this clairvoyant percipience? Ought we not to have the dying man's testimony that he saw his friend as well as the friend's testimony that he saw the dying man? Ought not the mass of our cases, in this view, to be *reciprocal*? and is not that type, in fact, of very rare occurrence in our collection?

The difficulty seems formidable; but there is, I think, a sufficient and an instructive reply. To put it in a sentence, the recollection of an act of clairvoyance is itself an occurrence as rare as is the perception of an apparition; it involves the same difficult translation of a quasi-percept from the supernatural to the normal consciousness. The very act of clairvoyance presupposes a psychical condition as far removed as may be from the stream of every-day sensation. The clairvoyance alleged to have been induced by direct experiment, as by mesmeric passes and the like, seems hardly ever to have been remembered by the subject on waking. So also the clairvoyance, on a smaller scale and more resembling hyperæsthesia, which has shown itself in certain cases of spontaneous somnambulism, seems rarely to persist into the normal memory. And, speaking generally, all supernormal operation (so far as we can at present tell) tends to form a secondary memory of its own, alternating with, or apart from, the memory of common life.

In order, then, that a "reciprocal" case may occur—a case in which A remembers to have had a clairvoyant perception of B and B's environment, while B also has perceived A's phantasm at approximately the same time—two chances have to concur, two difficulties to be surmounted,—the difficulty on A's part of recollecting his clairvoyant percipience, and the difficulty on B's part of externalising into memorable distinctness the corresponding impression conveyed to him. And we may expect that it will be hard to get a complete or stable account of so hazardous a transmission as this,—a kind of signalling between boats one of which expects no signal, and which come in sight of each other only when they both chance to be riding for a moment on the crest of a wave.

§ 26. Nay, more; in most cases the signalling boat can only produce a momentary flash, and sinks to the bottom directly after. In other words, the agent *dies*; and if indeed he has enjoyed a clairvoyant percipience of B (who saw his phantom), he at any rate cannot return and tell us. The great bulk of what might have been evidence to the reciprocity of supernormal percipience is thus destroyed at a blow.

Not even here, however, need we abandon all hope of getting at some fragments of evidence. The last words, the last gestures of dying men, which have been noted so eagerly by many a religious, and many a self-seeking bystander, may have for us an interest unconnected either with their form of creed or with their testamentary dispositions. Nothing, perhaps, has been so little looked for at death-beds as the special indications which we desire,—indications not of a first perception of another world, but of a last of *this*. Yet there are scattered tokens of some such supernatural percipience on the part of dying men, which carry us from mere vague expressions to distinct statements as to the distant person who has been clairvoyantly seen. Thus in case 309 the dying woman's statement is merely to be noted in connection with others of more weight. Case 296 must either be dismissed as a mere coincidence, of a very extraordinary kind, or accepted as an almost typical instance of what might, on my hypothesis, be expected to occur. Case 303 points in the same direction. Case 683, though well attested, is one whose *bizarrerie* may disincline the reader to attach to it the weight which I think that it ought to carry. On looking closer the reader will see that there are other features in that account besides mere grotesqueness; features which are very unlikely to depend upon any failure, or any embellishment, of memory. And if, as I am disposed to believe, what is there implied did actually occur, few words of men momentarily recalled from death have had a stranger significance.

Then we come to cases where there is a distinct statement of the dying person's. In this connection, case 354 seems to me important. It is remote, no doubt; but Miss W. has herself told me, with an earnestness that I cannot doubt, that it was, in a sense, the turning incident of her life, having excited a very marked influence on her character. Then there is case 612, and the parallel example given in the note on that case. Now I do not say that it is impossible that any one of these cases may have been merely subjective on the one part, though veridical on the other; so that Miss W's. dying aunt, for instance, only fancied that she saw her niece, while the niece did actually behold a phantom of her aunt at a corresponding time. But I doubt whether many minds will rest at this point precisely. Those who believe in the reality of the one experience will probably believe in the reality of the other; remembering that a dying person's object is not to collect evidence, and that it must be a mere chance whether he mentions any incident which can vouch to others for the genuineness of his clairvoyant perception.

I will conclude this section with a narrative whose accuracy there is no reason to doubt, though, on the other hand, it contains no complete proof of anything beyond a mere subjective hallucination. It finds therefore, no

place in our array of evidence ; but it will have an interest to those who have followed the present argument, as illustrating an occurrence which, in my view, must probably often take place, though it can seldom leave any record behind it. For here we have an account of that side only of the reciprocal incident which is usually lost to human knowledge altogether ;—I mean of the supernormal percipience of a man in the very article of death ; while there is no record of any corresponding sound or vision as experienced by those to whom he seemed to pay his visit of farewell.

Dr. Ormsby writes as follows from Murphysborough, Illinois.

“ April 22nd, 1884.

“ I received my degree from Rush Medical College, Chicago, Ill., at the close of the session 1857-8, and having said so much will proceed to give you as clear and complete a statement of the occurrence to which you allude as I can. Early in February, 1862, the 18th Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, of which I was Assistant-Surgeon, was ordered from Cairo to join in the attack on Fort Henry. The surgeon went with the regiment, and left me with the sick in the Regimental Hospital—about 30—among whom was Albert Adams, sergeant-major of the regiment. He was an intelligent and estimable young man, who had recently been in attendance, and I think graduated at a Literary College. I had removed young Adams from the hospital proper to a room in a private house—one that had been quite large—but a smaller room had been partitioned off at one end with a board partition, which was, I think, canvassed and papered ; and in the smaller room so partitioned off was my wife, who is now, besides myself, the only person who heard the speaking whose whereabouts I know. Seeing the young man would die, I had telegraphed, and his father came at 4 or 5 p.m. During all the afternoon he could only speak in whispers, and at 11 p.m. he to all appearance died. I was standing beside his father by the bed, and when we thought him dead the old man put forth his hand and closed the mouth of the corpse (?), and I, thinking he might faint in the keenness of his grief, said ‘ Don’t do that ! perhaps he will breathe again,’ and immediately led him to a chair in the back part of the room, and returned, intending to bind up the fallen jaw and close the eyes myself. As I reached the bedside the supposed dead man looked suddenly up in my face and said, ‘ Doctor, what day of the month is it ?’ I told him the day of the month, and he answered, ‘ That is the day I died.’ His father had sprung to the bedside, and turning his eyes on him, he said, ‘ Father, our boys have taken Fort Henry, and Charlie’ (his brother) ‘ isn’t hurt. I’ve seen mother and the children, and they are well.’ He then gave quite

comprehensive directions regarding his funeral, speaking of the corpse as 'my body,' and occupying, I should think, as much as five minutes. He then turned towards me, and again said, 'Doctor, what day of the month is it?' and when I answered him as before, he again repeated, 'That's the day I died,' and instantly was dead. His tones were quite full and distinct, and so loud as to be readily heard in the adjoining room, and were so heard by Mrs. Ormsby. Now, this is very remarkable, but perhaps little more so than the fact (which is true) that I have forgotten the day of the month on which it occurred.

(Signed) "O. B. ORMSBY, M.D."

In reply to some questions referring to a briefer account first given, Dr. Ormsby writes on December 28th, 1883 :—

"The fort was taken and the brother uninjured, as I learned when a few days afterward I went forward to the regiment. I never learned whether or not that which was said of the family was correct. The name of the soldier was Albert Adams, a young man of unexceptionable moral character and good education. He was then sergeant-major of his regiment. I understand that his father has been dead several years. I do not now recollect what other parties were present in the room besides myself and the young man's father, though there were several, but as we were almost strangers to each other, and soon separated, I could not expect to be able to trace them. The young man occupied a room, not in the hospital proper, which was crowded, but in a private dwelling where he could have the entire room. The next room, communicating with this by a door, I occupied as a sleeping room, and my wife, who was then on a visit, was in that room, with the door closed. I have just asked her whether she heard the words of the dying soldier, and she answers that she did, informing me that the partition between the rooms was of boards, papered, and that young Adams, instead of saying 'Our forces,' &c., said 'Our boys.' I learned nothing of any wraith or appearance to anyone.

(Signed) "O. B. ORMSBY, M.D."

§ 27. But apart from these cases where the evidence is barred by death, there are many others, as I have already implied, where the agent-percipient—the man whose clairvoyant perception has given rise to a corresponding hallucination in other minds—seems to be unable to recount his side of the experience simply because in his normal state he has forgotten it. In our rare narratives of a *voluntary* self-projection, this seems to have been the case on each occasion. The friend of the Rev. W. S. Moses, who appeared to him, (case 13,) had no recollection of the fact, but an unaccustomed headache may have been a trace of some forgotten psychical effort. In Mr. S. H. B.'s cases (Nos. 14, 15, and 16,) the

projection of the phantom was unremembered, and could only be effected during slumber, or if it was attempted during waking hours, the concentration of mind which was needed seemed to induce slumber.¹

§ 28. Passing from these voluntary cases to the spontaneous cases, I would ask the reader's attention, for instance, to case 100. From an evidential point of view, I agree with Mr. Gurney that, while regarding the case as a well-marked dream of telepathic origin, we cannot press the details—the memory of the hotel-passages and of Lieutenant O.'s bed-chamber. What entitles the narrative to a place in this book is the striking time-coincidence—not the details, which might have been “read back” into the half-recollected vision. But, on the other hand, if the incident were telepathic at all, there must have been some *modus operandi*; Mr. Allbree's dream must have had some sort of content; Lieutenant O.'s psychical appeal must have taken effect in some particular way. And if any hypothesis at all is to be formed on the matter, are not the recorded facts best met by the hypothesis that Lieutenant O.'s crisis evoked a clairvoyant percipience in Mr. Allbree just as the mesmeriser is said to evoke it in the sleep-waking subject? and that Mr. Allbree seemed to himself to pass through the surroundings and into the presence of his friend? and that on waking the memory of all this was gone from him, though it was afterwards revived by the bodily sight of the scene which he had already supernormally discerned?

Let us see, however, what kind of probability is given to this view by the records of cases where something of the *invaded scene* has remained in the recollection of the *invader*. I am forced, for clearness' sake, to use this new metaphorical term, since the words agent and percipient are no longer sufficiently distinctive, the agent in these cases being, in my view, the primary percipient also. The metaphor of *invasion* may be justified by the fact that in these reciprocal cases A and B always agree as to the scene where the apparition occurred. It is never (with one or two dubious exceptions) the case that A thinks that he discerned B in B's house, while B thinks that he, on his part, was transported to A's house and saw A there. On the contrary, if A fixes the scene as in B's house, there does B fix it too, a fact which is just what the present hypothesis would lead us to expect. This apparent localisation in one or the other *entourage* is all that my metaphor of invasion is here intended to suggest.

Let us briefly consider the amount of subsequent memory shown in a few instances by a *waking*, a *sleeping*, and an *entranced* invader.

§ 29. First, as regards the cases of invasion by a *waking* agent. These,

¹ See case 215 (Vol. i., p. 567), where Mrs. W.'s “trance-state” was semi-voluntary.

in my view, are likely to be scanty and incomplete. I conceive that it is seldom that the sense of transference to a distant locality can be strong enough in waking life to give rise to the correspondent impression in other minds. And in this group it seems to me natural to find the confused or inchoate reciprocity—if such indeed it were—of case 304. But we have also case 307, where Mr. L. seems to have fallen into a deep reverie resembling Mr. S. H. B.'s (Nos. 14, 15, and 16), though in Mr. S. H. B.'s case the reverie passed on into sleep. Case 617, again, perhaps supplies a kind of faint or transitional instance, which may indicate the way in which the occupation of two persons with the idea of each other may pass into something like a reciprocal hallucination.

Here too, if anywhere, must be placed the anomalous case No. 642—recalling, on the one hand, the most recent experiments of the communication of hallucinations to hypnotised subjects; on the other hand, the old accounts of so-called "obsession."

§ 30. More numerous are the cases where a sleeping person's clairvoyant vision of a distant scene has evoked a corresponding impression of his own presence in the minds of persons situated in that scene, and has also persisted into his own waking memory. Two striking cases have been quoted, Nos. 35 and 306. In these cases not only is the dream (so to say) *acted out*, but the clairvoyant retains a memory of actual circumstances, of the true positions and actions of the persons clairvoyantly discerned. In some other cases,—Nos. 94 and 301,—the incidents, as recollected on both sides, are dreamlike, but the locality of the visionary incident is agreed on by both persons concerned. We seem, therefore, to have here another transitional case, a transition between mere simultaneous dreams and the kind of *clairvoyant invasion* with which I am now concerned. Again, case 271, which touches the very nadir of triviality, seems to me on that account all the more instructive. I cannot think that a mere dream on Mr. Pike's part that he was calling for hot water,—a condition as far removed from "death or crisis" as can well be conceived,—would so strongly have affected the servant in his distant home. I conceive that the efficacy of the dream depended on his conception of himself as actually standing at his bedroom door; so that this, too, was a case of clairvoyant invasion, though the scene invaded was so commonplace that it left with the dreamer no memory of anything otherwise unknown. And this example, in its turn, may throw light on some less-developed clairvoyant dreams,—as for instance case 412,—where the dreamer's invasion was not manifested by any phantasmal sight or sound, though the trivial scene was recollected on awakening

§ 31. Still more propitious, in my view, to this mode of psychical interaction is a state of *trance*, or even of delirium, on the part of the percipient-agent, though here the profoundly abnormal state must usually preclude all recollection. Specially instructive in this connection is case 308, where the boy whose call was heard in the place where he feverishly conceived himself to be,—or at least in the *field of his clairvoyant perception*,—was afterwards entirely oblivious of that momentary *rapport* with his distant sister and friend. It is observable that the evidential value of this case depends on the accident that a watcher was present with the boy, and noted the almost automatic exclamation which his sudden vision evoked. Had there been no one thus present with him, the call of “Connie! Margaret!” would have ranked as a well-marked collective hallucination of a purely subjective kind. To this class also belong Mr. Cromwell Varley’s singular narratives (Nos. 84 and 305), which again, bring us round to the cases where the clairvoyant invasion is apparently facilitated by the hour of dissolution itself.

Lastly, while these pages are passing through the press, we have received a striking case where memory of what was perceived in the hypnotic trance persisted into normal consciousness;—namely, Mr. Cleave’s narrative (case 685, in the Additional Chapter) of his attempts first to see, and then to be seen by a distant friend. The sequence of incidents is curiously concordant with the theory which has been expressed above. First, the steady gaze of the friend who operated threw Mr. Cleave into unconsciousness. Then a new consciousness showed him the face of the distant lady, “which gradually became plainer and plainer until I seemed to be in another room altogether, and could detail minutely all the surroundings.”

This process was several times repeated: and he at last succeeded, (as he, at least, conceives the occurrence,) “in making himself seen by” the lady in question. Twice she saw him; and on the second occasion, at least, he perceived that she saw him, and noted where she was, and in what company.¹ Now there will probably be some readers who, even after all the evidence which these volumes contain, will set aside Mr. Cleave’s narrative as merely incredible. But among those who are by this time prepared to accept it as an honest and careful record of fact and impression, few, I think, will argue that Mr. Cleave’s own impressions were purely subjective, though the lady’s were veridical;—that she genuinely saw his phantasm in the place from which he imagined himself to be looking at her, while yet this imagination of his was merely fanciful, and his supposed perception of her amid her actual surroundings of the moment, a

¹The boy who was with her seems to have seen nothing; but this fact is quite consistent with my view. (See p. 290.)

mere chance coincidence. Rather they will hold that *he* saw *her* before *she* saw *him*; that it was because his centre of observation was in some sense transferred to the Wandsworth dining-room that she saw his phantasm standing in that dining-room;—that, in short, as I have already expressed it, “correspondently with clairvoyant perception there was phantasmogenetic efficacy.”

§ 32. I do not propose to enter here into a detailed criticism of the mass of narratives which this book contains. Many of them, I think, need, for the purpose of any instructive analysis, an experience of these phenomena far wider than we as yet possess. But I have said, perhaps, enough to enable the reader to detect for himself, in many other cases, indications of some such clairvoyant invasion as I have endeavoured to describe. The cases which I have selected for notice have some of them been of strange and aberrant types; but I wished to show that the scheme of psychical interaction here suggested does at any rate offer an appropriate niche to nearly every well-attested phenomenon which our collection includes. It may at least be useful to have, as it were, a *Linnean* system under which all our cases can be conveniently docketed, even though we may as yet be far enough from discerning their “natural order” or truest affinity.

For clearness’ sake, I will briefly trace the steps by which, as I conceive the matter, our veridical phantasms gradually approach that reciprocal character which forms their complete or ultimate form.

First come the numerous cases which are too faintly defined for specification—cases where the impression transferred retains a frankly psychical character, where neither is a distant scene supernormally discerned, nor does anyone amid his ordinary surroundings discern a phantasmal visitant. There is here no illusion of space-relations,—merely an emotional or ideational affection of the percipient’s consciousness. In most of these cases all that we can say is that some telepathic action has taken place. And the terms *agent* and *percipient* serve to express all that we know of the process; namely, that on one side there is either death, or some crisis, or at least some concentration of thought; while on the other side something is felt or perceived which corresponds in some way with the agent’s unusual agitation.

But now let us go on to cases which have reached a further stage of development. After passing through certain intermediate stages,—visions in the mind’s eye, &c.,—we arrive at cases where a spatial element is apparently introduced; that is to say, the phenomenon, whatever it is, bears reference to a special scene; and when this scene is well-defined, and the two or more persons concerned retain a memory of the incident, it

is found that they all agree as to what the scene was. It is rarely, however, that a reciprocity of impression can be satisfactorily attested ; or the other side of that phenomenon is usually aborted or absent. And according as the one or the other side emerges into normal consciousness, we regard the incident as belonging to one of two main classes ; it may be a perception of the scene by a distant person, or it may be the perception of a distant person as forming a part of that scene.

And as the terms agent and percipient now become inadequate, I am forced to use an avowed metaphor, and to speak of the person who discerns the distant scene as the *clairvoyant invader*, whose figure is sometimes discerned in the *invaded scene*. Now the clairvoyant invader must be regarded as primarily a percipient ; for his first function, so to say, is to discern the distant scene. But this discernment of his may fail to subsist into his waking or normal memory, or instant death may intercept his recital thereof, so that there may be no evidence to show that he was clairvoyant at all. And, on the other hand, since his clairvoyant perception is sometimes accompanied with a corresponding phantasmogenetic efficacy,—since his supernormal invasion of the scene may generate in the denizens of that scene a hallucinatory perception of a supernormal invader,—we have cases in which this invader, (though on my theory primarily a *percipient*,) appears in our evidence purely as an *agent* : so that A dies and A's phantom appears to B, and A is set down simply as an agent, and B is set down as the only percipient concerned. But in such cases I hold that A is quite as truly a percipient as B is ; but that the shifting of the threshold of consciousness which accompanied his perception,—whether that shift were from waking to sleep-waking or from life to death,—prevents him, even if his consciousness is shifted back again, from recalling or recording that perception as a link in his chain of normal memories.

§ 33. Now let us turn our attention for a moment to the other person concerned in the phenomenon ; to the denizen, that is to say, of the invaded scene. He is (it is plain) frequently a *percipient* ; unless he perceived the phantasmal invader we should often be ignorant that any invasion had taken place. But is he ever to be considered as an *agent* too ? Yes, I hold that in certain cases he is an agent in somewhat the same sense as a mesmerist is an agent when he induces clairvoyance in a subject. In that case I hold that a certain influence (I know not what) from the mesmerist evokes or disengages in the subject a pre-existent but non-manifest capacity of supernormal percipience, which first places that subject in *rapport* with the ideas or sensations of the mesmerist himself (as in experiments of our own, and other cases, to be found especially in Supplement, Chap. I.), but

which ultimately, in some few well-attested cases, does actually extend the subject's percipience beyond the range either of his own or of his mesmeriser's normal powers of sense. And somewhat similarly, I hold that if a man is dying or deeply agitated, and his friend, gifted with much latent capacity of supernormal percipience, is asleep at a distance, then some influence from the dying man may evoke or direct that percipience in the friend, so that he becomes cognisant first, perhaps, of the deathbed scene as realised by the dying man himself, but ultimately of that scene as it might be realised by an independent entrant, including casual denizens unnoticed by the dying man, but who may perhaps, on their part, discern the friend's phantasmal invasion, and thus be percipients without being agents (as in case 30); while perhaps the dying man, who is in reality the determining cause of that phantasmal invasion, may attain to no perception of it whatever.

§ 34. "But," someone will say, "are you not here introducing a cross-division? You have spoken hitherto of A as enabled by his *own* death to make a clairvoyant invasion of the scene where B sits in a normal condition. You now speak of A as enabled by B's death to make a similar invasion of the scene where B lies dying. You are thus classing the dying man alternately as the *invader* and as the *invaded*; and yet surely he who is undergoing this profoundest of all crises ought always to be ranged on the same side in whatsoever psychical interaction you are assuming; there cannot be other psychical conditions more marked and determinant than *his*." I have led up to a statement of this difficulty because I believe that the answer, if we ever attain to more than a glimpse of it, will involve that true principle of classification which we are still seeking. And as a hint towards such reply I will repeat what has been already suggested, namely, that the right way of regarding these startling incidents is not as isolated psychical operations, but rather as emergent manifestations of psychical operations which are continuous, though latent; and which belong, not so much to the self of which we are habitually conscious, as to a hidden chain of mentation, which, for aught we know, may comprise a continuity of supernormal percipience or activity. When therefore, B is dying and A has a clairvoyant dream, as of presence at the deathbed, the relation between B and A with which we have to deal is not the mere external relation between agony on the one side and repose on the other. It is a relation between that specific supernormal activity which accompanies death and that specific supernormal activity which accompanies slumber. And though the *death* is still the prime factor in the resultant interactions, we cannot say *a priori* what the *scene of interaction* in any given case will be;—whether

there will be an invasion by the dying man of the sleeper's chamber, or by the sleeper of the dying man's.

I will illustrate my meaning by a modification of an analogy which I have elsewhere employed. I compare our conscious existence to a barge floating down the Arve, where it flows side by side, but as yet unmingled with the Rhone; the water round our keel is habitually turbid and opaque, but occasionally an inequality of river-bed, a clash of currents, swings us for a moment into the more pellucid Rhone. The Rhone—our unconscious self—flows on as continuously as the Arve, but the barge enters it only by moments, and those moments may be determined by changes in the Rhone's bed as well as in the Arve's. For the most part, the reef which raises breakers in the one stream will raise them in the other also; and imminent *death*, for instance, may jerk us into clairvoyance by a shock communicated at once to our conscious and to our unconscious being. But there may also be crises which involve not so much a confusion of the normal life as an expansion or liberation of the supernormal; and when we become clairvoyant in deep sleep or the mesmeric trance this is because the turbid waters are running in a narrower channel, and the barge sways into the broadening current of the pellucid stream. Again, there may be crises which are merely dissociative or disintegrant; where the barge poises on the very boundary line between the two currents, and both streams of personality are manifested at once. It is thus that I explain Mrs. Newnham's case (Vol. I., pp. 63-9), where the intelligence which wrote the replies to unseen questions would seem to have consisted of an unconscious current of Mrs. Newnham's own existence, exercising supernormal percipience, but dreamlike and incomplete in co-ordinating power. And with Mrs. Newnham's case I should compare certain cases which bear, indeed, no plain resemblance thereto, and which Mr. Gurney has treated as almost obviously morbid and delusive,—cases where the "double" of a living person has been seen together with that person himself. Take the most bizarre of these cases, that of Mrs. Hall, (No. 333,) where, as a lady sits at table with three friends, her phantom semblance is seen by herself and by all present, standing at the end of the sideboard. Now the analogy between Mrs. Newnham and Mrs. Hall seems to me to be this; that in the compound personality of each of them the "critical point" of dissociation was reached (so to say) at a very low temperature.¹ In Mrs. Newnham's case, her unconscious self exercised supernormal percipience, and manifested itself by controlling her motor system, while her conscious self maintained its ordinary way. In Mrs. Hall's case, her unconscious self, assuming a too facile independence, and possibly exercising a

¹ I should explain in the same way cases 327, 328, 329, 348. Note that the girl seen in case 329 had previously been phantasmally seen, (like Mrs. Stone,) in the same apparently casual way.

supernormal percipience, manifested itself by its phantasmogenetic efficacy while her conscious self was unaware of any inward excitement or "shearing stress." I venture, however, to surmise that had Mrs. Hall been thrown into a mesmeric trance directly after her "double" had shown itself, she might have remembered contemplating the room as though from the position which the "double" appeared to occupy.

§ 35. There is thus a point of view from which these "apparitions of the double" represent the most developed type to which our veridical phantasms can attain. But in the process of development their veridicality, so to say, has become a quite subsidiary thing. Mrs. Stone's double¹ was, I believe, *veridical*, in the sense that it announced the fact of an exceptionally easy dissociation between the currents of her being. But this was not a fact of evidential value—it was not supported, as our cases in general are, by any coincidence with an external and objective incident.

Our preferable type, therefore, of a fully-developed veridical hallucination,—the "perfect flower" to which we may, for clearness' sake, suppose that so many rudimentary or partially-aborted psychical efflorescences are tending to conform themselves,—will be a complete case of reciprocal percipience, where the dying A clairvoyantly perceives B in B's *entourage*, and narrates that experience, while at the same time B discerns A's phantasmal figure in a place corresponding to that from which A conceives himself to be exercising his supernormal vision. In such a type as this, I conceive, the phenomena which we investigate separately under the titles of thought-transference, clairvoyance, apparitions, mix and meet; and though their very juxtaposition suggests fresh difficulties, these, as I claim, are not imported by any theorising of mine, but are inherent in all attempts to correlate things psychical with physical things. As regards the relation of this clairvoyant perception, this phantasmogenetic energy, to space and matter, the theory here advanced leaves us entirely uncommitted. This book, indeed, contains no evidence of any real or registrable action of psychical energy on molecular matter; and much evidence that an *apparent* action on matter may turn out to be of a quite hallucinatory kind. And as regards *space* we are left equally at liberty to suppose that the psychical energy here attributed to our own being, or to a part of our own being, operates in ordinary three-dimensional space, or in four-dimensional space (if that exists), or that it does not really operate in space at all, though its effects be necessarily apprehended as in space by the normal consciousness.

§ 36. Such emphatic expressions of ignorance as these must go hand in

¹ See p. 85. Observe that in one of Mrs. Stone's cases her consciousness seemed for the moment to become external to her ordinary self,—the barge, floating on the dividing line between the two currents, swayed momentarily into the Rhone.

hand with any attempt at positive theorising. Our endeavour must be to give to our strange and scattered phenomena enough of coherence and co-ordination to enable the reader's mind to grasp them and work upon them, while we expressly avoid any such self-committal to any one hypothesis as may *constrain* rather than *guide* inquiry. In so new a subject, if the need of this resolute open-mindedness be recognised from the first, there should be little difficulty in maintaining it. The mere popular prepossessions which encumber the outset of our inquiry may readily be swept aside; and we must then watch that no dogmatic statement, unprovable by the evidence, be raised into authority in their room. Thus the writers who speak of a "force neurique rayonnante," of "brain-waves," of "ondulationnisme," of a "mentiferous ether," as if these were more than purely metaphorical expressions, seem to me to be falling into the same error which has encumbered hypnotic experiment with the question-begging terms of "animal magnetism" and "electro-biology." Let us use every analogy which helps us, but let us recognise that nothing has been discovered which shows that thought-transference has anything to do with ether or with vibrations. Everything in the universe may be reducible to vibrations, for aught we know; but until some definite experiment, as of reflection, interference, or the like, can be brought forward to connect telepathy with ether-waves, it is surely safer to avoid using that analogy in a way which suggests that it has a prior right over many others which might be proposed.

For our own part, though obliged by the very structure of language to make frequent use of terms which are primarily of *physical* import, we have kept as much as possible to the simplest, and have spoken of the telepathic *impulse* or *impact* for sheer lack of expressions more abstract still. We have varied the metaphor by suggesting that the brief energy of the psychical element in man which seems to accompany physical dissolution recalled the momentary energy of combination possessed, say, by "nascent hydrogen," hydrogen just released from union with some other element. Electrical action, too—itself so unexplained—has furnished us with several parallels, and Mr. Gurney (p. 270) has especially pointed to its latent pervasiveness, its seemingly accidental manifestations.

And yet again, the views suggested in this paper lead us on to a novel range of analogy. The conception of a reciprocal reciprocity, the hints which have seemed to come to us of the perpetual but unmanifested operation of an unconscious element in our own being;—these notions lift us above the conception of mere mechanical interferences, and suggest a more vital communication. In the relation of the cell to the complex organism,—in the relation of the diffused and multiplex "colonial consciousness" of the sponge or the hydrozoon to the concentrated conscious-

ness of man ;—here, it may be, are analogies which have a psychical counterpart behind the scenes of sense. When from these dim and incöordinated beginnings the individuation of the human animal has risen complete ; when the hierarchy of his nervous centres has led up to highest centres which represent and govern his entire organism at once ;—then we are accustomed to start, as it were, afresh, and to conceive his hardly-won unity as an elemental unit in a larger integration. We speak of him as a ζῶον πολιτικόν, as a “member of the body politic,” as a component item in that *Leviathan* whose monstrous semblance, in Hobbes’ frontispiece, is packed together from a myriad visages of men. But the growth of the social organism is rather a psychical than a physical thing. It may take outward form in railway or telegraph, but its vitality lies in the inter-connection of cognate minds, in the differentiations and integrations of the thought and emotion of speaking men. A common interest, a common passion, is the vein or nerve which interlinks and modifies the monotonous isolation of individual lives. Is it not, then, conceivable that in these direct telepathic transferences between mind and mind—these associations which seem to effect themselves beyond our threshold of consciousness, and only to startle us by their occasional intrusion into the field of sense—we may be gaining a first glimpse of a process of psychical evolution, as true and actual as any in the physical world? of some incipient organic solidarity between the psychical units which we call man and man? Perhaps beneath the body politic a *soul politic* is integrating itself unseen ;—

totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.

Let this analogy take its place with the rest. It is too soon, indeed, to detect the law of these operations, but not too soon to affirm confidently that these operations obey their certain law ; it is too soon to discern in this *inextricabilis error* the path by which Evolution seeks its goal, but not too soon to be assured that it is the principle of Evolution itself which, like *Dædalus, cæca regens filo vestigia*, will in its own time unlock the labyrinth which its own magic force has made ; will conduct us from physical to psychical, perhaps from terrene to transcendent things.

F. W. H. M.

SUPPLEMENT.

_ The Supplement does not include the Additional Chapter at the end of the volume, which is to be regarded as belonging to the main body of the work.

SUPPLEMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE supplementary evidence now to be presented, like the larger body of the work, consists of two parts, pertaining respectively to experimental and to spontaneous telepathy.

The experimental cases, which will be given in the first chapter, are all connected with a more or less abnormal state of the percipient; and they belong for the most part to the *transitional* class,¹ where the mind of the agent is fixed on the sensation or idea which he desires to transfer, but the percipient is not aware that any experiment is being tried. Some of the cases are even *spontaneous*, in so far as the agent himself was not at the moment concentrating his attention on the effect to be produced; but they are *experimental* in the sense that they have belonged to a course of hypnotic treatment, deliberately pursued during a considerable period.

The subsequent chapters will be devoted to spontaneous phenomena, belonging to the various groups which have been already passed in review. And in relation to this branch of the subject, I must ask the reader throughout to bear in mind what the Supplement professes, or rather what it does not profess, to be.

§ 2. It does not constitute a case on which we should have felt that the reality of telepathy could be safely based.

It includes, in the first place, a large number of first-hand narratives where, for various reasons, the chance of error in some vital point seems less improbable than in those hitherto quoted. A detailed preliminary survey of these various reasons is scarcely necessary; the reader of the 4th chapter of the preceding volume will readily picture them, and they will be abundantly noted in connection with the testimony to which they apply. The chief points are

¹ To such cases I have attached numbers, they being parallel to the cases in Vol. i., Chap. iii., where the numbering of examples began. The cases where the percipient was (certainly or possibly) aware of being the subject of an experiment, are given without numbers—not as an indication of evidential inferiority, but because of practical difficulties, a whole series of experiments having often been made on a single occasion.

naturally those which introduce a doubt as to the closeness of the alleged coincidence, or as to the unique or highly exceptional character of the percipient's impression.

In the second place, a large number of the included narratives are second-hand. They are of a good type, no doubt; being received not from persons who have only casually heard the first-hand account without any opportunities of judging of its correctness, but from persons for the most part intimately connected with the original witness, and well assured at any rate of *his* conviction as to the truth of what he told, and of the impression which the experience had made on him.¹ Of the majority of these narratives, we think that the fair conclusion would be that, though possibly or probably inaccurate in minor points, they faithfully present the essential point which bears on the telepathic theory. But I cannot make the justice of this view evident; no such defence of it can be given as was attempted in Chapter IV. of the first volume, in respect of the first-hand testimony. It is an instinct, rather than a logically-grounded opinion—and is, in fact, the slowly-formed result of a very large amount of labour in the sifting and comparing of records, and in the examination of witnesses. But though the view cannot be proved correct, I may remind the reader that we who hold it have had exceptional opportunities of appreciating to the full the dangers which truth runs in passing from mouth to mouth; that we believe we do appreciate those dangers to the full; and that signs of this have not been lacking in the course of the work. And it may, I think, be taken as a further sign of such appreciation that we feel ourselves unable to regard the immense number of *bonâ fide* records that remain to be presented, as amounting to any sort of independent proof of our case.

§ 3. But in saying that our case could not be properly regarded as *proved* by the Supplement alone, I am far from saying that it is not *supported*. If the existence of spontaneous telepathy were a certainty, many of the experiences which follow might almost certainly be referred to it; and in proportion as the existence of spontaneous telepathy is probable, may they with probability be referred to it. The *bonâ fide* evidence for them exists, and has to be accounted for; and to us it seems just of the sort that we should expect to find, and exhibits just the sort of shortcomings that we should expect to find, on the hypothesis that telepathy is really a fact in Nature. This state-

¹ As an illustration of the difference, see Colonel V.'s case below, Chap. v., § 3, and the note thereon.

ment will of course not have any weight with those who differ from us, on *à priori* grounds, from the very outset. Such persons may, and indeed almost must, affirm that the far stronger body of evidence which has been already passed in review is just what *they* would expect to find, on the hypothesis that telepathy is *not* a fact in Nature. Their position here would perhaps be stronger if they had actually made this affirmation before the body of evidence was there. It at any rate does not seem certain that those who have dogmatically asserted that there are no sober first-hand accounts of, *e.g.*, apparitions at death from educated and unhysterical witnesses—or that there are not more than the very few which the doctrine of chances will at once account for—would have been ready, when our inquiry was taken up, to contradict themselves by predicting that many scores of such accounts could be had for the asking. But however that may be, my remarks are addressed only to those who would admit that the evidence already presented constitutes at least a solid argument for the reality of spontaneous telepathy. And these persons will probably agree, if a considerable number of cases are so attested that the rejection of the telepathic explanation of them would involve great improbabilities, that then (1) it is natural that a considerable number of cases should also be so attested that the rejection of the telepathic explanation of them would involve less, but still considerable, improbabilities; (2) the more completely evidenced cases establish a presumption that some, at any rate, of the less completely evidenced cases are genuine; and (3) the general objection to the reality of the class of phenomena, as out of relation to the general experience of mankind, is legitimately diminished by taking into account *all* the cases which, if the cause that we suggest be a reality, would more reasonably be referred to it than to any other cause. These last words of course involve the whole judgment of what follows; and I hope that, on the whole, they will seem defensible. In this, that, or the other case, a mistake may be easily imaginable. But here, as before, it may be represented that the argument is cumulative; that the body of narratives, as it stands, is harmonious and sober in character; that they introduce none of the obvious marvels which popular superstition is so ready to supply (Vol. I., p. 165); that they never pass the line up to which the more completely evidenced cases have carried us;—and that such are not the natural results of unconscious invention or exaggeration, playing at random over hundreds of disconnected instances.

CHAPTER I.

FURTHER EXAMPLES OF THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE, PRINCIPALLY
IN HYPNOTIC CASES.

§ 1. THIS chapter will contain some specimens of the older observations in "thought-transference" referred to in Vol. I., p. 12; and also a few more recent instances.

I will take first the most rudimentary transferences—those of tastes and pains.

Mr. Esdaile, for many years Presidency Surgeon in Calcutta, whose observations on hypnotic phenomena now form an accepted part of physiological science, gives the following case of transference of taste between himself and a patient whom he had mesmerised (*Practical Mesmerism*, p. 125). The subject was a young Hindoo, Baboo Mohun Mitre, who had been operated upon painlessly whilst in the mesmeric trance.

"One day that the Baboo came to the hospital to pay his respects, after getting well, I took him into a side room, and mesmerising him till he could not open his eyes, I went out and desired my assistant surgeon to procure me some salt, a slice of lime, a piece of gentian, and some brandy, and to give them to me in any order he pleased, when I opened my mouth. We returned, and blindfolding Lallee Mohun, I took hold of both his hands: and, opening my mouth, had a slice of half-rotten lime put into it by my assistant. Having chewed it, I asked, 'Do you taste anything?' 'Yes, I taste a nasty old lime': and he made wry faces in correspondence. He was equally correct with all the other substances, calling the gentian by its native name, *cheretta*; and when I tasted the brandy, he said it was *Shrab* (the general name for wine and spirits). Being asked what kind, he said, 'What I used to drink—brandy.' For I am happy to say he is cured of his drunken habits (formerly drinking two bottles of brandy a day) as well as of his disease."

The Rev. C. H. Townshend, in his *Facts in Mesmerism*, gives several examples. (See especially pp. 68, 72, 76, 122, 150, 151, 184.) The following experiments were made on a servant of his own, in

whom he had produced the trance-condition ; but it cannot be held impossible, from his description, that the results should have been due to an acute sense of smell, combined with a certain amount of luck.

“Wine, water, and coffee were handed to me successively, in such a way as to prevent the patient from perceiving, by any usual means, what the liquors were. He, however, correctly named them in order. The order was then changed, and the results of the experiments were the same. Flowers were given me to smell. I was holding the patient by one hand at the time, but turning altogether away from him to a table, over which I bent, so as to interpose myself between him and anything that might be handed to me. He, however, when I smelt of the flowers, imitated the action, and on my asking him what he perceived, replied without hesitation, ‘Flowers.’ Upon this, one of the party silently changed the flowers for a bottle of *eau de Cologne*, when he observed, ‘That is not the same smell ; it is *eau de Cologne*.’ With the manner of conducting this experiment and its results, all who were present declared themselves perfectly satisfied.”

“Three of my sleep-wakers,” Mr. Townshend says in another place, “could in no way distinguish substances when placed in their own mouths, nor discriminate between a piece of apple and a piece of cheese ; but the moment that I was eating, they, seeming to eat also, could tell me what I had in my mouth.”

The next case is also one of Mr. Townshend’s.

(358) “Did any one strike or hurt me in any part of the body when Anna M. was in sleep-waking, she immediately carried her hand to a *corresponding* part of her own person. Then she would rub her own shoulder when mine was smarting with a blow, manifesting that the actual nerves of that part were, *pro tempore*, restored to their functions. Once an incredulous person came near me unawares, and trod upon my foot, which was quite hidden under a chair. The sleep-waker instantly darted down her hand and rubbed her own foot with an expression of pain. Again, if my hair was pulled from behind, Anna directly raised her hand to the back of her head. A pin thrust into my hand elicited an equal demonstration of sympathy.”

Stimulated by Mr. Townshend’s experiments, the Rev. A. Gilmour, of Greenock, made some experiments on one of his servants. He described the results in a letter to Professor Gregory (quoted in *Animal Magnetism*, p. 211), in which the following passage occurs :—

“I could throw her into the mesmeric sleep in 40 seconds. She is able to tell what I taste, such as soda, salt, sugar, milk, water, &c., though not in the same room with me. When my foot is pricked, or my hair pulled, or any part of my person pinched, she feels it, and describes it unerringly.”

Professor Gregory himself says (*Animal Magnetism*, p. 23) :—

“I have seen and tested the fact of community of sensation in so many cases that I regard it as firmly established. No one who has had

opportunities of observing this beautiful phenomenon can long hesitate as to its entire truth—such is the expression of genuine sensation in the face and gesture, besides the distinct statements made by the sleeper.”

I need hardly say that a single carefully recorded experiment would be worth more than any number of such general assertions as this.

The following account is given by Dr. Elliotson in the *Zoist*, Vol. V., pp. 242-5.

(359) “I requested my butler to enclose, in five different packets of blotting-paper, salt, sugar, cinnamon, ginger, and pepper. These were wrapped in one common cover when given to me, and I handed them over to Mr. Scarlett, the eldest son of Lord Abinger, who gave me one packet after another, any that he chose, as each was done with by me. The Archbishop of Dublin and several clergymen and other friends were present.

“When I put each into my mouth, I was ignorant of its contents, and learnt its nature as the paper became moistened and gave way. The first was salt, and I stood with it in my mouth at Mrs. Snewing’s side, and rather behind her, saying nothing. Before a minute had elapsed she moved her lips, made a face, and said, ‘Oh, that’s nasty enough.’ ‘What do you mean?’ ‘Why you’ve put salt into my mouth, you needn’t have done that.’ I removed the packet of salt, and took another, which proved to be cinnamon. Presently she said, ‘Well that is odd; I never heard of such a thing; to put such things together into one’s mouth!’ ‘Why what do you mean?’ ‘Why now you’ve given me something nice and warm, very pleasant, but you’ve mixed salt with it.’ The impression of the salt thus still remained. ‘What is it?’ ‘I don’t know the name of it, but it’s very nice; it’s what we put into puddings; brown, and in sticks.’ She puzzled a long while and then on my asking if it was cinnamon, ‘Yes, that’s it,’ she replied, ‘How odd that I shouldn’t recollect the name.’ I then removed it, and took into my mouth another packet, which proved to be sugar, and I observed that Mr. Scarlett very properly peeped into it, before he gave it to me. After a minute or two she began, ‘Oh, that’s very sweet; I like that; it’s sugar.’ I removed it from my mouth and took another packet, which proved to be ginger. After a minute or two she exclaimed, ‘Well, this is the funniest thing I ever heard of, to mix salt, and cinnamon, and sugar, and now to give me something else hot.’ ‘What is it?’ ‘I don’t know; but this is very hot too. It sets all my mouth on fire.’ In fact I felt my mouth burning hot. After some difficulty, for she was puzzled between these conflicting impressions, she said it must be ginger, and went on complaining of the heat of the mouth, I took a glass of cold water, and she instantly said, smiling, ‘That isn’t hot, that’s nice and cool, it makes my mouth quite comfortable.’ ‘What is it?’ ‘Why it’s water; what else can it be?’ The last packet was now put into my mouth, and proved to be pepper. She cried out, ‘Why you’re putting hot things again into my mouth. It gets down my throat, and up my nose; it’s burning me,’ and she soon declared it was pepper. I could scarcely endure it, and took a draught of water. She was instantly relieved, and said, ‘How cool and nice that is.’ She could not have seen what I was doing had her eyes been open.

“A gentleman now came beside me and pricked one of my fingers with a pin. She took no notice of it at first, but, after a few minutes, slowly began to rub the fingers of her corresponding hand, and at last rubbed one only, that corresponding with my finger which had been pricked, and complained that someone had pricked it. The back of one of my hands was now pricked. She made no remark but remained in quiet sleep. The pricking was at length repeated at the same spot, and pretty sharply, in silence. Still she made no remark. We gave it up, and my other hand was pricked in silence. After a little time she began to rub her hand, *corresponding with that of mine which was the first pricked*, and complained of its having been pricked at the very same spot as mine. Gradually she ceased to complain, and was still again. After the lapse of another minute or two, all the party observing silence, she complained that the other hand, corresponding with that of mine last pricked, was pricked, and wondered that any person should do so. This is a most remarkable circumstance; perfectly corresponding to the phenomena of sympathetic movement in the Okeys, which often came out so long after the movement of the operator had been made. Indeed, after he, in despair of any effect, had made another motion for them to imitate, and when he was expecting the latter, the first would take place.¹ It shows how easily persons ignorant of the subject and unqualified to make experiments may come to false conclusions, and set themselves up as the discoverers of failures and imposition. In my patients the movement given for sympathy and not productive of apparent effect has often come out again in a *subsequent sleep-waking*, the impression remaining unconsciously in the brain. The heat and taste of the pepper still remained in Mrs. Snewing's mouth, and she went on good-naturedly, as always, complaining of it. While she was complaining, I suddenly awoke her, and asked what she tasted and whether her mouth was hot. She looked surprised, and said she ‘tasted nothing’ and her ‘mouth was not hot’; and she smiled at the question.

“A few weeks afterwards, I repeated these experiments with all the same precautions, in the presence of Mr. H. S. Thompson and Mr. Chandler, who are very accurate observers, Mrs. Thompson and a few other friends. I stood quite behind her large high-backed leather chair. Mr. Chandler gave me the packets at his own pleasure, and, on tasting each, I wrote on a slip of paper what I tasted, and held up the slip at a distance behind her, that all might judge of her accuracy and my truth. These were the same articles as in the former experiments; but, as they were on both occasions taken at random, the order, of course, turned out to be different. In addition, Mr. Chandler gave me a piece of dried orange-peel from his pocket; and I tasted water and wine. She named each article with perfect accuracy, and readily; remarking that it was very strange she once could not recollect the name of cinnamon. Indeed, on the first occasion, she described the taste and the external character and uses of the various articles with perfect accuracy, but hesitated in giving the names of the cinnamon and ginger and pepper; a fact showing that the sleepiness extended a little more over the mental powers than one might

¹ Compare Vol. i., p. 56. I may once more remind the reader of the interest of such facts, in connection with the “deferred impressions” of spontaneous telepathy.

imagine. In a note sent me lately by Mr. Thompson are the following remarks :—

“‘The patient’s lips moved, and in a very short time after you had detected its nature, she appeared to taste it as well as yourself ; and when it was anything disagreeable, begged you would not put the nasty stuff into her mouth in this way. She told, without the slightest mistake, everything you tasted : salt, sugar, cinnamon, pepper, ginger, orange-peel, wine, and some others. Not a word was spoken by any of the party to each other, and the only question that was asked the patient was, what she had in her mouth that she complained of. After the spices, when you drank water, she seemed to enjoy it much, saying it cooled her mouth ; but at other times as you drank it very freely, she requested that you would not give her any more water for that so much water was disagreeable to her. There were present, Mr. Chandler, Lord Adare, Baron Osten, a friend of his, whose name I do not know, myself, and my wife. We were all perfectly satisfied with the entire success of the experiments.’

“‘I then smelt eau de Cologne, without any noise. She presently said, ‘How nice ; what a nice thing you’ve given me to smell.’ But she could not tell what it was ; when I mentioned its name, she recognised it. I did the same with water. She made no remark. I asked her if she smelt anything. She replied, ‘No, I don’t smell anything ; what should I smell?’

“‘I put snuff to my nostrils ; she almost immediately complained of snuff being given to her.

The next account was sent to us by the late Professor J. Smith, of the University of Sydney.

“September 3rd, 1884.

(360) “‘The experiments [in the *Proceedings* of the S. P. R.] on transference of tastes brought to my mind a very interesting case which occurred to me more than 40 years ago, when I was a medical student. I have never seen a similar case in print, and therefore I am tempted to relate it, although possibly it may be quite familiar to you. When my attention was first drawn to mesmerism, I got hold of an errand boy, 12 or 13 years old, who turned out a most sensitive ‘subject.’ Among many other things that I tried upon him, while in the mesmeric sleep, was the transference of taste. The boy could describe the taste of anything I put into my mouth, although no sound was uttered to guide him, and I myself did not know what the substances were until I put them into my mouth. I stood behind the boy’s chair, holding one of his hands in mine, and put my other hand behind me for the different articles, which were supplied to me successively by a druggist, in the back room of whose shop we happened to be.

“‘One of the things he gave me was a glass of whisky, and a mouthful of this strong spirit taken unexpectedly gave me a choking sensation. The boy writhed on his chair, and gasped for breath. Becoming alarmed I asked my friend to run for a glass of water, intending to give it to the boy. On receiving it, it occurred to me that the best way of relieving the boy would be to drink the water myself. I did so, at the same time watching his throat. Being a medical student, I knew something of the mechanism of deglutition, and was aware that the act of swallowing, shown externally by the rise and fall of the ‘pomum Adami,’ cannot be

performed without something to swallow, and that a person cannot repeat the act voluntarily more than once, or at the most twice consecutively, unless something is put into the mouth. I therefore watched the boy's throat while I drank the water. His 'pomum Adami' moved up and down regularly with mine, and he was immediately relieved.¹

"J. SMITH."

The next extract is from *Animal Magnetism*, (1866,) by Edwin Lee, M.D., p. 127.

(361) "On one occasion I tested the community of feeling upon the celebrated somnambulist Alexis, who had not been previously subjected to a trial of this kind. His magnetiser, M. Marcillet, being behind, and quite out of sight of Alexis, whose eyes, moreover, were bandaged, I suddenly pricked his left elbow, upon which Alexis put his hand to his left elbow complaining of pain there. I then pinched the magnetiser's right little finger, and Alexis felt his right little finger pinched. There could be no collusion or mistake here, as neither of them knew of my intention, which indeed was unpremeditated on my part, the thought arising in my mind at the time."

The following case is of a different character, but may be inserted in connection with the last, as it concerns the same percipient, and was also observed by Dr. E. Lee. It serves to show how much which has been represented as *independent clairvoyance* may really be explained by *thought-transference*.

Miss Curtis writes from 15, Parade Villas, Herne Bay, Kent:—

"November 12th, 1885.

"About the year 1847 or 1848, the Dr. Lee who wrote a book on the German Baths, made an arrangement with Alexis Didier, a clairvoyant at Paris, and M. Marcillet, his mesmeriser, to come to Brighton. There was to be no public exhibition, but only séances at private houses, and about 12 persons to be present, and each to have an opportunity of trying Alexis in the manner he or she wished.

"I was at Brighton at the time, and before going to see Alexis, wrote his name on a piece of paper, and doubled it three or four times, and then put it in a box that had held steel pens, and tied it up. When my turn came, I gave the box to Alexis, and he began reading the letters on the outside. I told him there was a paper inside I wanted him to read, and Dr. Lee asked me to give my hand to Alexis, and think of the words. Alexis then said, 'The first letter is A. the second, L.' I answered 'Yes'; and he turned the box, and wrote Alexis Didier on the back. Before I saw him the second time, I took a small smelling bottle out of its leather case, put two seals inside—one seal was in the form of a basket. I gave the case to Alexis, and asked him how many things were inside, and he said two, and they were seals; he took a pencil and paper and drew them; they were then taken out, and the drawings exactly resembled them. Some one asked if Alexis could read what was on one of the seals; he said he could not, because it was written backwards. Dr. Lee asked me

¹ An apparent instance of telepathic imitation of a less abnormal sort is recorded in Townshend's *Mesmerism Proved True*, p. 65.

to give my hand; I thought of the word, and Alexis directly said, 'Croyez,' which was correct. [This, however, is no test; as we find on inquiry, that Alexis had taken the seals into his hand, and had had an opportunity of reading the word.] I then asked him two or three questions about the persons who had given me the seals, and he made a mistake, and said the lady who had given me one was in England, whereas she was in Africa. Alexis was unequal, some days telling almost everything, and other days failing in several things. The notes Dr. Lee made were printed, and I had a copy, but gave it away. "SELINA CURTIS."

[The first of these results is rendered inconclusive by the fact of the contact. Still it is unlikely that Miss Curtis unconsciously drew on Alexis' hand forms sufficiently distinctive to be recognised as A L. The rest of the name may, of course, have been a guess on his part—though (as Miss Curtis reminds me) he was not often called by the double name which she wrote. Dr. Lee mentions this first experiment, without details, in his book, but not the second.]

Corresponding to the cases where the hypnotic "subject" has shown sensibility to the hypnotiser's pain, instances are recorded where the hypnotiser has become sensitive to the "subject's" pain. In Lausanne's book, *Des Principes et des Procédés du Magnétisme Animal* (Paris, 1819), the following paragraphs occur:—

"Les personnes sensibles et bien en rapport ressentent-elles, comme je l'ai dit, une grande partie des effets que produit le travail de la nature renforcée de son action. C'est ainsi que je ressens intérieurement des pesanteurs de tête, des tiraillemens, des douleurs à l'estomac, au foie, à la rate, aux reins, à la tête, et dans toutes les parties de mon corps correspondantes aux parties qui travaillent dans le corps de la personne que je magnétise. Mes sensations ne sont jamais aussi vives que celles du malade, mais quelquefois elles le sont assez pour m'être incommodes. Il y a des jours où ma sensibilité est telle, que des mouvemens fugitifs et légers dans la personne malade me deviennent distincts. Il se présente dans ces sensations quelques phénomènes sur lesquels je vais exposer mes conjectures.

"Lorsque je suis près et vis-à-vis le malade, je sens la réaction de son travail dans la partie opposée; de sorte qu'une douleur au foie se fait sentir à ma rate ou dans les parties adjacentes, et celle de la rate se fait sentir à mon foie. Une douleur ou un tiraillement à l'épaule ou à la jambe droite m'est sensible à l'épaule ou à la jambe gauche. Les reins font le même effet. Observez que je ne parle que de parties opposées les unes aux autres, comme les tempes, les yeux, les oreilles, &c. Lorsque toute la tête est affectée, la mienne s'en ressent, et l'estomac répond à mon estomac. Les mêmes effets ont lieu lorsque je suis proche du malade, et assis à son côté. J'ai été quelquefois obligé de changer de place à l'orchestre de nos spectacles, parce que je me trouvais incommodé d'un mal de tête, de foie, ou de rate d'un de mes voisins. Ces sensations désagréables se dissipent par l'éloignement et par la distraction.

"J'ai remarqué que je ne recevais de ces impressions distinctes que de la part des personnes dont je m'occupais, soit par la conversation, soit par d'autres rapports. Il ne faut pas croire que dans de pareilles circonstances

un mal léger ou une douleur passagère puisse porter des impressions sensibles ; elles ne le deviennent que lorsque le mal est considérable. Je ne me suis aperçu de ces effets que depuis que je magnétise, apparemment parceque je suis habitué à porter mon attention sur mes sensations internes.

“Il m’est arrivé très-souvent de m’occuper fortement de quelques personnes avec lesquelles j’avais de grands rapports. Ma pensée se dirigeant vers les principales parties de leur corps, leur réaction me faisait sentir très-distinctement dans les parties correspondantes du mien, les différentes sensations que ces personnes éprouveraient dans ce moment. Faits très-certains pour moi, et pour les personnes à qui je l’écrivais, en leur détaillant les sensations qu’elles avaient éprouvées, les places et l’heure précise. Ce que je viens de rapporter m’a prouvé que la pensée produisait une action très-vive, dont la réaction portait sur nos sens des impressions très-distinctes.

“Je ne parle point ici de plusieurs personnes que j’ai mises en somnambulisme, ou que j’ai tirées de cet état à un éloignement assez grand.”

Such general descriptions are very far from convincing ;¹ and Lausanne gives the details of only one success, which, though certainly striking, may have been accidental. I may add, for comparison, a statement made to me by an amateur hypnotist, Mr. J. H. Fash, in whose good faith I have every confidence, but who has again failed to make the detailed notes without which such observations, in whatever quantity accumulated, will never make a chapter of science. It is possible that the mention of the type here may serve to elicit further instances.

“9, Commerce Street, Glasgow.

“July 28th, 1885.

“Instead of impressing my ‘subjects’ they seem to impress me ; and should they chance to have any soreness or pain in any part of the body, I feel it in a corresponding part of mine as soon as I have commenced mesmerising them ; and it sometimes remains with me for a considerable time after. In this way I am often able to discern aches or pains in various persons, who have afterwards stated that they felt relieved. Just this moment as I write, I am suffering from a severe soreness in the region of the spleen, and a feeling as of dyspepsia or indigestion at the stomach, and on making remarks to the sensitive a few minutes since that I felt this, he replied, ‘I felt that way before you mesmerised me but I am all right now.’”

§ 2. The following examples of the silent power of the will in producing the hypnotic condition, or in evoking particular actions on

¹ The author of *Réflexions Impartiales sur le Magnétisme Animal* (1784) says that he witnessed similar phenomena several times at Lyons : “Les différentes somnambules qui ont servi aux expériences sont des filles du peuple. On leur a présenté, des sujets malades qui leur étaient inconnus. Elles ont indiqué avec la plus grande exactitude les maux dont elles étaient affectés : je les ai vues ressentir vivement les maux de ceux qu’elles magnétisaient, et les manifester en portant les mains sur elles aux mêmes parties.” Bertrand remarks on the similarity of Carré de Montgeron’s account of the St. Médard “convulsionnaires.” But the lack of detail and corroboration must of course prevent such evidence from having any independent weight.

the part of hypnotised persons, are analogous to those recorded in Vol. I., pp. 88-94. The first account is taken from the *Traité du Somnambulisme*, (Paris, 1823, pp. 246-7) of Dr. Alexandre Bertrand, a physician of repute, whose works give the impression of having been written in a spirit of rational scepticism.

“J’avais coutume de faire sortir une malade du somnambulisme en lui faisant de légères frictions sur les bras ; et cette manœuvre, qui ne l’éveillait pas dans le courant de la séance, ne manquait jamais de produire cet effet à la fin, quand j’avais l’intention de la faire sortir du sommeil. Un jour je fis, à la fin de la séance, mes frictions accoutumées, en lui disant, ‘Allons, allons, éveillez-vous’—et pendant ce temps j’avais la ferme volonté de ne pas l’éveiller. La malade parut d’abord visiblement troublée, puis tout-à-coup son visage rougit beaucoup, ses traits s’altérèrent, et elle eut quelques mouvements convulsifs, sans sortir pourtant de l’état de somnambulisme. J’employai alors toute ma volonté à la calmer ; et quand je la vis enfin redevenue tranquille, ‘Qu’avez vous donc,’ lui dis-je, ‘qui vous a fait avoir des convulsions?’ ‘Comment,’ me répondit-elle, ‘vous me dites de m’éveiller, et vous ne voulez pas que je m’éveille.’”

Bertrand, whose treatment of the subject is thoroughly cautious and sensible, records (p. 280), a more ordinary case of thought-transference, in which the “subject” and the agent were both known to him, on the authority of the latter, who had his complete confidence ; but he declines to commit himself to results which he had witnessed without having an intimate acquaintance with the persons concerned.

The next case was reported by Mr. Charles Richet to the Société de Psychologie Physiologique, and appeared in the *Revue Philosophique* for February, 1886, p. 199.

(362) M. Richet begins by saying that, in spite of repeated trials, he has only on one occasion obtained satisfactory evidence of the induction of hypnotic trance at a distance. This was in 1873, when he was “interne” at the Beaujon Hospital. The “subject” was a woman whom he had frequently hypnotised.

“D’abord je l’endormais par des passes ; puis, plus tard, en lui touchant la main ; puis enfin, simplement, en entrant dans la salle.

“Le matin, quand j’entrais dans la salle avec mon chef de service, M. le professeur Le Fort, je la voyais aussitôt, dans le fond de la salle où elle était, s’endormir. Mais, comme je ne voulais pas qu’elle fût dans cet état au moment où M. Le Fort serait à côté d’elle je faisais tout mes efforts pour la réveiller mentalement ; et, de fait, elle se réveillait toujours quelques instants avant que M. Le Fort arrivât au lit No. 11.

“S’agissait-il réellement d’un acte de volonté de ma part, soit pour la réveiller, soit pour l’endormir ; ou bien s’endormait-elle et se réveillait-elle spontanément ? C’est là un point que je n’ai jamais pu bien établir. Et si, comme je vais le raconter, l’expérience n’avait pas été fait d’une autre manière, ce sommeil et ce réveil ne prouveraient absolument rien.

“ Un jour, étant avec mes collègues, à la salle de garde, à déjeuner— notre confrère M. Landouzy, alors interne comme moi à l'hôpital Beaujon, était présent—j'assurai que je pouvais endormir cette malade à distance, et que je la ferais venir, à la salle de garde où nous étions, rien que par un acte de ma volonté. Mais au bout de dix minutes personne n'étant venu, l'expérience fut considérée comme ayant échoué.

“ En réalité l'expérience n'avait pas échoué ; car quelque temps après, on vint me prévenir que la malade se promenait dans les couloirs, *endormie*, cherchant à me parler et ne me trouvant pas ; et, en effet, il en était ainsi, sans que je puisse de sa part obtenir d'autre réponse pour expliquer son sommeil et cette promenade vagabonde, sinon qu'elle désirait me parler.

“ Une autre fois, j'ai répété cette expérience en la variant de la manière suivante. Je priai deux de mes collègues de se rendre dans la salle, sous le prétexte d'examiner une malade quelconque ; en réalité afin d'observer comment se comporterait le No. 11, que j'aurais, à ce moment, l'intention d'endormir. Quelque temps après ils vinrent me dire que l'expérience avait échoué. Cependant, cette fois encore, elle avait réussi. Car on s'était trompé en désignant à la place du No. 11 la malade voisine, qui naturellement était restée parfaitement éveillée, tandis que le No. 11 s'était effectivement endormie.

“ J'aurais dû sans doute répéter et varier avec plus de précision cette expérience intéressante ; mais en pareille matière on ne fait pas tout ce qu'on désire faire, et ceux-là seuls qui ont expérimenté peuvent savoir quelles difficultés de toute sortes, morales et autres, empêchent la poursuite méthodique de l'expérimentation.

“ Quelques semaines après, la malade retourna dans son pays, à Béziers, je crois, et je n'ai plus entendu parler d'elle. “ CH. RICHEL.”

The next example, from Professor Beaunis, of Nancy, is published in the same number of the *Revue Philosophique*, p. 204. The concluding sentences of his account, as the admission of a physiologist of high repute, are of good omen for the future of our subject in France. The experiment was made in conjunction with our friend, Dr. Liébeault.

(363) “ Le sujet est un jeune homme, très bon somnambule, bien portant, un peu timide. Il accompagnait chez M. Liébeault sa cousine, très bonne somnambule aussi, et qui est traitée par l'hypnotisme pour des accidents nerveux.

“ M. Liébeault endort le sujet et lui dit pendant son sommeil : ‘ A votre réveil vous exécuterez l'acte qui vous sera ordonné *mentalement* par les personnes présentes.’ J'écris alors au crayon sur un papier ces mots : ‘ Embrasser sa cousine.’ Ces mots écrits, je montre le papier au Dr. Liébeault et aux quelques personnes présentes, en leur recommandant de le lire des yeux seulement, et sans prononcer même des lèvres une seule des paroles qui s'y trouve, et j'ajoute : ‘ A son réveil, vous penserez fortement à l'acte qu'il doit exécuter, sans rien dire et sans faire aucun signe qui puisse le mettre sur la voie.’ On réveille alors le sujet et nous attendons tous le résultat de l'expérience. Peu après son réveil, nous le voyons rire et se cacher la figure dans ses mains, et ce manège continue quelque temps

sans autre résultat. Je lui demande alors : ‘Qu’avez-vous?’ ‘Rien.’ ‘A quoi pensez vous?’ Pas de réponse. ‘Vous savez,’ lui dis-je, ‘que vous devez faire quelque chose à quoi nous pensions. Si vous ne voulez pas le faire, dites-nous au moins à quoi vous pensez.’ ‘Non.’ Alors je lui dis : ‘Si vous ne voulez pas le dire tout haut, dites-le-moi bas à l’oreille,’ et je m’approche de lui. ‘A embrasser ma cousine,’ me dit-il. Une fois le premier pas fait, le reste de la suggestion mentale s’accomplit de bonne grâce.

‘Y a-t-il eu simple coïncidence? Ce serait bien étonnant. A-t-il pu, pendant son sommeil, reconnaître le sens des paroles que j’écrivais à la façon dont je les écrivais sur le papier, ou a-t-il pu les voir? C’est bien peu supposable. Enfin je suis sûr qu’aucune des personnes présentes n’a pu le mettre d’une façon quelconque sur la voie de l’acte qu’il devait accomplir. Il y a là évidemment quelque chose qui bouleverse toutes les idées reçues sur les fonctions du cerveau, et pour ma part, jusqu’à ces derniers temps, j’étais parfaitement incrédule sur les faits de ce genre. Aujourd’hui j’arrive à cette conviction qu’il ne faut pas les repousser, les cas de réussite, quoique rares, étant trop nombreux pour être un simple effet de hasard.

“H. BEAUNIS.”

§ 3. To pass now to transferences of ideas unconnected with movement (Vol. I., pp. 94-6), the next two incidents are again reported by a French physician of high standing—not, however, as personal observations, but apparently as attested by another medical man. They occur in Dr. Macario’s work, *Du Sommeil, des Rêves, et du Somnambulisme* (Lyons, 1857), pp. 185-6.

(364 and 365) “Un soir le docteur Gromier, après avoir endormi par la magnétisation une femme hystérique, demanda au mari de cette femme la permission de faire une expérience, et voici ce qui se passa. Sans mot dire, il la conduisit en pleine mer, mentalement, bien entendu; la malade fut tranquille tant que le calme dura sur les eaux; mais bientôt le magnétiseur souleva dans sa pensée une effroyable tempête, et la malade se mit aussitôt à pousser des cris perçants, et à se cramponner aux objets environnants; sa voix, ses larmes, l’expression de sa physiologie indiquaient une frayeur terrible. Alors il ramena successivement, et toujours par la pensée, les vagues dans les limites raisonnables. Elles cessèrent d’agiter le navire, et suivant le progrès de leur abaissement, le calme rentra dans l’esprit de la somnambule, quoiqu’elle conservât encore une respiration haletante et un tremblement nerveux dans tous ses membres. ‘Ne me ramenez jamais en mer,’ s’écria-t-elle un instant après, avec transport; ‘j’ai trop peur, et ce méritable de capitaine qui ne voulait pas nous laisser monter sur le pont!’ ‘Cette exclamation nous bouleversa d’autant plus,’ dit M. Gromier, ‘que je n’avais pas prononcé une seule parole qui pût lui indiquer la nature de l’expérience que j’avais l’intention de faire.’

“Une autre fois, cette même malade était en proie à un profond désespoir. Voici ce que son médecin, le docteur Gromier, imagina pour ranimer son courage. Elle dormait d’un sommeil magnétique. Pourquoi, lui dit-il mentalement, perdre ainsi l’espérance? Vous êtes pieuse, la sainte Vierge viendra à votre secours, et vous guérirez, soyez-en-sûre. Puis il découvrit, par sa pensée, le toit de la maison; dans les angles il groupa des images

portant des chérubins, et au milieu il fit descendre dans un globe de lumière la sainte Vierge, dans toute la splendeur de sa magnificence. La somnambule tomba aussitôt dans le ravissement, dans l'extase, se prosterna à terre, et s'écria dans le plus grand transport, 'Ah! mon Dieu, depuis si longtemps que je prie la Vierge Marie, voilà la première fois qu'elle vient à mon secours.'"

[If correctly reported, these results seem to go beyond what can reasonably be attributed to unconscious physical indications on the experimenter's part.]

Quite parallel to such cases as these is the form of experimental telepathy for which there is perhaps most evidence in the older records—though it is one which we have never personally encountered—that where some place or scene, familiar to someone present, has been accurately described by a hypnotised "subject" who had no previous knowledge of it. The phenomenon has been almost always set down to independent clairvoyance—an explanation for which there has, in most cases, been little or no warrant. A single instance must suffice, and I select one from the late Sergeant Cox's *Mechanism of Man* (Vol. II., p. 220).

"One instance, within my personal experience, will suffice to give the reader a clear conception of the character of this very curious psychological phenomenon. The somnambule was a little girl, aged only 10 years. She was invited to go (mentally) with me to Somersetshire. She described accurately my father's house there—the verandah and the glass doors opening to the garden. Asked if she could see anything in the room? 'Oh, yes!' she said, 'such a funny chair, it rolls about.' (It was an American rocking-chair.) 'Anything more?' 'Yes—pictures.' 'Tell me what they are about.' 'One is a house pulled to pieces.' (There was a drawing on the wall of the ruins of an abbey.) 'Any more?' 'Yes; the sky is on fire; horses are jumping about.' (It was a large painting of a storm, and horses struck by lightning.) 'Anything more?' 'A river runs by the side of the house.' (Right.) I should state that the child had never been out of London.

"A friend who was present accidentally, then asked to be allowed to question her. He was placed *en rapport* with her simply by my removing my hand and giving her hand to him. Re-establishment of this relationship was essential to the production of the phenomena.¹ As I had never seen my friend's house, I cannot vouch for her accuracy with him as with myself; but I had his assurance that it was equally correct. I should state that neither of us gave the child the slightest intimation by word or look; indeed, we did nothing but put questions. My friend's house was at Dover. She described some of the way down—such as the tunnel and the cliffs. 'Now,' she said, 'I see a row of houses, and such a lot of steps to get to them.' 'Go with

¹ In such a case as this, contact cannot be held to give an opportunity for information by unconscious physical signs. Whether the effect that it has consists in more than symbolising to the "subject" a condition of confidence and *rapport*, is a doubtful and interesting question.

me up the steps of the third house.' 'Yes.' 'Now we go in; what do you see there?' 'Something like a monkey and some horns.' (Right.) 'Now go into the room on the left.' 'Yes; such a lot of books about; there is a horrid thing on the chimney-piece.' (It was a skull.) 'There's a portrait of a gentleman's head over it.' (It was a portrait.) 'Now we will go upstairs.' What a beautiful room, and oh! what a beautiful lady.' 'What is she doing?' 'Oh, no; it's a picture, I mean, with such a beautiful dress, and she has a hat on; how funny.' (It was the full length portrait of a lady in a riding-habit.) She stated much besides, which my friend stated to be correct. Then she added, 'There's a young lady with long yellow curls looking out of window.' He whispered to me, 'She is wrong there. I have a niece with such hair, but she is from home. She reads the picture in my mind.' My friend returned to Dover the next day, and the following post brought me a letter stating that he was surprised to find that his niece had returned unexpectedly, and was in the drawing-room as described, but she believes she was not at the window."

I will now give a case—rather remote in time, but resting on the first-hand testimony of living witnesses—which is remarkable for the long continuance of the telepathic susceptibility. The narrator is Mrs. Pinhey, of 18, Bassett Road, Ladbroke Grove Road, W.; her record, written out for us in 1883, is at any rate given under a strong sense of responsibility.

(366) "I have been asked to write down what I can remember of a very curious experience in mesmeric or animal magnetism, which I undertook and carried on for many months, more than 30 years ago.

"The difficulty of doing this accurately after so great a lapse of time is, I am aware, very great; and unfortunately, the diary which I kept for the greater part of the time is of the most meagre description, and can scarcely be said to do more than record the fact of the séances having been carried on daily with little intermission from the beginning of March, 1850, all through the summer of that year, until the end of October, when I left home for several weeks. On my return they were recommenced, and it was during that winter that the most remarkable thought-reading phenomena occurred; but I seem, meanwhile, to have discontinued my diary altogether, so that, though the main facts are so impressed on my memory that I cannot forget them, I feel the necessity for extreme caution in relating them, having nothing but my memory on which to depend—not even the occasional hints which, in the diary of the previous summer, have helped to bring back some circumstances to my mind, to fix the dates of others, and to show the general rate of progress in the experiments, which I had imagined to be much less gradual than it really was.

[The writer then describes how, having in 1849 heard a lecture on mesmerism as applied to disease, she resolved to try to influence a relative of her own, who was suffering from epilepsy. She failed and was considerably discouraged; but determined to make one more attempt with another "subject."]

"Miss M. N. was a parishioner of my father's. She and her sister lived

together on very small means, their circumstances having been much reduced at the time of the death of their parents, and M. was dreadfully afflicted with a chronic kind of St. Vitus' dance, besides other ailments. I visited her frequently, and as I looked on at her never-ceasing movement, her mouth and eyes twitching and her whole body jerking up and down from morning till night, to such an extent that she could not even feed herself, it occurred to me that hers was a fitting subject for mesmerism. What a boon would an hour or two of perfect rest be to such a person! At any rate, I would talk to her about it, and make my next attempt on her, if she would consent to my doing so.

"She had become very fond of me during our intercourse, and I had no difficulty in persuading her to allow me to do anything I liked to her; but some of her friends objected at first, having a sort of idea that mesmerism was a 'black art,' and not to be meddled with. My father's opinion, however, as clergyman of the parish, and my own reputation as the clergyman's daughter, prevailed so far that I was allowed to proceed without active opposition.

"At this time I had no expectation of any marvellous results. I did hope that I might succeed in quieting her nerves and muscles, and giving rest, if not sleep, for a few hours every day, and that this rest might have a beneficial effect upon my patient's health. But though I expected nothing, I was prepared for anything, *i.e.*, I was fully impressed with the necessity of keeping my own nerves quiet and unmoved under any circumstances. I rather dreaded than hoped that things might happen to 'astonish me'; but, if they did, I was prepared to look at them with as much calmness and philosophy as I could command.

"I think it was on the second occasion, that, *viz.*, of March 5th, noted in my journal, that I succeeded in inducing the mesmeric sleep, a state at that time of perfect repose, not unlike natural sleep—except that the muscles remained rigid enough to keep my patient sitting upright leaning back in the chair. She showed no disposition to lie down. In this condition I left her, at first with directions to her sister not to touch or disturb her until she awoke of herself, which she did in about an hour. As time went on, however, and the mesmeric influence gained greater power over her, I found it better to stay with her for an hour or two, and wake her before I left. Otherwise she seemed never to awake quite perfectly, but remained for some hours in a dreamy state after the actual sleep had left her.

"I cannot recollect, however, exactly the time when this change was made, but it must have been very early in the course of the séances, because on the 13th, after a week in which I had visited her every day, I find, in addition to the usual entry, 'Mesmerised M. N.,' the word 'Discoveries,' and that my mother was present, so that I must then have remained with her during the sleep.

"The 'Discoveries' and 'New Discoveries' entered on the 14th, referred to phenomena which, happening to myself in this way, with every possible guarantee for their perfect truth and reality, necessarily made a great impression on all our minds. They were, it is true, only the introduction to a series of much greater wonders, but, being the first, they surprised and startled us almost more than those which came after.

"The first unusual appearance that presented itself was a sort of

magnetic attraction towards myself. I noticed that whenever I moved about the room to fetch a book or my knitting, or perhaps to eat some biscuits or sandwiches (for I often took my luncheon with me to save time), her face turned towards me. I tried, by way of experiment, to get quite behind the chair on which she sat, with her eyes closed and quite still up to this time; but she shuffled about in her seat and made every effort to turn round so as to face me. Presently her arm stretched itself out with a mechanical kind of motion and pointed at me wherever I moved. About this time, too, she began to talk.

“Her voice and manner of speaking when asleep were much more animated and decided than when awake. Instead of a poor, weak, invalid kind of creature, she became quite a clever, animated talker. Instead of the humility and self-depreciation of her waking hours, she appeared quite pleased with herself and confident in her own opinions. It was very curious to watch her, with her eyes always shut, and her forehead rather pressed forward, as if that were the seat and medium of both sight and understanding. Sometimes she nipped her brows and a puzzled look came over her face, and then a bright smile seemed to show that all was clear again. But this is rather anticipating, for at first she spoke little and rather hesitatingly, except in answer to questions which I soon began to put to her.

“‘Why do you point at me, Mary?’

“Mary: ‘O, I don’t know, but I feel as if I wanted—wanted to get near you. It is very funny, such a funny feeling. I can’t help it. Now, you are not angry, are you?’

“The last sentence she very often used with a deprecating air and voice.

“Meanwhile the attraction became stronger every day till it caused her to stand upright and walk after me; a thing she could not do when awake, and had not done for many months or even years.

“All this, of course, interested me extremely, and my mother and father occasionally went with me to see the marvels I reported, and satisfy themselves of their reality. I thought, however, that all this walking about and general excitement might not be so good for my patient as a quieter rest would be. Besides, the clinging to me was rather troublesome and difficult to arrange for; so when her attentions in this way became too pressing, I told her rather peremptorily to go back to her chair and sit down, which, with some difficulty and exertion, she at last managed to do—sighing a little and begging me not to be angry with her, as she would do always what I wished if she possibly could, but it was very hard, &c.

“After that I found that she would always obey any command I gave her; and though I never tried her to that extent, I believe she would have hopped on one leg if I had ordered her to do so.

“By degrees, as time went on, I noticed that the attraction became fainter. I cannot now remember how much time elapsed before a new phase of the mesmeric state began to show itself. I notice that on the 30th March my father went with me ‘to see the wonders I reported,’ and on the 7th April the séance is marked as ‘very successful,’ but I think that both these entries must refer to the first phase, viz., the attraction already described.

"It was, however, about this time or a little later that, after a few quiet uneventful days, as I was sitting at work or reading in the same room with her, I observed that any little movement of my hands or feet was being repeated in a mechanical kind of way by my patient. As I worked, her right hand went up and down as if using her needle. If I moved my finger or thumb, hers moved too. If I lifted my hand to my face hers attempted immediately to follow the motion; and she then began also to associate herself with me in her speech—'This work tires us very much, doesn't it, dear?'—or if I wagged my finger experimentally and *well out of her sight* (supposing she could see), she would say, 'Well! I don't know why we should make this poor finger work so hard, wag, wag, it is quite laughable.'

"This sort of thing, which I shall call 'sympathy,' went on for some time, increasing in intensity as the 'attraction' had done, and then slowly dying out as before, till it gave place to new and still more wonderful phenomena. That is to say, the mere outward mechanical expression of sympathy wore out; but all the succeeding phenomena may be classed under the same head. The influence only went deeper and affected by degrees more important organs, the senses, and finally the brain itself.

"It was some time in that summer that I was sitting or standing near the window of her room, eating the cake or sandwich or whatever my lunch consisted of that day. 'M.' was in the mesmeric sleep, but had been less interesting than usual for some days. I was not watching her particularly, when rather a curious sound attracted my attention. I looked at her, and saw that she was apparently eating something very nice, munching away and enjoying the taste extremely.

"'What have you got there, Mary?' I said.

"'Oh! Why of course you know. We—we are eating our lunch, and it is very nice. We have got some cake to-day, and it is very good.'

"'That is right; then we will have some more.' So saying, I went to the little corner cupboard where I always deposited my luncheon and took, not cake this time, but a piece of dry bread.

"'Well, yes, bread is very good, but it is not so nice as the cake. We must not be discontented; but there is plenty more cake—why don't we eat it? Ah, I know,' with a laugh of triumph, 'you think I can't taste it, but that *is* nonsense. Of course we eat together,' and so on. I tried her in all kinds of ways, tasted salt and then sugar, then pepper, and did my best to puzzle her, but she never hesitated or made a mistake.

"I find in my journal various entries during the summer, showing the names of several persons who witnessed the facts I am relating. Amongst them, on May 21st, is that of Dr. H., a local celebrity, who lived next door to us, and was an intimate friend of my father's. He had formerly, at the request of the latter, seen 'M. N.' more than once, and now, on the 20th, he had been brought by my father to visit her again, and had confessed, though much prejudiced against mesmerism, that her health was certainly improved.

"The next day, however, when he came on purpose to see the wonders my father had described to him, the séance was a failure. The sleep took place as usual, but the patient remained apparently dumb. Whether the fact of his incredulity had, or could have any direct effect upon the patient, I cannot, with my limited experience, decide; but I am inclined

to suspect that the failure was due to my nerves being upset by the knowledge that the doctor had come on purpose to criticise. I know that I was extremely anxious that he should see the things which I saw day after day, and be convinced that at any rate I and my whole family were not the credulous fools he secretly suspected us of being, but that appearances, at any rate, justified our belief. This anxiety, and the nervousness produced by it, were, I believe, the sole cause of failure.

“No one (except perhaps my mother, who went very often) ever saw my patient at her best; the same cause operating, only in a less degree, whenever the séance was in any way made a medium of sight-seeing. And this leads me to remark that when these results are produced by trickery, or mechanism, they can be repeated any number of times with perfect precision and regularity; but when they come to us as the effect of experiments having to do with unknown or unexplained forces, we must expect to be often baffled, not knowing fully the conditions under which those forces act.

“With occasional interruptions, varying from a day or two to a week or two, the séances were continued daily all through the summer, and were witnessed by several persons at different times, besides the members of my own family. I find the names of seven people, many of whom are still living, who were present—some of them more than once—either in that summer or the winter following.

“I cannot now remember whether any real ‘thought-reading’ had begun before I left home for several weeks on October 24th. That it did so very shortly after my return is certain, from the following circumstances, which, though of a private nature, must be mentioned in order to make the rest of my story intelligible.

“It was during this absence that I became engaged to be married to a gentleman belonging to the Indian Civil Service. Circumstances made it expedient at the time to keep the matter quiet, and it was known only to my parents and immediate relations. The gentleman had gone to India immediately after our engagement, and I returned home to my usual occupations as if nothing had happened. No one in the town knew anything about it then, or till some weeks afterwards, yet I had no sooner magnetised my patient than she began talking as if all the facts were perfectly familiar to her. ‘India is a long way off, isn’t it, dear? I wish we could be nearer home, but, of course, if he is there we must go too.’ In fact for months she could talk of little else when mesmerised, and knew my husband’s name, age, and appearance, but was as ignorant as the rest of the world when in her natural state.

“Gradually this knowledge of all that I knew became more and more complete, and, accustomed as I was by this time to such marvels, she sometimes fairly astonished me. One day she suddenly burst out laughing. ‘Oh, what a hurry we were in, how we did fly down the stairs!’ I looked up, ‘What are you talking about? When do you mean?’ ‘Why, you know, this morning, and dear papa was waiting; he doesn’t like us to be late for prayers. But we only just wanted to finish that sentence.’ My curiosity was thoroughly aroused now, and I inquired, ‘What sentence?’ ‘Why, the German book—Schiller, wasn’t it?’ It was perfectly true, though the fact had made but a slight impression upon me, and I had certainly not thought of it again until thus reminded of it,

that I had been reading German upstairs that morning until the prayer bell rang, and then, lingering for a moment to finish a sentence, I had rushed hastily downstairs to avoid being late.

"This and other phenomena of the same kind puzzled me a great deal; not the fact of her knowing what I knew, for with that idea I was by this time familiar; but the thing which I could not understand was her brain being acted upon by such apparently trifling occurrences. I could perceive that things which had greatly impressed my brain might be repeated in hers, as the deflections of one needle are repeated by another at the opposite pole of the electric current. When I asked her a question, my brain probably gave the answer which hers repeated, but why did she spontaneously drag up little things which I had forgotten? Sometimes she even introduced little conversations between my father and mother which had taken place in my presence. 'Dear mamma was vexed,' she began one day, and then came particulars of some little argument between my father and mother, which I had heard at the time but had never thought of again, and certainly never repeated.¹ I have often thought over this difficulty since, but cannot in the least explain it except upon the supposition that certain things do impress our brains more strongly than others, although we may be unconscious of the fact. It is a line of inquiry which I should think might be worth pursuing in the interests of physical science, if any physician of note could so far shake off all prejudice as to make experiments for himself.

"I have only a few more wonders to relate, and they are all of the same kind. One day, during the winter, I was sitting by the fire opposite to my patient, and, to pass the time, instead of working on this occasion, I had a book. I have forgotten what it was except that it was a novel, one of Dickens' I think. Suddenly she began to laugh. I looked up, and saw her with her eyes shut as usual, but her head moving as if reading with her forehead, and her mouth smiling. 'What are you laughing at?' 'Why at the story, of course.' 'What story?' And she told me what I was reading about, making her comments on the characters, and expressing her amusement at some passages, and her sorrow at anything pathetic which I came to in the course of my reading.² I asked her the page and she told me. I asked her whereabouts in the page certain passages were, and she told me that also. I tried her with written letters and figures, and put her power to all kinds of tests, and the result always was that she knew what I knew but nothing beyond. She was never what is popularly known as 'clairvoyante.'

"I mention this particularly, because it was a point which I took great pains to ascertain; and several times when I asked her questions about people and things at a distance, her answers were so decided, and her knowledge apparently so minute and circumstantial that I was very nearly deceived into believing it to be true. But on every occasion of the sort, I found, on inquiry, that truth and fiction were mixed up together. Everything which I knew myself was true. But the particular facts

¹ This phenomenon is equally interesting whether it be regarded as an instance of an impression deferred for some time before emerging into the percipient's consciousness, or as an impression derived at the moment from an unconscious or sub-conscious stratum of the agent's mind.

² Cf. cases 149 and 407.

which were happening at the moment, and which she described as if she saw them, were purely imaginary.

“One remarkable instance in illustration of this I will relate. It happened during the summer, or early spring, of 1851. My married sister, with her husband and children, were expected at a vicarage 9 or 10 miles off, to pay a visit to his father. I knew this, and was, therefore, not surprised when she began to talk about it. Here, I thought, is a good opportunity to test her clairvoyance, so I said, ‘Oh, yes, we knew they were to come to-day, but have they arrived? Look and tell me?’ After a short pause she began in rather an excited way, ‘Yes, yes, I see them all just getting out of the carriage.’ ‘Whom do you see?’ I asked. ‘I see Mr. — and Mrs. — and the nurse, and so many children. They are going into the house, into the drawing-room on the left of the hall.’ She then described the vicarage, the drive up to it, and many other particulars with what I knew to be perfect accuracy, and her whole story was so likely, so much what I expected to happen, that I was quite prepared to have the whole confirmed on inquiry. But it was not so. In the first place, the train had been late, and the party did not arrive until an hour or two later; and, in the second place, my brother-in-law was detained at his own vicarage, many miles away, and never arrived at all at that time.

“On another occasion, some information she gave me about Mr. —, in India, though very likely and plausible, turned out to be incorrect.

“Her thought-reading was always perfect, but the clairvoyance always failed when accurately tested; and though I know how fallacious an opinion based on one experiment must often be, and also that there is plenty of good evidence for the truth of clairvoyance, I have sometimes speculated whether, if any apparent case of clairvoyance were accurately inquired into, it would not often be found to have its origin in ‘thought-reading.’ [See above, pp. 329 and 335.]

“Towards the end of the summer of 1851, I gave up magnetising ‘M.’ as a regular thing. Her health was much improved, and she lived for many years afterwards, only occasionally troubled with the St. Vitus’ dance, at which times my mother or one of my sisters took my place, and generally succeeded in quieting her.

“It was rather a trouble to me that after the first few weeks I scarcely saw ‘M.’ in her natural state. She was so sensitive to my presence that before I entered her room she was already half gone, and it was only at the end of each séance, when, with much difficulty, by means of upward passes, fanning, and other expedients I had succeeded in waking her, that I could communicate with her real self. I hoped that my long absence in India, eight years, would have worn out this influence; but when at last I returned home and went to see her, I found her already lapsing into the trance, and had great difficulty in keeping her out of it during my visit. I believe that a more experienced and skilful operator could have prevented this in the beginning, and throughout the course it was always a subject of regret to me.

“M. A. P.”

Two other witnesses of this percipient’s powers have supplied the following testimony. Mrs. D’Oyly writes on Nov. 24, 1885:—

“24, Westbourne Terrace, W.

“DEAR SIR,—My sister, Mrs. Pinhey, has to-day forwarded me a

letter of yours of July 30th. I had not seen her article [*i.e.*, the account just quoted], nor did I know till to-day that she had written one. It is difficult to know what corroborative evidence is required, but my own personal experience with Mary Naylor, my sister's patient, is curious and interesting, and I fancy almost identically the same as my sister's. On Mrs. Pinhey leaving England, I took up the case just where she left it. In every respect the same phenomena occurred with me as a mesmeriser as when my sister operated. My patient knew the contents of my letters, every thought of my mind; she would discuss the theatre, or the ball, or party, or church I might have been at since I had last visited her, and talked it all over as if *she* had been present; but sometimes, if a third person happened to be present, I would be a little nervous lest something should come out which I did not wish mentioned, but my inward fear would immediately make her cautious, and she would say, 'Oh, we must not talk about such-and-such things *to-day*, must we?' Sometimes during the séance she would complain of hunger. I would go to the cupboard, turn my back to prevent her seeing, and taste different things; she could always tell *what* particular thing I was eating, liked and disliked what *I* liked and disliked, and when I had had enough *her* appetite was satisfied. Mrs. Pinhey was totally unprepared for everything that happened, and each new phenomenon astonished her quite as much as it did outsiders.

"Her 'clairvoyance' was limited to this: that she knew any and every thing her mesmeriser knew, but no more. For instance, we would ask her for particulars of an absent sailor brother; her answer would be vague and 'guessing,' and always turned out to be merely the reflections of our own minds.

"As Mrs. Pinhey and I have had no communication on this topic, I hope my observations may be considered 'corroborative evidence.'—Believe me, yours faithfully,

"EMMA S. D'O'YLY."

Mrs. Ogle writes on the same date:—

"Sedgford Vicarage, King's Lynn.

"SIR,—I have been asked by my cousin, Mrs. Pinhey, if I remember seeing a girl, Mary Naylor (at Bury St. Edmunds), who was very ill of St. Vitus' Dance, and whom she mesmerised daily. As this was more than 30 years ago, I cannot recollect all I saw and heard; but one fact was deeply impressed on my mind, and I have often mentioned it since. Mrs. Pinhey had that morning received a letter from India, and after she had sent M. Naylor off to sleep, she held it up, without unfolding it, and made the girl tell her who and where it came from and certain particulars mentioned in the letter, known only to herself. This M. Naylor did with great reluctance, as she was overpowered with sleep, and begged to be let alone, and it required great firmness on Mrs. Pinhey's part to make the girl answer her questions. Mrs. Pinhey knew that I did not believe in mesmerism, and she was anxious that I should see the power she had over M. Naylor.

"I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

"HENRIETTA A. OGLE."

The following passages, bearing on telepathy, are extracted from some "Notes on Mesmerism," kept at intervals during the last few years, concurrently with the experiments which they record, by

Captain Battersby, R.A., F.R.A.S., of Ordnance House, Enniskillen. Both he and his mother-in-law, the percipient, Mrs. John Evens, of Old Bank, Enniskillen, have been mentioned before (case 311). The immediate object of the hypnotic treatment was simply the relief of pain. The extracts comprise phenomena of various sorts. To some of them the initials of independent observers were appended—to paragraphs A, B, and C, those of Miss J. A. Evens, Miss M. L. Evens, and Mrs. Battersby, and to paragraph D those of Mrs. Battersby—with the remark: “We certify that we were eye-witnesses of the occurrences to which our initials are appended, and that they are correctly described.”

(367) “To a question asked in a foreign language, the patient usually replied in the same, provided that I could myself have done so. Asking her, however, a question in German, the answer to which I could not myself have translated into that language, she (though herself a good German scholar) answered only—‘Your mouth is shut.’ Asked the same question when awake, she could answer in the language at once.

(A) “As a rule she would, when asleep, translate short sentences of Greek, Latin, or Irish, all quite unknown tongues to her, provided I knew the translation, but not otherwise. Now and then, however, this experiment failed.

“She could generally tell the time by a watch placed in her hand, the name of a book, the original of a photograph, &c., provided all these were known to me.”

[After describing an unusual trance which he observed in Mrs. Evens at the time of a distant thunder-storm, the narrator goes on:—]

“The electrical fluid in the air seemed to have excited Mrs. E. to a very high state of thought-reading, as she now began, for the first and only time I observed such a phenomenon, to speak of her own accord, unquestioned, and to follow the course of my thoughts aloud now and then.

(B) “During the trance there was apparently transference of sensation, as a hair tickling my forehead, a handkerchief dipped in eau-de-Cologne and applied to my face, &c., &c., all produced in her the corresponding sensations. She could also taste what I was eating or drinking. On one occasion strong smelling-salts applied to her nose produced no effect, but when applied to mine she started at once.

“On one or two occasions I mesmerised her from a distance, when in my quarters, half-a-mile off. On such occasions she was able to tell what I had been doing, and would generally go to sleep. The sensation she described was that of a hand pressed on her forehead. Though able thus to send her to sleep, I was unable to keep her so, as she would waken again the moment my attention wavered. The means used were stretching out my hand towards her house, and bringing my will sharply to bear, just as described in Robert Browning’s fine poem on ‘Mesmerism.’

(C) “After an absence of about 9 weeks I was curious to see whether

the force still existed unaltered, and accordingly tried the experiment, when Mrs. E. was playing a duet on the piano, with her back towards me, of willing her strongly to sleep. Almost at once she began to play false notes, and soon gave up playing, saying she felt tired and the piece was a sleepy one. I then ceased my influence, as I did not wish her to fall asleep.

(D) "I established the fact that Mrs. E. could be mesmerised by me without her knowledge, and awoke again so that she would have no idea that she had been in the mesmeric sleep, but would merely think that she had dozed for awhile. The incapability of rising by herself, however, which was always present after the sleep, would soon inform her of the truth.

"When partially awakened by the above means [reverse passes], however, the operation could be completed by a mere effort of will on my part, and this whether I was in the same room or no, Mrs. E. being at once conscious of this exertion of will."

In answer to inquiries, Captain Battersby says:—

"January 20th, 1886.

"On various occasions, separated sometimes by months from each other, I tried to mesmerise Mrs. E. from a distance; and in a large percentage of the cases she inquired of me, when she next saw or wrote to me, whether I had not done so at such and such a day or hour. At any time when in the trance, the act of looking at Mrs. E., or willing her to open her eyes, will cause her to do so."

In a later letter he adds:—

"I am sorry that I can give you no corroborative evidence of the mesmerism from a distance, as it was not often tried by me (for fear of causing Mrs. E. annoyance); and I do not think anyone was present with her on the occasions. She certainly was able to tell when I had been attempting to mesmerise her; but beyond that I cannot personally speak."

To these hypnotic cases, I will add a couple of instances of thought-transference where disease seems to have produced an equally abnormal condition in the percipient. The following account is extracted from a very remarkable record in Pététin's *Electricité Animale* (Paris, 1808). Dr. Pététin had been for some time attending a lady who suffered (among other things) from attacks of catalepsy. He says (pp. 55-7):—

"Je m'annonçai, comme j'avais coutume de le faire, en lui parlant sur le bout des doigts. Elle me répondit, 'Vous êtes paresseux ce matin, M. le Docteur.' 'Cela est vrai, madame; si vous en saviez la cause, vous ne me feriez pas ce reproche.' 'Eh! je la vois; vous avez la migraine depuis quatre heures, elle ne cessera qu'à six, et vous avez raison de ne rien faire pour cette maladie, que toutes les puissances humaines ne peuvent empêcher d'avoir son cours.' 'Depuis quand êtes-vous devenu médecin?' 'Depuis que j'ai les yeux d'Argus.' 'Pourriez-vous me dire de quel côté

est ma douleur ?' 'Sur l'œil droit, la tempe et les dents ; je vous prévient qu'elle passera à l'œil gauche, que vous souffrirez beaucoup entre trois et quatre heures, et qu'à six vous aurez la tête parfaitement libre.' 'Si vous voulez que je vous croie, il faut que vous me disiez ce que je tiens dans la main.' Je l'appuyai aussitôt sur son estomac, et la maladie, sans hésiter, me répondit, 'Je vois à travers votre main une médaille antique.' J'ouvre la main tout interdit ; la belle-sœur jeta les yeux sur la médaille, pâlit et se trouva mal. Revenue à elle-même, elle renferma dans une bonbonnière brune et à demi transparente un chiffon de papier, me donna la boîte derrière le fauteuil de sa sœur ; je l'enveloppai de ma main, et la présentai à l'estomac de la cataleptique, sans lui parler. 'Je vois dans votre main une boîte, et dans cette boîte une lettre à mon adresse.' La belle-sœur, épouvantée, tremblait sur ses jambes ; je me hâtai d'ouvrir la boîte ; j'en tirai une lettre pliée en quatre, à l'adresse de la malade, et timbrée de Genève.

"L'étonnement où me jeta cette découverte suspendit quelques instans ma douleur, et m'ôta toute réflexion. Je trouvai le tremblement de la belle-sœur très-naturel ; elle aurait pu se trouver plus mal, que je n'aurais pas songé à lui donner le moindre secours, et je restai stupéfait plus d'un quart d'heure. En revenant à moi, je demandai à la belle-sœur, comment elle s'était procuré la lettre qu'elle avait renfermée dans la bonbonnière ? Elle me répondit que cette lettre s'était trouvée dans la livre qu'elle lisait, en attendant ma visite ; qu'elle l'avait pris dans la bibliothèque de la malade, et qu'en l'ouvrant elle était tombée à ses pieds ; qu'elle l'avait relevée et mise dans sa poche pour la lui rendre, aussitôt qu'elle serait éveillée. Je pris le livre et l'examinai, comme si j'eusse dû y trouver l'empreinte de la lettre, tant ce nouveau prodige me paraissait incroyable ; mais me convenait-il bien d'en douter, d'après ma propre expérience ? Était-ce un autre qui avait mis dans ma main la médaille antique dont j'étais muni, avec le dessein de profiter de la première occasion pour la placer sur l'estomac de la malade, et voir si elle la signalerait, comme d'autres objets que je lui avais présentés ?"

In the evening, Dr. Pététin revisited his patient. He continues (pp. 62-5) :—

(368) "Avant de sortir, je plaçai, à tout événement, une petite lettre sur le haut de ma poitrine ; je m'enveloppai de mon manteau, et n'arrivai qu'à six heures et demie.

"Au coup de sept heures, la malade, très-attentive, animée par sa gaieté naturelle, éprouva deux secousses dans les bras ; et dans ce court espace de temps, ses yeux se fermèrent, sa physionomie exprima l'étonnement, ses couleurs disparurent, et la catalepsie la transforma en statue qui écoute.

"J'avançai mon fauteuil pour être plus près de la malade. Sa tête, toujours tournée du même côté, ne m'offrait que son profil ; je développai mon manteau, pour mettre le haut de mon corps à découvert. 'Eh ! depuis quand, M. le Docteur, la mode est-elle venue de porter ses lettres sur la poitrine ?' J'allongeai le bras pour atteindre du bout du doigt le creux de l'estomac de la cataleptique ; et en réunissant les doigts de mon autre main, je lui répondis à voix ordinaire, 'Madame, vous pourriez vous tromper.' 'Non, je suis sûre de ce que je vois. Vous avez sur la poitrine

une lettre qui n'est pas plus grande que cela—qu'on l'applique à la mesure.' En proférant ces paroles, elle donna une autre position à sa tête, qu'elle dirigea de mon côté ; elle avança les deux bras, alongea l'index de la main gauche, et avec celui de la droite qu'elle posa dessus, détermina dans la plus grande précision la place qu'elle devait occuper. Tous les regards tombèrent sur moi. J'écartai ma veste, on vit la lettre ; l'ami s'en empara pour l'appliquer sur le doigt qui l'attendait ; elle ne l'eut pas plutôt touché, que la malade ajouta, '*Si je n'étais pas discrète, je pourrais en dire le contenu ; mais pour prouver que je l'ai bien lue, il n'y a que deux lignes et demie, très-minutées.*' Après avoir obtenu la permission de l'ouvrir, chacun vit que le billet ne renfermait que deux lignes et demie, dont les caractères étaient menus. L'ami passant tout-à-coup du plus haut degré d'étonnement à celui de la plus grande défiance, tira de sa poche une bourse, la mit sur ma poitrine, croisa ma veste, et me poussa du côté de la malade. '*M. le Docteur, ne vous gênez pas ; vous avez, dans ce moment, sur la poitrine, la floche de M. B. ; il y a tant de louis d'un côté et d'argent blanc de l'autre ; mais que personne ne se dérange, je vais dire ce que chacun a de plus remarquable dans ses poches.*'" She fulfilled this promise.

Many other incidents are recorded in this case. Pététin himself regards them all as *clairvoyant* in character ; but the hypothesis of thought-transference was never excluded by the conditions (see pp. 329, 335, 342).

The final instance is another extract from the *Mechanism of Man* (Vol. II., pp. 175-7). This case, like the two last quoted, was observed during a considerable period. Serjeant Cox says :—

(369) "The patient was my sister, a girl of 15, of hysterical temperament and somewhat deficient in intelligence. I was 6 years her senior. I had then no knowledge of the phenomena of somnambulism, beyond the uses made of it by the novelist and the dramatist. I had never even heard of mesmerism. I was, therefore, a perfectly unprejudiced witness.

[The writer then describes cataleptic fits, from which his sister suffered, and which used to pass off, leaving her in a semi-conscious, trance-like state.]

"If, as she lay upon the sofa, her eyes firmly closed, I opened a book having pictures in it, and sat *behind her* in a position where it was physically impossible that she could see what I was doing, and I looked at one of the pictures, she forthwith exhibited, in pantomimic action, the posture of each person there depicted. It was perfectly manifest that she had the image of the engraving impressed upon her mind, as distinctly as if it had been conveyed to it by the sense of sight. Nor is it to be explained by the suggestion that the engravings were familiar to her, and that she guessed upon which of them I was looking ; for it was the same with books and pictures purposely tried which she had never seen. But whether that impression was obtained through *my* mind, in which the image also was, or that her mind perceived the picture itself directly, although out of the range of vision, is the problem to be solved. If the servant who attended her, obedient to her signalled desire, went to her

bedroom *on the floor above* the room in which she was lying entranced, she expressed the most obvious signs of annoyance if the servant above touched the wrong thing, and of satisfaction when she touched the right one, precisely as if the search had been made in the same room and she saw what was going on. The experiment was purposely tried many times, with various tests, so as to leave no doubt of the fact upon any member of the family who witnessed it.

“It should be stated that when a part of the picture was covered, so that I could see but a part, her perceptions were limited to the part seen by me. I was, indeed, unable to trace any power of perception of anything not seen by the person with whom her mind was at the time associated. She perceived behind her so much of the picture as was seen by me and impressed on my mind. She perceived the objects seen and touched by her servant upstairs and so impressed upon her mind.

“These phenomena continued for nearly 2 years, so that there was ample opportunity for observing them. Imposture was out of the question. Delusion was impossible. The occurrence was in a private family, and witnessed by none but themselves and the attendant physician, whose sagacious explanation of it I have narrated.” [The explanation referred to was that it was a case of hysteria “and in hysteria people can do anything.”]

CHAPTER II.

IDEAL, EMOTIONAL, AND MOTOR CASES.

§ 1. THE present chapter will contain instances parallel to those given in Chapters VI. and VII. of Vol. I., arranged as far as possible in the same order. These accounts, and the dream-cases of the succeeding chapter, belong (as pointed out in Vol. I., p. 234) to the weakest evidential classes; and I should have been glad to present them in a more condensed shape. But I found on making the attempt, that such force as they possess, and—what it is equally a duty to bring out—their evidential defects, were apt to disappear when their form was altered.

I will begin with cases where the transference of an idea seems to have been of a tolerably definite and literal kind.

The first five cases (taken in connection with others)¹ form a group which strongly suggests that a fugitive faculty of percipience may be developed by an abnormal condition of mind and body.

(370) From Mrs. Mainwaring, Knowles, Ardingly, Hayward's Heath.

“March 14th, 1885.

“During the Mutiny, I was staying with a friend, dreadfully ill—too ill to be told what was going on. A baby was born, and a day or two after, my friend's wife, sitting on my bed, received a letter. I said, ‘You need not read it, I know every word,’ and I told her. It was to say she must not drive that afternoon to the Fort as usual, for some men were going to be hanged on the road. I had not heard a word of the discovery of the plot, or of the plot, or of what was to be; but I said every word in the letter, and I remember my friend's face of astonishment, as she said, ‘Why, how did you know it?’ It didn't seem at all odd to me.

“E. L. MAINWARING.”

Subsequently Mrs. Mainwaring wrote:—

“June 18th, 1885.

“In compliance with your request, I wrote to my old friend, but I have not had a line in reply. I do not know what can have become of her, as it would have been very little trouble to say if she recollected the

¹ See the list in p. 162, first note, as well as the cases of the preceding chapter.

facts I told you of. I do not like to write again, and I am sorry, therefore, I cannot add her testimony.”

[In cases belonging to a weak class—*i.e.*, a class where the experience of the percipient is not of a sufficiently strongly-marked type to make it violently improbable that it would be afterwards imagined or modified in memory—absence of corroboration is of course a doubly important defect. This remark applies to a good many of the examples that follow.]

In the following case, again, the percipient was in a state of serious illness.

(371) From Mr. E. Chapman, (wood-carver) Windsor Hall, Brighton.
“1884.

“My father, when a young man, entered the service of Sir Charles Dymoke; estate, Scrivelsby Hall, Lincolnshire. He rose rapidly to become almost constant companion.” Mr. Chapman then describes how his father on one occasion saved the coachman of Sir C. Dymoke from very serious danger and disgrace, for which the coachman said that “he would thank him with his dying breath.”

“Many years after this happened, my father was lying very ill; so much so he could not help himself in any way. My mother had just made him as comfortable as possible, (he was perfectly helpless,) and she had gone downstairs to attend to her household affairs, when she heard a loud knocking, and going upstairs, found my father sitting bolt upright in bed. On asking him how he came in that position, he exclaimed, ‘O mother,’ (they always called each other mother and father), ‘what is the time?’ (being told); ‘What is it to-day?’ (Thursday), ‘And the day of the month? Now write it all down at once.’

“Being asked why he wished it to be written, he answered ‘So-and-so,’ naming the aforesaid coachman, ‘is dead.’ ‘How do you know that, father?’ ‘Don’t ask me. You will have a letter in two or three days.’ On the third day from that time the letter came announcing the death of the said coachman, somewhere in Norfolk—so that he and my father must have been 50 miles apart at the time. My father, on sinking down to his former helpless condition, exclaimed, ‘O how cold it was.’ We never could get a further explanation from him, but for a long time after, when anyone offered to shake hands with him in their shirt-sleeves, or had a light coat on, he would shudder and sometimes say, ‘How cold.’

“EDWARD CHAPMAN.”

[The last words suggest some sort of *sensory* impression made on the percipient; but the evidence for this is insufficient.]

In the next example the percipient was not only ill, but closely approaching death.

(372) From the *Memoirs of the Rev. Joseph Buckminster, D.D., and of his son, the Rev. J. S. Buckminster*, by Eliza Buckminster Lee, Dr. Buckminster’s daughter, (Boston, U.S.A., 1851), pp. 464 and 476–7. Both father and son were noted preachers. The “Mrs. Buckminster” mentioned was the father’s third wife.

“On Tuesday evening, June 9th, he (the son) expired.
When his [Dr. Buckminster’s] wife entered his [Dr. Buckminster’s]

chamber the next morning he said to her, with perfect composure, 'My son Joseph is dead.' Mrs. Buckminster, supposing that he had slept and dreamed that his son was dead, although no news of his illness had reached him, assured him that it was a dream. 'No,' he replied, 'I have not slept nor dreamed; he is dead!' This incident is related as received from the lips of her to whom the words were spoken, and there can be no shadow of doubt of their truth."

The particulars of dates, &c., are as follows:—

Dr. Joseph Buckminster was living at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where he had been for many years pastor of a church. On the 1st or 2nd of June, 1812, he left Portsmouth intending to travel for his health. He reached Peedsborough, a little village, on the 9th of June, and died there the following morning. The Rev. J. S. Buckminster (the son) was living at Boston in delicate health. He was taken suddenly ill on June 3, and died on June 9th, 24 hours before the death of his father. Dr. Buckminster must have been aware of his son's delicate state of health, but no one seems to have expected his death to occur when it did. There is no mention of letters being sent to warn Dr. Buckminster, nor do the family seem to have been aware of the son's illness until after the father's death. Indeed Dr. Buckminster had intended to visit his son and daughter at Boston, on his return from the expedition which was cut short by his own death.

The next example exhibits the faculty in a less fugitive form, and in connection with more chronic disease.

(373) From the *Zoist*, Vol. V., p. 311.

Dr. Elliotson writes:—"The following particulars were sent to me by a medical gentleman, who has already contributed with his name to the *Zoist*, but begs his name not to be disclosed on the present occasion, though I am at liberty to mention it to any person privately.

"JOHN ELLIOTSON."

"DEAR SIR,—I have some personal analogous experience. It is nearly nine years since I took the immediate charge of a gentleman of deranged intellect, with whom I reside in intimate association as friend. I have often, particularly in the earlier years of my charge, been thoroughly puzzled to account for his knowledge of circumstances, perhaps mere trifles, with which we did not wish him to become acquainted. I did not deem them worthy of note at the time, that is, I did not make any memorandum of them, and would not now like to trust to my memory as to the particulars, nor would they be clearly apprehended without entering into tedious prosy details. Suffice it that long before I read the *Zoist*, I had expressed to the able medical gentleman who regularly visits us an opinion that 'our friend seemed to know things as if a spiritual intelligence was at his elbow and whispered in his ear'; 'formerly they would have said he had a familiar spirit'; 'know, he certainly does, but how I can't make out'; and such like remarks, showing my impression at the time.

"Our patient's mental condition has greatly improved, and I do not now often observe these curious perceptions, or they are not so singular or

strongly marked as to preclude the possibility of their being matters of accidental coincidence.

“About three years since, for a few evenings, this perceptive power was wonderfully acute; he was in an argumentative and quarrelsome humour at the time. We sat together by the fireside, while our tea was infusing, seemingly both engaged in thought, when my friend exclaimed, ‘I don’t think that, sir; I don’t think that. I don’t believe it. I say I don’t believe it.’ I replied quietly, ‘Don’t believe what, Mr. —? I have not spoken; what do you allude to?’ He immediately, without noticing my remark that I had not spoken, referred to the precise subject of which I had just been thinking, and began to contradict me respecting it. Had this occurred but once, it might be said I was ‘unconsciously thinking aloud,’ but several similar manifestations of perceptive power took place about this time; and, as I was on my guard, I can certainly state, with as firm a conviction of the truth of my averment as any one who confides in his senses and memory can feel, that I *did not speak* my thoughts, but that there was a clairvoyant perception of them, or perception in some unaccountable manner.

“Another instance is well-marked, and caused us much interest and wonder at the time. Four-and-a-half years since, it became necessary that M—, our house-steward and butler, should be discharged. As he was an old family servant, and his dismissal might irritate our patient, it was deemed advisable that we should pay a visit to the seaside for a month, and his removal be effected during our absence. Without tedious explanation I cannot convey the grounds of my conviction, but surely convinced am I that our poor friend neither did nor could know anything of the contemplated change, until the day preceding that of our return home. He was then informed by letter that M— had, for certain reasons, been sent away, and a very comfortable, respectable elderly person, Mrs. T—, installed in his place. . . . Next morning we started for home, a distance of 60 miles. Whilst the horses were being changed for the last stage, . . . I explained that Mrs. T— would take care to make us comfortable; that she was a very respectable person; that we would not consider her a common servant, but call her our lady housekeeper, &c., &c., in the same strain, trying to impress that she was a very superior person to the one she had succeeded. As I finished, we started. My friend threw himself back in the carriage, and did not speak for 8 or 10 minutes, and then said, ‘I don’t see that, Mr. —’ (addressing me), ‘I don’t see that; I don’t believe it. M— kept a grocer’s shop’ (Mrs. T— kept a grocer’s shop before she came) ‘before he came; one grocer is as good as another; both shopkeepers; no difference in respectability, I think.’ This was strictly true; and the inquiries which I made to discover how our friend knew it only tended to puzzle me, as the attendants, whose casual remarks might have been overheard, declared that they did not know Mrs. T— was a grocer until I named it; and other sources of information there were not.”¹

¹ While this chapter is passing through the press, I have received, from Mr. W. H. Dayman, of Redbridge, Southampton, an account of Mrs. Occomore, a bed-ridden old woman in his village, blind and a little deaf, and living a completely isolated life, who seems sometimes to have an abnormal intuition of what is passing in other minds. From among other less distinct instances, I select the two following. I should premise that Mrs. Occomore, her daughter, Mrs. Fitcher, and a grand-daughter, are the only occupants of the house.

If the following case is accurately reported, the percipient must again have been in a very abnormal condition; as people do not usually commit suicide because their fathers die. It is probable that, though both deaths occurred, the exactitude of the coincidence may have been exaggerated; and the scene on ship-board has very likely become, in recollection and transmission, more picturesque and dramatic than it really was.

(374) From Mr. Nicholas Heald, Bowdon-by-Altrincham, Cheshire.

“July 7th, 1884.

“The late John Gisborne [the narrator’s brother-in-law], who was an officer in the naval service of the old East India Company, often during his life told the following incident:—

“One Saturday evening, when it was the sailors’ custom, among other toasts, always to give ‘Sweethearts and Wives,’ followed by others, and when the ship was thousands of miles distant from England, one of his brother officers who was silent, gloomy, and depressed, was urged to give his toast, but made no reply. At length, after constant pressure, he stood up and said, looking sternly around on his merry companions, ‘Well, fill your glasses,’ and followed this up by saying, ‘I give you the memory of my *dead* father.’ Shocked at this, his brother officers hesitated, when he again sternly repeated, ‘I give you the memory of my *dead* father.’ He then left the table, went upon deck and was seen no more, having, it is supposed, thrown himself overboard.

“On the ship’s arrival in the Thames, Gisborne, after reporting himself at the India House, went to the house of the young man’s father, some short distance in the suburbs, to communicate to the family his death. He asked to see the father, and on the servant saying he was dead, found, in answer to his inquiries, that he died the very *same day* that his son drowned himself.

“NICHOLAS HEALD.”

Mr. Gisborne’s daughter (Loventor House, Berry Pomeroy, Totnes) writes:—

“I recollect very well, and have often repeated it to others, what dear papa related, which was that at the mess table the officer suddenly drank to his just deceased father’s memory, and immediately left and threw himself overboard, and on arrival in England, papa found the date and hour *exactly* corresponded with the father’s death. I don’t know the ship or officer’s name.”

(1) “On the 22nd March, Mrs. F., who had been some time undecided as to giving notice to leave the house they all live in, which she rents, finally decided to do so, and sent Mrs. T. [her daughter] to Winchester to give notice to the proper authorities. On that day Mrs. O., who of course knew nothing about it, began declaring that they were all going to leave the house and that she must be packing up her things. So the whole of the day she was busy with her hands fumbling about the bed-clothes, fancying she was packing things. For two days she kept on like this.

(2) “On March 26th, Mrs. F. went out into her yard to clean up some straw which was littered about there. She was called off her work to attend to her mother (Mrs. O.). Upon getting into her room, Mrs. O. at once began telling her to sweep up the straw which she declared was strewn all over the room, and no assurances to the contrary would convince her that there was no straw there, till finally, to satisfy her, Mrs. F. got the broom and pretended to sweep it up.

Mr. Gisborne's widow says that she thinks the young officer's name was Hunter.

[Such an incident as the suicide would probably be recorded in the log, and a laborious search has therefore been made at the India Office, in order to ascertain the name of the ship ; but without success.]

(375) From Miss Butler, Priestown, Co. Meath.

December 18th, 1885.

Miss Butler begins by describing her unusually strong friendship with a Madame H., head of a finishing establishment for young ladies at F., in Germany, with whom she lived for some time. Mrs. H. having gone to Paris for a few weeks, to engage a French governess, Miss Butler spent this period at her own home, and the greater part of it in bed, as she was still suffering from the effects of an illness. Here she had a vivid sense of accompanying Madame H. on her search through the different convents of Paris. She finally insisted on returning to F., being sure that Madame H. would be back before the appointed time, which proved to be the case.

"I told her how I had followed all her movements; I described the different convents; described the room in the *Sacré Cœur*, I think it was, in which she saw the young woman she actually engaged; described the Mother Superior; told her the young lady's name, *Mdlle. F.*, which of course I had never heard, and told her the terms on which she had engaged her. She was astonished. There was a kind of superior housekeeper, a *Frau M.*, who was much in Madame's confidence; she was present while I told my tale and Madame said it was all true. I told her I remembered many other things, the particulars of which have escaped my memory, as they had no interest for me save as they concerned my Madame. Amongst others, I described her meeting with a French gentleman who used to visit her at F., and mentioned the subject of conversation. *Mademoiselle* came over with her; she made me describe to her the room at the convent, the conversation, &c., and the poor girl said she was frightened of me, she was sure I was not all right, and I don't think she ever got over the feeling of constraint, shall I call it, to the end of our connection.

"ISABELLA BUTLER."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Butler writes:—

"It must have been in the year 1849 or 1850. I have never had any further experience—at least nothing of the same kind that I could detail in as circumstantial a manner." She has long lost sight of Madame H.; and *Mdlle. F.* and *Frau M.* are dead.

In the next few cases the percipient was apparently in a perfectly normal state.

(376) The following incident is recorded in *All the Year Round* for May 6, 1859, by a physician who does not give his name, but who says that it was described to him as a personal experience by Prof. Wilson, of Edinburgh. The physician himself writes sensibly, and much of his paper is devoted to explaining the purely subjective nature of many of the hallucinations which have been marvelled at as "apparitions."

Prof. Wilson (as reported) begins by describing a picnic party, to which he went with some friends in Ireland:—

“The thick of the dinner being over, we strolled out, or lolled, in that pleasant prolongation of a repast, which is the best part of a thing of that sort; but as we knew that, according to the programme, our time was limited, on account of some other spots which we had yet to visit, I was deputed to see, by a reference to my watch, that we did not overstay the hour. Accordingly, I had placed my watch—a fine old silver warming-pan, the paternal gift—on a low fragment of ruin that was just opposite to me, and in the intervals of conversation I looked at it, though indeed not quite so often as at the face of Mary M. Suddenly—I perfectly remember the hands were pointing to twenty minutes past two in the sunshine—the watch arrested my gaze, while a remarkable feeling passed over me. I said to myself, but to this hour I know not why, ‘At this exact time my brother R. is dying in India.’ The sensation came and went with the rapidity of those unaccountable impressions

‘Which make the present, while the flash doth last,
Seem but the semblance of an unknown past.’

Yet, so much was I struck with the incident, that taking out my pocket-book, saying nothing, however, to anybody as to why I did so, I noted down the day and hour of this strange visitation of thought. I did not exactly place confidence in the prevision, yet I could not shake off an unpleasant feeling about it. At length the incident became merged in the frequent repetition to myself that it was ‘all fudge,’ and I might call it forgotten (there was plenty of time for this, for it was not in the days of steam), when a letter from India brought our family the startling intelligence that my brother had actually died there on the very day when I had made the entry in my pocket-book, and at an hour which, by allowance for latitude [no doubt a slip of the writer’s own], corresponded exactly with that marked by my watch when I had my eyes on it. Our correspondent also informed us that my brother had, in his last moments, mentioned me.”¹

¹ The following narrative is very similar, and in detail also closely resembles case 72. I do not give it an evidential number, as it is not certain that the witness was cognisant of the percipient’s impression before the news of the death arrived. Mrs. Harper, of Cotham, Bristol, narrates:—

“My father-in-law, Mr. A. Harper, told me that at one time of his life he was in the Spanish wool trade, and that it necessitated one of the partners residing in Spain, and in consequence his cousin, Mr. James B., went to Spain. Before leaving Bristol he became engaged to a Miss B. Some time after his departure, Miss B. was at a large party, seated at the piano, when she suddenly withdrew her hands, sobbing hysterically, saying, ‘James B. is dead; James B. is dead.’ She could not explain how she knew it, but had a most convincing consciousness that it was so, and he really had died in Spain at the time of Miss B.’s distress. “S. J. HARPER.”

Mrs. Hellier, of Headingly College, Leeds, writes on April 7, 1885:—

“My sister-in-law, Mrs. Harper, of Bristol, has forwarded to me your letter of the 4th, asking for further information regarding an incident related to her by my late father, Mr. A. Harper. I am sorry that I cannot inform you on the point you name, viz., my father being present when it occurred. The probability is that he was *not*, but that he heard it next day from those who were. He was then in the employ of his uncle, Mr. B. (a Spanish wool merchant), and consequently in daily intercourse with him and his other sons, all of whom are dead.

“I *well* remember hearing my father and mother talk of the incident in question, but being a mere child at the time (7 or 8 years of age) did not take much interest in the conversation. “JANE E. HELLIER.”

I will add a parallel case in which the incidents are so simple that even a third-hand account is of some evidential force.

Mrs. Michael Smith, of 27, Perham Road, S.W., narrates:—

“June, 1884.

“My grandfather, Mr. John Syme, of Ryedale, Dumfriesshire, the friend and patron

(377) From Mrs. Clerke, Clifton Lodge, Farquhar Road, Upper Norwood, S.E., the narrator of case 242.

“November 18th, 1885.

“My two boys returned to school on the 18th September. They intended to try the route *vid* Swindon and Andover, on account of the trains being more convenient, instead of going by Paddington.

“They left home about 3 o'clock, and I heard no more about them until the Monday following, but I was very uneasy all the evening, and about 9.30 I remarked to my daughter, ‘I am perfectly convinced that those boys have never got to Marlborough; I am quite sure they are *walking about the roads* this minute.’ She said, ‘What nonsense! of course they are all right. Gus’ (the youngest), ‘is so sensible, he never would make a mistake.’ I said, ‘I don’t know, but I feel quite sure they have missed one train after another, and have never got there.’ On the Monday following I heard from them. They *had* missed the train at Waterloo, had then gone to Paddington, missed the special there, and had gone by a later, which, by a curious combination of circumstances, had landed them at *Woodborough*. They got out, mistaking it in the dark for Marlborough, and only found out their mistake too late, and had walked 11 miles on a road unknown to them, and got to their school at 1 o'clock in the morning. They managed to scale the walls, and found a class-room open, where they got what sleep they could—very little. “M. CLERKE.”

Miss Clerke corroborates as follows:— “November 30th, 1885.

“I remember distinctly, when my brothers returned to school, that my mother remarked several times to me that she felt quite sure that they were walking about the roads somewhere. We found out afterwards that it was just as my mother said, and, at the time she spoke, they actually were walking to Marlborough.

“H. F. B. CLERKE.”

[In describing the incident to me, Mrs. Clerke, who is the reverse of a nervous or fanciful person, especially dwelt on her impression that her sons were *wandering on roads*. This particular idea seems a far less likely one to have been purely subjectively caused, through maternal apprehension, than that of some calamity, such as a railway accident. It was also a very unlikely thing to occur in reality. At the same time, it may be conceived that the mention of the projected novel route had led to some passing remark—such as, “Don’t blunder about your trains, or you’ll have to walk;” and that the odd impression had its origin in this forgotten suggestion.]

(378) Mr. J. W. Stillman, the well-known American writer, gives the

of Burns, was a remarkable man. Two of his sons were abroad, one in the army in India, one commanding a ship of his own in the merchant navy, at the West Indies. One day my grandfather entered the room where my aunt, his only daughter, was sitting, and said to her, ‘Harriet, your brother John is dead.’ Afterwards it was proved that he had died on that day in India. My aunt noted the day, and six months later came the news of his death. Another time he came to his daughter, and, in exactly the same way, stood in the doorway, delivered his speech, and went away—‘Harriet, Richard is dead,’—and subsequently word came that he had died on that day.

“This was told to me by an uncle, since dead. I have no means of corroborating this, though I know it to be literally true, as my grandfather died more than 50 years ago, and was then past 70. I never saw him. He was with Burns, crossing a moor in a thunderstorm, when Burns was inspired by ‘Scots wha hae.’”

The Harriet of the narrative (Mrs. Smith’s aunt) is also dead. Mrs. Smith never heard how the warning was given; she believes that her grandfather never told anyone.

following account of his experiences in connection with two friends. Of the first he says:—

“She had never been subject to visions or hallucinations, had no tendency to hysteria, and was gifted with great common-sense in practical matters. She was the wife of a physician, and mother of several children. But she had a psychological power which is in my experience unique, and between herself and any very intimate friend there was a mental sympathy almost amounting on her part to clairvoyance. Between her and myself there was especially a sympathy so distinct that I could generally, by excluding physical objects of attention, perceive her mental, sometimes physical, condition, and she on her part had generally a pre-sentiment of my visits.

“She passed a great deal of her time at the house of a married daughter in Brooklyn, my residence being in New York. On one occasion, while staying at her daughter’s, she was visited by what the Germans call the *Doppel-gänger* of myself. Entering the room where she sat sewing at a window, looking out on the street, at an hour in the afternoon when she had no reason to expect a visit, she remarked at once, ‘I knew you were coming for I saw you pass the window 10 minutes ago. You were looking just as you now look, and dressed in precisely the same manner. I waited for you to ring the bell, and when after some time no ring came, I said to myself “Stillman is coming.”’ I had not previously passed the house, but came straight from the ferry, and when I came in sight, came from the same direction as the *Doppel-gänger*, between which and myself, she said, there was no visible difference. [This, however, may have been a case of mistaken identity.]

“If she ever desired to see me urgently, I felt the impression of her mind so strongly that I invariably, when not urgently occupied, went to her at once. Some years after I knew her, she went to California, in the hope of throwing off the pulmonary disease of which she died, and during her absence we corresponded regularly. One day, during the voyage, I had a sudden and vivid impression that she was dying, and noted it in my diary. The impression passed away, however, and was not renewed. On getting the letter which announced her safe arrival I found recorded that, on the day I had noted in my diary, she had been completely overcome by the intense heat, and had it not been for the steamer’s fortunate arrival the same day at Acapulco, where ice and lemon were instantly procured from the shore, in her own opinion and that of the surgeon she would probably have died that day.

“One day, while working quietly in my studio at New York, not knowing where she was, nor having had any recent communication from her, I had suddenly a vivid perception that she wanted the help of Sara [her daughter]. I crossed the ferry at once to Brooklyn, took a carriage and drove to her daughter’s house, saying to her that her mother wanted her, saw her in the carriage, and on her way, and then went back to my studio. The next day I learned that [Mrs. M. had been suddenly forced to participate in a most distressing and agitating] scene, during which her daughter arrived, finding her mother completely prostrated and fainting, and carried her off to her own house.

“One of the most intimate mutual friends of Mrs. M. and myself was a Mrs. B., wife of a well-known American sculptor. Between Mrs. B. and

myself there was a *mental* sympathy, even stronger than that with Mrs. M., though different in kind. Like Mrs. M., she was much my senior, and like her, too, was a victim to an over-developed nervous system, though rarely ill—of uncommon intellectual gifts, and the friend of many of the best minds of that day in America. But, like Socrates, she heard a voice which warned, counselled, and answered her at all times, and whose admonitions neither she nor her husband ever hesitated to obey. She had Zschokke's gift¹ of seeing events in the past life of people with whom she was *en rapport*, and I remember W. C. Bryant saying one day that she had told him of events of the gravest importance in his life, known to no one then living but himself. In her normal condition she read the thoughts of any one with whom she was intimate, and answered mental questions, or described mental conditions with no hesitation, and the greatest fulness and clearness. Her gifts were carefully limited in their manifestation, or as subjects of conversation, to her circle of intimate friends, with occasional admission of one of their friends with a genuine interest in this class of mental phenomena; nor should I now make them the subject of any relation, but that she is dead. There are still many of her circle living who can attest the truth of what I say; but she would never submit to any examination by sceptical inquirers, and never made any attempt to induce belief in her powers, of which, no more, did she attempt explanation. Her 'occult' powers varied greatly, and sometimes seemed entirely suspended, as well as affected by the influence of people around her. Between her and myself there was always a complete confidence, and I found it quite impossible to think in her presence and keep my thoughts from her; and her feeling for me was that of an elder sister, so that I willingly submitted my mind to her scrutiny; nor did I ever find her perceptions unfounded, although, in some cases, it was several years before I found out the basis of her impressions.

"W. J. STILLMAN."

(379) From a lady who desires that names may not be mentioned, owing to the painful nature of one of the facts recorded.

"Sept. 1st, 1886.

"In the spring of this year, while my mother was suffering from a serious illness, a gentleman in the neighbourhood committed suicide by shooting himself in the mouth, between 4 and 5 in the morning, dying about three-quarters of an hour afterwards. Early in the morning of the occurrence, [while the narrator was nursing her,] she mentioned him several times, saying he 'kept flitting about her room and did so bother her, she wished he would go.' After this she addressed the supposed intruder, saying, 'Go! I wish you would go. Why do you come here? I don't want you.' He was a man with whom she was on terms of civility, but had never cordially liked, as she considered he had done her an injury. This led her to add, 'I forgive you, I hope God will. Go!' [This incident alone could have no weight, as in her illness Mrs. — had seemed to see other absent persons in her room.] She did not allude to him again, and was not quite so restless. The doctor called at half-past 10; and when I went back to her room after he had gone, I found her in a very excited condition. She said, 'Dr. S. has made me feel so

¹ For Zschokke's description of his gift, see *Eine Selbstschau*, (Aarau, 1843) pp. 227-9.

strange—I never had such peculiar sensations before ; I wish he had never come.¹ My head is so bad, I don't know how it is, perhaps I shall be able to explain it all to you when I am well.'

"She was very restless all the morning. At 1 o'clock my sister came to relieve me, and tried to fan her to sleep. Her efforts were unavailing, and at last my mother seized her hands, saying, 'It is of no use, you cannot send me to sleep while my head is so queer.' 'How queer?' 'I don't know, but ever since Dr. S. came and sat by me, I have felt so strange. When he took my hand, there was a shot, a pistol went off, and then all was confusion.'² But I do not see the blood ; was there any blood?' After which she added, 'I dare say I shall be able to tell you more about it when my head is better ; I cannot explain how I feel now, I have never been like this before—it is my brain.' Later on in the afternoon, she mentioned a friend, saying, 'Poor T. has to be shot in the back so often before I can be well. I am very sorry ; it is a shame to shoot a nice fellow like him, but they say "Shoot him, shoot him."' And again, complaining of her head, she said, 'What is all this murdering? I have never been amongst shooting and murdering, have I? There is a pistol—it went off first when Dr. S came, and it has been going on through my head ever since, and the bed is covered with them.' She continued in this excited state all the afternoon, and could not be persuaded to sleep. My sister went to the doctor, and he sent something which soothed her a little ; but she did not seem to be really herself again until the next morning.

"We heard from the doctor that he had been to the house where the suicide had been committed, before calling to see my mother, and that he had held the pistol in the same hand with which he touched her. She was not told of the gentleman's death until 3 weeks afterwards ; but she frequently alluded to Mr. — [the deceased] and his family—which appeared strange, as they were persons with whom she held very little intercourse. She once remarked that they had quite haunted her ever since that day she was so ill and heard the pistols. Her friend T., whom she had imagined to be shot, had heard early of the suicide, and been engaged in communicating the fact to relatives of the deceased gentleman."

Dr. S. confirmed these facts to me, as far as he was concerned. Mrs. — had never had any connection with pistols or shooting. The suicide was known of in the house before the doctor's visit ; but it was clear to me from Miss —'s *viva voce* description that no remarks on the subject could have penetrated to Mrs. —'s ears ; and, moreover, she was quite enough herself to understand the news, and comment on it, had it come to her knowledge in a normal way.

(380) From the Rev. Mr. Bryce, The Manse, Moffat. To my great disappointment, I am obliged to give a second-hand version of this case.

¹ His visits, as I learnt both from himself and from the narrator, had always, except on this occasion, been grateful and soothing to the patient ; and he had regarded her as convalescent.

² An account of this occurrence, which was sent without authority to a London newspaper, affords a good instance of the way in which a story may get rounded off and beautified in transmission. After exclaiming that a gun had gone off, the lady is made to look wildly round, and to cry "Oh, I see Mr. B. floating about the room,"—the vision of the deceased being thus brought into connection with the sound of the shot, through the juxtaposition of events which were separated by several hours ; and the fact of the other visual hallucinations being of course omitted.

On Oct. 1, 1886, Mr. Bryce gave me *visà voce* a detailed account, which I omitted to commit at once to paper, relying on his promise to write it out and send it to me immediately. Not having received it (Oct. 12), I am reduced to giving my present recollections, the accuracy of which, however, so far as they go, I think I can guarantee.

Some years ago, when Mr. Bryce was a student at Edinburgh University, he was called away for a time to attend an elder brother who was much attached to him, and who was seriously ill. His brother's health seemed to be improving; and there being no immediate anxiety, Mr. Bryce left him (I think at Lockerbie) in order to take part in an evening debate at Edinburgh. He was delivering the speech which he had prepared, and was completely intent on the matter in hand, when he was suddenly arrested by what, from his description, I should judge to have been an extremely vivid "mind's eye" vision, bordering on hallucination, and representing his brother. The room and everything in it seemed blotted out, and the single image of his brother seemed to absorb his whole consciousness. He says that he has never had such an experience, or anything in the least resembling it, on any other occasion. I do not recollect how far his peculiar condition excited the attention of his companions; but he himself felt at once convinced that his brother had died, noted the time, and, when he returned to his lodgings, mentioned his conviction to the housekeeper, Mrs. Fenton. (He promised to trace out Mrs. Fenton, who, he is certain, would corroborate him on this point.) His brother died, as he learnt next day, at the exact time—he believes to the very minute—of his own experience.

[Mr. Bryce is sure that he was not appreciably anxious about his brother's condition, and he was certainly not thinking of him at the moment. Still, as he had just left him, after being constantly with him for some time, and with a mind influenced perhaps more than he himself knew by his recent cares and duties, it would be difficult to argue that his experience was telepathic, rather than purely subjective, but for the alleged exactitude of the coincidence. And we may fairly suppose, I think, that the coincidence was at any rate a very close one; since Mr. Bryce was not led to consider the time of his experience by learning the fact of the death, but noted the time of his experience under a conviction that the death had at that moment taken place, and was specially interested in finding out, next day, whether his conviction had been justified.]

(381) From Miss Caulfield, 1, Hyde Park Mansions, N.W.

"December 8th, 1883.

"Many years ago, when staying with my father at Beckford House, Bath, I awoke one morning painfully impressed by the idea that something was amiss at my sister's (in Ireland); could not guess what it was—whether illness, danger, or accident. So being exceedingly uneasy, and convinced that something had happened, I wrote at once to inquire whether all were well. A letter from her crossed mine, telling me that she had had a great alarm, and had been in danger on that night; for that a beam of wood—connected with the nursery fireplace and the floor—had become ignited, and unknown to anyone had been smouldering for some hours; and had it proceeded any further unseen, they might not have been able to save the house, nor perhaps even themselves. The house being in the

country, at a considerable distance from any other dwelling, a fire, at night more especially, would have proved calamitous in the extreme.

“SOPHIA F. A. CAULFIELD.”

After writing to her sister on the subject, Miss Caulfield adds :—

“My sister remembers the incident, but has only a faint recollection of my letter having crossed hers.”

[Asked if this was a *unique* experience, or whether she had had similar impressions which had *not* corresponded with reality, Miss C. replied that she had had only one similar experience, and that there her impression was correct. (This other experience was a presentiment, and has no relation to the above.) And though impressions of the sort which are not stamped by a coincidence may easily fade from the memory, it may be assumed that a person who remembers *none* has not experienced *many* so strong as to have prompted her to write a letter.]

The following are instances where the impression seems to have been of a decidedly pictorial kind, as in the scene-cases at the close of Chap. VI. in the preceding volume. The account is unfortunately anonymous, but there seems to be no reason to doubt its *bona fides*. The mental condition of the percipient recalls case 373.

(382 and 383) From the *Zoist*, Vol. V., p. 30, sent by Mr. Clark, Surgeon, of York Place, Kingsland Road, E., who had received it from a lady of his acquaintance.

“July 11th, 1846.

“In the years 1841–2, my dear respected father was frequently attacked with mental derangement, originating greatly, I believe, from the knowledge of the unfortunate circumstances in which I, his beloved daughter, was placed, owing to the sudden death of my husband.

“The various scenes of mental delusion I was called to witness are not uncommon to gentlemen of your profession; I therefore pass them over simply to relate his strange knowledge of events.

“My attention was first excited by the following incident. So soon as the meat for dinner was brought from the butcher’s, of which he could have no possible knowledge, being confined to his bed, and out of reach of either seeing or hearing, he exclaimed (pointing to the floor underneath, which was the room it was in), ‘What a nice rump-steak; I will have some.’ Struck with his manner, and also knowing that it was not our intended dinner, I replied, ‘No, father, there is no rump-steak; we are going to have mutton-chops’; he went into a great passion, declared that there was rump-steak, that he could see it, and described the dish. I went downstairs, and to my utter astonishment beheld it as he related.

“In the morning, without making known my intention, I took a basket and went into the garden, to cut some cabbages and gather strawberries. The garden being at the side of the house, where there was no window to look into it, it was impossible for him to see me by ordinary vision. However, he turned to my sister, saying, ‘That basket into which Betsey is putting the cabbages and strawberries had better be moved out of the sun, or the fruit will be spoiled; tell her she is not gathering strawberries from the best bed, she had better go to the other.’ When I was told of it, I was completely puzzled. During the time of my visit, wherever I went, whatever I did or thought of, was open to his view.

“My sister afterwards informed me that his medical attendant lent her some books for her perusal. One morning my father said to her, ‘The doctor sends his respects, and will be obliged for the books.’ Supposing some message had been sent, my sister replied, ‘Very well.’ In the course of a short time after, the doctor’s boy arrived with his master’s respects and request for the books. On inquiry, she found no previous message had been sent, nor inquiry made for them. We have both come to the conclusion that he must mentally have travelled to the doctor’s and heard the message; I should think the distance three-quarters of a mile.

“Another time he said to my sister, ‘There is a handsome young man and an old woman, coming by the coach this afternoon to see me.’ Sure enough, to her surprise, when the coach arrived, it brought my brother and a nurse for my father. No one had any knowledge of my brother’s coming, or of his bringing a nurse with him. The distance from whence they came was 11 miles. I wish to call your attention to the circumstance that here he did not recognise the parties, though both were well-known to him; calling my brother a young man and the nurse an old woman, instead of mentioning their names.

“When in his senses, he knew nothing of what had transpired, and had no recollection of my coming to see him. He wasted away to a skeleton and died, midsummer, 1842, in the 64th year of his age. He never, until the time stated, had any mental derangement, though he certainly was for years very nervous. At the time, I knew nothing of phrenology, so cannot give his development. I know he was a talented and very active man, a kind and affectionate father.

“My second case, that of my eldest sister, though in priority of time before my father, is yet not so interesting. She was in a bad state of health some years—I suppose what might be called nervous. The circumstances I am about to relate occurred during a severe illness, in which mental derangement took place. At one time she would take no food, at another eat most voraciously. One day we had ribs of beef for dinner. How it came to her knowledge, I could never ascertain, but so it did, and she insisted on having some for her dinner. I gave her some; she wanted more. Fearing to make her worse I would not give it her; she declared she should have it, but soon after went to sleep. I went quietly downstairs, took the meat out of the kitchen, carried it down through the beer-cellar into the wine-cellar, covered it over with a tub, put a weight on it, went up and found her just as I left her. During the night, through fatigue, I fell asleep, and was awaked by her calling to me. What was my astonishment when I beheld her sitting in bed with a slice of this beef cut the whole length of the ribs, devouring it like a savage. I asked her how she obtained it, and she positively declared that she fetched it herself while I slept; that while lying in bed she saw me go down, take the meat, and she described every particular. I believe she never left her bed when I hid it; and had she, there were three doors which I closed after me, and I must have seen her. When she recovered she knew nothing about it, but on a relapse told me all the circumstances again, laughing heartily at the trick she had played on me.”

Here, again, it will be seen, the clairvoyance recorded does not pass beyond the telepathic type where what is perceived is within

the view or knowledge of persons connected with the percipient.¹ (Vol. I., pp. 266, 378-9.)

§2. The next two examples are parallel to the *arrival* cases in Chap. VI. (Vol. I., pp. 252-4).

(384) From Mrs. Gibbes, Alverton House, Croydon Road, S.E.

“September, 1884.

“My son was in Mexico and I had no reason to expect his return. He had been absent for four years.

“In December, 1883, an impression came upon me that he would be soon home, and I could not get rid of it. My daughters laughed at me, but my feeling of it grew so strong that I determined to prepare a room for him. I began quietly one evening, and got up early next morning to clean out a study for him myself, not letting the others know that I was doing it. Whilst I was on the step, dusting the birdcases, a telegram arrived to say he would be home in the evening.

“He had had an attack of yellow fever, and had come by sea to New York. His uncle persuaded him not to telegraph from there, but to come as a surprise.

“I have had impressions of misfortunes, and have noted down the dates, but nothing has happened. “KATE GIBBES.”

Mr. Gibbes writes:—

“I find the statements correct as far as my memory is concerned.

“W. R. GIBBES (M.R.C.S.E., &c.)”

In conversation, Mrs. Gibbes stated that her son's letters had contained no hint of his return, which would not have occurred but for his attack of yellow fever. Her daughters bore witness to her state of excited expectation.

[Here the impression at any rate produced a definite act of a very unlikely kind. The final sentence in Mrs. Gibbes's account of course detracts somewhat from the force of the coincidence; but, though I am bound to print that sentence, she herself (in August, 1886) doubts its correctness, and cannot recall to what it referred.]

¹ The same remark applies to an interesting case in the *Correspondence de Mme. la Duchesse d'Orléans* (Paris, 1857), Vol. i., pp. 112-3, to which our attention was called by M. Guillaume Guizot.

“Versailles, 2 mars, 1709.

“Il y a dix ans qu'un gentilhomme français, qui a été page du maréchal d'Humières, et qui a épousé une de mes dames d'atour, amena avec lui un sauvage [du Canada] en France. Un jour qu'on était à table, le sauvage se mit à pleurer et à faire des grimaces. Longueil (ainsi s'appelait le gentilhomme) lui demanda ce qu'il avait, et s'il souffrait. Le sauvage ne fit que pleurer plus amèrement. Longueil insistant vivement, le sauvage lui dit: 'Ne me force pas à le dire, car c'est toi que cela concerne, et non pas moi.' Pressé plus que jamais, il finit par dire: 'J'ai vu par la fenêtre que ton frère était assassiné en tel endroit du Canada' par telle personne qu'il lui nomma. Longueil se mit à rire, et lui dit: 'Tu es devenu fou.' Le sauvage répondit: 'Je ne suis point du tout fou; mets par écrit ce que je t'annonce, et tu verras si je me trompe.' Longueil écrivit, et six mois après, quand les navires du Canada arrivèrent, il apprit que la mort de son frère était arrivée au moment exact et à l'endroit où le sauvage l'avait vu en l'air par la fenêtre. C'est une histoire très vraie.”

We cannot be sure that this incident was told to the Duchess d'Orléans by any one who was cognisant of the experience before the news which confirmed it arrived. But supposing the report to be substantially correct, it is to be presumed that the percipient was acquainted with the man whose death he seemed to behold; though it is still probable that the presence with him at the time of that man's brother was to some extent a condition of the percipience, as in cases 242 and 355 above. I have drawn attention (Vol. I., pp. 156-7) to the suspicious exactitude of coincidence which characterises second and third-hand narratives of this type.

The next narrative, though worth quoting, can hardly receive an evidential number; for its incidents could only be attributed to thought-transference by assuming—what is not proved—that the visits were already intended, at the time that the impressions were felt; and, moreover, in the absence of an accurate written record, every allowance must be made for the liability in such matters to note successes and not failures.

From Mr. Robert Gibson, Mulgrave Cottage, Limerick.

“January 18th, 1884.

“Scores of times, when I would be going down to my office, after breakfast, my wife [who was in delicate health, and is since deceased] would say to me, ‘Miss So-and-so or Mrs. So-and-so will be here to-day; don’t let them come up to the house; say I am not able to see them’; or ‘So-and-so will be here to-day, let them come in.’

“I used to laugh, and say, ‘Humbug, how do you know they are coming!’ and she would reply, ‘I feel that they are, and be sure you leave word with some of the men if you are going out.’

“With only one exception was she ever wrong, to my memory; that was one Friday. She said, ‘The Miss Mercers are coming to-day.’ I happened to be in my office the whole day; and they did not come; so at length I laughed, and said, ‘Well, my love, you were wrong, the Miss Mercers did not come.’ She asked me, ‘Are you sure?’ ‘Quite,’ I replied, ‘I never left the place all day.’ ‘Well,’ she said, ‘I am positive they were coming.’ Of course I laughed at her, and told her it was stupid to be positive about what was not so.

“You may guess my surprise if you can, when on the next Sunday, coming out of church, Miss Mercer came up to me, and said, ‘Please tell Mrs. Gibson that Nan’ (her sister) ‘and I were coming to see her on Friday, when Nan remembered a book she had promised to take Mrs. Gibson and ran back for it, leaving me walking up and down the street. I waited fully 20 minutes, and then went in and found Miss Nan sitting by the fire, cloakless and hatless, with a book in her hand. She could not find the book she was looking for, and after looking for it for ever so long, thought I had gone on, and that there would be no chance of overtaking me, so took off her hat and cloak, and sat down to read.’”

To these I may add two more cases in which the chief feature is a sense of someone’s proximity, but in which the fact of that proximity was already known to a third person, who may have been the agent.

(385) From a lady, Mrs. W., who prefers that her name should not be published.

“1884.

“In the autumn of 1860, I was staying in London with my husband [since deceased] for a short time, and one Saturday evening was alone in my bedroom dressing to go to the opera, when suddenly something seemed to say to me, ‘Shut and lock your door, there is a madman in the house.’ So strong was this impression that I searched all over the room and

locked the door. I dressed hurriedly, rushed downstairs, and told my husband, who was very much amused, and laughed at me! The next evening (Sunday) we sent the servant on a little errand for us; she was about an hour away. When she came in, she said she was very sorry she had been so long, but she had to wait for the mistress's return, who had been taking her husband back to the lunatic asylum, for when he was not violent she had him home from Saturday until Sunday night.

"My husband was very much startled, and we left the next day."

Mr. Podmore says:—

"In conversation, Mrs. W. explained that she had imagined her landlady to be a widow, and had not had the least suspicion of the true state of the case. She told me that she has on one or two other occasions had strong impressions of this kind, but never so marked as in this instance. She had no recollection of any impression of the kind which had not 'come true.'"

(386) From Mr. James Cowley, who wrote from 32, Langton Street, Cathay, Bristol.

"January 8th, 1884.

"Some two years ago, in the Hereford Cathedral, at an evening service, I became oppressed with the *feeling* that a certain person (I must withhold the name), whose contact would have been most painful to me, must necessarily have been near me. I had not seen that person for 5 years. More than once I turned my head to take a look round. But there was no sign of him. Next morning I learned that he had been in Hereford on the day before (Saturday), and that a person *sitting next to me*, in the cathedral, on my left-hand, had been for some hours in his company."

Asked if he mentioned the incident at the time, and if he could refer me to the person who was sitting near him, Mr. Cowley replies that:

"The Hereford Cathedral affair did not (from the nature of the circumstances rendering the sensation so distressing) admit of my referring to it. It was only when asked by a tradesman, brother-in-law of the person whose fancied proximity distressed me, 'Did you see So-and-so on Saturday?' that to him alone I mentioned the occurrence."

§ 3. I will insert next a curious little group of cases in which it is difficult or impossible to assign the impression to the "agency" of any particular person, and which recall the Greek notion of *φήμη*—the rumour which spreads from some unknown source, and far outstrips all known means of transport.¹ The type is one where the

¹ Something of this sort has been occasionally observed in outbreaks of religious hysteria. For example, the Rev. P. Barrow Matthews, rector of San Salvador, writes as follows of a recent case in the Bahamas:—

"When the girls came to [after their fits], they gave very detailed accounts of the visions they had seen. A great deal of these visions was, of course, nonsense, but one thing was remarkable—they spoke of people doing things many miles away from the place. Upon inquiry it was found in some cases that what they had seen corresponded exactly with the events. One most remarkable feature in this outbreak was that it was not confined to one spot. Almost simultaneously in every settlement on the island (the island is 42 miles long and 12 broad in places) similar outbreaks occurred. Girls living at distances of 5 or 10 miles from the scene of the 'shouting meetings,' as they were called, would be seized. Being seized by a kind of frenzy, they would run, as if by inspiration, to the spot where the rest were assembled, no matter how far."

scope of accident is so hard to estimate, and which is so distinct from that of the remainder of our telepathic evidence, that I quote most of the accounts without evidential numbers. They may possibly serve to elicit further instances.

Mr. R. Stuart Poole writes from the British Museum on Aug. 1, 1884 :—

“ My recollection of the story of my brother’s impression of the Duke of Cambridge’s death was this. He was sitting with one or more of his relations one evening, and suddenly took out his watch, and said, ‘ Note the time, the Duke of Cambridge is dead.’ The time proved to be correct. My brother had no acquaintance with the Duke, and no reason for any interest in him. He was a very clear-headed official man, without what is called superstition. ”

“ REGINALD STUART POOLE.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Poole writes :—

“ I do not recollect being present when my brother had the monition, but my recollection is that he told me himself, or that it was told me by someone present. It made a strong impression on me at the time.”

We find from the *Times* that the late Duke of Cambridge died, somewhat suddenly, at 9.40 p.m., on July 9th, 1850 ; but bulletins as to his health had been published in the last week of June, and on the day before his death.

Though the case is undoubtedly weakened by the fact that the person who died was old, and in failing health, such a coincidence—when backed by others of the same type—seems to claim attention ; at any rate till one hears of a good many cases where similarly positive statements have been made by clear-headed practical men, as to similar matters of which they could know nothing by normal means, and have proved incorrect. Yet to suppose a direct telepathic transfer from the dying man to a total stranger would seem extravagant ; and hardly less extravagant may seem the only alternative that it is easy to imagine—namely, that the “ agency ” was of a collective kind, and consisted in a certain shock of interest in the minds of a considerable number of persons who had already heard the news.

I give three more examples—of which two are properly “ borderland ” cases, but are best presented in this connection. It is a rather quaint accident that the honour of occasioning such psychical storms should (so far as these instances go) seem reserved for persons of ducal or imperial rank.

Mr. Gervase Marson, of Birk Crag, Higher Broughton, Manchester, writes, on Dec. 6, 1883 :—

“ On the morning of December 6th, 1879, I suddenly awoke, and sat up in the bed, as if startled. To my great surprise I found myself uttering the words, ‘ Portland, Portland.’ The next day I read in the papers

of the death of the Duke of Portland, which I believe took place about the time when I was involuntarily uttering his name.

"I cannot account for this experience at all. No conversation respecting the Duke of Portland had taken place the evening previously; I did not know he was ill; never saw him in my life; had never been at any of his residences; and, in fact, neither knew nor cared anything about him. I was not dreaming just before I awoke, but believe I was sleeping, as is my wont, quite soundly. "G. MARSON."

[The *Daily Telegraph* of Dec. 8, 1879, states that the late Duke of Portland died at 5 a.m. on Saturday, Dec. 6.]

Mr. G. W. Waddington, of 26, Bagdale, Whitby, Yorkshire, writes, on Aug. 5, 1884:—

"When a passenger on board the 'Satellite' in the Pacific, on a voyage from San Francisco to Callao, Peru, I was awoke about 4 a.m. of the 14th of September, 1852, by the noise of one who jumped on deck and called out at the cabin door, 'The Duke of Wellington is dead.' The occurrence was the subject of conversation at breakfast, and being noted, it was inquired if such an event had taken place from the captain of the port, before any communication took place with any other person coming on board. I had seen the Duke but once, and that on the occasion of an inspection of troops before the Horse Guards, on the Queen's anniversary coronation day of June 28th, 1842. "G. W. WADDINGTON."

Mr. Waddington admits that the noise of the jumping may have been a real sound, but says, as regards the voice, "I do not think anyone on board could have invented any such means of trying one's credulity."

[The Duke of Wellington died on September 14th, 1852, at 3.15 p.m. Consequently, if the hour of the experience is correctly remembered, it preceded the death by at least 3 hours, and probably by more.]

Madame Novikoff writes, on Aug. 7, 1884:—

"A friend of mine, whose accuracy seems to me undeniable, gave me the following account:—

"On the night when the late Empress Maria Alexandrovna died, my friend awoke her husband, exclaiming, 'The Empress is dead.' It was not a dream, but a spontaneous impression. She added that she had had several experiences of a similar kind. Her husband disliking this subject I do not wish to apply to her on the matter. "O. K."

[We find from the *Times* that the Empress died at 8 a.m., on June 3, 1880. She had been known for some months to be in a critical state.]

Comparable with these cases¹ are the two following, which, if more

¹ The following narrative is too amusing not to be quoted. It is from *A Memoir of C. Mayne Young, with Extracts from his Son's Journal*, by the Rev. Julian C. Young, pp. 337-340. After describing his liability, when over-fatigued, to persistent inward impressions of words, amounting perhaps to a low stage of auditory hallucination, Mr. Young continues:—

"On waking on Monday night last, I was possessed, as it were, by four mystic words, each of one syllable, conveying no more idea to my mind than if they were gibberish, and yet delivered with as much solemnity of tone, deliberation of manner, and pertinacity of sequence, as if they were meant to convey to me some momentous intimation. They were all the more exciting that they were unintelligible, and apparently

than accidental coincidences, can only be accounted for by the fact that the idea was "in the air." The hypothesis is here, perhaps, a little less difficult, as the original impression was of a sort which affected numbers vividly and simultaneously.

(387) From Mr. J. A. Edmonds, 16, Waterloo Road South, Wolverhampton. 1883.

"At a period during the formation of the Thames Tunnel, the date of which I cannot recall without reference to the daily papers, my brother, Cyrus Read Edmonds, was head-master of the Leicestershire Proprietary Grammar School, at Leicester, and lived almost close to the school buildings.

"On one occasion, when he was in bed, his wife was awoke (I think, at somewhere about 5 or 6¹ in the morning) by a loud exclamation of terror from my brother. She inquired the cause, and he, in a state of horror, said that he had seen the Thames Tunnel break through, that the workmen rushed to the staircases or ladders, the means of exit, but one poor fellow (less active than the others who escaped) was overtaken by the rush of water and perished. My brother was in a state of tremor and distress, such as a humane man might be supposed to suffer as a witness of such a scene. He begged his wife not to sleep, but to converse until it should be time to rise. She urged that it was but a dream, and that the effect would pass off if he could get a little sleep. 'A dream,' he said, 'it is no dream. I distinctly saw all that I have described.'

"On the day in the early morning of which this vision occurred, my

could not serve any ostensible purpose. I could not exclude them by putting cotton wool in my ears, for they came from within and not from without. To try to supplant them by encouraging a fresh train of ideas was hopeless: my will and my reason were alike subservient to some irresistible occult force. The words which beset me were 'dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court,' and they were separated as I have written them into monosyllables, and were repeated with an incisive distinctness and monotonous precision which was quite maddening. I sat up in my bed and struck a light to make sure that I was awake, and not dreaming. All the while were reiterated, as if in a circle, the same wild words: 'Dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court.' I lay down again and put out my candle, 'dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court.' I turned on my left side, 'dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court.' I turned on my right, 'dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court.' I endeavoured as a means of dispersing these evil spirits—for they began to assume the importance of spirits in my heated brain—to count sheep over a stile, but still 'dowd,' 'swell,' 'pull,' 'court,' rang in my ears and reverberated through my mind."

After many vain efforts, Mr. Young at last fell asleep. He mentioned his experience next day to his father and to some friends, the Misses Smith. On the following Thursday, he says:—

"I walked into Folthorp's Library to read the papers; and, as usual, ran my eye down the births, marriages, and deaths in the *Times*. As I came to the obituary the following notice caught my sight:—

"On Tuesday night, November 11th, John E. Dowdswell, of Pull Court, Tewkesbury.' [We have verified this notice in the *Times* for November 13th, 1851. The name is Dowdeswell.] So that probably, on the self-same night, at the very time when this gentleman's name and residence were so unaccountably and painfully present to my mind, he was actually dying." [This last expression is misleading, as the death did not take place till the following night.]

Mr. Myers says:—

"I have spoken to the Misses Smith as to this occurrence, which they distinctly remember. They were slightly acquainted with Mr. Dowdeswell, but Mr. Young was a stranger to him entirely."

¹ I don't assert this.—J. A. E.

brother and his wife were engaged to a dinner-party at the house of a gentleman, whose name, I believe, was Whetstone. Before they left the drawing-room for the dining-room, his host said to my brother, 'Have you heard the sad news from London?' He said, 'No, what is it?' He replied, 'The Thames Tunnel has broken in. All the people in the works escaped, except one poor fellow who was overwhelmed.'¹ My brother thought that his wife might have told their host, and that they would rally him out of his depression. But on looking at her, the look of astonishment quite precluded this notion. He asked his host if he were joking, at which he was much surprised, and asked how a joke could possibly be elicited from such an occurrence.

"My brother then said, 'I saw it happen, just as you have related it, so my wife will assure you, and I am yet suffering from the exhaustion and depression produced.' He then told the company what I have related above.

"I heard the whole relation both from him [by letter at the time, and *vivá voce* some weeks afterwards] and his wife [both now dead], and many of our friends were acquainted with the history.

"J. AUGUSTUS EDMONDS."

The construction of the Thames Tunnel lasted from 1825 to 1843. During this period there were five irruptions of the water of more or less importance. The fourth was the only occasion on which one man was drowned. The *Times* of Nov. 4th, 1837, records that at a few minutes before 4 o'clock on that morning, a sudden irruption of the river took place and filled the tunnel. J. Francis, engineer on duty at the time of the accident, stated that, on discovering the water was beginning to overflow he "immediately gave the alarm for all hands to run, and from that time the filling of the tunnel occupied less than five minutes. We then ran with all speed to the shaft." The water lulled slightly, and he in company with two other men "went down the archway about 200 feet, and saw the water rolling up the roadway with a terrific appearance. We then ran to the staircase, and finally ascended to the top of the shaft. The water arrived a few seconds after us. I then had all the names called over, and found only one missing, Garland, an old man, a miner."

(388) From a book called *Pith* (Trübner and Co., 1881), by Newton Crosland, pp. 63-4.

"In October, 1857, about 1 o'clock in the day, I was going from my office to sign an export bond at the Custom House, Lower Thames Street, a distance of about a quarter of a mile. I was in my usual satisfactory state of health; my mind was occupied with merely common-place ideas; the traffic in the streets was going on with ordinary monotonous activity, and nothing was apparent there to wake in me the slightest trepidation, when, just as I was crossing Great Tower Street, I was seized with an unaccountable panic. I conceived a dread that I might be attacked by a tiger, and the idea of this horrible fate so haunted me that I absolutely began running in hot haste, and I did not stop until I found myself safe inside the walls of the Custom House. Anything more contemptibly absurd than this apparently causeless fear could scarcely be imagined—a

¹ We have ascertained from the Post Office that at that time the London mail-coach would reach Leicester about 6 p.m.; so that the report may easily have arrived before dinner-time.

merchant in the streets of London in danger of a wild beast! The possibility of such a disaster seemed to me to be so ridiculous, the moment I thought about it, that I laughed at myself for allowing so foolish and morbid a fancy to take possession of my mind, and I really considered that I must be fast becoming stupidly nervous. The feeling of apprehension soon, however, passed away, and wonder at my own weakness became predominant. The next morning I took up the *Times* newspaper, when to my utter astonishment, I read that at precisely the same time when I felt the crazy fear, a tiger had actually escaped from its cage while it was being conveyed from the London Docks, seriously injured two children, and had, to the terror of every observer, ferociously misconducted himself in the public street of Wapping—about a mile, as the crow flies, from the spot where I was passing.”

The following passage occurs in the *Times* on Oct. 27, 1857:—

“*Frightful Occurrence.*—Yesterday afternoon, about 1 o’clock, as a cattle van was conveying from London Docks a Bengal tiger, the door gave way and the animal bounded into the road, encountered a little boy, sprang upon him, lacerating him in a frightful manner,” &c.

A subsequent report, October 30th, states that *two* boys were injured.

Mr. Crosland writes to us, on June 7, 1884:—

“42, Crutched Friars, London.

“I am afraid I cannot help you much in your attempt to strengthen my evidence respecting ‘the tiger story.’ When on my way to the Custom House I felt the dread of a tiger in the streets, which impelled me to run to a refuge. I was not so much disturbed as to exhibit any signs of alarm. After I reached the Custom House, I soon recovered my composure, and thought my fear was so causeless and silly that I did not mention the circumstance to anyone. I considered that to do so would be to make myself appear ridiculous.

“NEWTON CROSLAND.”

In another letter he says, “I am quite certain that my sensations were felt at the *precise time* when the incident occurred at Wapping.”

§ 4. We come now to a group where the impression, though indefinite in character, recalling the purely emotional cases of Vol. I., Chap. VII., had reference to a particular individual known to the percipient, as in case 86.

(389) From a clergyman, who desires that his name may not be published. He writes as follows to his daughter:—

“1882.

“When your brother E. was at Winchester College (about 1856 or 1857), on going to bed one Saturday night, I could not sleep. When your mother came into the room, she found me restless and uneasy. I told her that a strong impression had seized me that something had happened to your brother. The next day, your mother, on writing to E., asked me if I had any message for him, when I replied: ‘Tell him I particularly want to know if anything happened to him yesterday.’ Your mother laughed, and made the remark that I should be frightened if a letter in Dr. Moberly’s handwriting reached us on Monday. I replied, ‘I should be afraid to open it.’ On the Monday morning a letter did come from Dr.

Moberly, to tell me that E. had met with an accident, that one of his schoolfellows had thrown a piece of cheese at him which had struck one of his eyes; and that the medical man, Mr. Wickham, thought I had better come down immediately and take your brother to a London oculist."

In answer to inquiries, the narrator writes to us, on March 13, 1885:—

"The impression, with regard to my son, was on a Saturday. The accident had occurred on the Thursday previously, but Dr. Moberly did not write to inform me of it till Saturday, when the Winchester medical man had ordered that a London oculist should be consulted.

"I cannot call to mind any occasion on which I received a like impression which was not verified. There is one which occurred in former years, which I call to mind. When at school and saying my prayers one evening, I was impressed with the idea that my eldest brother was dying, and this was the case, as I was informed the day following. I did not know at the time that he was ill."

[The first of these cases could hardly have been presented alone, owing to the lack of precision in the coincidence. But its interest is increased by the occurrence of the other more precise experience to the same person.]

(390) From Mrs. Brandon, resident in Canada, who wrote from Farmhill, Donegal, Ireland.

"January, 1884.

"The steamship 'Canadian,' in which Mr. Brandon was sailing to England, was shipwrecked in the Atlantic, east of the straits of Belleisle, on the 4th of June, 1861. She foundered in the ice, and 38 lives were lost. In the evening of the same day, Mr. James Patton, a merchant in Montreal (where we were then living), was teaching Mr. Brandon's Tuesday evening class in Great St. James' Street Methodist Church, I being present at the time. Mr. Patton said, 'This day my mind was urgently impressed with the necessity to pray for Mr. Brandon—so much so, particularly at the hour of noon, that I *had* to leave off writing about my business in my office, and retire to a private place, and pour out my soul in prayer to God for Mr. Brandon.' We could not understand at the time the meaning of the mysterious circumstance; but 10 days afterwards we understood it all. At the *very hour* when Mr. Patton was engaged in prayer for Mr. Brandon, he (Mr. B.) was standing on the wreck of a sinking ship, and was miraculously saved from a watery grave."

[Mr. Brandon has sent us an account of the foundering of the ship, and the loss of 38 men. Mr. Patton is deceased.]

(391) From a letter entitled "Brain Waves—a Theory," written by Mr. James Knowles, which appeared in the *Spectator*, 30th January, 1869.

"Mr. Woolner, the sculptor, tells me the following story of two young men—one of them a personal friend of his own now living. These two men lived for very long as great friends, but ultimately quarrelled, shortly before the departure of one of them for New Zealand. The emigrant had been absent for many years, and his friend at home (Mr. Woolner's informant) never having kept up correspondence with him, naturally almost lost the habit of thinking of him or his affairs. One day, however, as he sat in his rooms in a street near Oxford Street, the thought of his friend came suddenly upon him, accompanied by a most restless and undefinable discomfort. He could by no means account for it, but, finding the feeling

grew more and more oppressive, tried to throw it off by change of occupation. Still the discomfort grew, until it amounted to a sort of strange horror. He thought he must be sickening for a bad illness, and at length, being unable to do anything else, went out of doors and walked up and down the busiest streets, hoping by the sight and sound of multitudes of men and ordinary things to dissipate his strange misery. Not, however, until he had wandered to and fro in the most wretched state of feeling for more than two hours, utterly unable to shake off a sort of vague consciousness of his friend, did the impression leave him, and his usual frame of mind return. So greatly was he struck and puzzled by all this, that he wrote down the precise date of the day and hour of the occurrence, fully expecting to have news shortly of or from his friend. And, surely, when the next mail or the next but one arrived, there came the horrible news that at that very day and hour (allowance being made for latitude and longitude) his friend had been made a prisoner by the natives of New Zealand, and put to a slow death with the most frightful tortures."

Mr. Woolner, in writing to us in August, 1883, after making some trifling corrections, says:—

"Mr. Knowles has told the story accurately; and having told him only once, I am surprised that he should have been so faithful in his narrative. I have not seen or heard of the person for many years, and know not the least where to find him. I am very sorry I cannot help you any further."

The name of the man who was killed was Cooke, or Cook. Mr. Woolner has given us the name of his informant, but desires that it may not be published. We have tried to trace him without success. Mr. Woolner says: "I believe he was perfectly sincere when he told me the story in or about 1850"; and adds that the incident occurred some time between 1842 and 1846.

Of the three impressions in the following account two were connected at the moment with a particular individual. The three, though each alone might easily have been accidental, are worth presenting as having occurred in the experience of a single person; and they find their most convenient place here, though two of them seem to have been of the "borderland" class. In the second case, the narrator's experience followed the death (she thinks) by perhaps a day or two; nor can she be certain that the coincidence in the first case was closer than this, though it may have been closer.

(392) Miss Loveday, of Arlescote, Banbury, enclosed to us, on February 14, 1884, the following letter from her sister, who desires that her own name should not be published. In conversation she described herself as a matter-of-fact person; and she is certain that she has never on other occasions had impressions at all resembling those described.

"I have had three different intimations of death—on Uncle William's death, on Henry H.'s [a brother-in-law's] death, and on B.'s. The two first were more sensations than anything else. It is a thing hardly to be described. It is like nothing else. *Not* alarming; rather like one's idea of the severance of nerves; of something cut off, that is, and lost to your-

self, of a want, a something gone from you. On the occasion of Henry's death, I did not know who was gone. I was away in Germany; but I awoke with the sensation, and I told my children, 'I have had that feeling that I have had before on the loss of a *relation*. I do not know who is gone; but someone seems gone; perhaps it is Aunt Edward.' Then in a day or so came the news of Henry's death. [The narrator was warmly attached to both her uncle and her brother-in-law.]

"The last occasion (*i.e.*, of B.'s death) it was the most distinct of all. [Miss Loveday says, "B. was an old servant of our family, who was very dear to us all."] It was in 1880, in the autumn. I was in Germany. I had gone to lie down after the early dinner on Sunday, to rest before the long walk to church; and I fell asleep. I had the most calm and delightful awaking—no actual words, but a happy feeling that B. was passing away to Heaven peacefully, and that I was intended to know it. If I put into words what my impression was, it was this—'As if some spirit had gently touched me and said, "B. is passing away, rise up and pray."' I at once rose up and went into the next room, and told my boys 'I have had an intimation that B. is dying; remember it. I shall hear.' I then went back to my bedside to kneel in prayer. The happiness and peace of the few minutes was intense. I had longed to see him once again before he died, and had feared I should not be in England in time, though I was going in a few days, as I knew his end was near; but being led to know the day and hour was to me like a leave-taking and a good-bye from himself, and I felt it was permitted to assure and comfort me. Two or three days later I heard it *was that very* day he died; and when I got to England and saw his wife, Cath, I found it was the same *time*, allowing for my being nearly 40 minutes to the eastward on the globe. The two first intimations, though not alarming, were not of the comforting, reassuring, and happy feeling of the last."

We find from the Register of Deaths that B. died on October 10, 1880. The two previous deaths took place on April 2, 1875, and January 21, 1878, respectively.

One of the narrator's sons writes on Jan. 28, 1886 :—

"I distinctly remember that one afternoon (I think Wednesday), about two weeks before we came away from Germany, mother was lying down, and suddenly she said to me that she felt as if a friend, someone whom she had known for a very long time, was at that moment dying. She did not think it was a relation, because the feeling was not the same as when Uncle Henry died. She thought it was very probably B., but did not say that she felt as if it was of necessity B. who was dying. I did not feel surprised, because almost exactly the same had happened when Uncle Henry died, and yet I felt equally sure that it was correct.

"About three days afterwards we got a letter to say that B. had died on the very afternoon in question, at about the same time as events above recorded, *i.e.*, at about 3.30 p.m., as nearly as I can recollect."

The other son writes from Cambridge, on Jan. 26, 1886 :—

"I shall be happy to testify to the fact of my mother having mentioned to me that she had a presentiment that 'B.' was passing away and that this was anterior to any communication even of an illness."

[The force of the last coincidence is of course greatly diminished by the fact of the percipient's having known that B.'s "end was near." The

narrator thinks that she was aware of her uncle's being rather seriously ill; but she had no similar knowledge in the case of her brother-in-law, whose death was quite unexpected.]

(393) E. M. Arndt, a well-known writer on political and social questions, in his *Schriften für and an seine Lieben Deutschen* (Leipzig, 1845), Vol. III., pp. 523-4, records two telepathic experiences of the emotional sort which befell the same person.

The first occurred when Arndt was under the tuition (apparently) of Dr. Masius, at Barth. One of his fellow-pupils, while at play, had broken an arm. Just as a messenger was starting to convey the news to the boy's mother, who lived at some miles' distance, she herself rushed in, exclaiming, "My son, my son! What accident has befallen him?" From Arndt's description, it seems certain that he was himself present on the occasion.

The same lady, Arndt continues (but without naming his authority), was one day calling at a neighbour's house, when suddenly she started up and called for her carriage, under an impulse of uncontrollable apprehension, and found, on arriving at her home, that an accident had occurred by which her youngest child had been scalded to death.

§ 5. This last incident leads us on to the next group, where the emotional impression was not connected, when felt, with the person to whom (if telepathic) it was due. The following case exhibits the element of actual physical discomfort on the percipient's part, as in Nos. 22, 70, and 76, and notably in 391 above.

(394) From Mr. Frederick H. Poole, Sneyd Park, Durdham Down, Bristol.

"June 10th, 1884.

"Upwards of 40 years ago, when I was about 12 years of age, I was visiting at my uncle's vicarage in Gloucestershire. I had been there for a month previously, and was one afternoon sketching in the neighbourhood, in good health and spirits, when suddenly I became very depressed and ill, which induced me to return to the house. I told my uncle my symptoms, and expressed my belief that I should die,¹ and asked his permission for me to return home that afternoon, for I should like to bid farewell to all at home, especially to my mother, to whom I was very devotedly attached. Nothing he said in reply would pacify me, until he promised I might return on the morrow if I felt no better. After a restless night, I felt worn and weary—as one would naturally feel after unusual excitement—but my intense longing to return home had subsided, and I consented to remain. By that afternoon's post a letter reached my uncle from my home, announcing the death of my mother on the previous afternoon.

"Having given above the unvarnished fact, I am disposed to leave the subject without comment.

"I will only add that I had no knowledge of my mother's illness at the date of aforesaid 'incident.' We heard a few days previously that she was progressing favourably after her recent confinement.

"FREDERICK H. POOLE."

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Poole says:—

¹ Precisely this experience is recorded in cases 22 and 76.

“ I never had, excepting on the occasion named in my last letter, the unaccountable sort of depression mentioned therein.”

(395) From Mrs. Herbert Davy, of Burdon Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne, the narrator of the more definite case No. 45. “ December, 1883.

“ It was in August, a few years ago—my husband was at the moors. I drove to a nursery garden to procure some flowers. I waited outside the gate under the shelter of some trees, sending the groom in for the flowers.

“ It was one of the hottest afternoons I ever experienced. My ponies, usually restive, stood perfectly still. Before I had waited there many minutes, an unaccountable feeling took possession of me as though I fore-saw and recognised the shadow of a coming sorrow. I immediately associated it with my husband—that some accident had befallen him. With this miserable apprehension upon me, I got through the rest of the day and evening as best I could, but weighed down by the shadow, though I spoke of it that night to no one.

“ Nothing had happened to my husband. But a little child—a relation, who had lived with us and been almost as our own—had died that day rather suddenly in Kent, where she was then visiting her parents. I had thought a good deal of little Ada, as I sat waiting in the phaeton that summer afternoon—had pictured her reaching out her hands to me; but the great apprehension I felt was for my husband, not for the child.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the child died on Aug. 14, 1875.

A friend who was with Mrs. Davy writes :—

“ Newcastle, January 5th, 1884.

“ I was driving with Mrs. Davy on the day she had the strange presentiment, while waiting outside the nursery gardens. She spoke of it at the time, and was quite depressed and unlike herself. Mr. Davy being from home, she feared something had happened to him. “ AMY GRACE.”

After an interview with Mrs. Davy on April 15th, 1884, Professor Sidgwick writes :—

“ She affirmed unhesitatingly that the feeling was a sudden unique shock of sadness, quite unlike any depression of spirits which she had ever felt at any other time—she had had experiences of such depressions. The girl, Ada, was likely to be thinking of her.”

(396) From Mr. S. N. Wilkinson, J.P., Apsley Cottage, Stockport.

“ 1884.

“ I was at Blackpool in the March of 1881, and about tea time I felt a strong conviction of some unknown evil which made me perfectly restless. Next morning, a letter came from the manager of my works in Stockport, reporting that the day before he had to stop the mill in consequence of the breaking down of the main driving wheel. My niece remarked that this was an explanation of my restlessness, but I was not satisfied with the explanation, and said to her, ‘ That is not it, it is something worse.’ On arriving at home, the day following, I found two telegrams, one announcing the death of one of my most intimate friends, the other inviting me to the funeral. He died at Aberdeen. At the time of my uneasiness I was not aware of his illness. I attended his funeral there. This was not the only case in which I had presentiments, but it is the most remarkable that I have experienced. “ S. N. WILKINSON.”

We asked Mr. Wilkinson if he would procure for us his niece's corroboration; but he said that he did not feel disposed to take any further trouble in the matter. In conversation he described the impression as quite unique in its strength, preventing him from settling to anything; and he entirely disclaimed any tendency to nervousness or unaccountable fancies.

§ 6. I turn now to the production of motor effects—sometimes of a blind sort, sometimes under a sense of being wanted—which must be understood in the sense explained in Vol. I., p. 292.

(397) From Mr. F. Morgan, of Nugent Hill, Bristol.

“July 11th, 1883.

“On Monday, February 14th, 1853, I was listening to a lecture by the late Geo. Dawson, of Birmingham, in the Broadmead Rooms in Bristol. I frequently spent my evenings at lectures, concerts, &c., and often took a little walk afterwards on my way home. I had lived nearly all my life (27 years) at home with my mother, whom I strongly resemble in face and in many characteristics. We were much attached to each other.

“I was thoroughly interested in the lecture, and had so little intention of leaving before its conclusion, that I remember noticing a friend among the audience, and making up my mind for a walk with him on my way home.

“The lecture must have been more than half through—I was not tired, and had no reason to move—when I noticed, at the side of the platform farthest from the back entrance to the hall, a door which I had never seen before, flush with the panels, and it suddenly became the most natural thing that I should walk half the length of the room, and away from the main entrance, in order to see if this door would open. I turned the handle, passed through, closed the door gently behind me, and found myself in the dark among the wooden supports of the platform.

“I clambered along towards a glimmer of light at the other end, passed round a side passage, crossed the end of the hall to the main entrance, without any thought of the lecture which was still going on, and walked home quietly, without excitement or ‘impression’ of any kind, and quite unconscious, till long after, that I had done anything unusual.

“On opening my door with a latch-key, I smelt fire, and found my mother in great alarm. She had also noticed the strong burning smell, had been over the house with her servant, and was longing for my return. On going upstairs, I saw flames issuing from a back window of the next house, immediately gave the alarm, removed my mother to a safe distance, and then had two or three hours' struggle with the flames. The adjoining house was destroyed, but mine only slightly damaged.

“The point which has seemed to me most striking, whenever I have recalled this occurrence, is the entire absence of any presentiment or impression on my mind. I should probably have shaken off anything of the kind had I been aware of it, and refused obedience. Neither was there on my mother's part any intentional exertion of her will upon me, only a strong wish for my presence, which must have begun about the time I left my seat.

“FREDK. MORGAN.”

Mr. Morgan adds, in reply to our regular inquiry, that he has never done anything similar to what is here described on any other occasion.

He also sends a plan of the lecture-room, which shows that he walked in a dark passage round nearly three sides of the hall. "But *going home*," he adds, "was not in my thoughts when I moved." He told his mother of his experience next day.

We have confirmed the date of the fire in the *Bristol Times*. The account there given states that Mr. Morgan's house, though only slightly damaged, was "in great danger, and only escaped destruction by the intervention of strong party-walls."

(398) The following passage, in the original, is a continuation of that quoted in Vol. I., p. 274, from *Der Sogenannte Lebens-Magnetismus oder Hypnotismus*, by Dr. E. L. Fischer, of Würzburg, a book the reverse of credulous in its general tone.

"I had accepted an invitation to a jubilee, and went to the place in the afternoon. I had not been at table more than an hour, when I was seized with a peculiar feeling that I must leave—that someone was waiting for me. I had no more peace; I was expecting every moment to be summoned away. I remained half-an-hour under the continuous pressure of the feeling that someone was most strongly desiring my presence. Then I got up and went home to bed, in the confident expectation of being called off to someone at a distance in the course of the night. It was quite impossible to go to sleep, for every two minutes I was raising my head, to listen whether there was not a pull at the house-bell. In a quarter of an hour there was really a ring. I sprang out of bed with one bound, and was told that I must come to a sick woman at a village about a couple of miles off. On my arrival I found the patient in a piteous condition. She could neither speak nor move her limbs, though still able to see, hear, and feel. I did all I could, and departed, with the promise to come again later. On the second occasion, I found her much better, and she now told me how earnestly she had been longing for me to come on the previous afternoon and evening. Her husband had not returned home till late in the evening, and had then lost no time in sending for me. So the matter was explained.

"These two incidents [*i. e.*, this and the one already quoted] prove to my satisfaction that there are such things as sympathetic divinations (*Ahnungen*); and I could supply other instances, though of a less striking character, from my own experience, besides similar experiences which have been reported to me by my friends."

[I have sufficiently expressed dissent from Dr. Fischer's view that telepathy can be demonstrated from a few instances.]

(399) From Mr. William Blakeway (a bricklayer), of New Ross, Rowley Regis, near Dudley.

"1885.

"I was in my usual place at chapel on the Sunday afternoon, in May, 1876, when all at once I thought I must go home. Seemingly against my wish, I took my hat. When reaching the chapel gates, I felt an impulse that I must hasten home as quick as possible, and I ran with all my might without stopping to take breath. Meeting a friend, who asked why I hurried so, I passed him almost without notice. When I reached home I found the house full of smoke, and my little boy, 3 years old, all on fire, alone in the house. I at once tore the burning clothes from off him, and was just in time to save his life. It has always been a mystery to me, as

no person whispered a word to me, and no one knew anything about the fire till after I made the alarm at home, which was more than a quarter of a mile from the chapel. This is a true statement.

“WILLIAM BLAKEWAY.”

Mr. C. Smith, of 12, Short Street, Black Heath, near Dudley, writes:—

“I beg to say I heard of the incident from Mr. Blakeway himself in a few days after the occurrence, and never forgot it, as I thought it very remarkable.

“C. SMITH.”

Mr. Blakeway went through the account to me *viva voce* in such a way that I could not doubt the vividness of the experience; he has never had any other at all resembling it. The friend whom he hurried by was one to whom he invariably talked for some minutes when he met him. He thinks that he probably took about a minute and a half in getting home, and that his first impression may quite have coincided with the accident to the child, who was alone in the house and caught fire in reaching for something.

(400) From Herr Heinrich von Struve, procured through the kindness of Mr. J. B. Johnston, M.A., of 17, Pilrig Street, Edinburgh. The original was in German.

“25, Pilrig Street, Edinburgh.

“July 10th, 1885.

“It was in the night between the 9th and 10th of November, 1835, that I felt a sudden and peculiar yearning, which laid hold of me with great intensity, for my dear mother, who lived in Carlsruhe, in the Grand Duchy of Baden. I myself was living with my elder brother in Poland, and intended to pass the winter with him. This yearning affected me so strongly that I resolved to move to Carlsruhe without delay, which I explained to my brother at breakfast, after I had informed him of my sudden feeling. It was no small and insignificant journey in those days and at that advanced season of the year. Carlsruhe was over 130 German miles from where I was living. I passed [on horseback] through the province of Posen, through Silesia, Saxony, and, after crossing the Erz Mountains and Thuringia in deep snow, through Bavaria. At Jena, where an aunt lived who had always been in the most intimate relations with my mother, I intended to rest for a few days. But as she told me that she had received very sad news from Carlsruhe, according to which her dear friend had been attacked by nervous fever and given up by the doctors, I could not rest, and in the greatest consternation and anxiety recommenced my journey, and reached Carlsruhe on the 4th of December.

“With sinking heart I betook myself first to my brother, who was attached to the Russian Embassy at the Court of Baden, and rushed up the steps, where my brother received me with great astonishment. On my eager inquiry after my mother’s health, he told me that the danger had passed off, and that she was recovering. Then I hurried swiftly to my mother’s house, where my sisters lived with her, and they confirmed the happy news. As I then learnt from my eldest sister, the chief crisis of the illness occurred on the night between the 9th and 10th of November, when my beloved mother, in her delirium, continually spoke with intense love and care for her youngest son, called me and longed for me.

“H. VON STRUVE.”

In answer to inquiries, Herr von Struve says, “I have never on any

other occasion experienced an affection of the same sort, and naturally therefore have never had occasion to take action on one."

[This case is very remote ; but the narrator is not likely to be wrong in remembering that he undertook a long and arduous journey in consequence of his impression.]

I will conclude with the only pendant that we have to M. Liébeault's remarkable case at the end of Chap. VII. in the preceding volume. But a second-hand account of so exceptional an occurrence, received from a person who himself only heard of it some years after it took place, cannot of course carry much weight, at any rate as far as details are concerned.

(401) From Mr. S. Jennings, of Westbury House, Denmark Hill, S.E.

"March 24th, 1885.

"In reply to your note, the occurrence [which is narrated below] was related to me by Mr. Nelson himself, since dead. He told me, as nearly as I can remember, in the year 1868, but the event itself must have taken place four or five years before.

"At the time he told me he was frequently in the habit of thus writing under some external influences, some of which he describes as agreeable, and others very much the reverse. He showed me a book in which these writings were made, and I was much surprised at the singular differences in the apparently various handwritings.

"I never had any reason to do otherwise than believe what he said, particularly as he was always very reticent on the subject, which he said concerned nobody but himself. "SAMUEL JENNINGS."

The following is from a letter written by Mr. Jennings to Professor Barrett, on September 26th, 1882. After describing Mr. Nelson's automatic writing, and his inability to get rid of the consciousness of some external presence or influence "without providing writing materials," the account continues :—

"On one occasion this feeling seized him in the train when travelling from Raneegunge to Calcutta, and he tore a leaf out of a book, and laid it on the seat of the carriage, his hand grasping a pencil resting upon it. Ordinarily, to write under such conditions would be impossible in a train rushing along ; the motion would effectually prevent it. Nevertheless, a long communication was made purporting to be from his daughter, who was at school in England. It contained a simple account of her illness and death, described the circumstances under which it occurred, and the persons who were present, adding that she wished to say good-bye to her father before leaving. This threw Mr. N. into a state of great excitement, for he did not even know of his daughter's illness. He went home and said he was very uneasy about Bessie in England. Finally, he gave this note to his married daughter, Mrs. R., to keep till they could hear by the ordinary post. The child had in reality died that very day, and under the very circumstances thus mysteriously communicated to Mr. N. I have subsequently received some corroborative evidence regarding this young lady's death from an entire stranger to the family."

CHAPTER III.

DREAMS.

§ 1. THE cases to be now presented are supplementary to those of Vol. I., Chap. VIII.; and will be arranged, as far as possible, in similar groups.

The first group is that of simultaneous dreams which correspond in content.

(402) From Mr. A. A. Watts, 19, Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.

“1883.

“When I was a young child, about the year 1830, my father had been called out of town by business; and my mother took me into her room to sleep. She awoke in the middle of the night, or early morning, out of a dream in which it had appeared to her that the servant was attempting to murder her with a knife. I had awakened at the same time, and was sobbing in my crib by her bedside. Upon her inquiring what was amiss with me, I replied that I had dreamt that John was murdering her with a knife. She always affirmed that, to the best of her knowledge, I had at that time never heard the word murder. She rang up the servants; and wrote immediately to her husband, who returned to town at once, and discharged the man without more ado. My mother had had no previous antipathy to the man, rather the contrary, for he was a very clever and handy servant, and had been a sailor. We had never heard then nor did we hear subsequently anything to his disadvantage.”

[This evidence cannot rank as better than second-hand.]

(403) The following letter appeared in the *Nation* for November 26th, 1885:—

“SIR,—I have been much interested in the cases of telepathy reported in the *Nation*, and give the following, which happened here last week. Mrs. F. dreamed her watch was broken, and was greatly afflicted to see it all in pieces, and in her distress awoke. Feeling very ill, she awakened her husband to go for a physician. His first words on awaking were, ‘Who broke your watch?’

“M. E. W.

“Dover, N. H., November 16th, 1885.”

The writer of this letter, Dr. Mary E. Webb, was applied to for details, and wrote to us as follows :—

“37, Trowbridge Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

“February 3rd, 1886.

“Near midnight, Mrs. Flynn dreamed her watch was broken. She saw the crystal and all the works crushed to fragments. She awoke in some pain, and aroused her husband from a sound sleep, and his first words, according to her report, were, ‘Who broke your watch? How did your watch get broken?’ &c. Then she told me she laughed in spite of the pain, and told him that was just what she had dreamed before the pain had awakened her; then they found their dreams coincided exactly as to the manner in which the watch was broken; and that the watch was got and examined, to make sure it was not as they had dreamed.

“This they related to me the same night, as something worth the telling. They thought it singular and interesting. I asked them what they had said about the watch before going to bed, and they said ‘Nothing’; that they had not thought of it at all.

“MARY E. WEBB.”

In the next three cases, the telepathic influence of a distant agent seems to be involved, and may have acted independently on the dreamers (*cf.* case 127, and see Chap. XII., § 2); or one dreamer, so influenced, may have infected the others.

(404) From the Rev. P. T. Drayton, Undercliff, Portishead.

“January, 1884.

“When a child in the West Indies, there was an old African woman who had great attractions for me. She was full of ghost stories, and, though a Christian, had not, I fear, discarded obeah ideas altogether. Sometimes she would come in to show us how she would look dressed in her grave clothes, which she kept by her, and we would make merry over it. Well! several years afterwards I saw in my dreams her figure by my bedside in full grave-costume; it was very vivid, and I awoke with a determination that I would eat no more late suppers.

“At breakfast, next morning, my sister told us that she had had much the same dream, but as she had never seen the old woman masquerading in her shroud, as I had, it made more impression. Some time afterwards we had a letter from W. I. mentioning the old woman’s death on the day on which these dreams occurred.

“This occurred some 45 years ago, and I cannot be responsible for its strict accuracy.

“P. T. DRAYTON.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Drayton says :—

“Taking your queries *seriatim* I would reply, first, that my sister has been dead over 30 years. Second, that my sister and self had the dream on the same night, without having been either talking or thinking of the old woman. Third, that *to the best of my recollection* the tidings of the old woman’s death arrived shortly after.”

A lady, a connection of Mr. Drayton's, through whom we procured this narrative, says, "All the family knew of these dreams."

(405) From Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary* (London, 1617), Part I., Chap. II., p. 19.

"I may lawfully swear that which my kinsmen have heard witnessed by my brother Henry whilst he lived, that in my youth at Cambridge I had the like dreame of my mother's death, where, my brother Henry lying with me, early in the morning I dreamed that my mother passed by with sad countenance, and told me that she could not come to my commencement; I being within five months to proceed Master of Arts, and she having promised at that time to come to Cambridge: and when I related this dreame to my brother, both of us awaking together in a sweat, he protested to me that he had dreamed the very same, and when he had not the least knowledge of our mother's sicknesse, neither in our youthfull affections were in any affected by the strangeness of this dreame, yet the next carrier brought us word of our mother's death."

(406) From Mr. Swithinbank, Ormleigh, Mowbray Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.

"May 26th, 1883.

"During the Peninsular War, my father and his two brothers, William and John, were quartered at Dover. They were natives of Bradford, and had there living their father, mother, and the rest of their family. On one special night my father had a dream that his mother was dead; the dream was most vivid, and in his waking moments the dream kept continually recurring to him, and he could not shake off the impression of sadness it brought upon him. The other brothers each slept at different parts of the garrison, and they only met each other on parade. The morning following the dream, and after the parade was over, my father ran hurriedly on to meet his brothers, and as he approached them they each appeared as anxious to meet him as he was to meet them; in a tone of breathless anxiety my father said, 'Oh, William, I have had a queer dream.' 'So have I,' replied his brother, when, to the astonishment of both, the other brother, John, said, 'I have had a queer dream, as well. I dreamt that my mother was dead.' 'So did I,' said each of the other brothers. It was true that each brother dreamt during the same night that their mother was dead; and it is equally true that in the course of a few days (for the posts then were seldom for such long distances) they heard from home that during the night of their dream their mother, who had had no previous illness of which her sons knew anything, had quietly passed away.

"GEORGE EDWIN SWITHINBANK."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Swithinbank adds:—

"I heard it over and over again from my father and the two brothers concerned."

A sister of Mr. Swithinbank's corroborates as follows:—

"Farnley, near Leeds.

"October 20th, 1883.

"I fully confirm this statement, as the only surviving daughter of the

younger of the three brothers. The last time I saw my uncle William, shortly before my father's death, he specially named the circumstance to me, and I had heard it from my early infancy repeatedly from the lips of my father and his other brothers.

“R. M. HUDSON, (*née* Swithinbank).”

§ 2. Next comes a group in which some thought on the part of a *waking* agent seems to have been represented in the dream.

The following case strongly recalls No. 149, where the percipient seemed to catch the idea of a scene about which the agent was silently reading.

(407) From Miss Julia Wedgwood, 31, Queen Anne Street, W.

“March, 1886.

“My dream was that I was hurrying along the street somehow in company with a little girl of about 10, who was telling me of her life in Florence, where she had been brought up. I was listening to her with great interest, and I remember in my dream being surprised that I could feel interest in the conversation of a child of that age. One odd thing was that she was telling me about building, and that we wandered into some grand new structure, where I had never been before.

“In the morning I took up the novel Marian had been reading before she went to bed, sitting close to me. I will copy the passages which made me feel that her interest in the book must somehow have been transferred to my mind. My building was not a cathedral, and what the child said about building had the absurdity of a dream, so my dream was not exact. The little girl in the novel *has* been brought up in Florence.

“JULIA WEDGWOOD.”

The extracts, from a novel called *Clarissa's Tangled Web*, are as follows:—

“Thus wandering, she passed to the east end of the north aisle, much secluded from view by the back of the great organ and the pulpit, and so alone had she felt that she started when she saw a little girl seated on a stone step, the first of three leading up to an old oaken door filling a low narrow doorway in the wall. . . . She noticed too that the little girl looked towards her, and closed her book, and now appeared rather to invite than to deprecate conversation. So she drew nearer, and said in the peculiarly pleasant voice which generally prepossessed strangers, and not seldom drew forth unexpected confidences, ‘You enjoy, my dear, being in this cathedral?’ Irene rose. ‘Yes, ma’am,’ she said, ‘I do. I have seen many much finer cathedrals and churches [having been brought up in Florence], but this is a good building in many respects, and I *do* like being here very much.’

“Mrs. Weatherill felt rather amused by the air of experienced judgment and critical discernment assumed by this very young connoisseur; but she said pleasantly, ‘You know the building much more familiarly than I do, I have no doubt.’ ‘I have read about it, ma’am, and have observed for myself,’ Irene said, quite willing to impart information and give her own impressions. ‘You see the vaulting of the roof, how it is filled in

and held up by those arches, so many intersections and changing lines—that is quite a unique arrangement, but *I* think it is beautiful! And then, ma'am, . . . you see that the height of the vaulting in the two side aisles and the middle aisle is exactly the same," &c.

In reply to inquiries, Miss Wedgwood says:—

"I am quite sure that Marian Hughes read not a word aloud, and did not mention to me any of the circumstances which reproduced themselves with the grotesque triviality of such things in my dream, and that I did not know anything of the contents of the book.

"It was one of a number sent me to review (I leave it with you, with the relevant passages marked), and Marian being very unwell, I advised her to look through the heap instead of doing anything else. She sat by me all the evening reading this novel. I was busy with something else, and we hardly exchanged a word. We went to bed at the same time, and I had a vivid dream of meeting two children in the street (there is only one in the book), and getting into a conversation with the girl about building. The only sentence which remains with me is the absurd one, 'What! don't you know that all the heart of oak used in England comes from Florence?' where she told me she had lived all her life. I had a vivid sense in my dream of the intelligence and rare knowledge of the little girl, and when I opened the book at p. 38 it came to me with an almost startling sense of familiarity. I think I mentioned that I was wandering with my little girl in a curious new building, and noticed the ceiling, but it was *not* a cathedral, so that again was only partly like, but it was, I remember, a curiously low roof. There was a sense of rather dramatic interest in the little girl which the story reproduces, and which is very rare in dreams, but I can remember no words to help it out. I think the child was 10, but the sense of premature cleverness and of surprise at myself in being interested in a child's talk about buildings is what remains with me."

Miss Wedgwood adds:—

"The dream corresponded with her [Marian's] inaccurate recollection of the fiction *more* than with the fiction itself. She fancied that the incident was supposed to occur as in my dream—a grown person walking with a little girl in the street. It is one of several faint coincidences of the same kind, but most are so uninteresting that we forget them.

"Another little case of thought-reading between us may have interest for you. I should premise that M. H. is my most intimate friend as well as my maid—copies all my writings for me, and shares all my interests.

"In the year 1880, I was troubled by some circumstances which I carefully concealed from her. I thought that some actions of mine might have caused annoyance to a friend long dead, if he had been still among us, and the doubt stirred up much speculation in my mind as to the possible feeling in those who are gone. On the morning after I had been dwelling on this (which I did with a sense of vivid anxiety), M. H. said to me, 'Oh, I had such a strange dream last night. I thought I saw Mr. A. come alive in his picture in the wall, and stand out of the picture, and look down with sorrow and grief, as if he were much hurt!' I felt she had exactly read my anxious feelings, all sign of which had been

carefully concealed from her. She had never seen the picture which was very familiar to me."

(408) From Mrs. Hunter, 2, Victoria Crescent, St. Helier's, Jersey.

"January 8th, 1884.

"The following happened in India some 13 years ago. My second daughter had been with me, while I was preparing for bed one night. Our talk was merry, and only gossip. At last she left me for her own room. In the middle of the night I awoke in an agony of grief, and sat up in bed, sobbing and trembling. In vain I reasoned and tried to believe 'it was only a dream.' For a time I could not; it was so *real*. My dream was that a cobra di capello had bitten my daughter, and she raised a blanched, pinched face to mine, and said, 'Must I die, mamma?' and I had replied, in agony, 'You *must*, darling.'

"Next morning, my dream hardly remembered, I was dressing, when she, as usual, came to me. Her first words were, 'Oh, mamma, I had such a horrid feeling last night while I was undressing. I felt *sure* there was a snake in my room, and had such a hunt before I got into bed; indeed, I feel sure the wretch is there still, and I have ordered the hammal (male housemaid) to turn my bathroom upside down. It was a horrid feeling.'

"No snake was ever seen in her room.

"Even in those days, before one had heard of thought-transference, I explained it to myself in some such way, viz., that *her waking* terror had communicated itself to me *in sleep*, and caused my dream.

"H. E. HUNTER."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Hunter adds:—

"No, we never had dreams nor apprehensions, nor talks about snakes. At hill stations, where they *may* be seen, we have, of course, talked of them (glad to have any subject for talk!), but at the time of my dream we were living in a large house close to the sea, and where snakes were almost unknown. As to the seeming discrepancy in *time*, it *can* be removed in this way. I got into bed directly she left me, and in India, when in health, I generally went to sleep *at once*. She was given to sit up reading, and it was while undressing the panic began; then followed the *hunt*, and we may feel sure that even after she got into bed sleep might not come all at once. My *feeling* when I awoke was *as if* it were the middle of the night, but it might really have been only an hour or two. I never looked at the time."

[We of course cannot assume that the coincidence was exact.]

(409) From Mrs. Sibley, 6, Radipole Road, Fulham, S.W.

"January 26th, 1884.

"The following occurred about May, 1859. I believed my son to be away in the Mediterranean, and I had no reason to believe he would come home for a year or two, when one night I dreamt that I had a letter, and all that was written on it and inside it was 'Woolwich,' 'Woolwich,' 'Woolwich.' I awoke with the belief that I must be going to hear from him; it was then about 6.30. I could not sleep any more, and when I heard the postman's knock at the door, I sent immediately for the letters. Only one was brought to me, and that had for its postmark 'Woolwich

Dockyard,' and it was from my son, telling me of the safe arrival, the night before, of the ship he was on. My son was in the navy, and I am perfectly certain that the idea of his speedy return had never crossed my mind; for aught I knew he might be several years away. This dream is unique in my experience, in the strength of the conviction it produced that it *must* correspond with reality.

"I mentioned this dream immediately on waking to a daughter (since deceased), who was sleeping with me. "KATHERINE SIBLEY."

The following corroboration is from the wife of the present writer, a younger daughter of Mrs. Sibley's:—

"26, Montpelier Square, S.W.

"Jan. 26, 1884.

"I remember the news of this incident spreading through the house before breakfast, and our rushing to my mother's room—when we were shown the letter, and told the dream.

"KATE S. GURNEY."

(410) From Mr. E. C. Trevilian, 3, Petersham Terrace, S.W.

"February 2nd, 1884.

"The following occurrence took place some 12 or 14 years ago. I was unmarried, and my house in Somerset had no establishment in it—merely an old housekeeper and a maid-servant. I lived more than half the year in chambers in London, and when I went alone down to the country, I never gave notice of my coming.

"On the day in question I walked up from the station, leaving my luggage to follow, and rang—as usual—at the side door. The maid-servant unlocked and opened it, paused a moment while a look of terror came over her face, and fled in much confusion. I walked in slowly, and instead of turning towards my study, marched straight to the servants' hall. The old housekeeper was by the fire, and as I approached her, walking up one side of the long table, she rushed down the other, and out of the room. I retreated to my study, and in about half an hour rang the bell. The old woman was still a little shaky, but was able to explain that the two had so entirely made up their minds that I was dead, that on my appearance just now they had taken me for my ghost. The maid-servant had dreamed, some 10 days before, that I was out shooting, that my gun had burst, and that I had been killed on the spot. They had mentioned this to several people—among them to the clergyman and to my agent—but without producing much effect. The girl had been so positive, that she, the old woman, had come to feel equally sure of my death.

"Now on the day of the dream it is a fact that my gun had *burst*—that is, it had gone in two at the breach, and no harm had been done. It was at a country house in Oxfordshire, and I was using sawdust powder, then a new invention, and several accidents had occurred with it about that time, and some had been mentioned in the newspapers. This, however, I well recollect. My host and I, then and there, standing among the beaters, decided that the accident should not be mentioned, and we looked regularly and found no notice of it in the local or London papers; nor

could I find out that any mention of it had been seen in any of the *Somerset* local papers, though it was chiefly by inquiry and not by myself examining the files that I went to work.

"I have quite lost sight of the servant-maid—the old woman was still in existence in the neighbourhood some months ago.

"E. C. TREVILIAN."

(411) From Miss Augusta Gould (now Mrs. Temple, and resident in India).

"Sunnybank, Ealing Dean, W.

"December 19th, 1883.

"When my brother was in Glasgow, I told his son I had had a curious dream of an unwieldy chair coming to me as a present from his father. As I was only residing in his house, I had no idea or need of receiving a chair.

"The next post brought me a letter from him, saying he had bought me such a curious American revolving chair, which was unwieldy when it came, the heavy pedestal and legs giving us difficulty in moving it from one place to another.

"I have had other curious unexpected events occur after dreams foreshadowing them, but will not burden you with more particulars. Surely the affair of the chair was a curious case of *rapport* between my brother's spirit and mine. As he never retired to rest till very late, and then was sleepless, he might have been thinking of his present to me when I was dreaming of it.

"AUGUSTA GOULD."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Gould added :—

"I send my nephew's corroboration of the dream as to the chair. I may mention that my nephew is 26 years old and clear in memory usually, but he forgets that my brother was in Glasgow at the time. As to one of your questions, I dream always in sleep, either by day or night. Whenever I wake a dream is broken into; so I often dream things which do not come to pass, though often a foreshadowing of events does come to be realised."

The following is from a postcard written to Miss Gould by her nephew, from 6, Ellison Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and forwarded to us :—

"January 2, 1884.

"I remember perfectly about the chair; it was one time when my father was south that you had the dream, and when he came back he brought the chair with him. I have told several people about the circumstance.—ALEX. G."

Where the subject of the dream is as odd and unlikely as in this case and the next, its triviality can scarcely be held to diminish the force of the coincidence.

(412) From a letter written on June 27, 1875, by Mr. J. L. O'Sullivan, then United States Minister at Lisbon, to the late Serjeant Cox, as President of the Psychological Society, and handed to us by Mr. F. K. Munton, who was Secretary of that Society.

Mr. O'Sullivan was engaged to dine, one evening in 1858, with his

British colleague, Mr. (now Sir Henry) Howard. By an accident, he was obliged to present himself in a pair of wet, muddy, and broken boots, which he sedulously kept concealed during the evening, taking care to arrive after the dinner had begun, and to play cards afterwards, instead of resorting to the drawing-room.

"The next morning I went as usual to the bedside of my invalid mother, who for years had not been able even to turn over in bed. After a little while she said, 'My son, I had such a queer dream about you last night. I saw you at Mrs. Howard's party, and you were in such a comical but annoying predicament. I thought *you had on a pair of wet and muddy and broken boots, and you were keeping your feet hidden under the table.*' And she laughed over the recollection of such an absurd dream.

"I ascertained that my servant had not become afterwards conscious of his omission, and that no human being under my roof knew that night of what had indeed been my queer predicament."

(413) From Mrs. Barr, Apsley Town, East Grinstead.

"Dec. 11, 1883.

"When in England some years ago, I had a very bad cough, for which a blister was ordered by my medical man, but being improperly applied it left a very ugly mark, like the print of a horse's shoe. I was then preparing to rejoin my husband [the late General Barr] in India, and carefully avoided mentioning the circumstance to him.

"On my way out to Bombay I was taken seriously ill, and was so weak on my arrival that I had to be carried on shore. As our own house was some miles from the place of landing we rested half way at my father-in-law's house. Whilst there my husband's mother said to him, 'Does Lizzie look at all as you saw her in your dream?' Upon which my husband turned to me and said, 'I had such a horrid dream about you the other night. I saw you looking pale and ill, as you do now, but you had a dreadful mark like a horse shoe upon your chest.' Being ill, I had landed in a white muslin dressing-gown, and I slightly parted it in front and showed him the mark. He was much astonished and said, 'How did you get that? It is *exactly* the mark I saw in my dream.'

"ELIZABETH H. A. BARR."

(414) From a narrator, Mr. B., whose name and address (though he made no stipulation on the subject) it seems right to suppress.

"January 16th, 1885.

"In March, 1880, our servant A. had been with us a few months, was well recommended by people we knew, and for the time she had been with us proved trustworthy, and as good as we could expect a servant to be. The dream Mrs. B. had respecting her happened in the early morning. She dreamt that the maid came into the dining-room, sat down by her (a strange proceeding), and said she had something on her mind to tell her mistress. It was that she had a boy of three years old, whose name was Bertie. When Mrs. B. got up, which she did after breakfasting in bed as usual, she went out into the orchard where A. was hanging the clothes. Mrs. B. told her her dream, and A. made no reply, but looked very pale and peculiar. Mrs. B. left her under the impression that she had offended her. Some time after, Mrs. B. found

A. in the kitchen, crying bitterly. On inquiring what was the matter, whether she was offended, she replied, 'Oh, no! ma'am, your dream is quite true in all respects, even the name.'

"It seems that A. had had it on her mind to tell Mrs. B. about this child from the first, and her mother had pressed her to tell Mrs. B. about it. Mrs. B. says she had not the least suspicion of this matter, not even after the dream.

"The servant A. and her mistress had a great liking for each other, more than is usual with servant and mistress, and A. had never been so happy in a situation before.

"A.'s age at the time was 23 years.

"[A year subsequently,] when in London, visiting her relatives, Mrs. B. dreamed that her servant, A., whom she had left at home, was in dreadful trouble—could see her in tears; all night Mrs. B. was continually dreaming of her. Next morning Mrs. B. determined upon returning home, although it was arranged for a longer stay. On her arrival, A. opened the door, and at once burst into a paroxysm of grief, saying that 'Bertie was dying,' that she had been praying for him and for Mrs. B.'s return, and crying all the previous night, and wished to go to him at once. (It should have been mentioned that the child, Bertie, was living with A.'s mother.)

"Mrs. B. is not remarkable for many dreams."

Mrs. B. writes:—

"I certify that the foregoing statement is quite correct.

"ELLEN B."

In answer to inquiries as to the first dream, Mr. B. says that his wife did not mention it to him till some time afterwards, but then could refrain no longer. In conversation Mrs. B. told me that she was quite confident that the detail of the *name* occurred in the dream, and was not subsequently read back into it; and also that she had had no idea whatever of A.'s history. The dreams were exceptionally vivid in detail.

(415) From Miss A. J. Middleton, 20, Stanley Gardens, Kensington Park Road, W.

"1884.

"Some years ago, I was staying with friends, and came down one day, saying I had had such a dreadful dream, that my youngest brother was drowned; the impression was so vivid I could not forget it. When the second post letters came, at about 2.30, I heard that a man who was boating with this brother had slipped getting into the boat, and was drowned, and my brother was in great distress about it; the man I never saw, and did not know his name. When I read the letter, my friends said, 'How odd that you should have dreamed your brother was drowned; we should have said you had made it up had you not told us first.'

"A. J. MIDDLETON."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Middleton adds:—

"I send you the card to-day I received from my friend confirming my first dream. I fancy I stayed with them about a week. This is the only occasion on which I have had a very distressing dream of death which left a vivid and lasting impression."

The card is as follows:—

“ Kirkbright Vicarage.

“ March, 1884.

“ Yes, I quite well remember your telling us about your dream, and your hearing the news the next morning. Thanks to our visitors' list I can tell you the date of your coming to us, January 21st, 1881.

“ M. COPE.”¹

The dream in this case, if telepathic, was probably due to the idea in the brother's mind. The next case might be explained in a similar way, by reference to what was filling the minds of those who surrounded the percipient ; but it might also be regarded as a case of direct impression from the drowning man ; and the mis-recognition would then be very similar to what has been observed in other examples (Nos. 170, 171, 249, and *cf.* 455 below). The case may further illustrate that development of the percipient faculty in illness, which was noticed in the preceding chapter (p. 349).

(416) From Miss Copeman, St. Stephen's House, Norwich.

“ March 2nd, 1884.

“ My mother nursed my grandmother all through her last illness, and a few days before she died they received the intelligence of the sudden death by drowning of the eldest son of the family. It was not referred to in the presence of my grandmother, but that day or the next, awaking from a sleep, she said, ‘ I have just seen John in the water ; has anything happened to him ? ’ *Joseph* was the name of the one drowned, and they were able to say that *John*, another son, was quite well, and she was quieted. It was thought she meant *Joseph* at the time, but in her febleness did not remember the right name. She died a day or two after.

“ I have often heard my mother repeat this, as a remarkable coincidence not to be explained.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Copeman writes :—

“ May 13th, 1884.

“ I fear I cannot give all the particulars you wish to have ; the coincidence is one not easy to relate clearly, for no one is living now who remembers anything definite about it. I only know of it as I heard it from my own mother's lips, and it is 3 years since her death. I have ascertained from another member of my family that the two deaths occurred in the year 1844, with an interval of about a week between them. My grandmother's name was Mrs. Elizabeth Buck, of East Dereham, Norfolk.

“ My father and sister confirm my statement, as they, too, have more than once heard my mother speak of it.

“ LUCY A. COPEMAN.”

¹ We have received a parallel case to this from Miss M. J. Potter, of 42, Northumberland Avenue, Kingstown, who tells us that in 1860 she dreamt very vividly that a cousin was drowned in a deep pond, on the night after the drowning in a mill-pond of another cousin who was living in the same house as the one dreamt of. The news of the accident arrived before Miss Potter left her room next morning, and before she had an opportunity of mentioning her dream.

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Joseph Buck was drowned at Sproughton on the 9th of August, 1844, and that his mother died on the 17th.

[In cases like this it is impossible to be absolutely certain that the news did not become known to the sick person through a whisper, or a reference made to it when she was supposed to be asleep, which may have acted as the nucleus of a dream.]

It occasionally happens that a *scene* seems to have been telepathically represented at a time when it was not occupying the agent's senses, though it may have been consciously occupying his mind (*cf.* Miss Wilkinson's case below, Chap. IV., § 2).

(417) From the Rev. W. Champneys, Haslingden Vicarage, Manchester.¹

“September 3rd, 1884.

“The incident to which I imagine you allude happened to my father, the late Dean of Lichfield. I have often heard him tell the story.

“One of his brothers was secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and in that capacity was often travelling about the country, preaching sermons and attending meetings. He was in precarious health, having once had rheumatic fever, which had left behind it heart-complaint. One night my father dreamed that he was walking through the street of a village where he had never been before. The whole scene was entirely new, and impressed itself strongly on his memory. Coming to the village inn, he walked up to the door to inquire after his brother, who had started off on one of his journeys a few days before, in his usual health. The landlady, of whom he made the inquiry, returned an evasive answer, and then he asked if his brother's wife was there: to which she replied, ‘Not his wife, sir, but his *widow* :’ and with the shock of these words he awoke.

“As soon as a message could reach him the next day (it was before the days of telegraphs), he heard that his brother had been taken ill on his journey the day before; that trying to reach the town, where he was expected, they had been obliged to put up at a village inn on the way, and that there, after a very short illness, he had died; and when my father went to the place that day, which was one he had never been to before, or even heard of, the whole scene was exactly the same that had been before him in his dream—street, houses, country, everything was the same, and at the very inn where he dreamed he had inquired for his brother, he found his brother's body lying.

“WELDON CHAMPNEYS.”

Through the kindness of the Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, we have been able to ascertain that the death of the Rev. E. T. Champneys occurred on June 16, 1845, at Caxton.

[The essential point of such a narrative as this is of course independent of the alleged correspondence of detail, which is likely to seem in memory more exact than it really was.]

¹ A not quite correct version of this narrative, without names, is given by the Rev. J. S. Pollock, Incumbent of St. Alban the Martyr, Birmingham, in *Dead and Gone*, p. 30.

The next case may possibly be of the same kind; but we have no proof that the scene was more than an imaginary setting supplied by the dreamer (as in several of the cases in § 4 below). The percipient did not himself believe that he had been asleep; but without external evidence that he was awake, we can hardly regard otherwise than as a dream an experience in which he appears to himself to be acting a part, during a time much longer than the actual duration of the impression.

(418) From Mr. Adrian Stokes, M.R.C.S., 16, Howell Road, St. Davids, Exeter. The account was originally published in the *Spiritual Magazine*, in December, 1867.

“My uncle, the late Adrian Stokes, Esq., of Thornbury, near Bristol, was living at his villa in that little town, in the year 1842, and on the evening of a certain day in November had retired to bed, in his usual health, at his customary hour. Contrary to his habit, however, he could not sleep, but lay awake counting the hours until 3 o'clock in the morning, when suddenly he found himself in a country whose features were quite strange to him. He became aware that he was in the Neilgherrie hill country of India, where his brother Sam was on invalid furlough. It appeared to him that he remained three months there with Sam, that he attended him during his illness, and that finally Sam died, when the vision faded, and he found himself again in his bed.¹ He was now satisfied that this vision had revealed a certainty to him, turned round and fell asleep, and in the morning he told my aunt all about it. He has mentioned this matter to me several times, and always expressed his belief that he was broad awake while he saw the vision, which he thought must have passed with the rapidity of ‘thought,’ and was quite sure it was no dream.

“In due course my uncle received from his brother’s agents at Madras a letter containing information of Sam’s death at such and such a place in the Neilgherrie Hills, at the precise day and hour that my uncle saw the vision in his bed at Thornbury. ‘It was no news to me,’ said my uncle to me when telling me of the circumstance; ‘I knew poor Sam was gone several months before.’

“ADRIAN STOKES.”

We find from the Indian Service Register that the death took place on November 12th, 1843 (not 1842), at Ootacamund.

In answer to a question, Mr. Stokes tells us that he was not told of this vision till several years after its occurrence.

The following example might be referred to the same type, if we

¹ We have a similar case—first-hand, but remote and from an uneducated witness—where the dreamer saw her brother, a carpenter’s mate, fall from a yard and break his leg, and then nursed him till his death. She says that she marked the day, as it happened to be his birthday, and afterwards learnt from one of his shipmates that he had died on the date of her dream, having broken his leg by a fall three days previously.

could be quite sure that the details following the accident really figured in the dream ; but they may easily have been “ read back ” into it ; and the case is again second-hand and remote.

(419) From Mr. A. W. Orr, Kingston Road, Didsbury, near Manchester.

“ January 2nd, 1885.

“ Some 40 years ago, my father was house-surgeon at the City of Dublin Hospital, and one day a young man, a sailor, was brought in who had fallen from one of the yards of the vessel on which he served. He was badly injured, and in about three days he died. Late in the afternoon of the day on which the man died, an old woman, very poor and fagged, came up to the hospital and asked to see the surgeon. My father saw her, and inquired what he could do for her ; when she inquired whether a young sailor had been brought to that institution, and if so, could she see him ? My father told her of the man above mentioned, and that he had died that morning.

“ It turned out that the old woman was the young man’s mother, that she lived in the Co. Carlow, and that three nights previously she had dreamt that her son had fallen from the rigging of the vessel, and had been taken to an hospital. So vivid was the dream that she could not rest till she got to Dublin (where she had never been before), and the moment she saw the hospital, she recognised it as the building she had seen in her dream. Her dream was only too true, for she found that her son had died from the effects of injuries occasioned by a fall just as appeared in her dream.

“ The old woman had walked a distance of over 60 miles, and entered the city by the road which passed the front of the hospital.

“ A. W. ORR.”

In a second letter Mr. Orr says :—

“ You may rely upon the facts being as I have stated them, as I have frequently spoken to my father on the subject, the case being of such a very remarkable character.”

§ 3. These last cases form a transition to the next class, which is distinguished by the direct correspondence of the dream with a *real event* that befell the agent ; but many of the dreams may still, as before, be regarded as literal representations of the agent’s thought. The prominent event, as usual, is death.

(420) The Rev. W. B. B. having communicated to me the fact that some time ago, he had had an exceptionally vivid dream—which haunted him for a portion of two days—of the death of an acquaintance, and that the death had happened coincidentally with the dream, the usual questions were asked. He replied as follows :—

“ The Vicarage, —.

“ December 9th, 1884.

“ In reference to the subject of your note, I am able to say that I had

no means of knowing that the lady in question was ailing or even in delicate health. She was the wife of a cousin from whom or of whom I do not think I had heard for some months. I have so much to do in my parish that I have little time for correspondence, but in consequence of what I dreamed I at once wrote to the son of the lady referred to, having previously, on awaking, mentioned the matter to my own wife. My remark to her was, 'We shall hear some bad news, I fear, from R——' (the residence of my cousin), and I then repeated the dream. Within another post I heard that Mrs. B. had died *on that night*." [The narrator goes on to say that a very near relative of his had three times had exactly similar intimations. See p. 132, note.]

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death occurred on Sept. 2, 1866.

The following is the corroboration of the narrator's wife :—

"December 11th, 1884.

"Mrs. B. has much pleasure in confirming the statement made by her husband as to his having communicated to her the substance of his dream boding something very serious to his cousin's family. We had had no intimation of the illness. The family lives in Ireland, and the news of the death did not reach us until two days after."

[The slight discrepancy as to when the news arrived does not seem important. It will be seen that the dream was impressive enough to cause a busy man to write a letter.]

(421) From Miss C. D. Garnett, Furze Hill Lodge, Brighton.

"December 18th, 1883.

"On the 13th of February, 1883, when at Biarritz, I dreamt that a relative, whom we had left in perfect health in England, and between whom and myself there was a strong affinity, was dying, and that we had to leave Biarritz sooner than we intended. The dream haunted me throughout the following morning, and in the evening we received a telegram summoning us home at once. She died as we reached England. I may mention that this event was entirely unlooked for.

"C. D. GARNETT."

We find from the *Liverpool Daily Post* that the death occurred on Feb. 15, 1883.

Miss Garnett adds :—

"March 3rd, 1885.

"In reply to your questions respecting the dream I had at Biarritz :
1. What was the state of the dying person at the time of the dream?—She was *unconscious*.¹ 2. What was the character of the dream?—I dreamt that we were summoned home suddenly (we had then been a week in Biarritz, and intended remaining two months), that we received a telegram announcing the sad state of my relative ; and the dream was all concerning her—and a very troublesome one. It wasn't an ordinary dream. I felt greatly disturbed throughout the day following, and in the evening, about dinner time, the telegram came."

¹ See Chap. v., § 10, and Vol. i., p. 563, note.

Miss M. Garnett writes, on December 30, 1883 :—

“ I understand from my sister that you desire a corroboration of her remarkable dream at Biarritz. She mentioned it to me the following morning. She was much attached to the relative dreamt of.

“ MILLICENT GARNETT.”

(422) From Colonel V., who says that the case “ was written from memory, and dates in my diary.”

“ March 11th, 1886.

“ On Sunday night, 25th May, 1884, I had a most extraordinary dream. I dreamt that my son A., a young officer in a regiment at Gibraltar, was lying very ill there with fever, and was calling out to me, ‘ Father, father, come over and let me see you or my mother.’ The next morning I went to see the Rev. G., the well-known coach, living near me. On entering his room, he exclaimed, ‘ Do you believe in “ dream-waves ” ?’ I replied, No, I did not. He remarked that just as I was entering the room, he was on the point of sitting down before his desk and commencing a letter to me, asking me to come over and see him. I then said, ‘ I had a curious dream last night. I saw before me my son A. down with fever at Gibraltar, imploring me to come over and see him.’ As I had that morning a letter from him, written in good spirits, I thought it curious, and gave the dream no further thought.

“ On Tuesday, the 27th May, I went to Ramsgate with my second son, for change. On the 29th May, one of my family here wired to me to return home, as news had arrived from Gibraltar that my son A. was very ill with Rock fever. I returned in a few hours. I read over my letters from Gibraltar. It appears that on the 17th May my son fell ill, and was placed on the sick list. The attack turned out to be Rock fever. He gradually got worse ; on the 24th he was delirious, and on the 25th his brother officers had to get a nurse, Mrs. S., to take charge of the patient. On the 23rd a second doctor was called in consultation. So bad was the news that I received from Gibraltar by letter and telegrams, that I left London on the 4th June, and reached it on the 9th. I found the patient doing well, but very weak. I had to remain there till the 3rd July, the attack of fever continuing, and we both returned home on the 8th July.

“ I mentioned to the nurse my curious dream of the 25th May. She said she was placed in charge of the patient on the afternoon of that day. He was very delirious all that night, and was constantly calling out, ‘ Oh, mother, mother, do come over to see me ’ ; and as he probably remembered how delicate she was, and that she could not take a sea voyage across the Bay of Biscay, he also called out, ‘ Father, father, come and comfort me, and let me see you again.’

“ It was months after our return home before the fever left him, and he did not quite get rid of it till November, 1884.”

In conversation, Colonel V. informed me that he dreams very little, and scarcely ever has distressing dreams ; and that, quite apart from the confirmation, this dream would have been very exceptional in its character. Mrs. S., who was an excellent nurse, and whom he regards as entirely trustworthy, has left Gibraltar, and gone, he thinks, to Morocco.

The Rev. H. P. Gurney, to whom Colonel V. described his dream next morning, writes from 2, Powis Square, W., on March 22, 1886 :—

“ I do not remember any particulars of Colonel V.’s dream. It occurred nearly two years ago, and at a time when I am particularly busy. I only recollect that he told me that he had had a curious dream about his son at Gibraltar, who is one of our former pupils. I cannot recall any particulars, but I think that his son called to him to come and visit him. I know that he afterwards found out that he was seriously ill with fever, and had to go out to bring him home.

“ H. P. GURNEY.”

Mrs. Thrupp, of 67, Kensington Gardens Square, W., writing to us on April 2nd, 1886, says that she called at Colonel V.’s house when he was on the point of starting for Gibraltar to see his son, and that he then told her “ all about his dream.”

(423) From Mrs. S. (the narrator of case 74), who is willing that her name should be given to any one genuinely interested in this case.

“ October 27th, 1885.

“ In 1871, I was staying at Düsseldorf with my daughter, who had just been to an eminent doctor in Bonn to have an operation performed on the throat. My mother-in-law was also in Bonn, and, after the operation, had run after the cab containing my daughter and myself, and had given the former (who was a child at the time) a ten-thaler note, as a reward for the brave manner in which she had submitted to the operation. She was in excellent spirits, and laughed and joked with us before parting. A day or two afterwards I awoke, and said to my daughter, who slept in the same room, ‘ O M——, I have had such a dreadful dream. I dreamt your grandmother *was dead.*’ The terror caused by the dream was so great that I felt compelled to wake my daughter, though I knew that in her condition this was most unwise, as she was still suffering from the effects of the operation. I felt I *must* tell someone. My daughter said it was ‘ only a dream,’ and told me to go to sleep. I asked how her throat was, and she said it was better. I pulled out my watch from under the pillow, and found it was between 3 and 4 a.m.

“ The following morning, at 10 o’clock, I received a telegram, telling me to meet my mother-in-law’s sister at Cologne Station. I did so, and they broke to me the news of my mother-in-law’s death, which had taken place the previous night. I had been in no sort of anxiety about her, and I was only told afterwards that she had been suffering for many years from some internal complaint, for which she had been operated on on the day following that on which I last saw her. I was totally ignorant that this was going to be done.

“ This was the only occasion on which I remember having had a vivid and distressing dream of death.

“ M. S.”

[Mrs. S.’s daughter “ thinks her testimony [would be of little use, as she was quite young at the time, and her memory is not quite clear on several points.”]

(424) A lady who prefers that her name should not be published, having been asked (by Miss Bryce, of 35, Bryanston Square, W.) whether

since January 1st, 1874, she had had an exceptionally vivid dream of the death of some person known to her, answered:—

“1884.

“Yes, on August 13th, 1877. I was 27, and in excellent health, as I was on my way home from a month's stay in Switzerland. The impression lasted for some hours after I rose. In the night it was so distressing as to wake me. The person of whose death I dreamt was my oldest and dearly-beloved brother, a young man of 26. He died at Blackheath just at the same time, *i.e.*, between 12 and 3 in the early morning. I had heard the day before that he was unwell, but no fatal consequences were thought of.”

In answer to further inquiries, our informant writes on May 17, 1884:—

“My brother was a young man of fine physical frame, in vigorous health, going daily to the City from his home with my parents at Blackheath. He had, however, a constitutional weakness in the ‘hæmorrhagic diathesis,’ which was not appreciated by me as in the least likely to shorten his life.

“At the time in question he had taken a fortnight's holiday at Maidenhead, chiefly spent in rowing, at which he was an adept. After his return he fainted, one morning, and a bruise was found on his left shoulder. The letter that I received told me of this, adding that the doctor had seen him, that some anxiety had been excited, but *that he was better*.

“Had there been any apprehension of fatal consequences, or even of a serious illness, I should have left Boulogne on the day I received the news (Sunday). But I remained there with my husband, and, as I said, in the night between Sunday and Monday, I had the terrible impression—the chill horror of which I cannot forget.

“On reaching London in the afternoon of the next day (Monday), I learnt that he had died suddenly at the time of my distress; the cause being internal hæmorrhage from the lacerated muscle. He had never had internal hæmorrhage before. He had only been unwell three or four days.”

We have verified the date of the death in the *Times* obituary.

[Mrs. W.'s husband prefers not to state positively whether it was *after* or *before* the news of the death that he first heard of the dream. On the supposition that latent anxiety may possibly have been the source of the dream, the case is excluded from the group used in the calculation in Vol. I., Chap. VIII., § 4.]

(425) From Mr. T. J. Norris, Dalkey, Ireland. The account was written many years ago.

“In the year 1839, Mrs. Norris, of Mohill, Co. Leitrim, accompanied by her two daughters (now Mrs. West, the Asylum, Omagh, and Mrs. Crofton, Portnashangan Rectory, Mullingar) and by Mrs. Draper (now Mrs. Simonet, St. Helier's, Jersey),¹ went to Lausanne for the benefit of the health of one of her girls, and remained there for a couple of years. Mr. Norris being an extensive land agent, could not remain with them, but paid them a visit each summer. While there in 1840, and just before the day fixed for his return home, Mrs. Draper, at breakfast, in-

¹ Since deceased.

formed all present that a Mrs. Wilson, of St. Helier's, a friend of them all, had died the evening before, at such an hour and under such-and-such circumstances, and asked Mr. Norris to write to Jersey about it. He first entered all the circumstances minutely in his pocket-book, and then wrote over as requested, desiring the answer to be directed to him in Mohill, to which he was about to return. I, his only son, was with him one day, when the post came in, bringing him a letter from Jersey. He opened and read it, and then gave me his keys and desired me to bring him down his pocket-book, to open it at a certain date, and see how far his memorandum agreed with the information contained in the letter. In substance they were identical, except that it *appeared* that Mrs. Wilson did not die until more than half-an-hour after her appearance to Mrs. Draper. I suggested that this could be accounted for by the difference of longitude, and on calculating this it just made up for the seeming discrepancy.

“THOMAS J. NORRIS.”

Mrs. West, of Sion Cottage, Sion Mills, Co. Tyrone, writes :—

“December 7th, 1882.

“I am not sure whether it was a *dream* or that Mrs. Draper thought she saw Mrs. Wilson ; but if the former, Mrs. Draper must have awoke at once, as I know she looked at her watch and remarked the hour, and afterwards, when she heard of Mrs. Wilson's death, she inquired particularly at what hour she died. We at *first* thought the time was different, till we calculated the difference of Lausanne and Jersey time.

“A. M. WEST.”

Mr. Norris has given us his reasons for fixing the year as 1840 ; but we cannot find the death in the Jersey Register for that year. Registration had been then only recently introduced, and had perhaps not become universal.

[This case is very remote ; but the incident which Mr. Norris relates was such as would be likely to impress the facts on his memory, at any rate to a greater extent than if he had merely been told the story.]

(426) From Miss Churchill, 9, Eversley Park, Chester.

“August 13th, 1884.

[A few words are added from a second account written on November 18th, 1885.]

“About the month of August, 1877, I dreamt most vividly of the death of a gentleman, a friend of the family, whom I had not seen for some years. I fancy I saw him in the dream, but cannot distinctly remember. I had not heard of his illness, or anything of him at the time of my dream. But the next day I heard of his death having taken place ; I do not remember the hour, but as far as I can say I believe he must have been dead at the time of my dream, or dying.

“I cannot positively say whether I mentioned my dream before hearing of his death ; I think I did.

“EMILY CHURCHILL.”

In answer to an inquiry, Miss Churchill replies :—

“I do not remember (with this exception) dreaming vividly of a death, and believe the one referred to to be the only one.

One of Miss Churchill's sisters says :—

“I can perfectly well remember hearing the dream before we heard of

the death. As he was a strong man, and as far as we knew in excellent health, we did not for a moment suppose it was true. If I remember rightly, he was only ill three or four hours."

Another sister writes :—

" August, 1884.

"It is so long ago that we have rather forgotten. My own impression was that Emily told us her dream at breakfast, and that we heard of the death in the evening,—that the gentleman concerned had died the day before. I know I was much impressed at the time, but I couldn't declare that she told us in the morning. I know directly Lizzie told us of the death (she had not been at home in the morning) Emily exclaimed to her, 'I dreamt last night that he was dead.'"

We find from the *Times* obituary that the death took place on July 19th, 1877.

In conversation, Miss Churchill mentioned—as showing how sudden the death was—that the daughters of the gentleman who died had just gone on a visit, and had to be telegraphed for. The two families lived in the same town ; but the interest of the Misses Churchill was in the daughters ; they rarely saw the father, and had not seen him for a considerable time before his death.

The following is a similar case, where the death of a person not closely connected with the dreamer was dreamt of vividly, but not in a specially pictorial way.

(427) From Miss G., whose mother sent us the main facts of the case in 1883, and who herself wrote a fuller account on January 12, 1886.

In November, 1880, Miss G., the daughter of a country rector, was staying in her father's former parish in London. The vicar of this parish had exchanged livings with her father, and was thus associated in her mind with both her homes, though she only knew him slightly. One Saturday night she dreamt that he was dead. There was an odd confusion in the dream, as her father's death was also suggested. She felt it was something to do with *both* parishes. On entering the breakfast-room, she learnt from the friend with whom she was staying that the vicar had died in the night. She had heard some days before that he had a cold ; but, as she remarks, "colds in November are anything but uncommon," and she had thought no more about it. "He had said, the Thursday before, that he was feeling so much better that he hoped to be able to take his Sunday duty ; but on the Saturday he had grown suddenly worse, and died that evening." Miss G. does not remember to have dreamt of death on any other occasion.

We find from the *Times* obituary that the death took place on November 13, 1880.

The friend with whom Miss G. was staying writes to her (in February, 1886), "I am afraid I do *not* remember about your dream at the time it happened ; but I quite well remember your telling me some time afterwards you had dreamed a dream which I ought to have remembered." Miss G. is confident that she mentioned the dream before sitting down to breakfast.

(428) From a most trusted and valued servant of the present writer's—now Mrs. Humphry, residing at Hiley Lodge, Kensal Green—who wrote, in the week following the dream:—

“On Tuesday night [March 24th, 1885], or rather Wednesday morning, I dreamt that Fenning, a milkman in the employ of Mr. John Jarvis [of Dale Hill Farm, Ticehurst], formerly in the employ of Mr. Thos. Jarvis, my late master, said to me, ‘He’s gone at last.’ I said, ‘Who?’ He said, ‘Why, Mr. John Jarvis is dead.’ On Wednesday morning, when I saw my fellow-servant, Rose, I told her my dream.” [This was confirmed in writing, at the same time as the account was written, by Rose Wade.]

On March 30th, the news of the death arrived, and Mrs. Humphry at once mentioned the coincidence to her mistress. She was told to ask the day and hour of his death, and the following is a copy of her brother’s reply:—

“Platt Cottage, Ticehurst.

“March 31st, 1885.

“Just a line to let you know that Mr. Jarvis passed away on the 25th—that was last Wednesday morning as near as I can tell you at 2 o’clock.

“WILLIAM VIDLER.”

We have confirmed the date by the Register of Deaths.

Mrs. Humphry told the present writer that the dream was quite unique in her experience, for its vividness and the distress that it caused her.

(429) From Fynes Moryson’s *Itinerary*. (See above, p. 382.)

“Whilst I lived at Prage, and one night had sat up very late drinking at a feast, early in the morning, the sunne beams glancing on my face as I lay in bed, I dreamed that a shadow passing by told me that my father was dead; at which awaking all in a sweat, and affected with this dreame, I rose and wrote the day, the houre, and all things connected therewith in a paper booke, which Booke with many other things I put into a pouch, and sent it from Prage to Stode, thence to be convoyed into England. And now being at Nurnberg, a merchant of a noble family, well acquainted with me and my friends, arrived there, who told me that my father died some two months past. I list not write any lies, but that which I write is as true as strange. When I returned into England some four years after, I would not open the pouch I sent from Prage, nor looke in the paper booke in which I had written this dreame, till I had called my sisters and some friends to be witnesses, when my selfe and they were astonished to see my written dreame answer the very day of my father’s death.”

(430) From the Rev. F. R. Harbaugh (Pastor of Presbyterian Church), Red Bank, Monmouth County, New Jersey, U.S.A.

“February 7th, 1884.

“In the afternoon of January 29th, 1881, between the hours of 2 and 4 o’clock, while asleep (in ordinary good health), and with no conscious or immediate procuring cause for the same, I had a ‘dream’ charged with every element of the horrible and distressing. I awoke greatly confused in mind, but with these very distinct impressions:—first, that some tragedy

had occurred ; and second, that some relative was implicated in it. The dream, for the while, very greatly affected me, so much so as to seriously disqualify me for my Sabbath services the day following.

“ Within a few days after this dream I received a letter from my father, which began something like this :—

“ ‘ You will be shocked to hear that your cousin —, on last —, (the same day on which I had my dream), ‘ took the life of his wife and babe, and then killed himself.’

“ It is not necessary to give the details of the crime. My reply to my father’s letter contained the following :—

“ ‘ Shocked I certainly was by the intelligence in your last letter, but hardly surprised ; for ever since last — afternoon I have been oppressed, because of a dream, with an impression that something of the kind had occurred.’

“ From his letter in reply, I found that my dream was coincident (how exactly I do not remember) with the tragedy. With regard to the person who committed the crime, I had neither seen him nor had any communication with him, nor, indeed, any information about him, since we separated, in our early boyhood. No acquaintance of mine of so long a time could have been more absent from my mind than he. Nothing proximate to the tragedy had transpired to recall or suggest him. I have never been able to detect what it was, or might be, that brought him to my knowledge. The absence of anxiety, or anything like it, may be seen in my almost utter forgetfulness of him. Indeed, for 20 years I did not know whether he was living or dead.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Harbaugh says :—

“ Horrifying dreams are exceedingly rare with me. The doubt on my mind as to the coincidence of time (as I now recall the occurrence) is as to the hour. The day of the tragedy and of my dream were the same.” He adds :—

“ A clergyman residing in the place where the crime was committed writes, ‘ I am going to see the man who was the first in the house after the deed was done, and ask him for the exact hour.’ Later he writes, ‘ I find it was on Saturday evening, January 29th, at just about 7.30 p.m. The town marshal fixes the time at the same hour.’ My recollection of the day of the week and the time of the day on which I had the dream is very distinct—as well as the recollection of the letter I received from my father, telling me of it, and of my reply.”

[If this case was telepathic, the idea of the deed must have been present to the perpetrator’s mind 4 hours before it was acted on—which seems a reasonable supposition. The telepathic explanation is of course rendered less probable by the absence of intimacy or affection between the parties ; but we have had indications that mere kinship may supply the adequate condition (see, *e.g.*, case 244).]

§ 4. Coming now to the class of more distinctly *pictorial* dreams, corresponding with some critical situation of the agent, but not a mere reflection of his conscious thought, I will begin with cases where what is seen is a tolerably simple embodiment of the idea

supposed to have been transferred, and then pass on to cases where the dreamer invests the idea with fresh elements and imagery of his own.

The following four cases are of the simplest possible type. The first of them resembles the last quoted, in the fact that there was no bond of friendship between agent and percipient; but the proximity to the latter of a third person—her father—who was connected both with her and with the agent, suggests that though the impression did not affect his consciousness, it still reached her in some sense through him (p. 267).

(431) From Mr. G. J. Davis, St. Chloe Endowed School, Amberley, near Stroud. (The account is slightly condensed.)

After mentioning that about 1848, he had served under a certain clergyman, Mr. S., Mr. Davis continues:—

“About 1860, I married my present wife, and she did not, nor my children, know anything of Mr. S., and, consequently, took little interest in hearing about him. We seldom or never spoke about him, except perhaps when a letter came from him, and I might mention the fact.

“One Saturday morning, as I was reading the *Standard* after breakfast, my daughter, aged about 19, suddenly broke the silence thus:—

“‘Papa, have you heard from Mr. S. lately?’

“‘No, I have not,’ I replied; ‘in fact, it is my turn to write. He wrote about three months ago; but I have not written since. Why do you ask?’

“‘Because I dreamt about him last night. I dreamt he had lost the use of his side’ (here she made a motion with her hand down her side); ‘paralysed, don’t you call it?’

“She spoke very earnestly, I noticed; but I merely replied, ‘How strange,’ and went on reading my *Standard*. This was on Saturday morning, you will observe.

“Well, the next day was Sunday, and we always made it a point to call at the post-office for our letters on Sundays. We did so on this Sunday. Among them was a C—— newspaper, I noticed the address was not in Mr. S.’s handwriting; this moved my curiosity, and there being no folk about, I opened the paper, and what was my surprise to find a paragraph marked, announcing, ‘That their respected neighbour, the Rev. E. H. S., had been seized with paralysis.’ Certain persons were with him—doctors, &c.,—and they hoped he would get better, &c., &c. Of course, I was very much surprised, and when we got home, I said, ‘Sissy, do you remember anything more about your dream?’ (after reading the paragraph, and saying how strange it was, &c.)

“‘No,’ she said, ‘but the dream made such an impression upon my mind that I lay awake thinking about it, and wondering how I knew he was paralysed, for he didn’t tell me, and I saw no one else but himself lying ill in bed.’

“This is all literally true.

“GEORGE JESSON DAVIS.”

In reply to an inquiry, Mr. Davis wrote that the date of Mr. S.’s seizure was Nov. 8, 1878. We have verified the occurrence and the date in the local newspaper of Nov. 16. It would appear, therefore, that the dream must have been on the night of Nov. 15—*i.e.*, a week after

the actual seizure—though while its effects were continuing. This extension of time of course extends the scope for accidental coincidence, and so far weakens the case; on the other hand there is the strong point of a *double* correspondence, the right person being associated with the right complaint, though neither one nor the other had been in the least degree occupying the dreamer's waking thoughts. Mr. S. never recovered from the attack, and died some months afterwards.

In conversation Mr. Davis stated that his daughter was not in the habit of having vivid dreams, and that her mention of this one was exceptional; and that by temperament she is the very reverse of gushing or visionary.

(432) From Mrs. Jennings Bramly, Strathmore, Killiney.

“February 3rd, 1886.

“I am happy to give you an exact account of the dream which I had about my brother, Professor of Greek in Trinity College, Dublin. I cannot fix the exact time; it was probably two and a-half or three and a-half years ago. It was simply a *vivid* dream; I by no means saw an exact enactment of what was going on. I dreamed (being at home in my own house in Killiney, my brother being in his, in Dublin) that I saw my brother covered with blood, and that I threw my arms round him and implored him not to die, and that I *felt* the blood touch me, and saw it drip on me. I awoke in great distress, and remained awake lest I should dream it again. In the morning I told my husband I had had a fearful dream. I did not in the least think it was true, but it was very real, and it frightened me. In spite of daylight, and companions around me, I still felt a vague uneasiness, and in order to dispel the feeling by seeing my brother in perfect health (as I quite expected I should), I went into Dublin by train, and to his rooms in College to see him. I found him sitting by the fire, and I asked him if he would come to us next day and play tennis. He replied, ‘that he should not be able to play tennis for many a day,’ and then told me ‘he had had an accident the evening before; he was in the garden with his children, and one of them had got up on the roof of a small tool-house, which had a glass window in the roof; the child was frightened, and my brother went up the ladder to lift him down; he put one foot on the window and reached forward for the child, when the glass broke and my brother's leg went through, cutting a vein in the leg; it bled *profusely* for a couple of hours before a doctor could be found to bandage it up. This accident took place early in the evening; I, probably, was not in bed until after the bleeding had been stopped.

“My brother noticed how white I had become while he was telling me of his accident. I told him my dream, and he agreed with me in thinking it a very remarkable coincidence. He evidently had not thought of me the previous night, or he would have said so. My attachment for him is, I believe, unusually strong, and my sympathy in all his pursuits extreme. It is right to mention that in 1879 he had had a much more serious accident, about which I had no dream. “M. GERALDINE J. BRAMLY.”

Mr. Bramly writes on Feb. 3, 1886 :—

“I recollect my wife telling me her dream, as above narrated, on the following morning. She has a very accurate memory.

Professor Tyrrell writes, on Feb. 5, 1886 :—

“W. J. BRAMLY.”

"I remember the incident communicated to you by my sister, Mrs. Bramly. The details are accurate. She told me of her dream when she called on me in College the following morning." Later he adds:—

"I should wish it to be understood that I look on the dream and the accident as mere coincidence.¹ The accident was slight, but there was considerable effusion of blood. "R. Y. TYRRELL." *

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Bramly says :

"I am a *very* restless, uneasy sleeper, and every night dream the wildest dreams possible. I have never, however, except in this instance, dreamed of any accident to anyone, or of the death of anyone."

(433) From Mr. Durell, Wrenthorpe, The Thicket, Southsea.

"April 1, 1886.

"On the night of the 4th May, 1863, when I was in Australia, I dreamed that a postman handed me a letter with a deep black border. The purport of the letter was to announce the death of an uncle in England, and that he had left me some property which would necessitate my immediate return to England.

"When I awoke, the dream still haunted me, and I made a note of it, and mentioned it to several of my friends, feeling sure I should hear of my uncle's death.

"I could not do so by the next mail, but the one after that brought me the intelligence of his death *on* the 4th of May, the day of my dream, and he had left me property which required my return to England.

"I had no idea of my uncle's illness, and still less that he was going to leave me any property. "F. T. D. DURELL."

The *Times* obituary confirms May 4, 1863, as the date of death.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Durell writes :

(1) "I do not recollect ever having had a dream about death, certainly none that ever impressed me as this did; and I am not in the habit of having distressing dreams.

(2) "I *did* make a note at the time of my dream; unfortunately the diary I had of that year, 1863, I lost.

(3) "The two friends who were with me at the time of the dream, and to whom I mentioned it, are both dead."

In conversation, Mr. Durell distinctly confirmed the fact that the date in the letter was compared with that in his diary, and found to be the same; he does not know what was the hour of death. He is not, and was not, at all in the habit of having vivid dreams: this one made an extraordinarily strong impression on him *before* the receipt of the news. Mrs. Durell well remembers hearing the account very soon after Mr. Durell's return to England.

(434) From a gentleman, resident at Widnes, who prefers that his full name should not be published. The account is dated Dec. 12, 1882.

"I was about 14 years old, and at school at Southport, a town about 30 miles from my house. One night I dreamed in a most vivid manner that I saw my mother dead. Next morning I was oppressed with the firm

¹ Professor Tyrrell clearly means *accidental* coincidence. A similar remark might be made, as I have again and again pointed out, about almost every isolated case; yet no one, on reflection, will maintain that the cases to which it would apply have therefore no legitimate place in a cumulative argument.

conviction that my mother had died, and though we happened to have a half holiday that morning, I could not throw off the feeling. While we were playing some game in our cricket field, a messenger came to say that my master wanted to see me at once. I felt that I knew what he had to say, and I suppose that my face must have shown some signs of my trouble, as, before telling me that my mother had died during the previous night, he asked me some kindly questions as to whether I felt ill. I have never had any similar kind of dream since (indeed, I *very* rarely dream), but I can never forget the impression made on me by this dream.

“H. W. D.”

[The memory of the subsequent incidents in this case to some extent confirms the coincidence. In conversation, I found the narrator very far from disposed to attach significance to an isolated case of the sort, though the impression made upon him was very strong.]

In the following case, though remote in date, there is no reason to doubt that the facts are correctly recorded. It is at any rate a point in favour of that view—and one rarely met with in second-hand narratives of the sort—that the degree of closeness in the coincidence is left uncertain.

(435) From Mrs. A. L. Udny, 61, Westbourne Park Villas, W.

“My father-in-law, George Udny, of the Bengal Civil Service, at one time Member of Council there, and a great friend of Lord Wellesley when he was Governor-General, was a man of deep religious feeling and high honour, but I imagine not the least disposed to believe in any superstitions or marvels; so I think his narrative may be depended on, and this was his account.

“He was residing at Maldah, in India, in 1794,¹ and his only brother, Robert, to whom he was much attached, was living in Calcutta, with his wife Anne. Mr. Udny dreamed one night that he saw his brother and his wife struggling in the water, which distressing dream awoke him. He was about 200 miles from Calcutta, and very shortly received by dāk-post a letter informing him that his brother and his wife had been drowned in the Hooghly shortly before, I do not know exactly how long. Robert and Anne Udny had been to pay a visit at Howrah on the other side of the Hooghly, and not returning at night to their own house, the servants had supposed that they had been induced to stay all night, and it was only the next day found that they had left their friends and had embarked in a Boleah (a large river pleasure boat), to return—which had got foul of, and been overturned by, the cable of a vessel lying at anchor in the river, and the current had carried away their bodies some distance down the stream, where they were found locked in each other’s arms.”

In a letter which accompanied the account, dated 25th July, 1883, Mrs. Udny writes:—

“I had always heard that the dream was three times repeated,² but the story as I have it, written down from my husband’s dictation,³ is as

¹ From *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, the Serampore Missionaries*, we have been able to fix the incident as in January or February, 1794.

² As regards the frequent recurrence of the number *three* in narratives of this sort, see p. 229, note.

³ The account was only in part dictated, but was throughout revised by Mr. Udny, on April 27, 1861.

above ; and I believe he was afraid to add more particulars, as he was a most exact man, and would rather understate than exaggerate, even undesignedly, any story."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Udny adds that her husband was not born till 1802, and therefore cannot have heard of this incident till a good many years after its occurrence ; "but his father lived till 1830, and it must have been often talked of after my husband had grown up."

In the next case, it seems possible that the dreamer was impressed by some one known to her on board the ship (she knew Captain King, the commander), and that she embodied the idea of wreck in a simple manner.

(436) From Mr. E. Gardner Colton, Southampton Buildings, W.C.

"July 31st, 1883.

"Some years ago we were living in Derby Lane, Stoneycroft, Liverpool. I remember one morning, early, a Mrs. Tate, a friend of my mother's (and who lived at Iquique, Peru, but was stopping with her father in England), came to our house and informed us she had had a very strange dream that morning early, in which she saw the steamer 'Santiago,' of the Pacific Company, strike on a rock in the Straits of Magellan, through which she [Mrs. Tate] had many times passed, and founder.

"Now, the extraordinary news came several weeks later that the steamer had that night or time run on that *very* rock.

"I well remember Mrs. Tate's vivid description of it.

"E. GARDNER COLTON."

We have written to Mrs. Tate, at Iquique, but have received no reply.

Mr. Colton's mother writes, from 61, Park Street, Southend-on-Sea :—

"I remember this also, and it is quite correct. And Mrs. Tate was so strongly impressed by the dream that she noted the time by her watch, and, as far as I can recollect, it agreed with the time."

We learn from the Secretary of the Pacific Steam Navigation Company that the "Santiago" was lost in the Straits of Magellan on 25th January, 1869.

[The *Times* of March 19th, 1869, says that the ship "struck on a sunken reef, not shown in the charts." This shows that the accuracy of the dream has been to some extent exaggerated. We have no reason to doubt its exceptional vividness ; but the case is clearly not one that would deserve attention, so long as the reality of telepathy was doubtful.]

In the next case, which is recent and corroborated, the death-scene is still just such as the dreamer might most naturally conjure up.

(437) Letter to the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, now of Rhyl, from Mrs. Harrison, of Park View, Queen's Park, Manchester.

"September 2nd, 1885.

"I had a dear uncle, John Moore, St. John's, Isle of Man. I knew he had failed in health and strength during the winter of 1883 and 1884, but was not aware that he was really ill, or worse, so had not been thinking of him more than usual, nor anticipating a change ; on the contrary, I was rather sanguine that, with the return of spring, his strength

would revive, knowing that he had only two years before recovered from a severe illness, his constitution being so excellent, though he was 85 years old when he was taken away. But on the night of March 1st, or very early in the morning of the 2nd, 1884 (I did not ascertain the time, but I had retired to rest very late and seemed to have slept two or three hours), I awoke crying, and with the agitating scenes of my dream clear before me. It was that I stood in the bedroom of my uncle, that he lay there dying, his remaining family near him, I just a short distance from the bed, looking on. When I joined my husband and daughter at the fireside, on coming downstairs in the morning, I told them my dream, and then thought no more about it till two days later, 4th March, when a letter arrived, saying that my uncle had passed away at 2 o'clock on the morning of the 2nd.

“R. J. HARRISON.”

Mrs. Harrison can recall no other dream of death.

We find from the Isle of Man Register that the date of the death was March 2, 1884.

Mr. Harrison corroborates as follows:— “September 2nd, 1885.

“I distinctly remember my wife telling me the above dream on the Sunday morning, 2nd March, 1884, and it has often been spoken of in the family since. The letter acquainting us of Mr. Moore’s death arrived at Manchester, from the Isle of Man, two days after, *viz.*, Tuesday, 4th March, 1884.

“J. P. HARRISON.”

[In conversation I learnt that Mr. Moore’s son and daughter, who appeared in the dream, were the relatives likely to be present; so that point goes for nothing. But there is no doubt as to the exceptional character of the dream. On account of the age and infirmity of the person who died, this instance has not been included in the special group, used in the calculation in Vol. I., Chap VIII., § 4.]

In the next two cases, again, the death is represented in a completely natural way.

(438) From the late Mrs. Denroche, of 1, Berkeley Villas, Pittville, Cheltenham, who said that she had “never had any distressing or remarkable dream save this one.”

“February 23rd, 1885.

“On the Easter morning [1843], about 6 o’clock, I dreamt that I was looking out of my bedroom window, and that I saw Mr. R. walking up the avenue, and that, knowing him to be in Australia, I felt so surprised and pleased that I ran down to meet him at the glass portico. When I put out my hand, I said, ‘Oh, how glad I am to see you again.’ He looked so sad and said, ‘You will not be glad, as I bring you sad news. Your brother Stephen is dead.’ I awoke at the moment, and it seemed as though the words were sounding in my ears. When the servant came to assist me to dress, I told her my dream, and to comfort me she said that dreams always went by contraries, ‘and that he was most likely being married,’ but said I must not tell this dream to my mother or to any one who might do so, as my brother writing so seldom always made her so anxious and unhappy; and so acting upon her advice, I did not speak of it, but the thought of it constantly recurred during the four months that intervened between the Easter and a visit to Bangor, in Wales, where a letter from Mr. R., dated Easter Sunday, was forwarded to me. He wrote

to me for the reason that he thought I could more gently break the sad news to my dear mother, and his letter commenced almost with the same words that I had heard in the dream. He told how that, a fortnight before his death, my brother had reached his house sadly out of health, and worn with the toilsome journey. At once he became too ill to write, and continued so till he died on Easter Sunday morning. "OLIVIA A. DENROCHE."

[The death must have preceded the dream by a good many hours. The case is remote; but the fact that Easter Sunday is so marked a day makes it fairly probable that the coincidence was rightly remembered. Australian newspapers have been searched, as well as the most likely English obituaries, for a notice of the death, but without success.]

(439 and 440) From *La Chance et la Destinée* (1876), by Foissac, p. 599. Récit de M. Longet, membre de l'Institut, professeur de physiologie à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris.

"Notre savant confrère (M. Jules Cloquet, membre de l'Institut, professeur de Clinique Chirurgicale) nous a raconté que sortant fort avant dans la nuit d'une soirée chez M. Chomel, et s'étant endormi, il vit en songe un fantôme qui lui représentait son frère Hippolyte. Il portait sur son dos une grande liane de papiers qu'il jeta au milieu de la chambre, en lui disant, '*Maintenant je n'ai plus besoin de rien,*' et il disparut. A son réveil M. Cloquet raconta ce songe aux personnes de son entourage sans en être autrement impressionné. Il se rendit à l'hôpital, fit sa leçon de clinique comme à l'ordinaire, puis M. Giron de Busarainque lui dit, en lui prenant le bras: 'Ton frère Hippolyte est malade.' 'Allons le voir,' répondit M. Cloquet. Chemin faisant, M. Giron de Busarainque lui apprit qu'Hippolyte Cloquet était mort dans la nuit d'une attaque d'apoplexie.

"Le songe qui me concerne est plus explicite encore. Lorsque j'étais étudiant en médecine, et interne de Dupuytren, je rêvai que je voyais mon père atteint d'une maladie qui le conduisait au tombeau. Je m'éveillai dans un grand trouble que je cherchais à dominer en me disant que j'avais quitté mon père le dimanche d'auparavant en parfaite santé; nous étions au mercredi. Je me représentai que c'était une grande faiblesse de m'inquiéter d'un songe, et je résolus de n'en tenir aucun compte. Mais l'image de mon père mourant était sans cesse présente à ma pensée, et pour échapper à cette obsession, quoique honteux de ma faiblesse, je partis pour St. Germain, où je trouvai mon père atteint d'une fluxion de poitrine qui l'enleva en cinq jours."

[This second case would more properly belong to the preceding section.]

Similarly in the next case, the agent's actual thought may have been the nucleus of a dream to which the dreamer supplied a setting.

(441) From Mr. Alexander G. Sparrow, Derwent Square, Liverpool.

"1882.

"About 23 years ago, my youngest sister was visiting my then bachelor quarters; there was then residing in Liverpool an old friend of mine, D. L., a bachelor past 40, and who was considered by his friends most unlikely to marry. One morning at breakfast I related to my sister a very vivid dream. I was in the Old Exchange room; not being the

'Change time, it was nearly empty. I was leaning against a sort of counter under the clock. D. L. was sauntering up the middle of the long narrow room; and when he caught sight of me he quickened his step, and smiling put out his hand, saying, 'Sparrow, congratulate me; I am engaged to be married, and am as spooney as I was at one-and-twenty.' I did offer him my congratulations, and asked who the lady was, to which he replied, 'She is an Irish girl; I met her at Kingstown Regatta.'

"My eldest sister was, at that time, living with her husband in Ireland. When I returned from business that evening, my sister said, 'Your dream has come true, even the very words.' She put a letter from my eldest sister into my hand, and I read, 'Tell Alick his friend D. L. is engaged to one of the daughters of our rector. *He met her at Kingstown Regatta.*'

"ALEX. G. SPARROW."

The sister to whom the dream was told vaguely remembers the main fact of the occurrence.

[In conversation, Mr. Sparrow told Mr. Myers that he did not know his friend to be in Ireland, though he may have noticed that he was not on 'Change as usual; that there was nothing to connect his friend with Kingstown Regatta; that he had thought him a "regular old bachelor"; and that the words used in the letter were the exact words used in his dream. But after so long an interval of time, memory cannot be implicitly trusted for such details.]

The next dream presents an interesting mixture of right and wrong detail. If telepathic, and not accidental, it probably fell on the night following the event, and would then seem more naturally referable to the agent's subsequent picturing of the scene than to an immediate "clairvoyant" impression whose development had been deferred. The dream, as so often in these coincident cases, produced a quite exceptional impression of reality.

(442) From Mrs. Saxby, Mount Elton, Clevedon.

"January 31st, 1883.

Mrs. Saxby begins by saying that her husband was on the Continent at the outbreak of the Franco-German war, and that in one of her letters to him she copied out the famous "draft treaty."

"One night, not long after this, I saw in a *kind* of dream that my husband was walking on a high road, under the shade of broad spreading trees. I was charmed with the brilliancy of the green of their translucent leaves, through which the sunlight streamed overhead.

"I noticed that a country cart with three men in it passed him, and that one of the men had remarkably bushy black whiskers. They were all dressed in blouses, and had a very peculiar kind of cap on their heads. These caps had peaks to them. Presently the cart halted, and the men had some communication with my husband, in which the man with the black whiskers took a prominent part. I noticed that the men got out and in of the cart, and stood up and spoke for some time. There was evidently something going on, and it ended in one of the men going one way, on foot, while the other men jogged away in the cart in the contrary direction, and all, including my husband, passed away.

“I cannot state why I knew that this was one of my mysterious kind of dreams, but I *did*, and I felt sure that something had happened to my husband ; so I sat down and wrote to him directly, telling him my dream, and describing the scene and the circumstances that occurred in it, describing also the men and the cart as exactly as I could. I even etched with my pen a picture of the man with the black whiskers, and I asked my husband what kind of trees they were with the very bright translucent leaves, and what had happened to him under them. On August 2nd, 1870, dating from Luxembourg, my husband wrote to me :—

“MY DEAREST EFFIE,—I write a line from this station, while waiting for the train, to say that all is right.

“This will be posted somewhere on the way up the line, and will very likely not get to you much before. I am coming in sight of England, only it is better you should hear from me before any chance story appears in the papers (should it so appear) of my having been taken prisoner by the Prussians yesterday (August 1st).

“I was simply at Wasserbillig, the pretty frontier station of the Luxembourg Duchy, and instead of roasting on the bridge over the little stream which here joins the Moselle, and marks the Prussian boundary, I strolled leisurely along in the deep shade of the walnut-trees by the river-bank, intending to turn back as soon as I should see the Prussian sentries.

“I had not gone far before I met a cart, with four sturdy peasants in blouses. As soon as they had passed me, they stopped the cart. One of them sprang out to cut off my retreat, and the rest took me prisoner. They were soldiers in disguise, all signs of douanes or frontier-guard having been done away in order to entrap spies, the patrols going about in blouses, with revolvers underneath, and short swords tucked away in their trousers, I think.

“They took me to Izel, near Trèves, the nearest outpost, first possessing themselves of all letters and papers out of my pouch, and the having upon me a MS. draft of the proposed treaty for the French acquisition of Belgium, written in French, while I asserted myself to be an Englishman, made a fine point against me.

“The Major in command of the post was, luckily, a gentleman, though very strict in his examination, and the thing ended in my being released, and sent back to the Duchy under guard, but I was within an ace of being sent into the interior, to headquarters, for adjudication as a spy.

“You did not imagine what your diligence was putting in pickle for me, in copying the treaty, did you? Good-bye.—Ever your affectionate husband,
“S. H. S”

“After this my husband told me that the sergeant who took him prisoner had bushy black whiskers, and answered to the description I had given of one of the men whom I saw in the cart. He also told me that the soldiers, disguised as peasants, did not wear the caps with peaks, which I had drawn ; but, strange to say, I had drawn the common foraging cap of the Prussian soldier, I not knowing what those soldiers wore.

“He also told me that when I sent him a copy of the draft treaty it had not appeared in any of the Belgian papers.

“If I recollect right, our letters crossed in reaching us.

“J. E. SAXBY.”

Writing on March 25, 1886, Mrs. Saxby adds :—

“The only hitch about it is that according to my calculations I saw the whole thing happen before it did happen, but I cannot help *guessing* that, because of the uncertainty of letters at the time of the war, I made a mistake as to dates. All I am quite sure there could be no mistake about is, that my husband’s letter about the event and mine telling him what I had seen, *crossed on the road*. I have got his letter to me, and he brought home mine to him with the picture on it; but he subsequently burnt it, so my date was lost.”

In the next case, a feature is introduced into the dream which happened to be impossible, but was in no way fantastic or symbolic.

(443) From Mr. J. D. Best, 70, Meldon Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

“December 23rd, 1885.

“The experience that you refer to took place just four years ago. My age was almost 19, and at the time I was in perfect health mentally, though physically rather fagged. The particulars, as far as I remember them, were as follows :—

“I had spent the evening of December 5th in close study at Greek grammar. About 11 o’clock I stopped, and sat down by the fire to read Manon Lescaut. Some time afterwards I fell asleep, and it was then that the idea of my grandmother’s illness or death (I am uncertain which) first came to me. On waking, about 12.30, I found my dictionary under the bars, and my anxiety for that made me, for the moment, forget my dream. Carelessly leaving the gas burning, I went to bed; and all I remember is that every particular of the room which I saw was strongly impressed upon me; that the old lady was breathing very heavily; and, strangest of all, my mother, who was and is in Australia, seemed in the room. She, as I thought, turned to me, saying, ‘I fear, Duncan, she is dying!’ How long it was before I wakened I cannot say; but every fact was strangely distinct, for I seem to remember even the ticking of the clock. The gas being quite bright when I awoke, I rose to extinguish it, and quite accidentally noticed the time.

“On receiving the intimation of her death, on the morning of December 7th (Wednesday), the time, I noticed after my surprise had passed away, was between 4 and 5 a.m. On further inquiry, my aunt said that it was between half-past 4 and 5 o’clock. The time I had noticed was 5.30. I did not know that my relative was ill until I heard the news of her death. She was no great friend to me, and consequently I rarely troubled her, or thought of her. I had received a letter a week before, saying that she was not very well; but as she was a woman of about 76 years, I took but little notice of this, and had thought no more about it.

“You ask if I have ever had other dreams of death, which did *not* correspond with the reality. I think I can honestly answer ‘No.’

“JOHN D. BEST.”

[Mr. Best has gone to Australia, which prevents us for the time from obtaining further details.]

The next case introduces a distinctly bizarre element—the percipient's imagination reacting in a typically dreamlike fashion on the telepathic impression.

(444) From Miss Hutchinson, 3, Bagdale, Whitby.

“December 6th, 1885.

“On the morning of the 15th February, 1864—the day after Valentine's Day, which impressed it on my mind—my father told me he had had that night a most painful and vivid dream, begging me not to mention it to our mother. The dream was this. Our dear E. clinging to him wet and naked, and begging him to save him, for he was drowning; but the form was not that of a man of 22, but what he was as a baby.

“Early in March we received the sad intelligence that E. was drowned off the Cape, on the 14th February, through the swamping of a boat. He and one of his brother officers were caught in a squall when returning to H.M.S. ‘Tartar,’ after a few hours leave. These are the plain facts.

“ELIZABETH L. HUTCHINSON.”

In reply to inquiries, Miss Hutchinson adds:—

“Both my father and mother are dead, and *if* my father made any note of the dream at the time, it has been destroyed. It was natural for him to tell me, being the eldest in the family, six years older than my naval brother. It was on *the morning of the 15th* that he told me of his dream. A fortnight later, the Cape mail brought the sad news. An apparently foolish and trivial thing impressed the date on my memory at the time that it was told me, the day after Valentine's Day.”

We find from the Admiralty that Lieut. A. E. Hutchinson's death occurred on Feb. 14, 1865; and Miss Hutchinson has kindly sent us a photograph of a tablet, erected to his memory, which records that he was drowned in Simon's Bay on the *night* of that day, by the swamping of a boat. The difference of time between England and the Cape is not much over an hour.

In the following case the brightness of the figure, and its gesture, were imagery sufficiently appropriate to the circumstances. We should hardly be justified in treating the experience as other than a dream; but it must be remarked that the form of the vision—a single figure appearing in the room where the percipient knows himself to be—is very unlike ordinary dreaming (see cases 527 and 545).

(445) From the Rev. John Mathwin, Vicar of West Pelton, Co. Durham.

“December 19th, 1884.

“Forty years ago, or thereabouts, when I was about 20 years of age, a lady friend of mine, a distant relative by marriage—age between 40 and 50—had for some time been in a delicate state of health, though not confined to the house. We frequently had quiet conversations together on religious matters. Neither of us was of an excitable turn of mind. As well as I can now recollect, I last saw my friend alive about a fortnight before her death. She did not seem at that time to be worse than

usual, and apparently might have lived at any rate for a few years. However, one night when I was in bed—say about 4 o'clock in the morning—I had what I may call a vision. A figure appeared before me neatly draped, and a certain brightness about it seemed to awake me. I at once felt conscious that someone was near me who wished to make a communication to me. I soon recognised the face of my invalid friend. She seemed to wish to give me time to collect myself—evidently intimating that there was no cause why I should be afraid. As a matter of fact I had no fear at all. My then feelings may perhaps be best described as partaking both of wonder (or expectation) and pleasure. When, apparently, the figure had convinced herself that I recognised her, and that I had satisfied myself that I was under no delusion, she seemed to beckon me cheerfully with one or two fingers of her right hand, and to say to me, 'It's all right; come on.' She then vanished, and I neither saw nor heard anything more.

"Though there was no injunction given to me not to tell what I had seen, I yet felt that the communication was of too solemn a nature to allow me at once to talk of it openly. But I said to my brother at breakfast, about 8 o'clock that morning, that I had dreamt in the night that Mrs. So-and-so was dead, and it turned out, as we heard about 10 o'clock, that our friend had died during the night. For some years I never mentioned this experience to anyone, but afterwards I felt no hesitation in talking about it to intimate friends."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Mathwin writes on Feb. 17th, 1885 :—

"To my brother I spoke of what I call the vision as if it had been a dream; but this was because I did not wish to draw his attention very specially to it, although I felt constrained to mention it to him in some way.

"He tells me now that he has no recollection of my having spoken to him about it, as I did at breakfast, on the morning of the death, but before we knew of the death having taken place. I am not, however, surprised that my brother should not now recollect the remark I made to him at that time.

"I never had any similar experience before, neither have I had since. I had no reason to expect any communication of the kind at any time.

"JOHN MATHWIN."

[In an uncorroborated case of so remote a date, it is of course impossible to be certain that the coincidence was as exact as in memory it appears to have been.]

The next case is very similar, though it was possibly not the dying person who was the agent.

(446) From Mrs. Penny, The Cottage, Cullompton.

"November 30th, 1882.

"One day I slept late, having a bad headache, and dreamed that I was in a wonderfully beautiful garden, and while I walked along its alleys a friend of one of my sisters, F. H., came smiling towards me, dressed in white, and looking radiant with joy. She said, 'I am here now,' and it is

always so lovely.' On waking, I found breakfast and letters brought up, and one open on my pillow to my sister from the sister of F. H., telling her that she had died after a very short illness.

"Now, as this poor F. H., who seldom had a day's happiness, was to me only an acquaintance, I conclude that the *aura* of her sister conveyed to my higher consciousness the fact of which she was full, and in the momentary duration of a dream this fact got translated into the adjacent ideas of life in Paradise.

"Very likely the consciousness of my two sisters did affect my dreaming brain by some wave of new and energetic impulse; but I know there had been no possibility of *talking* in my room that morning. Though it all happened years ago, I can vouch for the accuracy of my memory. I cannot be sure whether it was in 1852 or a year or two later.

"A. J. PENNY."

We find from a notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine* that F. H. died on June 6, 1852.

(447) From a German nurse who has been for 22 years in the service of Mrs. Balgarnie, of 9, Filey Road, Scarborough.

"July 9th, 1885.

"In February, 1871, I dreamed one night that I received a letter, on the envelope of which was written in my father's handwriting, '*O Death, where is thy sting?*'

"Next morning I went in great trouble to my mistress, saying I felt perfectly sure my father must be dead, and related my dream. This fact was immediately written down, but the paper cannot now be found. Three days after the news came that my father had died that Sunday night, quite suddenly. During the day of the night on which he died he had evidently wished to tell me something, for he twice said, 'Tell Marie, tell Marie!' He soon became unconscious, and died in his sleep. I had not seen him for eight years, and though I knew he was not well, I had no idea that death was expected. My father lived and died in Germany, while I was, and am, in England.

"MARIE LAUTIER."

Miss Balgarnie, writing on December 11th, 1884, gave us a precisely similar account, saying, "the date and circumstances were put down by us immediately" on the narration of the dream.

Mrs. Balgarnie writes on July 28, 1885 :—

In answer to yours, I can only say that the nurse told me her dream, on my entering the nursery one morning, adding, 'I am sure my father is dead.' And so it proved; in three days the letter announced the fact, and that he died with her name on his lips.

"I do not think I can give you any more particulars. I can't find the memorandum of the incident.

"M. BALGARNIE."

[The narrator's father, it appears, had been ill for 3 or 4 months; and she states that, though she had not heard of his being worse, her thoughts had been a good deal occupied with him. Mrs. Balgarnie, however, thinks that she now rather exaggerates the extent to which this was the case, from an objection to having her experience regarded as of any special interest.]

In the next case, the imagery is again distinctly suggestive of death, and fantastically represents the popular conception of "spirit" as a tenuous form of matter, but has no emotional character.

(448) From Mr. W. Brooks, Brooksby House, 87, Petherton Road, Highbury New Park, N.

"May 27th, 1885.

"On the 15th November, 1875, at 5, Wallace Road, N., at 7.45 a.m., or thereabouts, I saw my late brother as a spirit, but when I spoke to 'him,' he gradually disappeared. I then woke up.

"On arriving at Hastings the following morning, I learnt from my sister that the above was the time my brother died there. This was the only time I ever saw him in the form of a 'ghost.' "W. H. BROOKS."

We find the date and place of death confirmed in the *Times* obituary.

The following is a more detailed account of the dream :—

"The 'appearance' was: There was a long room or gallery, and several of my friends there, including my brother. He was like 'Pepper's Ghost' as regards substance, or rather want of substance. None of the other friends had a hazy appearance. They were in ordinary attire, as I should see them in a room. My brother was the only 'ghostly' figure. He advanced gradually towards me, which made me feel a little nervous, and looked kindly at me. I advanced a little and said, 'James, why do you not speak?' which utterance seemed to make him recede. He retired a little down the room, and gradually became more indistinct, and disappeared. None of the friends seemed to take any decided notice, and did not speak. I then woke. My forcing or insisting upon a reply seemed to be the cause of my waking, and I had to look round to gather myself together and ascertain that I was in bed when I so awoke.

"I do not think I can afford any corroboration. On the afternoon of the same day, I mentioned the matter to my aunt and her husband. She is now dead, and I do not think my uncle would recollect the account. I did not make much of it, as I was a disbeliever in ghosts. I dared not mention the occurrence to my mother, as she would have grieved all day about my brother if I had.

"I have never had any other similar instance. I have had relations die, but have been near them at the time of death. "W. H. BROOKS."

In later letters Mr. Brooks writes :—

"I have communicated with my uncle as I promised, but he does not recollect any of the circumstances.

"In reply to your further queries :—

1. "The dream did not make a *particularly* unpleasant impression ; it was certainly unpleasant and unusual, and on waking I felt nervous, but the occurrence faded from my memory slowly, so far as the *sharp* impression was concerned. All day Sunday, however, I was wondering how my brother was, and when I saw my sister on the Monday I thought of the strange coincidence.

2. "My sister recollects when she informed me (of the 'time' of the death) on the Monday that I remarked, 'How strange! that is the time I saw James at my bedside.'

3. "I had no reason to expect my brother's death at the time it did take place, except an expectation that one's worst fears might at any time be realised in a case where consumption had taken hold."

The following is from Mr. Brooks' sister, Mrs. Plaistowe :—

"Brooksby House, August 4th, 1885.

"In answer to your letter, I have to state that my brother William, on his arriving at Hastings in November, 1875, and being informed by me of the hour of my late brother James's death (viz., a quarter to 8 a.m.), said that it exactly coincided with the time that he, my brother William, saw James in a spirit or vision. [In conversation, Mrs. Plaistowe stated that Mr. Brooks came down on the Monday afternoon, and, on hearing the hour of his brother's death, came to the conclusion that the dream was exactly coincident.]

"I may remark that the death was unexpected by the members of the family, as James was away from home with me at Hastings; and although he had been suffering from consumption for three or four years, no intimation of his becoming worse had been received by any one in the family, so that my brother's statement to you is corroborated by me.

"M. PLAISTOWE."

On examination it turned out that Mr. Brooks' strong impression is that his dream occurred on a *Sunday* morning—in which case it preceded the death by some 24 hours, though of course falling at a time of critical illness. This view accords with his recollection of mentioning the dream to his uncle and aunt in the afternoon; but is opposed to his recollection (which Mrs. Plaistowe supports) of noticing at the time that the coincidence was exact. There being a doubt on the matter, the case must not be included in the special group of death-dreams dealt with in Vol. I., p. 307.

(449) The journal *Psychische Studien* (Leipzig) for March, 1874, contains a long and interesting account, written down for the late Professor Perty, of Berne, by the wife of the Russian Imperial Councillor, M. Alex. Aksakof, who says that he has frequently heard all the particulars.

Madame Aksakof was 19 at the time of the occurrence, and says that she "had no ideas about Spiritualism, and no tendency to enthusiasm or mysticism." The principal incidents were that Madame Aksakof's brother-in-law, Dr. A. F. Sengireef, from whom she had parted about half a year previously with some coldness, appeared to her, on the night of May 12th, 1855, in what seems to have been a very prolonged and feverish vision, in which she must have been partially awake, as in the course of it she heard the clock strike 3, and her child and its nurse move. The figure in the vision held his cold hand on her mouth, and repeatedly bade her kiss it; and then, after spreading out a roll of parchment beside her, recited a prayer in front of a crucifix, and finally disappeared, to the sound of sacred music and in a blaze of light. She noticed his "long black hair hanging down on his shoulders, and a large round beard such as I had never seen him wear. The day after this terrible event," she continues, "we received the news of the illness of my brother-in-law, Sengireef, and about a fortnight later, tidings of his death,

which took place in that night of the 12th-13th of May, about 5 o'clock in the morning. The following is noteworthy. When my sister-in-law, a few weeks after the death of her husband, came to live with us at Romanoff-Borissogliebsk, she mentioned incidentally to a lady in my presence that her late husband had been buried with long hair hanging down to his shoulders, and with a large curious-looking beard which had grown during his illness."

M. Aksakof suggests that the parchment in the vision may have represented a "sin-remission chart" which it is a Russian custom to place in coffins.

I will now give a group of cases where death is symbolised in some more mundane and gloomy manner.

(450) From a lady whose name I am at liberty to mention, but not to print.

"March 5th, 1885.

"Two friends of ours, Mr. X. [name given in confidence] and Mr. Y., lived together till the marriage of Mr. X., and were, therefore, intimately associated in our minds.

"It happened that though Mrs. X. and I had exchanged cards we had not met, and I merely knew her by sight at the time when Mr. Y. also married. But as I had found Mrs. Y. at home, I was slightly acquainted with her.

"It was a few months after Mr. Y.'s marriage, on the night of May 14th, 1879, when my dream occurred. I was staying at Bristol at the time. It seemed to me that I was making my first call on Mrs. Y., and that she proceeded to show me her trousseau—a thing that would never have occurred to her in actual life, or to any but very intimate friends. A variety of dresses were displayed, and as I was looking at a black-net evening dress, with crimson trimmings, thinking it was very like one of my own, a sudden transformation took place. Mrs. Y. had changed into Mrs. X., and the dress was a widow's dress complete. I woke very strongly impressed with the dream, and mentioned it to my father the next morning. It haunted me till, on May 15th or 16th, I saw the *Times* announcement of Mr. X.'s death.

"Afterwards I learnt that, on the afternoon preceding my dream, Mr. X. had returned home, apparently in his usual good health, only rather tired, but within-half-an-hour had died of quite unsuspected heart disease.

"My father was ill at the time of my dream, and does not remember the circumstance. But my sister remembers it clearly, and testifies to the fact [by her initials].

"A. E. R.

"J. T. R."

We find from the *Times* obituary of May 16, 1879, that the death took place on May 14.

In answer to inquiries, Miss R. says:—

"My sister was not with me, so I could not speak about it to her. I cannot find any of my letters written after May 14th, so do not know if I wrote

to her on the 15th or not. But she came to me (as my father was taken seriously ill about that date) and heard of the dream and of the death at the time [*i.e.*, she heard of the dream at the same time as she heard of the death]. I am *quite certain* that the dream was on the night of the day of death, May 14th."

Fortunately Miss R. has been able to obtain a copy of a letter (post mark, Bristol, May 17, 1879), which she wrote to a friend 3 days after her dream; in which the following words occur:—

"Poor Mr. X. died on Wednesday; I do not know of what.

"On Wednesday night [May 14th] (having heard nothing of them, Mr. and Mrs. X., for months, since I saw them looking well and happy together), I dreamed Mrs. X. was showing me her trousseau, and that she called special attention to an elaborately made shroud. She said that Scotch people always considered these the most necessary part of a trousseau. The one I saw was her husband's; hers changed to simply a black dress, as I looked at it. It was a very vivid dream and impressed me. Last night we saw the death in the *Times*, May 14th."

Referring to the account above quoted, Miss R. adds:—

"I do not know why I should have forgotten about the shroud; this must have been one of the many dresses I saw before the change took place. My friend did not know the Y.'s, and did not know Mr. X., so that I left out any superfluous matter."

(451) From a niece of the late Rev. G. L. Foote, Rector of Christ's Church, Roxbury, Litchfield Co., Conn., U.S.A.

"1884.

"In 1848, the Rev. George L. Foote drove with his family to Windham, Greene Co., N.Y., to visit Mrs. Foote's mother. At this time, his youngest brother, Henry, afterwards Dr. H. H. Foote, of Newtown, Fairfield Co., Ct., was studying medicine in Durham, about 10 miles from Windham, and living with an aunt who resided there. Mr. Foote, with his family, arrived in Windham on Friday, and it was his intention to start on his return to Roxbury on Monday, deferring his visit to his brother and aunt until his return for his family a few weeks later. On Friday night he dreamed that he was taking the body of his brother home to Newtown in a metallic coffin, and that he had died of small-pox. He thought not enough of the dream the next day to speak of it, but on Saturday night he dreamed the same dream in every particular twice,¹ and it so impressed him that he was unable to keep it out of his mind.

"The clergyman of the place desired him to preach for him on Sunday, and he consented; but during the whole of the service and the sermon, the recollection of the dream continually intruded itself upon his thoughts. After service he told his brother-in-law, O. S. Tuttle, now of Minneapolis, Minn., that it was impressed upon his mind that something was wrong at Durham, and he wished he would harness his horse and drive him over there. He accordingly did so, and as they drove up in front of the house of his aunt, she came out upon the porch, and holding up her hands, exclaimed, 'George Foote! What has sent you here? I have just

¹ As to the repetition, see Vol. i., pp. 357, 445, and *cf.* case 213, and cases 457 and 484 below.

persuaded Henry to let me write to ask you to come and take care of him ; he is sick with small-pox.' Although she had had the disease and consequently was not afraid of it, she knew she could not alone take care of him, and that of all the relatives George was the only one who could with perfect safety attend him, as, while in Trinity College, Hartford, he had varioloid, in consequence of taking care of a room-mate who had the same disease. Mr. Tuttle returned to Windham, leaving Mr. Foote to nurse his brother through the sickness, which was so terrible that very few have ever been so low and have been raised again to health and strength.

"Mr. Foote used often to say that, if anyone had been nursing his brother who had no special interest in him, he had no doubt he would have been buried ; for at three different times he himself thought the last breath had been drawn, but he persevered in the use of restoratives, and by the most assiduous care helped fan to a flame the apparently dying spark."

Mr. H. L. Foote, son of the Rev. George L. Foote in the narrative, writes :—

"The above account is given by the niece of the Rev. George L. Foote, and is substantially the same that I have heard spoken of by the members of my family."

The Rev. R. Whittingham, of Pikesville, Maryland, U.S.A., a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R., writes on September 9, 1884 :—

"Several years ago I heard the Rev. Mr. G. L. Foote allude to this dream as having saved his brother's life, according to his belief. He was ignorant of any existence of small-pox [at this place] as it had not been prevalent ; nor did it become epidemic, although there were three or four other cases at the time." [This last point is from a reply of the Rev. G. L. Foote himself to an inquiry which had been specially addressed to him on the subject.]

(452) From Miss Tracy, Mawson Road, St. Barnabas, Cambridge (now Mrs. William Tracy).

"December, 1885.

"My mother died on the 11th of February, 1882, about 8.30 p.m., on a Saturday, at Beccles, Suffolk. At that time, my youngest brother, who is blind, was (and is still) at the Blind College, Worcester. On the evening above mentioned, he went to bed as usual, and, I believe, to sleep. Rather later in the evening, one of the masters went into the room where my brother was, to see if all was right. When there, he heard one of the boys crying, and found it was my brother, who said his mother had come to him to say good-bye, as she was going away, &c. It was some time before he could be quieted. He did not hear of his mother's death until the Monday following. He was at the time 9 years old.

"This is as nearly as possible what I was told nearly four years ago. If the master who heard him was found out, he would be able to give it more correctly.

"E. M. TRACY."

In conversation with a friend of ours, who made inquiries on our behalf, Miss Tracy said that her mother had died very suddenly. She had complained of a slight headache about 5 o'clock, and died between 8 and 8.30. She was unconscious for some time before she died ; therefore it would have been impossible to tell the exact moment of her death ;

and in the consternation of the moment they did not look at the time. The boy said that he had seen his mother (it appears that he always speaks of *seeing* people, though quite blind); that he had tried to hold her, but that she had slipped away from him. He did not refer to the vision the next morning, nor has he ever alluded to it since; and they do not wish him to be reminded of the circumstance."

The *Times* obituary confirms the date given, and the fact that the death was sudden.

The following letter is from the Rev. S. G. Forster, Head-Master of the Blind College, Worcester.

"December 17th, 1885.

"The facts of the boy Tracy's dream, as elicited from himself, are that he dreamed on the Saturday night, during the night (and did not wake up till 7 a.m. next morning), that his mother was dead, and was being buried in part of our old place called The Swings. His mother, as I understand (but Miss Tracy could clear this up), died at 8 p.m. on Saturday night. Tracy would go to bed at 9 or 9.15, an hour or so after the occurrence. Owing to the surprise and trouble at home, we did not hear of it by letter till the Monday after.

"S. G. FORSTER."

In reply to inquiries, Mr. Forster writes on January 5, 1886 :—

"I do not remember who the particular person was to whom he told his dream, but I can distinctly state we all knew of it, and that the dream was described before the fact was known."

Mr. Forster subsequently ascertained that the dream was first related, not to a master, but to Mr. L. G. Sandford, one of his pupils, who has written to us as follows :—

"Icomb Rectory, Stow-on-the-Wold.

"February 12th, 1886.

"I regret that, at this distance, I cannot give you dates. As far as my recollections go, Tracy told me of his dream on the morning following the night on which he had it. It was simply that his mother had died. Beyond this, it was mixed up with all the inconsistencies and absurdities common to dreams, and which I do not think it necessary to mention, unless you particularly wish to hear them. The news of his mother's death reached him on the day after he told me of his dream, her death having happened on the same day—that is, the day on which he told me. I believe she died late in the afternoon, but of this I am not sure.

"L. G. SANDFORD."

(453) From a lady who prefers that her name should not appear.

"My father was one of a family of 21 children, between many of whom naturally little or no communication was kept up in after years. Among them was an uncle living at Blackheath, whose wife I had never seen, and all I knew of her was that she was suffering from a mortal disease, but of her prospects of a more or less prolonged life I had heard nothing, nor had my thoughts been in any way turned towards her—when one Sunday night, while I was on a visit to an aunt in Hampshire, I dreamt that I had a letter from my aunt at Blackheath, urgently pressing me to come and see her. Accordingly in my dream I set out, and travelling all night, arrived at Blackheath on Monday morning. I was

shown up to my aunt's room, who lamented to me that she had been so much estranged from our branch of the family, and after talking for a while, she looked at her watch and said, 'It is a quarter past 8, now you must go'; telling me to go down to the others. I had great difficulty in finding my way in an unknown house, and was a long time about it, but at last, when I saw by my watch that it was a quarter to 9, I reached the dining-room, and found there a number of my relations in mourning, who explained it by saying that my aunt was dead.

"In the morning I had a very vivid impression of my dream, which I told to my relations with whom I was staying; and I had so strong a feeling of the reality of the intimation, that I wrote privately to my dressmaker to countermand a pink silk dress that I had ordered. The next day, when a mourning letter arrived, I said, 'Now you will see that Aunt Eliza is dead.' And so it proved to be the case, my aunt having died at 8.30 on Monday morning, midway between the time at which she had told me in my dream that I must go, and the time I reached the dining-room where her relations told me that she was dead. It will be observed that my dream was several hours before the actual death."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death occurred on February 2, 1869, which was a Monday.

[The countermanding of the pink dress may certainly be taken as a sign that the dream produced an exceptional impression. The narrator is out of England, and we have been unable to obtain the corroboration of her relatives.]

(454) From Mr. Richard Mountjoy Gardiner (Solicitor), 8, Bath Terrace, Blyth, and 13, Groat Market, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

"February 6th, 1884.

"In 1875 I was in a sailing ship bound for Australia. Amongst the officers on board was one of my dearest friends; he was third mate, and had to keep watch from 8 to 12 on the fore-castle. I invariably made it a rule to stay with him during his watch. One night, after his duty was over, instead of staying for an hour and smoking a pipe as was his general custom, he 'turned in.' I remained smoking and talking to the sailors. About 1.15 my friend came up to me in a very excited manner and said, 'I am sure that the Major' (who was his father) 'is dead, as I dreamt I saw him put in his coffin.' I tried to calm him as much as I could, and told him it was nonsense. However, he would not go back to his cabin that night, so we remained on deck until morning. With the return of daylight he recovered his spirits, and felt inclined to laugh at his dream. In the evening he kept watch as usual, but again turned in a few minutes past 12. I remained on deck; about 1.10 he came rushing up and said he knew his father was dead as he had seen the coffin put into the hearse, and had followed it to Kensal Green Cemetery, and had seen it lowered into the grave. I took him into my cabin and made him sleep in my bunk. He was very quiet for a few days after, and could not bear to have the subject mentioned. However, he shortly recovered his usual good spirits. [On their arrival at Melbourne, a letter conveying the news of his father's death was found there.] After a few weeks he was able to calmly talk the matter over, and on our consulting our diaries, we found that his father had died on the same night as his first dream, and

was buried on the second. On our return to England, we ascertained (after calculating the difference of time) that his father died and was buried at the *exact time* that he dreamed it. The most curious thing was that he died at an hotel in Harley Street, Cavendish Square, London, of dropsy, and the proprietress—for the convenience of her visitors—requested that he might be buried the day after he died, which was done. There are others besides myself who can vouch that the whole of what I have written is true.

“Another curious fact about my friend’s dream was that he dreamed his father was buried at *Kensal Green*, which was the fact, though his family vault is at Brompton Cemetery, but for some reason there was not time to go through the necessary formalities to have it opened.

“RICHARD MOUNTJOY GARDINER.”

[We hope in time to receive an account of this incident from the dreamer himself, Mr. G., who is now on distant service. Inquiries have been made at every lodging-house and private hotel in Harley Street, but most of them have changed hands since 1875, and we could obtain no record of the death. There is probably some mistake as to the Kensal Green Cemetery; for we find that no Major G. was buried there in 1875. But apart from this, it is difficult to see how the statement as to the second dream can possibly be correct. For since the letter had time to outstrip Mr. Gardiner’s ship, that ship must have been quite 6 weeks’ sail from Australia at the time of death, and probably not far east of long. 0°. To have exactly coincided, therefore, with the second dream, the funeral would have had to take place at midnight. It will be observed that the second dream, while difficult to account for by telepathy, would be a very natural sequel to the first. Cf. case 468 below.]

(455) From Mr. G. H. F. Prynne, 10, Torrington Square, W.C., who wrote the following letter to his mother, from Australia, in the autumn of 1874:—

“I was extremely sorry to hear [in a letter from his mother] of the sad death of poor Miss E. I remember her very well, and have her name in my diary for 1871 mentioned several times, and it is a most extraordinary thing that on the night of the 7th of April (or 8th), I am not quite certain which, I had an extraordinary dream.

“I dreamt I was walking along some road with dear Ted, and that I met two people, carrying a box. We both asked to see the contents. These gloomy personages stood still, put the box on the road, and then ran off. I came and opened the box, which I had no sooner done than a dead hand of a corpse fell on to mine. I can well remember the feeling of horror that came over me, and I ran back, saying I would not examine the box further. The face seemed to me like that of Edith L. Eddie said he *would* see who it was, and on returning I found it to be the corpse of some well-known person, which in the latter part of the dream I recognised to be that of Miss E.¹

“The dream seemed so much out of the ordinary that I told it fully to H. and two other friends at breakfast, and also to the W.’s two days afterwards.”

¹ As regards the particular form of delayed recognition, this case resembles No. 249 and once more exemplifies the parallelism of dreams and waking hallucinations.

Colonel B., father of the Miss E. referred to, writes that Mr. Prynne had met his daughter a few times, in 1871, when she was about $14\frac{1}{2}$ years old; and that she died on April 8th, 1874. From the *Times* obituary, we find that she died in the morning of that day. Thus whether the dream in Australia was on the night of the 7th or of the 8th, it may very well have been within 12 hours of the death.

[Mr. Prynne has tried to procure corroborative testimony to his immediate mention of the dream; but his friends have moved, and he has not yet succeeded. He is certain that his dream was on one of the nights mentioned, though he does not now recall what enabled him to fix it so accurately some months afterwards. It will be observed that the doubt which he felt between two nights is a strong indication that he had some independent means of narrowing down the time to that extent. He believes that he mentioned his dream in a letter to his mother at the time, *before* hearing of the death; but no such letter can now be found.]

(456) From Mrs. Mogridge, of 137, Cowbridge Road, Canton, Cardiff.
"January 3rd, 1884.

"My little girl, aged 7, came into my room on the morning of the 25th of December, 1882. She said, 'Oh, mamma, I have had such a dream: I saw baby Harris in a little box on the table downstairs, and her hands were crossed; and she looked so white.' [Mr. Mogridge tells us that the Harrises were acquaintances in a distant part of the town.] I am certain she had not seen the child, nor had she heard us speak of it or the family, and I do not think she had seen it more than once during the four months of its life.

"On the evening of the 25th or 26th, my daughter, aged 17, told me of the death of the child, which took place on the night of the 24th. And a day or two after, the mother took my little girl into her house, and showed her the child in the coffin on the table (where it had been placed for the convenience of the inquest), exactly as she had described it to me in her dream.

"M. A. MOGRIDGE."

The death was caused suddenly by an accident; and the Register of Deaths confirms the date given.

[We should not be disposed to lay stress on the correspondence here, beyond the simple coincidence of the death. The details were not written down, and may have crept in afterwards; and in any case the coffin, as we have found, is a very common dream-symbol. The case is one of those where personal knowledge of the witness has been a specially important element in our judgment.]

(457) From a lady whose friends would prefer that her name should not appear.

"1884.

"I had a dear friend at Ilfracombe—the wife of the incumbent, the Rev. W. M. We did not correspond much, and I had not seen her for some months. I went down to Plymouth, and the first night, as the rooms we took were not quite ready for us, my friend, Miss P., slept with me. I awoke frightened and sad, having dreamt thus:—

"I sat in a wide hall in some unknown house. Mrs. M. entered and walked slowly towards me dressed in white, with a long dark cloak over

her snowy robes. As she neared me she uncovered her arm, and I saw that she was carrying a little dead baby. As I looked at her, I felt that she was mad, and yet dead, too! Mr. M. followed her, and signed to me that her mind was gone. It was her pallor that made me feel she was a spirit; the expression in her eyes told me she was insane, or delirious. Mrs. M., after showing me the dead child, turned silently away and went up a staircase on to the roof, which was a flat roof. Mr. M. and I followed her. She dug with her hands at this roof, and earth seemed to come up. She buried the baby in this earth, then lying down upon this strange grave she sank through it, and disappeared from sight. I awoke, and woke Miss P., and related my dream. She soothed my alarm, and, being very tired, I fell asleep. The dream was repeated, and before morning I had dreamt it three times,¹ and knew, instinctively, it was in some way true.

“Throughout the day I was restless and unhappy. The next morning a deeply-edged letter came, and as I saw the black-rimmed envelope I cried out, ‘Oh, my dream, my dream! Mrs. M. is dead!’ And so it was. She had been prematurely confined of a dead child; had delirium and fever, and died unconscious, or rather, insane, on the night of my dream.”

We find from a notice in the *Western Times* that the death occurred on Nov. 13, 1862.

In answer to inquiries, the narrator says:—

“My friend Miss P., who was with me that night, I have lost sight of for years. Yes, I often dream, but I have not realised a death in an illustrated form except that once.”

[One rather distrusts this amount of detail, remembered after a lapse of a good many years; but some kind of death-imagery was probably a feature in the dream.]

(458) From Mrs. Williams, 1, Wilmington Place, Clerkenwell, W.C. A shorter account was given in writing to our friend, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, in February, 1883, immediately after the receipt of news of the death.

“January 1st, 1886.

“I had an uncle, father’s brother, living in Birmingham. On the night of the 21st December, 1882, I dreamt that I saw him standing by my bedside. I saw him quite plainly, and he said, ‘If you wish to see me, you must come at once.’ Afterwards I saw him in a cart, laid in a coffin. I woke my husband and told him about it—said that I felt sure something had happened. He said it was only fancy, and told me to go to sleep. In the morning we talked about it again. The 22nd December was the anniversary of our wedding, and that fixed the date of the dream in our minds. We heard nothing about the death until February 9th, 1883, when, in answer to a letter from my husband, the enclosed card and letter came from my aunt in Birmingham. The impression on my mind was certainly that something had happened to my uncle. The dream must have been within a few hours, as he died at 5 a.m. 22nd December, and it was in the night of the 21st-22nd that I had the dream and woke my husband.”

¹ See p. 418, note; also p. 229, note, as to the number three.

The following is an extract, copied by the present writer, from the letter written to Mrs. Williams by her aunt :—

“February 8th, 1883.

“I have lost my poor brother. He went to bed on the 20th December ; on the 21st I found him, at 9 o'clock in the morning, in a fit. I sent [for] a doctor. He never spoke, and died the next morning at 5 o'clock—on the 22nd. Poor fellow ! Now I am left without anyone.”

The enclosed mourning-card contains these words :—“In affectionate remembrance of David Gillan, who departed this life December 22nd, 1882, aged 64 years. Interred at Witton Cemetery, December 28th.”

In conversation, Mrs. Williams told me that she did not remember having dreamt of death, or of her uncle, on any other occasion. Her husband stated to me that his wife woke him immediately after her dream, and that she told him the details of it next morning, and that they noted the date as being the anniversary of their wedding. I asked to see their marriage-certificate, and found that it was for Dec. 22, 1872. Mrs. Williams was not aware of anything being amiss with her uncle, nor had she for a long time previously heard of his being ill in any way at all. His death was sudden.

The next case is, of all the dreams included in this book, the one least easy to harmonise with the view of telepathy that the great bulk of our evidence supports, owing to the absence of any perceptible link between agent and percipient. If we could suppose that we had lighted on the *one* death-dream (of those occurring during the last 12 years, within our circle of inquiry) which by the doctrine of chances might probably have coincided with reality *by accident* (Vol. I., p. 306), this would be the one to select. But though the type is abnormal we should not be justified in suppressing examples of it on that account ; and the “borderland” cases, Nos. 490 and 506, of the next chapter, might be adduced as somewhat similar.¹

(459) From Miss E. F. How, Stainforth House, Upper Clapton, E.

“April, 1884.

“Date of dream, night between June 20th and 21st, 1883. Age 28. Health perfect. [The form of these sentences is due to the fact that the information was filled in on a census-form (Vol. I., p. 304).] The dream was so vivid that I described the details to my mother ; it was of a child being buried alive by two men servants. I asked its name, and was told it was a Fitzgerald, infant son of the Knight of Kerry. The impression was most distressing, and remained all day, and returned in a less degree whenever anything recalled the dream. At the

¹ Mrs. Alfred Wedgwood, of 20, Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone, dreamt that she heard of the deaths of Mr. Hayward and M. Rouher the night before she saw the announcement of them. The names were in the papers of the day before she had her dream, but she is confident that she had not seen them. If telepathic impressions, caught from an idea which is abroad, are possible (p. 365), this might be a specimen. On the other hand, it may only illustrate the indefinite scope for accident that dreams afford.

time I knew absolutely nothing about the Knight of Kerry: I did not even know whether he was a married man.

"On June 25th, I saw in the paper an announcement of the death of the only child of the Knight of Kerry, on June 21st. [We have verified the date in the *Times* and in Burke's *Peerage*.] This at once recalled the dream, which I had entirely forgotten.

"I accounted for this coincidence by imagining my eye had unconsciously fallen upon some paragraph mentioning the illness of the child, but I am told there never was any announcement of the kind.

"All the details of the dream were wrong. "E. F. How."

In answer to inquiries, Miss How adds:—

"The whole of the dream, with many details now faded from my memory, was told to my mother on the morning of June 21st. She laughed at the dream, but on June 26th she greeted me with: 'I have seen in a paper that the Knight of Kerry did lose a child the night¹ of your dream; you must have seen that it was ill.' I had then also seen the announcement in the paper.

"This winter I met some friends of the present Knight of Kerry, and from them heard that there had been no notice in the paper excepting of the birth of the child."

Asked whether she had previously known that the family name of the Knight of Kerry was Fitzgerald, Miss How replies that she had, having once met a member of the family abroad.

The following is from Mrs. How:—

"Stainforth House, Upper Clapton, London, E.

"April 25th, 1884.

"On the morning of June 21st, 1883, my daughter related to me, in detail, a vivid dream she had the night before.

"I remember perfectly that when she came down in the morning she said she dreamt that the infant son of the Knight of Kerry, a little Fitzgerald, was being buried alive; that she struggled to save it, but felt no surprise at the people trying to bury it alive. A few days afterwards I saw the death of a young son of the Knight of Kerry in the paper, the date being June 21st.

"FRANCES A. HOW."

[The accuracy of Mrs. How's recollection is shown by her further mention of some details of the dream, which Miss How had previously communicated to us, but had not in any way recalled to her mother's memory.]

In connection with death-imagery of a gloomy kind, I may remind the reader of the passage in Guerzoni's *Garibaldi* (Florence, 1882, Vol. I., pp. 398-9), in which Garibaldi describes his dream of a funeral procession, of a corpse with his mother's face laid down beside him, and of his impression of an ice-cold hand, remaining even after he was awake. "On that day," he continues, "and in that hour, I lost my parent, the best of mothers." The dream occurred on March 19,

¹ We cannot discover that it was mentioned in the papers that the death took place in the night.

1852, when Garibaldi was on a voyage to China ; and there is nothing to suggest that he knew his mother's death to be impending.

I will conclude the list of symbolic dreams with the example mentioned in Vol. I., p. 368, where a particular dream, not in itself suggestive of death, has on a noticeable number of occasions more or less nearly coincided with deaths affecting the dreamer. I need not repeat the remarks already made as to the total inconclusiveness of most alleged specimens of this class, and the proneness of mankind in general to remark and record the few hits, and not the thousands of misses.

(460) From Mrs. Burton, Longner Hall, Shrewsbury,

“ February, 1883.

“ I am a healthy woman, in a responsible position, neither dyspeptic, hysterical, nor morbid, and my mind is chiefly occupied with matters of business. I am 41 years of age, and a grandmother.

“ Ever since I was 21, the following dream has occurred with certain varieties:—In my sleep I see suddenly, by a brilliant light, a naked infant, either lying in or falling into a bath. Sometimes I see a person standing by the bath whom I recognise, which gives me a clue on waking, by which I know in what family the death is likely to take place ; at other times I only see the infant and the bath ; then I know I shall hear of a death within 12 hours, and I suffer anxious suspense until I hear the news.

“ I should weary you if I related all the strange fulfilments of this dream, but am willing to send you a few instances with dates, &c., if you wish it.

(1) “ On the night of the 29th of January, 1873, I dreamt that I saw a baby in a bath. When the postbag came in the morning, I said to my husband, ‘ Please don't open it yet, I am sure there will be news of a death in it, but I can't tell whose ; none of our friends are ill, and the dream was so vague.’ He laughed, and proceeded to open the bag ; it contained a letter from the Rev. S. A., announcing the death of his only boy. [Here the dreamer had no knowledge of the illness of the person who died.]

(2) “ On the night of April 24th, 1877, I dreamt that I saw an infant in a bath. On the 25th, I heard that my cousin, B. C., had died on the 24th. [Here the dreamer had no knowledge of the illness of the person who died.]

(3) “ On June 11th, 1877, while asleep in a chair, I dreamt that I saw my husband's aunt, Mrs. B., looking at an infant in a bath ; she was dressed in white, with a strong light round her. She died in the evening of that day. [Here the dreamer knew of the illness of the person who died.]

(4) “ Before my husband's death on November 17th, 1880, I had my warning dream. I seemed to stand in deep mourning watching an infant in a bath. [Here the dream preceded the death by more than a day. The husband had been long ill, but his immediate death was not expected.]

“ C. S. BURTON.”

We find the above dates of death in cases 1, 3, and 4, confirmed by the *Times* obituary, and that in case 2 by the Register of Deaths.

[Mrs. B. has kept a diary of her dreams, which shows that she has had several dreams of accidents which have never taken place. She thought that she had never had the dream of a baby in a bath without receiving news—usually within 12 hours or thereabouts, and never later than 2 days after—of the death of a relative, friend, or at least acquaintance or servant ; but on more minute inquiry, it proved that in one case there had been an interval of as many as 11 days. She promised to keep in future a more carefully written record ; but writing in March, 1886, she says that she now seldom dreams, and seems to be losing her sensitiveness. She has no idea why the telepathic impressions of death (if such they could be considered) should associate themselves in her mind with these particular images.]

§ 5. I now come to the large class of “clairvoyant” dreams—this word being used in the restricted sense explained in Vol. I., pp. 368-9. The perception still varies greatly both in clearness and amount, and often foreign elements are introduced ; so that this class differs rather in degree than in kind from the last. The cases are so numerous that I must present some of them in an abridged form ; but I shall suppress no item which could be regarded as a weak point in the evidence.

I will first give a case which, though second-hand, rests on the authority of two persons to whom the dream was narrated before the reality was known. The whole labour bestowed on the present work would be amply repaid if by its means half-a-dozen such incidents, which would otherwise have been left to float, like this one, on the uncertain tide of human memory, obtained immediately and for ever the security of a written record.

(461) From the Bishop of Bedford, who, in January, 1883, corrected for us the account that appeared in the *Spectator* for Sept. 9, 1882, after comparing it with the written record. The account was written down, he says, “not less than from 20 to 25 years after the occurrence, probably a few years later still. I asked my father and aunt to verify and correct my account, which they did.”

“Stainforth House, Upper Clapton, E.

“January, 1883.

“When my father, Mr. W. Wybergh How, was a young man, he left his home, which was at Isell, near Cockermouth, to settle in Shrewsbury as a solicitor. In the year 1819 he revisited Cumberland, staying of course with his father, the Vicar of Isell. He and his sister, Miss Christian How, who was to return with him to Shrewsbury, had arranged to leave on a certain Monday, and to spend that night with a former governess, who was married to a Mr. Forrest, and lived at Everton. On the Sunday, after church, Mr. and Mrs. Wybergh, my father’s uncle and aunt, who lived at Isell Hall, told them they had invited a party of young people for the Monday night, and would not hear of their leaving that day. They were persuaded to stay, and wrote to Mrs. Forrest, although fearing

there was no post which would reach her sooner than they themselves would on Tuesday night. The party was a very merry one, a large number of their old friends being there. The only fact I need name at present is that a Miss Harriet Fenton, a young lady who had lately lost her brother and was in deep mourning, sat most of the evening alone upon a sofa, not joining in the amusements of the rest.

“ My father and his sister reached Everton by the coach on Tuesday night ; and when they explained the reason of their delay Mrs. Forrest told them, when the coach had come in the night before without them, she had gone to bed, and had dreamed it was a party for which they had stayed, and that she had dreamt of being there. A little later, while they were at supper, she said she must tell them her dream, as it was so wonderfully vivid ; and first of all, she told them who were there. As she had been governess at the vicarage, and knew all the neighbours, this excited little surprise. She then, however, went on to describe the most minute circumstances of the evening, saying she had seen some of them dressed up in fancy dresses and dancing about in them ; that they had got a dirty round table, which she had never seen before, into the drawing-room, and were eating something out of a bowl upon it (they had a syllabub, and someone saying it must be eaten from a round table, one was sent for from the kitchen) ; that old Mr. and Mrs. Wybergh and old Mr. and Mrs. How, who were playing at Boston in the inner drawing-room, came in and asked what they were doing, finding fault with them for having brought in the dirty kitchen table ; that the old people were not allowed to come to the round table, but were told they might taste what was in the bowl ; with other minute details. Mrs. Forrest had told her husband the dream early in the morning in bed, and had afterwards told her children, one of whom corrected her in her narrative, saying, ‘ Oh, mamma, you told us so-and-so this morning,’ the correction being the true version of what had occurred. My father and his sister were very greatly startled and astounded as Mrs. Forrest went on, but were still more so when she ended by saying, ‘ And I was sitting all the evening on the sofa, by the side of a young widow lady !’ This was the only mistake ; but years afterwards I met this lady (then Miss Fenton), and we spoke of this wonderful dream ; and she told me it was not so very far from being all true, for she was at the time engaged to be married, and did marry very shortly, and her husband died on their way out to India directly afterwards.

“ I have only to add that the letter written to Mrs. Forrest arrived the morning after, *i.e.*, on the Wednesday. The narrative was (with the one singular exception mentioned) a perfectly accurate account of all that took place to the minutest details, and the dream appears to have been dreamt at Everton at the very time of the occurrence of the events at Isell. My father and my aunt, before their death, verified and vouched for the above story.

“ W. WALSHAM BEDFORD,

“ Bishop Suffragan for East London.”

(462) From Mr. J. Ridley, 19, Belsize Park, N.W., who tells us that he has had no other impressive dream of death.

“ March 5th, 1885.

“ Whilst staying at Mrs. M.’s in June, 1867, on the night either of June 3rd or 4th, I had a vivid dream that I saw an old friend [name

given in confidence] lying dead with a wound in his head—noting the colour of his hair and other particulars. I told Mrs. M. of this dream, and later in the day we heard that the friend I had seen in my dream had actually been killed by a blow on the head, in a fall from a conveyance, on the night before the dream. The wound was on the *opposite side* of the head from that seen in my dream.

“The scene of the accident was some miles from the house where I was staying. “J. R.”

Mrs. Mawson, of Ashfield, Gateshead, with whom Mr. Ridley was staying at the time of the dream, was asked by Mr. Ridley’s daughter, at our request, if she remembered anything of the dream. She replied on March 3rd, 1885 :—

“I remember very distinctly Mr. Ridley telling me his dream, and how strongly it impressed me at the time. I remember that your papa had the dream, and spoke of it before the news of J. M.’s death reached him, but I cannot call to mind exactly what was the cause of death—in the dream, I mean ; but I think your papa thought he saw him injured by a fall from his horse or conveyance. I think he told me that he saw him lying on the ground injured, and his wife mourning and weeping over him, but I cannot be certain of the exact particulars, only I know that the dream was singularly like what in reality took place on the very same night. “E. M.”

Miss C., a resident in the village where J. M. lived, was asked if she could discover the exact date of J. M.’s death. She replied :—

“West Boldon.

“March 4th, 1885.

“To-day I saw E. M. (now Mrs. H., the daughter of J. M.). Her father died on June 4th, 1867. On the morning of that day, as Mrs. M. M. was on her way to Hylton, she found him lying insensible at a turn of the road. He was in the habit of driving furiously. It was supposed that in the dark he had not managed the corner, and so was thrown out. He never recovered consciousness. “A. C.”

[If Mr. Ridley’s dream was on the night of the 3rd, it must have been within a few hours of the accident ; if it was on the night of the 4th, it may still have been within 12 hours of the death.]

(463) From Miss Augusta Gould (now Mrs. Temple), the narrator of case 441, above.

“December 19th, 1883.

“When a child, I dreamed of places I was not likely to see, and when by chance I did see them they were exactly as my dream foretold.¹

“A curious dream happened one night, I believe in the spring of 1880. I saw the bedroom of an old lady friend, with blood² all about the floor and the window broken. I told my brother I was afraid there might be murder for the sake of money. He laughed at my fears, but the next Sunday, on his return from taking service at Lord H.’s private chapel,

¹ This experience has pretty often been described ; but it would be impossible to attach any importance to it, unless the dream had been written down or described in detail before the reality was seen.

² Compare cases 135, 221, 432, 466, 467.

near the home of the lady, he informed me of a great alarm her friends had had. They found her insensible in bed, one day, covered with blood, as was the floor of the room, and the window broken. Afterwards, she related that she had awaked in the night, finding her face and chest streamed over with blood, and a suffocation oppressing her; had got out and tried to open the window, but being faint and unsteady had run her hand through the small panes, then turned and fainted before she could get into bed again, and after doing so knew nothing more. I may add that the doctor said this serious attack had saved her from apoplexy."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Gould wrote:—

"January 3rd, 1884.

"I cannot remember if the accident to the old lady was on the same night as my dream of it; but certainly the dream was two or three nights before I *heard* of the accident.

"My brother, to whom I mentioned the dream beforehand [*i.e.*, before the news of the event], died in 1881."

(464) From Miss Barr, Apsley Town, East Grinstead, the narrator of case 111.

"April, 1884.

"When I was in Singhur, in 186-, I had a very strange dream. I saw, as in a small disc of light¹—something like a magic-lantern picture, only in small—the following scene:—The inside of a small hill tent, lighted (from above, apparently—the whole scene was in vivid light) on the floor, close beside a dhurrie (a small Indian carpet), and, between that and the door, a very large black scorpion, and entering by the door the figure of a man, an intimate friend, now dead. The vision was apparently of but momentary duration, and disappeared before I could see more. I made a note of the fact, with the date, in my diary. On the return of this friend, a few weeks afterwards, from his hunting expedition, he volunteered the information that they had been much pestered by insects of all kinds, and added that one night he had gone into his tent and found there 'a whopping big black scorpion.' The *black* scorpion is not quite so common as the ordinary or pink scorpion.

"I asked him what that night was, and he told me. I remember that he fixed the exact date, either from having made a note of it, or from some other incident having occurred on that same day. I never told him of my dream."

[Miss Barr stated in conversation that she and her sisters had satisfied themselves at the time that the days corresponded.]

(465) From Mr. J. W. Beilby, of Beechworth, Victoria (mentioned above, p. 226), son of Dr. Wm. Beilby, well known in Edinburgh forty years ago. The account was first printed in the *Harbinger of Light*, Melbourne, August, 1879.

"In 1849, I was on a certain night sleeping at an inn in the Portland district, being there mustering stray cattle to deliver, with my station sold, when intending to return to Scotland. I dreamt I was, with other members of my family, at my father's death-bed in Edinburgh. Everything said and done was vividly represented, but I wondered that my father was not in his usual bedroom. Several months afterwards news of

¹ Cf. case 220, and the remark which follows it.

my father's death, *on that very night*, reached me; but it was not until a sister arrived in the colony, later, that every minute particular was corroborated, and I learned the reason for his occupying the bed I saw him die in, in his dressing-room.¹"

Mr. Beilby tells us that he seemed, as if in a vision, one of those around his father's bed; and that the night was May 30th. We find, however, from the *Edinburgh Courant* that Dr. Beilby died on June 7, 1849.

[Such an error of date is not important, in a case where the narrator has no *separate* recollection of the date of his own experience. But at this distance of time it is impossible to be sure that the degree of coincidence was accurately ascertained, or that it has not become more exact in memory. To our request for corroboration, Mr. Beilby replies:—"My sister is too remote to refer to as to facts stated in my last letter." This is not the only instance in which the idea of writing a letter to a distant country has seemed to paralyse an informant's power of assistance.]

(466) From Mr. B. Lomax, Curator of the Brighton Free Library and Museum.

"January, 1883.

"In 1860, I took my newly married wife to live on the Fryer's Creek Diggings. Her mother, Mrs. F., lived in Melbourne, so that mother and daughter were 73 miles apart. After a few weeks, having to attend at the Survey Department, I returned alone to Melbourne, intending to pass a week at my father-in-law's house. On the third day, Mrs. F. (who, by the way, was a cousin of the late John Oxenford) came to me in tears, and entreated me to return, as she had last night dreamed that she had seen her daughter covered with blood, and led to bed by two women. Moved by her anxiety, I returned that night, and found the fact as she had stated. A sudden fright, caused by the violent entry of a drunken woman, had brought on a miscarriage, and she had been assisted and tenderly nursed by two neighbours.

"BENJAMIN LOMAX."

With this dream may be compared the following hypnotic vision.

(467) From *Beiträge zu den durch Animalischen Magnetismus zeitlich bewirkten Erscheinungen*, by W. Arndt (Leipzig, (1818), pp. 76-9. Arndt held a post to the name of which the nearest English equivalent is Secretaryship to the Royal Prussian Superior County Court. The percipient was a Madame S., 19 years of age, who had been suffering from hysterical attacks, and was hypnotised by Arndt during a period of some months, in 1812.

"During a magnetic séance, the sleeping patient, who had just before been quite gay, all at once began, without any perceptible cause, to utter lamentations, to wring her hands, and to weep. When I asked her the reason, she said, 'Ah, God! Ah, God! my father; my good father! he is dying.' 'How do you know that?' 'Ah, God! don't I see it! he is

¹ We have a very similar case from Mr. Alex. B. Burton, of 4, Baronsfield Road, St. Margaret's, Twickenham, who, on January 7th, 1880, dreamt very vividly of his father's death as taking place in a room quite different from that which he believed him to be occupying at the exact hour. He got out of bed, and marked the time by his watch as a little past 4.30. The facts and the time of the death exactly corresponded; and Mr. Burton's mother testifies that the dream was described to her before she mentioned the actual change of room. The death of the father was, however, known to be imminent; and the case is therefore not numbered as evidential.

losing a terrible amount of blood! Ah, he is dying, dying!’ After trying in vain to pacify her and rid her of this fancy, I woke her. She opened her eyes with the brightest smile, and all gloomy thoughts had vanished. To divert her still more, I conversed with her on various subjects; then, as I had broken into her sleep, I hypnotised her again. Before long the disquieting picture again appeared to her. To put an end to her grief, I again woke her. Her joyous look on waking showed that she was quite unaware of what she had just been describing.”

On her being put to sleep a third time, the vision was repeated, and her lamentations were heart-rending; but this time she was allowed to sleep, and she gradually became more composed. She woke at last with the exclamation, “Alas!” For the rest of the afternoon she was very melancholy, without being able to say why; and neither Arndt nor her husband (the only two persons who had been present) revealed to her what had passed. Next day she had recovered her spirits.

Her father was at the time 70 German miles away. His last letters had assured her that he was well; nor had she the slightest cause for anxiety on his account. But some weeks later Arndt found her much cast down; and on inquiring the cause, was told that at about 3 p.m. on the day of her strange experience (which Arndt says that he had noted), her father had slipped while descending into the cellar, and the cellar door had fallen on his breast, which caused violent hæmorrhage, and very nearly cost him his life. “So the fact which could not by any possibility have been suspected, actually happened, at the very hour at which the patient at a distance perceived it.”

(468) From the Rev. F. Teasdale Reed (Unitarian Minister), Colehill, Tamworth.

“October, 1884.

“I had an uncle who, after spending 33 years on board ship, left the sea, got married, and settled down near London. His only son, Jack, and myself were constant playmates, and for a short time school-fellows also. [Jack ran away to sea.] Months passed by and no news came. At length—perhaps it was 12 or 18 months afterwards—my thoughts were again directed to my missing cousin. It was in this way.

“One Sunday morning, my father invited me to go with him to see my uncle and aunt. On the road he told me that during the night he had had a most remarkable dream, and he wished to test it as far as he could, for he was strongly persuaded that it would be fulfilled. At the same time he urged me to notice the date, and preserve in my memory the details as far as possible. I may just say, in parenthesis, that we continued our journey, paid the visit, but found that nothing had been heard of my cousin. The dream, so far as I can recollect it at this distance of time, was somewhat as follows:—The scene is in a foreign port (guessed at the time to be Spanish). On board a British man-of-war that is anchored there a young man (my cousin Jack) is giving instructions to some men at work in the rigging. He is apparently dissatisfied with what they are doing, for he hurries up, makes some slight alteration, and then descends. A rung of the rope ladder gives way as his foot touches it, he falls backward, head first, and dies instantly. The surgeon hurries to the spot, examines the body, but leaves it, as he can do nothing there. Then arrangements are made for the burial. The coffin is taken on shore, some of the officers and

men accompany it, and it is solemnly lowered into the grave. There the dream ended.

"Some time after, my father (he had already ascertained the time it would take for a letter to come from the Spanish coast to England) asked me one morning if I still remembered his strange dream. He then made me repeat it to him. After that he said: 'Well, if there is anything in it your uncle will have heard something about it by this time, let us go and see him.' When we reached the house we could see at a glance that something had happened. My father at once asked if there was any news yet of Jack. Yes, that morning's post had brought a large envelope bearing the Lisbon post-mark. It was written by one of the officers of a man-of-war that was then anchored at Lisbon, and its purpose was to make known the death of my cousin. After a very kind and favourable notice of Jack's general conduct and abilities, it gave full details of his death and burial. Those details tallied exactly with the details given in my father's dream, and it occurred the very date of the dream. I was perfectly amazed. I inspected the letter and could not see any point in which there was the slightest contradiction or even divergence. Of course my uncle was then informed of the dream.

"F. T. R."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Reed adds on October 28, 1884:—

"I can quite understand your desire to verify, as far as possible, every statement made, but unfortunately I shall not be able to furnish much corroboration. I have just a little; what there is I will place before you. I found the enclosed 'inspector's certificate.' I see it corrects my story in one point, and confirms it in another. I said that the event happened about 32 years ago; this document is dated 1847, *i.e.*, 37 years ago. At the time of writing the paper I did not sufficiently think over the question of time. I would add that the family consisted of my uncle, aunt—who are both dead—my cousin John (of whom I have written), and his sister, who is still alive in Australia. She may be able to furnish more particulars. [We have written several letters to this lady, which have not been answered.] However weak it may be in collateral evidence, I am positive as to the fact of the dream, and that I have fairly represented it in its essential points."

The inspector's certificate shows that John Tabner, seaman, died at sea, on board H.M.S. "Canopus," on the 24th of April, 1847. In the *Navy List* for June, 1847, we find the ship reported as "off the coast of Portugal."

[In the absence of an independent account of the details of the death, and of written notes of the dream, we cannot assume that the coincidence of detail was so close as seems to be remembered. Clearly there would be a difficulty in explaining the closing scene of the dream as telepathically produced, though the dream may naturally enough have taken that course. Mr. Reed mentioned in conversation that there had been a very strong bond of affection between his father and Jack. He was himself 11 years old at the time.]

(469) From Mr. W. Noble, J.P., Forest Lodge, Maresfield, Uckfield.

"September 8th, 1882.

"The Baroness van Lynden (my mother-in-law) had a maid who

subsequently lived with Mrs. Noble and myself as housekeeper, and died in this house after 35 years' consecutive service in the family; her name was Elizabeth Gowling, and she came of a most respectable stock of the farming class from Appleby, in Westmoreland. She left Westmoreland when she was young, and had not been near it for a good many years, when the very curious event occurred which I am about to relate.

"I must say here, that when living in Appleby, Gowling had known a woman, by sight, whose name, I regret to say, I have forgotten, but who lived in a suburb called Bongate. They had in no sense ever been friends, nor had any communication passed between them, or any mention of the woman's name ever been made to Gowling by any one, after she left her native county.

"Well, one morning she came down, as usual, to dress her mistress, and, in obviously a very nervous and excited state, told her that she had just had such a terrible dream that she could not get it out of her mind. She had, she said, dreamed that this Bongate woman had gone to a drawer, taken out a piece of rope, proceeded to an outhouse, and hanged herself, and that her daughter had come into the outhouse and cut her mother down. My mother-in-law, of course, pooh-pooh'd the whole affair, told Gowling not to be silly, that dreams were all nonsense, &c., &c. But a week or two afterwards Gowling received a local newspaper from some one of her Westmoreland friends, which contained, *inter alia*, an account of an inquest on this very woman; who, on the night in which the dream happened, had proceeded to an outhouse and hanged herself, and had been cut down by her daughter.

"WILLIAM NOBLE."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Noble says:—

"It was some considerable time after it happened that I first heard of it; but I have done so, without the smallest variation, repeatedly, both from my mother-in-law and from Gowling herself."

In conversation with Mr. Podmore, Mrs. Noble gave an account which precisely corresponded with her husband's, and stated that she herself—then a young girl—had heard Gowling describe the dream on the morning after its occurrence.

From the Coroner of the district, who has kindly made inquiries, we have learnt the name of the woman who committed suicide, and the fact that the occurrence took place about 40 years ago; but his and our endeavours to trace the exact date have failed.

(470) From Mr. Henry Maitland, Balmungo, St. Andrews.

"December 28, 1885.

"On the 16th of August, 1820—it was the anniversary of his wedding—my father took my mother and eldest sister to dine and spend the night at the country house of an uncle a few miles off. I can see the trio now, through the long vista of years, starting for Lathrisk on the Irish car, my father in high spirits, and seemingly in perfect health.

"That night, my two sisters, who were left at home, one 20 and the other 21 years of age, slept together; and early next morning the younger one awakened her companion, to tell her she had had a strange, unhappy dream. She dreamed she was at Lathrisk with her father and mother; the family party were at dinner, and all went well till the servants had

cleared the table and withdrawn. My father, she said, then suddenly rose and walked to the window, which he opened as if for air. She, in her dream, went round and set a chair for him, putting her arm round his shoulders to support him in what seemed a sudden faintness. My uncle then came and supported my father, and the doctor soon arrived; but before then my father had breathed his last. Dreams, however impressive to the dreamer, do not sound equally so in other ears, and this one was no exception to the rule; the elder sister made no account of it, and no more was said on the subject.

“A few hours later, a messenger from Lathrisk brought the sad news of my father’s death, and the whole details of the closing scene were strictly and literally identical with those of the dream, excepting only that my eldest sister, who went with her parents, was the actor, in place of the dreamer, who remained at home.

“My father was in his 50th year, full of health five minutes before he died; and the mental condition of the family was that of joy and hopefulness.”

We find from the *Edinburgh Courant* that Mr. Maitland’s father died on August 25th (not 16th), 1820. Mr. Maitland explains that he knew his father’s wedding day to have been August 16, from an entry in a family Bible, and that he was either told that the day of the death was the same, or has himself, in memory, modified close proximity into identity.

In reply to inquiries, he adds, on Jan. 3, 1886:—

“I am the sole survivor of my family. I was not told of the dream at the time; my age (7 years) precluded this. Let me give you the assurance that both sisters concerned were women in whom, perhaps above most persons, the precious quality of conscientiousness formed the basis of character. In 50 years’ close relationship to them, I never heard them speak of a dream but the one in question; and I don’t believe either of them was, either literally or metaphorically, a ‘dreamer.’

“HENRY MAITLAND.”

In conversation Mrs. Maitland told me that she also had heard the incident described by the dreamer, her sister-in-law.

[It is needless to observe that no amount of scrupulousness on the part of a witness can sufficiently guarantee unwritten recollections of a long-past incident, involving some amount of detail. But the quality of the evidence in this case is at any rate good second-hand; and one can hardly doubt that a coincidence of a striking kind occurred.]

(471) From Mrs. Sykes, who at the time to which the narrative refers, was residing with her brother-in-law, the late Dr. Symonds, of Clifton Hill House, Clifton, Bristol.

“1883.

“On the 6th of November, 1854, I want to see a poor woman named Scott, living in St. Michael’s parish, Bristol. She had a son in the army, and his regiment was serving in the Crimea. As soon as she saw me, she said, ‘I know my dear boy is dead.’ On my asking what made her think so, she said, ‘Yesterday morning I saw him quite plainly. He and others were fighting and I saw him fall; the men seemed in disorder and were all in their shirt-sleeves. I saw Willie as plainly as I see you now.’ I tried to comfort her, saying how improbable it was they should be fighting

in their shirt-sleeves. 'It is true,' she said. 'I know he is gone, and I shall always know the day and time, Sunday morning, November 5th, for I awoke from the sight of this battle as the 8 o'clock bells rang out from St. Michael's Church.'

"Quite late that day (the 6th) we heard of the battle of Inkermann and that the soldiers were surprised early on the 5th, and had not time to dress entirely, but fought in their shirt-sleeves. Young Scott's regiment was there (I forget which). This poor woman never heard of her son's death till some time afterwards, when the list of killed came out; but so convinced was she of the fact that she wrote his name and the date of his death on a tracing (life size) of her soldier son, that she and her other son had drawn on the wall, before he went to the Crimea. This rude drawing I saw."¹ "M. A. SYKES."

[The Christian name William is probably incorrect; among the non-commissioned officers and privates mentioned by the *London Gazette* in the list of Inkermann casualties, as killed in the battle or dying of wounds very shortly afterwards, are three Scotts—John, Henry, and Peter. The detail of the shirt-sleeves cannot be pressed; but the sense of reality must have been strong, to prompt the writing of the name and date.]

(472) From Miss Weale, Nepaul, Croft Road, Torquay.

"January 26th, 1884.

"My mother was tired, and went to lie down, and fell asleep and dreamt that her younger half-brother, Godin Ellis, had died in India, and she heard in her dream hurried remarks about it, and heard some one speak the name of the officer standing by. She awoke with such a deep sense of its reality that, when my father came up to dress for dinner, she proceeded to ask him to kneel down and say the prayers from the Burial Service, for that Godin was dead. She proceeded to tell him

¹ In connection with this case, I may quote a narrative which I refrained from giving as evidence in the last chapter, on account of the pre-occupation of the recipient's mind with her absent son. It was procured through the kindness of a Cambridge friend, Mrs. B., whose sister, Mrs. G., is the narrator.

"The following narrative was told to me by my aunt, Mrs. B.; the son to whom it relates is F. G. B. (68th Regiment), who fell at Inkermann on Sunday, November 5th, 1854. The narrative was told to me on Sunday afternoon, September 2nd, 1883, and written down at the time. She had told me substantially the same narrative many years before, though she did not like talking of it. My son, who was also present when the story was told, read over my account, and pronounced it correct. I do not believe that my aunt ever experienced any similar impression. I have known her intimately all my life, and stayed with her for months together, and never heard her mention anything of the kind. She had always prayed that she might know at the moment if he were killed or badly wounded. The 5th November was a Sunday. She was at Ruscombe Church, and early in the service (while kneeling in the Confession) she had a sudden sensation; she saw nothing, but felt sure something was by her, and that it was her son. Her husband asked her what was the matter, but she kept up, and did not leave the church. On returning home, she said she was sure they would hear bad news. When the news did arrive, some days later, they found he was shot at the very hour when she felt his presence in Ruscombe Church."

Professor Sidgwick writes on September 5th, 1883:—

"Mrs. B., who knew her aunt well, has just told me that she never heard of her having any similar impression."

It is probable, from Kinglake's and Russell's accounts, that Lieutenant B. was killed in the morning; but at what hour is not known. For the form of the experience, compare the subjective impressions described in Vol. i., p. 483. The case is eminently one where, after the receipt of the news, the impression would be likely to assume in memory a definiteness and uniqueness that did not really belong to it.

the name of the place, and the hour, and the name of an officer standing by. She insisted on my father writing down the particulars, and he, to quiet her, complied, and also joined her in saying the prayers; but he would not allow her to go into mourning, and disbelieved that it would be found correct, because Godin had not intended going into the Madras Presidency.

“In due course of time the news came, and full written particulars from the officer whose name she had heard; and it had happened at the hour and day (allowing for reckoning), and in the little place, and as she described it—an accident with a gun. He had only known the officer for a few days, and the name was one unknown to my parents. My mother had been certain her dream was, as she termed it, a vision of the true. She was a very healthy, sensible, calm-minded woman.

“C. J. DORATEA WEALE.”

In reply to inquiries, Miss Weale wrote:—

“My mother scarcely ever had a dream. The dream took place as far back as in 1837, I think, but that very day she told us. All were told in the house, and she was vexed because my father would not let her go into mourning. The relatives who know, with me, of my mother’s true dream are foreigners, and scattered about the world, and I rarely write to them. But it was all written down, and given to the Rev. Dr. Neale at the time.”

[Here, again, the occurrence is far too remote for certainty as to the details of the dream. But some of the collateral incidents, *e.g.*, about the mourning, are such as would be likely to impress themselves on the daughter’s mind. We have done our utmost to trace the exact date of the death, but without success.]

(473) From a lady who scruples for the present to allow the publication of her name, as a near relative has an abhorrence of the subject.

“May 26th, 1884.

“I cannot fix the date—it may have been about 18 years after my mother’s marriage—one morning at breakfast my mother told us she had had a very strange dream. She had dreamed of Mrs. W., [a lady whose house had been a home to her in youth, but whom she had not heard of for years,] and Mrs. W. wanted to kiss her. My mother did her utmost to prevent it, using all her force to push Mrs. W. away, and the strangest thing of all was that she saw the inside of Mrs. W.’s throat, and saw it most distinctly, and it was as black as coal. That was the entire dream. About a week or 10 days after the dream (I cannot be sure of the interval), a mutual friend sent us news of Mrs. W.’s serious illness, told us that she was confined to bed, and suffering from a very uncommon disease which had attacked her throat. After hearing this report there were many talks of Mrs. W., but no way of gaining further information about her was found.

“After another short interval, my mother told us she had dreamed again. Mrs. W. was dead, everything about her was white, and there was an immense amount of the colour somehow, but she was not in her own room, neither did my mother recognise the room she was in as like any of the bedrooms in the house. In two days the post brought us an

intimation of Mrs. W.'s death, which had happened during the night, on the precise date of my mother's dream.

"About three months afterwards, we had a visit from a niece of Mrs. W., a lady who had nursed her aunt during her last illness, and who called to deliver a message sent to my mother from her friend before her death. My mother told this lady of her two dreams, when the following explanations were given us:—Mrs. W.'s illness was entirely in her throat, and its most distressing symptom was an extreme difficulty of breathing, necessitating having both windows and door continually wide open, as the only means of alleviation, the weather at the time being bitterly cold. Immediately after Mrs. W.'s death, a daughter-in-law, a somewhat eccentric person, arranged all details herself. For some unexplained reason she caused the body to be moved immediately to a parlour downstairs. The table in the room was covered with a white linen tablecloth, and the body draped in white placed on it; a sofa in the room was covered with a white sheet, and every chair, and also every picture in the room was treated in a similar manner. My mother said, 'I know the room—that was the room I saw in my dream.'"

[This incident happened about 30 years ago, but the narrator has a very clear recollection of it. She says that her mother dreamt a good deal, and that many other singular coincidences had been noticed, but that most of them were of a more trivial nature. Of course the second dream can only be explained telepathically by supposing (in accordance with Chap. XVIII., § 7) that a common interest in the dead woman established a line of communication between persons who were strangers to one another; and it is not an example on which we should be disposed to lay any stress. The first experience is more striking, as the detail about the throat (both in the dream and in the reality) would be likely to be remembered, and not likely to be unconsciously imagined.]

(474) From *Des Hallucinations*, by Dr. Brierre de Boismont (Paris, 1862), pp. 285-6. It is to be presumed that he received the account from the dreamer herself, as otherwise his prefatory remark would have no force; and in an English translation of another edition of the work, the narrative is followed by the words, "This statement was made to us by the lady herself, in whom we place the most perfect confidence."

"Le fait suivant est un de ceux qui nous ont le plus frappé parceque la dame de qui nous le tenons était un de ces esprits sensés et respectables dont les paroles méritent toute confiance.

"Mlle. R., douée d'un excellent jugement, religieuse sans bigoterie, habitait, avant d'être mariée, la maison de son oncle, Désessants, médecin célèbre, membre de l'Institut. Elle était alors séparée de sa mère, atteinte, en province, d'une maladie assez grave. Une nuit, cette jeune personne rêva qu'elle l'apercevait devant elle, pâle, défigurée, prête à rendre le dernier soupir, et témoignant surtout un vif chagrin de ne pas être entourée de ses enfants, dont l'un, curé d'une des paroisses de Paris, avait émigré en Espagne, et dont l'autre était à Paris. Bientôt elle l'entendit l'appeler plusieurs fois par son nom de baptême; elle vit, dans son rêve, les personnes qui entouraient sa mère, s'imaginant qu'elle demandait sa petite-fille, portant le même nom, aller la chercher dans la pièce voisine; un signe de la malade leur apprit que ce n'était point elle, mais sa fille qui

habitait Paris, qu'elle désirait voir. Sa figure exprimait la douleur qu'elle éprouvait de son absence ; tout-à-coup ses traits se décomposèrent, se couvrirent de la pâleur de la mort, elle retomba sans vie sur son lit.

“ Le lendemain Mlle. R. parut fort triste devant Désessants, qui la pria de lui faire connaître la cause de son chagrin ; elle lui raconta dans tous ses détails le songe qui l'avait si fortement tourmentée. Désessants, la trouvant dans cette disposition d'esprit, la pressa contre son cœur en lui avouant que la nouvelle n'était que trop vraie, que sa mère venait de mourir ; il n'entra point dans d'autres explications.

“ Plusieurs mois après, Mlle. R. profitant de l'absence de son oncle pour mettre en ordre ses papiers auxquels il n'aimait pas qu'on touchât, trouva une lettre qui avait été jetée dans un coin. Quelle ne fut pas sa surprise en y lisant toutes les particularités de son rêve que Désessants avait passées sous silence, ne voulant pas produire une émotion trop forte sur un esprit déjà si vivement impressionné.”

(475) From Mrs. Hébert, 16, Monmouth Road, Bayswater, W.

“ December 26th, 1883.

“ I shall relate to you a dream which happened to me several years ago. I was then in Germany at Mayence, learning German in a school, where I was employed as a teacher of the French language.

“ One night I went to bed, very tired but without any particular anxiety. I fell into a heavy slumber and dreamt of my mother. She was in bed, lying ill, and thin ; her hands, almost transparent, were stretched convulsively as if seeking for some object, whilst she moaned most piteously in calling me by my name. In fact, she looked as if she were dying. I recognised perfectly her bedroom, the furniture, &c. ; it was dimly lighted by a candle, and close to the head of the bed, in a green arm-chair, slept an old woman. I knew her also as a charwoman, who, as it seemed, was acting as nurse. My mother in her desperate motions succeeded in touching the shoulder of the old woman, who awoke with a start, and asked her crossly what she wanted.

“ ‘My scissors,’ said my mother in a feeble voice.

“ ‘What for ?’

“ ‘To cut some of my hair. You shall give it to my daughter in remembrance of me.’

“ ‘She does not want it, go to sleep,’ answered the old woman, angry at being disturbed. She pushed back my mother on the pillow and went to sleep again, without noticing her agony, her prayer, to have some of her hair cut. I could hear distinctly the voice of my mother becoming weaker and weaker, but always plaintive, and supplicating the old woman for her scissors. At last I heard nothing. I awoke in a frightful agitation ; it was 2 o'clock after midnight. I told my dream to some people. They advised me not to think of it, as they said that dreams generally go by contraries. But a few days after, I received the news of my mother's death ; it had happened just at the time of my dream.

“ LOUISE HÉBERT.”

Mrs. Hébert returned to France in a few weeks, and, on seeing the nurse, reproached her with her conduct, and was convinced by her manner that the charge was true ; but there was no further evidence. In con-

versation, she told me that she had no idea of her mother being ill; that the dream was quite unique in her experience; and that the effect on her was so strong that the persons she was living with had great difficulty in persuading her not to start home at once. The incident happened more than 20 years ago, and she has lost connection with her native place in Lorraine.

[The case is first-hand, from a witness who, I am sure, desires to be accurate; but again the remoteness of date and lack of corroboration are most serious defects, and the correctness of the details in the dream is mere conjecture.]

(476) From Mrs. Drummond Smithers, Bridge House, Crookham, Farnham, Hants.

“November 22nd, 1884.

“My father [Mr. Thomas Pickerden] was an architect and builder, which obliged him to be about very early of mornings; and on Monday, the 19th January, 1857, at 7 a.m., whilst on his way to see some of his men, he fell, in a fit of some kind. That same morning I perfectly remember not falling asleep until after 2 a.m., having counted the clock up till that hour, and wondering why I could not sleep, as I always slept well at that time. As we breakfasted at 10 a.m. in those days, we were not early risers, so probably it might have been 8 or 9 o'clock before I woke. I cannot make a nearer statement, as I am not positive as to the time; but my dream was between the hours mentioned. It was that my father had been taken suddenly ill in the streets of Hastings, that he was put into a fly by two men, and taken home—when I woke. The dream seemed to impress me very much. I tried not to think seriously of it; having dressed and breakfasted, still the dream haunted me. I could not shake it off. When I spoke to my sisters-in-law, with whom I was staying (my then husband was their brother), they advised me to tell him, which I did, and he at once granted my request of going on to Hastings. He left me at Etchingam Station, and going direct to our home, Hawkhurst, he found a telegram there to the effect that my father was ill, and that I was to go at once. I had by this time reached Hastings and found my dream verified.

“The event occurring so many years back, not one witness is living.

“ANNIE SMITHERS.”

In the same letter Mrs. Smithers says, “The dream preceded my father’s sudden illness some few hours;” but the account shows that there is no reason to suppose this.

In answer to inquiries, she adds:—

“29th December, 1884.

“In my dream I did not actually see my father fall, but was at the spot just as the fly was going off, and saw distinctly there were two persons inside the fly, but the back of one man who was holding my father prevented my recognising him; the man on the box I distinctly saw, and knew him as a flyman of Hastings, and he was the man who drove my father on that fatal morning—for so it proved, as he never rallied from that illness, never was out of his bed more than to have it made a few times. He died 5th March, 1857. I never knew him to have an illness

previous to that, nor fit of any kind ; he always appeared a healthy strong man. I am generally so free from dreaming that this one made a great impression upon me at the time."

The *Hastings News* confirms March 5, 1857, as the date of the death.

[This case again is remote in date and uncorroborated ; but the narrator is not likely to be wrong as to the fact of her taking a journey on the strength of her dream, and finding it confirmed.]

(477) From Miss Morse, Northfield, Vermont, U.S.A., who was the percipient in case 41.

"May, 1884.

"Often impressions of persons and places have come to me while asleep, or when I *seemed* to be dreaming. For example : When our civil war was in progress I corresponded with several soldiers. One of my correspondents was Captain Fischer, a Dane, who had formerly been a sailor, and roamed the world over. While the army of the Potomac was lying idle, I dreamed of a strange place. The moon shone brightly on newly-made streets, dotted with small white houses, arranged to impart on the whole scene a picturesque daintiness. One of the little dwellings especially won my attention. I stopped before it, exclaiming, 'How beautiful ! I never saw anything like it. I wonder what it can be.' A voice, which I did not recognise, replied, 'It is a Grecian temple.' 'Am I, then, in Greece?' 'No, this is an imitation of such temples as one sees in Greece.' I awoke, and in a moment the clock struck 12. I could not rid myself of the feeling that I had been to a new place, and seen something real.

"A few days after, a letter came from Captain Fischer, in which he minutely described the place I saw in my dream, explaining that the soldiers, to pass the time, had laid out streets and avenues, and by many ingenious devices had contrived to make their tents resemble houses. His own tent, which was much admired, he had converted into quite a clever model of a Greek temple, &c. Near the close he alluded to the brilliant moonlight, and added : 'It is near midnight, and my men are asleep all around me.' Comparing dates, I found I dreamed of the scene while his pen was describing it."

In reply to inquiries, Miss Morse says :—

"The date of the dream was firmly fixed in my mind, because it came the one night that I passed at the house of Mrs. Paine's father. I well remember telling Mrs. Paine the dream in the morning. When I saw her again I told her of Captain Fischer's letter, which was received after I returned to W. R. Junction. Had the dream occurred at home I could not have been so sure of the time."

Mrs. Paine, Northfield, Vermont, writes as follows :—

"May 24th, 1884.

"My testimony in regard to Miss Morse's dream in connection with Captain Fischer, whom I know well, is a mere mite. I well recollect her telling me the dream, which occurred while she was on a visit at my father's, but whether she related it to me the next morning or later, I cannot remember. She says she told me the dream at the time, and its

singular verification afterwards, as she did not receive the letter from Captain Fischer until after she returned to her home at White River Junction—but so many years have elapsed that they are inseparably connected in my mind. I only remember it in connection with the letter, although I presume she is correct.

“LUCIA A. PAINE.”

(478) From Mr. Latimer H. Saunders, St. Helens, near Ryde, who was concerned in case 44.

“April 26th, 1884.

“While at school, I had a remarkably vivid dream of a fire, in which it appeared my father’s offices were destroyed, entailing upon him heavy loss. So realistic did it seem to me that I related it to one of my school-fellows (George A.) before rising. [This gentleman, however, cannot recall the circumstance.] He told me in his quaint way that I was very foolish to repeat a dream before getting up unless I wished it to come true; at which superstitious fancy I laughed, and told him there was no fear of such happening in this case, as the fire I had seen in my dream was not at my father’s offices, 16, Mincing Lane, to which I had been in the holidays, but at Messrs. Bailey and Co.’s offices, a large block of buildings, No. 1, Mincing Lane Buildings, situate some distance away, and the only thing connecting them with my father was that in my dream I saw his name-plate on the entrance instead of theirs. A few days after, I heard from my mother that my father’s offices had been burnt to the ground, and that unfortunately he was not insured, having only just removed into new offices. I afterwards learnt that it was the block of buildings I had seen in my dream that was burnt down on the same night; and stranger still, that my father had taken the very offices occupied by the firm I mentioned, the only knowledge of whom that I could have had was from seeing their name on the building, in passing to my father’s offices when I visited the City.

“LATIMER H. SAUNDERS.”

Mr. Saunders’s father says, “The date [of the fire] was, I think, November, or early in December, 1862.” We find from the *Times* that the fire took place on Dec. 9, 1862, breaking out shortly after midnight, in Mincing Lane *Chambers*, and thence extending to other buildings.

[Mr. Saunders tells me that one of his brothers (Mr. Harris Saunders, of Leacroft House, Staines) was, he believes, at the fire—which would be in favour of the telepathic explanation; but Mr. H. Saunders declines to tell us whether he actually was present. The case is too remote for any certainty as to the exact correspondence of date and detail.]

(479 and 480) Mr. Rowland Rowlands, of Bryncethin, Bridgend, has given us the following dream-cases out of many impressions which he believes to have been veridical. (See also Vol. I., pp. 252, 291.) He was until recently manager of the Pen-y-graig Collieries.

“July 2nd, 1884.

“About 23 years ago, when I was taking a little rest, about 40 or 50 miles distance from Pen-y-graig, I saw a man named Edwin Gay falling down from a slope on the surface to an old pit, which was covered with old timber and full of water. But the timber protected him. I

instantly wrote a letter to caution them to take care, but when the letter reached, it was too late, because the man had fallen, very likely at the very moment I saw him going. I met Mr. Gay [within] the last fortnight, and went over the facts with him.

“On one occasion, about 1868, when at the Pen-y-graig Collieries, I had come from the works to my house, about dinner-time, 1 p.m., and having been up all night had got into bed—when, just as I was dropping off to sleep, and still between sleeping and waking, I saw the roof of the stall belonging to a man named William Thomas moving, and the timbers which supported it bending and breaking. I got up at once and ran off to the colliery, just in time to meet William Thomas coming out of the works, the roof of his stall having fallen in, just as I had seen it. My vision must have taken place at the very moment of the accident. William Thomas is now dead.

“On another occasion, when in bed, between 1 and 2 a.m., I dreamed that I saw the colliers, who should have stayed in the works until 5 a.m., putting away their tools and making ready to go. I hurried on my clothes, told my wife what I had dreamed, and ran off to the works. I found that the men were just about to leave, but had hurried back on seeing the approach of my light. They wondered much how I had discovered the trick which they had intended to play.”

[This last case may probably have been due to some latent idea in the dreamer's mind.]

I append some specimens of a rather numerous class in which letters are alleged to have been perceived shortly before their arrival. The following are instances which there is no difficulty in accounting for telepathically. (See also cases 409, 433, 447, above; and cases 136, 137.)

(481) From Mr. Conquest, Mead House, Biggleswade.

“December, 1884.

“It was, I think, in October, 1869, that I dreamed that I received a letter from an old friend, Rev. S. H. Ireson, then a curate of St. Thomas' Church, Liverpool, and residing in Birkenhead, from whom I had not heard for 12 months or more. His handwriting was very distinct, and it stood out very clearly before me, as I read that his wife had presented him with another little daughter. On reaching the bottom of the page, I tried to turn over the leaf, but could not, and the effort awoke me. The vividness of the dream was such that on coming down to breakfast in the morning, I said to my sister (now Mrs. Daniel, of The Elms, Biggleswade), ‘I expect to hear from Ireson this morning, for I dreamed last night that I received one announcing the birth of a daughter.’ In a few minutes the postman came, but there was no letter from Ireson. It came, however, the following day, and the first page seemed to be identical with the one I had read in my dream. Towards the end of December, in the same year, I think, I visited Ireson at Birkenhead, and, one day, happening to mention the above circumstance to him, he said, ‘I distinctly remember writing you that letter—it was between 1 and 2 (or 2 and 3) o'clock in the morning, and after I had written the first page, I went to bed and

finished the letter next day.' Ireson afterwards became Vicar of Barnoldswick, and died a few years ago.

“FRED. W. CONQUEST.”

Mrs. Daniel corroborates as follows :—

“The Elms, Biggleswade.

“December 17th, 1884.

“I perfectly recollect Mr. F. Conquest telling me of his dream, respecting the birth of Mr. Ireson's daughter, previous to our receiving information of the event, and have pleasure in adding my testimony in confirmation of it.

“T. F. DANIEL.”

Mr. Conquest has antedated his experience by some months, as we find from the Register of Births that his friend's daughter was born on July 9, 1870. In conversation he informed me that he had had no idea of the impending event; and also that he does not dream much. Mrs. Daniel described to me the place where she and her brother were standing when he told her of the dream, and the arrival of the post immediately afterwards.

(482) From Mrs. Paramore, 43, Shaftesbury Road, W.

“March, 1884.

“On the night of the 21st March, 1871, I woke from some distressing dream, sobbing. My husband [since deceased] inquired what was the matter. I told him I had had such a dreadful dream, something about my Aunt Baker, but I could not remember any particulars. Towards morning, I think about 5 o'clock, I woke up again in great distress from a similar, though more vivid, dream—something still connected with my Aunt Baker; but I told my husband I had received two letters, black-bordered. When I got up, I felt unusually depressed, and kept saying to my husband I could not shake off a dreadful feeling of wretchedness; as I was nearly always in excellent spirits, he was surprised, but our astonishment was inexpressible when the post brought me two black-edged letters, both in the handwriting of my Uncle Hubert Hutchings, my Aunt Baker's brother. The envelopes were numbered 1 and 2—the latter I have found with the letters amongst my papers. No. 1 contained the intelligence of my aunt's illness, of which until then I was unaware. The other one, written shortly after, told me of her death. My husband and myself were greatly impressed with this extraordinary circumstance—for I never attached the slightest importance to dreams; but this was undeniably a mysterious coincidence.”

Mrs. Paramore sent the two letters—concerning respectively the illness and death—for our inspection. Both were dated the same day, 21st March, 1871, and the black-edged cover in which one of them was enclosed bore a dated stamp-impression of that day.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Paramore writes on March 23, 1884 :—

“I do not at this distant date actually remember as to whether the *two* letters were black-bordered or not, but I distinctly dreamt they had reference to my aunt, whose illness and death were announced the following morning in the two letters I sent you. Whilst dressing, I frequently remarked (before the post came in) to my husband how wretched I felt about my dream, and that it was something about my Aunt Baker. I do

not remember any other very distressing dreams that have or have not come true.

“LEONORA E. PARAMORE.”

In conversation Mrs. Paramore dwelt on the quite unique feeling of distress which followed the dream. As to the particular feature of *repetition*, see Vol. I., pp. 357-8, and below pp. 700-1.

(483) From Mr. E. W. Phibbs, 84, Pembroke Road, Clifton, Bristol.

“February 10th, 1885.

“In 1856, living in Manchester, where I carried on the business of silk and cotton manufacturer, I dreamed one night I saw a sheet of paper with a written order upon it, unimportant in itself, from a house which was in the daily habit of sending me orders—A. and S. Henry and Co. As I saw it, it looked like a sheet of wet paper without any surroundings, covered with writing. When I got to my place of business, about half-past 9, my partner, who was always there before me, remarked that he had a curious (from its insignificance) order from A. and S. Henry and Co. I said, ‘Before showing it me, give me a sheet of paper,’ on which I wrote out a part of the order—the upper portion—and remarked, ‘I can’t repeat what is below, because it is smeared in the copying-press.’ He looked at me very much surprised, and produced the original, showing that it was identical with my description.

“Thinking over the matter for some weeks, a difficulty presented itself in the thought that, at the moment when I dreamed I saw it, the order would be folded in an envelope, and not be an open sheet. Also, why should the sheet appear wet? At last I questioned the writer of the order, without giving him any reasons, and on asking him to describe the daily procedure of the business of writing such orders out, he answered that, when he had written a number of such orders the last thing at night, he gave them to the copying clerk, who was in the unusual practice of leaving all these orders in the copying-book in the press all night. The first thing the following morning, these would be put in envelopes and distributed through the town. This at once explains the open and damp sheet of my dream.

“The order began in the ordinary form—‘Order for (500) pieces,’ &c. The words written down (before seeing the actual order) contained *all* that was extraordinary in it. The smeared portion only contained further particulars.

“E. W. PHIBBS.”

Mr. Phibbs’ partner is dead. But Mr. Phibbs has forwarded to us a letter, written to him on Feb. 18, 1886, by Mr. Fitzgerald, of 34, Marble Street, Manchester, who heard of the occurrence at the time, completely confirming the above account; and Mr. J. Lang writes, from the Manchester *Examiner and Times* office, to the same effect.

In August, 1883, Mr. Phibbs had another curious dream, of seeing his dog, who was not with him where he was staying, dying under a wall; and Mrs. Phibbs confirms the fact that this dream was narrated to her immediately. It turned out that the event had taken place, and that the dog was buried, by persons who were in some degree responsible for the accident that led to its death, at (apparently) the hour of the dream. But the dog was fond of climbing, and the case can hardly be numbered as evidential.

I may conclude, in this connection, with the following complicated

case, the value of which it is difficult to estimate, but which at least has a decided suggestion of genuine telepathy for anyone who believes in the reality of that influence.

(484) From a lady who thinks that to allow the publication of her name would involve a breach of confidence. She is a scrupulously conscientious witness.

“1884.

“I make the following story as short as possible, suppressing many details, and, of course, entirely changing the names of those concerned. Miss Black, with whom I have been most intimate for many years, became much interested in a Mrs. Gray. Although Miss Black and I are so in sympathy that I may call our interests mutual, I, from the first, took an unaccountable dislike to this particular friendship; so much so that, although I was always told when the friends met, no personal details were ever told me. I never heard Mrs. Gray or her husband described; I never saw her writing. I believed her name to be —, which is that of her daughter.

“At the end of nearly three years I received an anonymous letter, written in a hand evidently meant to be disguised, asking me to give the writer some particulars of the disposal of Miss Black’s property. The reply was to be addressed to certain initials at a Post-office. I did not reply. A short time after, I dreamt that I stood looking over the shoulder of a lady writing a letter, and that she signed herself ‘— Gray.’ The room door opened and a tall old man came in, and the writer hastily put the letter away. Two days after, I received a second anonymous letter of the same purport, which I did not answer. I dreamt the same thing again. Soon after (I forget how many days), a third letter reached me, begging that I would never let Miss Black know what had passed. I then wrote, saying the letters were destroyed, and that from me Miss B. would never hear of the matter. A month or two after this, while staying at my home, Miss B. and I were at church. An old man sat near us who struck me as extremely like the figure I had seen in my dreams. Miss B. whispered, ‘That is *so* like Major Gray.’ This impressed me very much, and I afterwards found out that Mrs. Gray’s name *is* —, not —, as I had supposed; also that she has a great quantity of almost white hair, which I have omitted to say was the only thing I very distinctly saw about my dream-lady, as her face was hidden from me.

“In the course of her visit, Miss Black said, ‘It seems to me your dislike to Mrs. Gray has taken a more definite form; you *know* something about her.’ I denied the *knowledge*, all being surmise, and I being most anxious that Miss B. should not be wounded by the feeling that anyone was speculating on what would happen in the event of her death, specially as she is in delicate health. The subject was then dropped between us; but when, on a visit to her, we had been sitting alone and silent for some time, her hand being on my shoulder, she exclaimed, suddenly, ‘It is something about my will that makes you dislike Mrs. G. so much.’ In point of fact, I had at the time been thinking over the whole matter. I then told her all, and it is now a matter of great regret I did not at once send Miss B. the letters, as things then might have been cleared up. It has been a cause of distress to Miss B. and myself, as it has made a breach

in her friendship with Mrs. Gray, who denies all knowledge of the letters, but refuses to meet me and discuss the affair. I need trouble you no further, nothing more of interest, from a psychological point, having occurred."

Referring to the above account, "Miss Black" writes, on October 5, 1886:—"I can corroborate the facts therein contained."

In answer to inquiries, the narrator says:—

1. "After receiving the first anonymous letter I *did* suspect its author to be Mrs. Gray. Before this I never had the least suspicion that her interest in Miss Black was a mercenary one, and I have been at a loss to account for feeling so assured she was the writer, without there being any evidence to favour the idea.

2. "I am quite sure I recognised the old man in church as being like the man in my dream *before* Miss B. spoke of the resemblance to Major Gray.

3. "I am quite sure I never saw Major G., and I have not the slightest remembrance of having heard any description of him.

4. "Previous to Miss Black 'reading' what certainly were my thoughts about Mrs. Gray, we had made some very small experiments in thought-transference, with, however, too slight results to submit to the S.P.R. In these experiments I was the percipient; my 'willing' had no effect whatever on Miss Black. We discontinued our experimenting as I found it exhausting. I think it is clear that a 'sympathetic rapport' exists between us, as once it was 'borne in upon me' with inexpressible power that she was in some distress. The impression seized me suddenly at a certain hour, and no effort would dispel it. The news reached me next day that Miss B.'s sister had been taken worse at the time, and was dying. She had been ill, but not seriously so, and the last account I had received was very good. When we are together we have often answered unexpressed thoughts.

5. "I am very sorry I made no notes whatever of the incident, never having been in the habit of keeping a diary, and I cannot be at all accurate as to dates. [The narrator has however told us privately what were the months in which the various incidents occurred. The first was less than 4 years ago.]

6. "I do not remember ever having dreamt more than once [*i.e.*, having had repeated¹] a dream in which any one besides myself has appeared.

"Not having any idea that Mrs. Gray's name is —, in fact being impressed with the idea that it was —, does it not strike you as a very curious coincidence that I should have dreamt that I saw the true signature? The *real* name [communicated in confidence] is a rather uncommon one. I have never known more than one person bearing the same.

"I quite forgot to say that Miss Black writes that she does *not* remember her hand being on my shoulder, but that I was sitting so near as to touch her; my own impression still is that it was so."

In conversation the narrator told Mr. Podmore that, when she told the whole story to Miss Black, the latter brought down a bundle containing many letters from various persons, and that she (the narrator) without difficulty picked out a letter of Mrs. Gray's, from the resemblance of the writing to that seen in the dream.

¹ See p. 418, note.

CHAPTER IV.

"BORDERLAND" CASES.

§ 1. THE most convenient mode of arranging the cases in the present chapter will be, not by the character of the experience narrated—visual, auditory, and so on—for it happens that a large majority are visual;¹ but by the character of the evidence—first-hand or second-hand, recent or remote.

I will begin with some cases, first-hand or on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148), to which the chief objection, from an evidential point of view, is their remoteness of date.

(485) From the late Mr. Robert Henry Dix, 63, Lanark Villas, Maida Vale, London, W.

"February 2nd, 1884.

"In 1836, when a very young man, I had become engaged to a young lady; but I decided to leave England and try my fortune elsewhere, and wait until I should be able to establish myself, and could then send for my intended and be united. Of course we were to keep up a regular correspondence.

"I left England and went to St. Petersburg, where I had some friends, and very soon after my arrival there I got an appointment on an estate in the South of Russia, belonging to a rich and influential nobleman. In the course of a year I succeeded in obtaining a very good position, and could fairly hope to be enabled to marry in the course of the next spring. In the meantime, the correspondence with my intended continued very regularly. All at once it ceased, and for some time I had received no letters from her. I wrote to one of her family, and was informed that my intended was taken seriously ill, and had gone to Jersey to some friends there, hoping that the sea air and change of climate might be beneficial to her. This naturally unsettled me very much, and I became depressed and low-spirited in consequence. One day I remember I was particularly so. I had been very much occupied during the day, and towards the evening threw myself on the sofa in my sitting-room, and dropped off to sleep. It might have been an hour or so that I had been asleep, when, suddenly awaking, I observed at the foot of the

¹ The cases which were exclusively auditory are Nos. 496, 497, 506, 507, 538; and an auditory impression was a prominent element in cases 489, 495, 498, 508, 509, 513, 519, 520, 522, 526, 527, 528, 539, 540, 547.

couch a sort of bluish vapour,¹ which seemed to fill up the end of the room, and what seemed to me a shadowy form appeared to come out of it, which gradually took the form of a female; the features bore the exact likeness of my intended. I was now fully awake. I raised myself on the sofa, and exclaimed, 'Louisa, is that really you? What has happened?' I received no answer, and in a few seconds the apparition was gone, and seemed to melt away into the vapour, which also disappeared. I still supposed that I had been dreaming, but I could not shake off the impression this apparition had made upon me.

"I wrote to my friends in England, saying that I feared my intended was dying or dead. I received in answer that my fears were too well founded, and that the poor girl had died of inflammation of the brain, on the same day, and about the same time, as I mentioned having seen the apparition.

"R. H. D."

In conversation, Mr. Dix explained to Mr. Podmore that he could not give the precise date of the apparition; it occurred some time in the autumn of 1837, between 6 and 7 p.m., when it was dusk, but not yet fully dark. He made no written memorandum of the occurrence, but told one or two friends in Russia on the following day. When he received the letter announcing the death, he noted that it took place on the same day as the vision, but he never learned whether the hour exactly corresponded, only that the death took place in the afternoon.

All those who could give corroborative evidence in this case are either dead or dispersed, so that they cannot be traced. None of the letters are preserved, and no one is living of Mr. Dix's own relations who could attest the receipt of his letters.

Mr. Dix was certain that he had never had any other experience of hallucination. At the same time, it must be noted that he was at the time in a state of distinct anxiety respecting his *fiancée*.

We have more to rely on here than the mere recollection of the experience; this receives, so to speak, a *point d'appui* in the recollection that a letter was written in consequence. Similarly, in the next two cases, and in others that follow, we have the recollection that the phantasm was immediately described and commented on. In respect of many of these borderland visions, I may remind the reader that the percipient's certainty of having been completely awake at the time, though not conclusive as to the fact, is in itself quite sufficient to distinguish the experience from an ordinary dream.

(486) From the late Mrs. Lever, of Culcheth Hall, Bowdon, wife of Mr. Ellis Lever, well known in Manchester.

"May 14th, 1884.

"When at Ashton-under-Lyne, in my father's house, and being about 14 years of age, I was lying awake in bed, and my sister, Anne, sleeping by my side. It was nearing the dawn at morning, when I saw my cousin, Mary Tinker, come to my bedside, and she laid one hand on the pillow

¹ Compare cases 193 and 194, and see Vol. i., p. 526, note.

near my sister's head, while her eyes were uplifted, as if in prayer. (My cousin Mary was particularly attached to my sister Anne.) She was in her nightdress, which was frilled down the front, and a nightcap, also frilled; and I saw her dark-brown eyes as distinctly as possible. I was so afraid that I shrank under the clothes; but then, reflecting that I had done nothing to grieve her, and no reason to be afraid, I resolved to speak to her. But on removing the clothes, she was gone, and not knowing where she could have gone to, I concluded that it must have been her spirit.¹ At breakfast, the same morning, I mentioned what I had seen to my father and brothers, and to my sister Anne. They said I must have been dreaming, but I was quite awake, and assured them that this was the case.

"The next day a letter came stating that my cousin Mary had died, and it was ascertained that her death occurred at the very time at which I had seen her apparition. This coincidence convinced the members of my family that I had seen my cousin, as I assured them I had.

"CATHERINE LEVER."

Mrs. Lever's daughter writes, from Cambridge House, Monmouth:—

"June 4th, 1884.

"I am staying with my mother's sister [Anne], who distinctly remembers about her cousin Mary.

"ADA LEVER."

Mrs. Lever, herself, however, says, "My sister only just remembers my mentioning Cousin Mary, and she cannot give me the date."

(487) From a lady, Mrs. H., who prefers that her name should not be published.

"1883.

"When I was a child of 11 years of age, a very singular thing happened to me, which is well-known to my family, and impressed itself so vividly on my memory that I can still, though now a grandmother, recall every circumstance.

"One night I awoke in a great state of fright, thinking someone had touched me. I saw distinctly, standing by my bedside, my brother, but I was terrified to see that he looked very terribly strange and altered, as it struck me, like a dead person, though at that time I had never seen anyone dead. I was also very astonished at seeing that he seemed dripping wet, his clothes wet and stained, his hair dripping, and he stood with his eyes fixed on me. In my terror I called out 'Alick!' (his name), when the figure immediately vanished.² I jumped out of bed, running through the door, which was always left open, into the next room, my governess's, telling her of what I had seen, and in my alarm, getting into her bed, where I remained that night. She tried to laugh away my fears, saying I must have eaten something that had disagreed with me, and that what had passed was a nightmare, and forbidding me to mention it to my grandmother, under whose care I was living, she being an old Scotch lady, and superstitious, and that it might upset her. Nothing, therefore, regarding the circumstance was in any way placed on record.

"About three months afterwards, as I was reading aloud to my governess in the same sitting-room with my grandmother, the Indian post arrived. She made the remark, 'How singular! No letters, only a news-

¹ See p. 48, note.

² As to the sudden disappearance on speech, compare case 540, and see p. 91, note.

paper,' which she began reading. After a little while she dropped the paper with the exclamation, 'Oh, my God!' My governess ran to her, and presently read my brother's death by drowning in a quicksand in the River Sone, near Sonepore, in Bengal. He was marching with his regiment; they were encamped on one side of the river bank, another regiment on the opposite side. This regiment, in which my brother had a young friend, had asked him to early breakfast, about 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning; and the native who was showing him the way across afterwards deposed he heard a struggling all of a sudden, looked back, and saw my brother and his pony floundering in the quicksand, with which the river is full, and of which it is supposed the coolie had forgotten to warn him. Instead of throwing my brother a rope or stick to catch hold of, the man, in a great state of fright, ran back to the camp to give the news; but by the time help arrived it was too late, and my brother was quite dead when the body was recovered.¹ This happened March 21st, 1845. In Bengal by that month the sun is well risen by 5 o'clock, or at all events quite broad light, and being in advance of us some six hours, the time at which he was drowned would tally with my seeing him during the night at home.

"M. C. H."

From the only public notice of the death that we have been able to discover—a letter quoted by *Allen's Indian Mail* from the *Bengal Hurkaru* of March 4, 1845—it appears that Mrs. H.'s brother was drowned in the Sone when returning one morning to his regiment, having spent the night with another regiment on the other side of the river, and that he was *buried* on Feb. 23. It is thus likely enough that the accident occurred on Feb. 21. The *March 21*, in Mrs. H.'s account, cannot be correct.

Mrs. H. adds the following incident, which is perhaps worth giving in connection with the former one; but it is possible that the daughter who was in the same room with her called out in her sleep.

"My eldest daughter had come out to us to Calcutta, and she happened for the time to be sleeping in my bedroom. Early one morning, December, 1870, a few days after her arrival, I woke suddenly, hearing her, as I thought, calling out, 'Mamma, mamma,' in a very strained sort of voice, but, to my surprise, found she was sound asleep. About 24 days afterwards, we got the news that my second daughter, a girl just 14, then at Dover with a relative, had scarlet fever very badly, and in the delirium attending kept only calling out, 'Mamma, mamma.' She recovered; so this shows, as so many cases of the same kind do, that it is not only at the moment of the spirit's departure these manifestations occur; but I think they only do so in cases where either very strong attachment exists, or to people whose temperament is of the rather nervously sensitive breed, and I am so in many ways; for instance, I have the most extraordinarily keen hearing."

The narrator states that she has never experienced any hallucination of a purely subjective kind.

(488) From Mr. William Garlick, F.R.C.S., 33, Great James Street, Bloomsbury, W.C.

"Between 6 and 7 in the morning of August 29, 1832, when lying in

¹ This chapter and the next contain a good many cases where the death of the agent was by drowning. See p. 26.

bed, half asleep and half awake, I was suddenly startled by perceiving the form of my brother George, then absent from home, standing beside me. The room was quite light, and my recognition of the figure was complete and clear. He looked at me, and then seemed to fade slowly away.¹ My brother, who had a specially warm affection for me, was at that time a sailor on board the merchant ship, 'Eliza,' bound for the East Indies. I had no reason to suppose anything was wrong with him, nor was he specially in my thoughts. The vision, for I felt certain that I was awake and not dreaming, made a very strong and painful impression upon me, so much so that the family where I was staying asked the cause of my troubled looks. I told them what I had seen, and at my hostess's (afterwards my mother-in-law) request made a note of the occurrence.

"Months afterwards we received the intelligence that my brother had died at Baroda, of dysentery. The date and hour² of his death, as nearly as could be calculated, coincided exactly with that of his appearance to me at Stroud (Gloucester). I am of a calm and unimaginative temperament, and have never had any similar experience before or since. The coincidence was well-known to various members of my family, but I do not now remember that I mentioned the matter to anyone else at the time.

"WM. GARLICK."

Mrs. Garlick writes, on Nov. 18, 1884 :—

"I was present at the breakfast table on the 29th August, 1832, when my mother, Mrs. Humpage, questioned Mr. Garlick on the cause of his unusual gloom and quietness. He then told us that he had seen his brother—who was at that time at sea—in his bedroom an hour or two before. My mother answered, 'You will be sure to hear something, so note the date.'

"Some months afterwards I remember that a letter came for Mr. Garlick, forwarded from his mother, announcing the death of this brother on that day, the 29th August. I heard of this, of course, as soon as the letter was received.

"L. GARLICK."

Mr. Garlick has never had any other hallucination. In conversation, he explained to Mr. Podmore that the figure remained in his sight, apparently, for about 10 minutes; but the length of time, in such circumstances, is apt to be greatly exaggerated. He has a very vivid recollection of the features, but cannot recall the dress. He infers from this that the dress was that which his brother usually wore, as he would certainly have noticed and remembered any unusual detail in the costume. He was about 18 years old at the time. The "note" referred to was a mental note only, but he is confident of the accuracy of his memory. He showed Mr. Podmore the entry of the death, with the date, in his family Bible.

We have not been able to verify the date of death, as it has been impossible to trace the "Eliza."

(489) From Mrs. Nind, Midleton House, Westcombe Park, Blackheath.

"May 14th, 1883.

"On a Good Friday morning, many years ago, I had been awake early,

¹ See p. 97, first note.

² This word, as Mr. Garlick has subsequently explained, is a slip. The hour of death was not mentioned in the letter which conveyed the news; so that no calculation could establish a precise coincidence.

and finding it too soon to get up, was lying in bed, *not asleep*, when a figure stood by my bedside, in fact, my father-in-law, an old captain in the Royal Navy; he spoke to me a few words¹ and disappeared. I was so startled that I called my husband (since dead), who was asleep, and told him what was said. I immediately got up and told my mother and sister [since deceased], who chanced to be staying with us. Now, what makes this story seem strange was that my father-in-law had died the night before, suddenly. We did not get the news before the *afternoon* of Good Friday, as he was residing at Bridgnorth, in Shropshire, 16 miles from a railway. I saw him in the early morning, I count about 8 hours after his death. The case was no dream; and the fact of my having mentioned it before I heard of the death of my dear father-in-law made a strong impression on all the family."

Asked if this was her sole experience of a hallucination of the senses, Mrs. Nind replied in the affirmative.

We find from the Register of Deaths that Commander Philip Nind died of heart disease on March 25, 1853—which was Good Friday, not the day before it. Probably the death took place in the early morning, and the coincidence was closer than Mrs. Nind supposed.

(490) From Mr. Harold Lafone, Hanworth Park, Middlesex, a cousin of the percipient, Lady C—g, who endorses the account.

"1884.

"About the year 1849, an apparition was seen by Lady C—g, then Miss Gale, under the following circumstances:—

"She was living at the time in her father's house at Grately, in Hampshire. One night, on awaking suddenly from sleep, she saw the figure of a young man, apparently attired in his night shirt, standing at the foot of her bed. She was naturally much surprised, and inquired who he was, and what he wanted? He replied that he was the ghost of John Dowling, and Lady C—g states that, as he spoke, she distinctly saw the initials J. D. marked on the edge of his nightgown. At this distance of time she will not venture to give the exact words of the conversation between them, nor to describe the exact appearance of the figure or its manner of departure. It disappeared, however, immediately after revealing its name.

"She mentioned the circumstance to her family at breakfast the next morning, but was inclined to regard it merely as a strange and very vivid dream, until, on driving the same afternoon to the neighbouring town of Andover, she heard there for the first time that Mr. John Dowling, a young solicitor of the town, had died on the previous night, as far as she could judge about the time when the apparition was seen by herself. Lady C—g knew Mr. John Dowling by name and sight, and had recognised the likeness of the apparition to him, but she had never met or exchanged a word with him, nor had she the faintest idea that he was ill."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place some years earlier than Lady C—g supposed, on Nov. 3, 1845.

¹ The words were, "Aggy, there will be a child in the family before this day 12 months." This event actually happened, rather unexpectedly; but the idea of it may probably have been latent in the mind either of Mrs. Nind herself or of her father-in-law.

[I have seen a letter, dated Dec. 19th, 1873, from Lady C. to Mr. H. Lafone, in which she says that her husband objects to her *signing* the account. She says, "It is all true as far as I can remember at this remote period," but adds that she has a certain dread and dislike of the subject.]

(491) The following two letters were written by the late Mrs. Clarke, wife of the late Mr. Thomas Clarke, of Bishopton Close, Ripon, to her stepson, Mr. William Fowler Stephenson. He gave them to his cousin, the Rev. J. T. Fowler, of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham, who handed them on to us.

"October 17th, 1872.

"On the morning of my father's death, between 4 and 5 o'clock, I saw a sort of shadowy light at the foot of my bed, and half arose to look at it. I distinctly saw my father's face, smiling at me.¹ I drew the curtains apart, and still saw him looking fixedly at me. I awoke the girl who was sleeping with me, and asked her to draw up the window blind. I then asked her if she saw anything. She said, 'Nothing. It is too dark.' I fancy I saw the vision for fully five minutes, and then all was dark again.² The face was bound under the chin, as usual in death, and the cloth seemed stained, but not so deep as iron-mould quite. On looking at my father's corpse, after returning to Hull, I told an old friend, who was with me, that it was just so he looked at me, except that the cloth was discoloured. She at once said: 'Then he did come to you, that's certain, for the cloth was stained, and I changed it after daylight.' It was within a few minutes of his death that I saw him, and he was asking God to bless me. He was asking for me continually.

"M. C."

In reply to a request of Mr. Stephenson's for more particular information on certain points, Mrs. Clarke wrote:—

"October 19th, 1872.

"I had been in Harrogate for some weeks, and was confined to my room from a feverish cold³ which caused restless nights. It was thought necessary for one of the maids to sleep with me, so I asked her to draw up the blinds. This was a little after 4 o'clock in the morning of the 11th of November, 1846. On that same day, about 9 o'clock, by post, I received the enclosed letter, being the first intimation I had of my father's illness. He was taken ill on the Sunday; they wrote to me on the Monday, and he died on Tuesday morning. I was then 23 years of age. My sister, Christiana, and a woman-servant attended to my father. A faithful old friend, Mrs. Dible, came as soon as possible to do what was necessary on such occasions, and it was to her that I mentioned what I had seen. She explained that, in the excitement of the moment, they had used what had been the bottom of an old blind, which, as soon as it was daylight, she saw was stained, and changed it herself. I can never explain what I felt on that day, if it can be called feeling. They said I was like marble to look at, and like ice to touch."

The letter referred to by Mrs. Clarke, announcing the illness of her father, was enclosed. Two persons had written to her on the same sheet—

¹ Cf. case 315, where an appearance of bright vapour preceded the more definite impression. The expression "shadowy light" recalls the "bright shadow" of case 251.

² See p. 459, note.

³ See p. 162, first note.

Mr. Jubb, a friend of the family, and her brother, Mr. J. Rollit, a solicitor in Hull. Mr. Jubb's letter runs:—

“Hull, November 10th, 1846.

“MY DEAR MATILDA,—If you wish to see your dear father alive, you must come immediately you receive this; he is not likely to survive long. —Yours truly,

“WM. JUBB.”

We find from the *Hull Advertiser* that the death took place on Nov. 11, 1846, as Mrs. Clarke asserts. She made a mistake (of no importance) as to the days of the week. The 11th was a Wednesday, and the letter to her was written on Tuesday.

(492) From Mrs. George Grant Gordon, Milton of Kikaroch, Nairn, N.B.¹

“April 17, 1886.

“I am most happy to accede to your request, and send you an account of what I experienced at the time of my father's [Colonel Sibbald's] death. I remember it as clearly as if it happened only yesterday. It was early on the morning of the 31st May, 1857, while I was lying *perfectly* awake in bed, that I saw my father suddenly standing at the foot of my bed. I recognised him immediately from his likenesses. [He had been for years in India.] He was dressed in regimentals, stanching a wound in his breast with a pocket-handkerchief. Two other officers in regimentals were beside him, whom I did not recognise.² I did not reveal this vision, or whatever it can be called, for some time to the friends who had charge of me [Dr. and Mrs. McBeth], for fear of being laughed at [for] what they always termed my ‘fancies’; but when they did hear of it, they noted it down.

“For 3 months we received no news from India, owing to the disturbed state of the country; but when the letters did arrive, the news tallied exactly with what I had seen. It was on that very day my father had been shot twice, on his way to the parade-ground. On being missed, two officers went in search for him, and found him lying wounded.

“E. T. GORDON.”

Colonel and Brigadier Hugh Sibbald, C.B., was almost the first victim of the Indian Mutiny; and at the date of his death there had been not the slightest anxiety on his account in England. We find from *Allen's Indian Mail* that the rising at Bareilly, where he was in command, took place at 11 a.m. on May 31, 1857, and that he was shot in the chest by one of his orderlies, while riding to the parade-ground, and shortly afterwards dropped dead from his horse. Allowing for longitude, it will be seen that the coincidence was probably extremely close.

In answer to the question whether she has ever had a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion, and to other inquiries, Mrs. Gordon writes:—

“I cannot remember having actually *seen* anything else, though I have always had strange presentiments. The friends who had charge of me in those days are both dead, and they are about the only persons I

¹ This case was procured through the kindness of Mr. Andrew Lang, who gave a fairly correct, though fourth-hand, version of it in his article on “Apparitions,” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

² As to the appearance of more than one figure, see Vol. i., pp. 545-6.

can remember who could have known of the vision *before* the sad news arrived. I was perfectly clear as to the date; as the *previous* day I had been to a pic-nic; and that date they all remembered being the 30th of May [a Saturday]. It was the following morning I saw my father. The first news of the Mutiny that reached us must have been much later. I had no reason whatever to feel the *least* anxious about my father."

We have received an account which substantially agrees with the above (but omits the detail of the two other officers), from Miss Lang, of Hughenden Cottage, High Wycombe, Bucks, to whom the occurrence was described in 1868, by an aunt of Mrs. Gordon and sister of Colonel Sibbald.

We cannot assume here that the experience was in any degree a clairvoyant vision of the scene, or that the two strangers who appeared were anything more than a subjective addition of the percipient's. For there is nothing in the contemporary account to suggest that Colonel Sibbald was not riding alone; and if he dropped from his horse, as described, he must have been lying *dead*, not merely *wounded*, when others approached.

(493) From Mrs. Fitzgerald, 14, Windsor Terrace, Kingstown, Ireland.

"January 22nd, 1884.

"More than 25 years have elapsed since the memorable event occurred, which stands out as a landmark in my memory. My husband, David Fitzgerald, and myself were later than usual in retiring to rest on the night in question. After leaving my dressing-room, in getting into bed, I found my husband firm asleep, so crept in quietly. It was then near 12 o'clock. I did not sleep for some time. Between that and 3 o'clock my husband awoke me, saying, 'Sarah, stop Fred, don't let him go.' I immediately got up, went round to the door of the dressing-room to close it, as I firmly believed there was someone in the room, but found it closed. On lighting the candles, my husband was sitting up in the bed greatly disturbed, saying, 'Did you not see Fred?' In order to make light of the matter I said 'It was only a dream.' He looked at me, not as if he were convinced with what I said. Next day I drove to town, to know what time Fred last wrote to his brother, never saying a word of what had occurred the night before. Time passed; on the arrival of the news of the death of poor Fred I was so thrown off my usual discretion that I exclaimed to his brother William, 'Oh, I know when he died, for he was with his father that night.'

"S. M. FITZGERALD."

Mrs. McKern, of 53, George Street, Limerick, writes as follows:—

"January, 1884.

"About 25 years ago, David Fitzgerald, Land Agent, of Limerick (my grandfather), at that time between 65 and 70 years of age, was residing at Richmond, his private dwelling, about half-a-mile outside the city. The other occupants of the house were his second wife, Sarah Fitzgerald, and his step daughter, Mary Hunt.¹ He had, besides, many sons and

¹ Since married to a Mr. French, R.M.; but we learn from Mr. McKern that she was away at school at the time.

daughters, the youngest of the former having gone to Australia. One night (hour not known to narrator) he was awakened from sleep by the howling in front of the house of a favourite dog—spaniel or retriever—of the absent son, Frederick. (Note, in Ireland, the howling of a dog is looked upon as a sure sign of death in the immediate locality.) He awoke his sleeping partner, and said, ‘I am sure there is something wrong with Freddy; do you not hear the way the dog is howling?’ She endeavoured to soothe the old man, and went to sleep again, when she was again awoken by him in a sudden, not to say violent, manner. He was in a highly excited state, exclaiming, ‘I saw Freddy! I saw Freddy! He stood at the bottom of the bed, with the curtains drawn aside, and looked at me.’ The next morning a note was made of the occurrence, and the following mail from Australia brought news of the lad’s death, which the narrator believes to have corresponded with the father’s vision.

“S. E. MCKERN.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. McKern adds:—

“I could not possibly recollect from whom I first heard of the occurrence, as I was very young at the time; but I have often heard it spoken of by different members of the family. I do not remember having had any conversation on the subject with Mrs. Fitzgerald.”

[The incident of the dog’s howling seems not unlikely to have been imported into the story; and it will be observed that neither it, nor the dramatic repetition of the experience, occurs in the more authentic account. We do not know that the coincidence of day was anything more than a conjecture.]

(494) From Mr. H. Atkins, Office-keeper at the Royal Marine Office, 40, Spring Gardens, S.W. (originally published, with a *nom de plume*, in the *Daily Telegraph*, for October 20, 1881).

“In the year 1849, I was serving in H.M.S. ‘Geyser,’ on the east coast of Africa, and in company with H.M.S. ‘Brilliant,’ anchored in Tamatave Roads, Madagascar. The following facts I can vouch for. Some of our officers were dining on board the ‘Brilliant.’ A boat’s crew were ordered to be ready at six bells (11 p.m.) to fetch them on board. The lights were out on the lower deck, and everything quiet. A messmate (T. Parker) and I, belonging to the boat, were sitting in the mess, abreast of the cook’s galley, and opposite each other, he with his arms on the table, and face resting on them, and, as I thought, fast asleep—when all at once he jumped to his feet, declaring that he saw his mother cross the deck in front of the galley, and was very much excited. I pointed out to him that it was quite impossible, as his face was towards the table, at the same time laughing heartily at him for being so foolish. Our schoolmaster, Mr. T. Salsbury, was lying awake in his hammock close by, and in the morning he made a note of the circumstances, putting down time and date. On our arrival at the Isle of France, some time after, Parker received a letter from home, stating that his mother died that very night. I am no believer in ghosts, but think this a very remarkable coincidence.”

Mr. Atkins, from whom we first heard on February 12th, 1884, has added the following additional information:—

“It is quite possible that Parker may have raised his head from the

table, in which case he would have a clear view of the spot over which the apparition was said to walk. It was very dark, and a real person walking in the same place would have been unrecognisable.¹ There was not the slightest doubt, apparently, in Parker's mind; for he did not examine the figure, but called instantly that he saw his mother, and then commenced sobbing and crying. These sounds drew the attention of Mr. Salsbury, the schoolmaster, and caused him to note the time of the circumstance. For the three or four months that elapsed before the Isle of France was reached, Parker 'moped about,' and would not be cheered. In comparing the date of the death with that of the apparition, allowance was made for the difference in time, and the two events were found to exactly correspond by the schoolmaster."

[It would be a quite impossible task, Mr. Atkins says, to hunt up any of his old shipmates, but if he should meet with anyone who can corroborate his account, he has promised to communicate with us. The schoolmaster and Parker are dead.]

(495) From Mr. George Waddington, of 26, Bagdale, Whitby, mentioned above (p. 366).

"Passing the night at an inn in Nevada City, California, I dreamt, or awoke, by the door of room where I was sleeping being opened, and the figure of my great-aunt, Mrs. Beaumont, of Wetherby, Yorkshire, observed standing in what was her usual dress, as worn in 1842, and heard to say, 'George, George.' A note was made at the time, the date being the 28th July, 1851. She died early that morning.

"She had the night before been the subject of my thought, on travelling late in the dense darkness of the forest. "G. W. WADDINGTON."

We find the date of death confirmed by the *Leeds Mercury*.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Waddington says that he had last seen his aunt in February, 1842; and that the dress of the apparition was "out-door walking costume, the bonnet being a prominent part of it." He adds:—"The note was made on the back of a letter, and used for reference when the news arrived; but this was not kept."

The letter announcing the death is missing; but at our request Mr. Waddington applied to his mother, and she informed him that she arrived at Wetherby, in response to a summons, at 2 p.m. on July 28th, and found that Mrs. Beaumont had died at noon, which would be 4 a.m. in California. Mr. Waddington's experience took place, he tells us, "about dawn"; and the coincidence was thus probably very close, though he himself, through not allowing for longitude, had imagined that there was an interval of about 8 hours. He adds that the hallucination is unique in his experience.

[This is a case in which it seems probable that the percipient projected the image in the dress which had remained associated in his mind with the original. See Vol. I., p. 546.]

(496) From the late Mr. G. Wadsworth, Aston, Birmingham.

"October 21st, 1882.

"About 30 years since, I became acquainted with a young lady residing

¹ I have mentioned (Vol. i., p. 551) that visual phantasms of both the subjective and the telepathic class are often more clearly seen than a real figure could have been in the same circumstances. Compare case 250, and the note thereon (p. 72).

at Shrewsbury. This friendship continued for many years, although for a long time we saw each other but rarely, her health gradually failing. One morning early I was startled by hearing the stairfoot door open, and Maria called me distinctly twice, 'George, George!' So plain was this that I at once answered, 'Yes, Maria, what is it?' and went down to the sitting-room to her, only to find the whole a dream or an illusion. Next day I received a letter informing me of her death that morning.

"G. WADSWORTH."

[Mr. Wadsworth's death, which took place soon after this account was written, has prevented us from obtaining further information.]

(497) From Mrs. Fagan, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot. "1882.

"Early in the year 1857—I think in the month of April—I was awakened one morning by my sister (whom I supposed to be some hundreds of miles away) sorrowfully saying, 'Oh, Sally, Sally!' Thinking she must have arrived unexpectedly by dāk, and had met with some great trouble on her journey, I turned and spoke to her, but she was gone. Rousing my husband, I asked him to go and see what was the matter, but she was nowhere to be found. That morning, at that hour, my sister received the news of the sudden death of her eldest boy at school, and she wrote and told me that her first words were, 'Oh! Sally, Sally, wishing you were here!' I have no recollection of ever having heard the voice of any other one, not actually present—certainly never before this.

"SARAH H. FAGAN."

We find from a notice in *Allen's Indian Mail* that the death occurred on April 18, 1857. The sister's letter is unfortunately lost; and she cannot trust her memory sufficiently to corroborate the account.

The next case is an interesting example of death-imagery, occurring in what is represented as a waking experience (Vol. I., pp. 539, 547; and compare case 404).

(498) From Mrs. Chermside, Regia House, Teignmouth.

"August, 1884.

"E. B. was engaged to be married to H. A. D. He was a surgeon in the army. Want of means on both sides delayed the marriage, and he suddenly came to her one day to say 'good-bye,' as he was ordered to take troops to Canada. He sailed, and she heard of his safe arrival. He spoke of his return in the following spring. One night, being 28th December, she saw him enter her room about midnight. A light seemed to shine about him;¹ but he was clothed completely in grave clothes. She sat up in bed and said, 'Oh! H., why are you so strangely dressed?' He said, 'Do not laugh; this is my new uniform.'² He then departed as he came.

"She lay trembling all night, and weeping sadly. Next morning she refrained from telling her family, as they were opposed to her marriage; she, however, unburdened herself to me. I tried to persuade her it was only a silly dream; however, the idea that her lover was dead was most firmly fixed in her mind. A month after, she received the news of his

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 550-1.

² Compare cases 547, 568, 639, 654. The complex form of hallucination in which there is an interchange of remarks with the phantasmal figure occurs equally in purely subjective cases. See Vol. i., p. 476, and compare p. 588 below.

death on that very night, and that the last word he uttered was her name. The whole thing took such possession of her that she slowly faded away, and died about two years afterwards."

The following addition is from the notes taken by Professor Sidgwick during two interviews with Mrs. Chermiside in September, 1884 :—

The occurrence was in the winter of 1845. It was on the next morning that E. B. told Mrs. Chermiside of the appearance. She (E. B.) was quite sure that it was not a dream ; and had no doubt that her *fiancé* was dead. She heard the details of his death within a month or so—as soon as letters then came from Canada—from one of his brother officers, and also from his sisters ; and then wrote to tell Mrs. Chermiside that he had died the night that she saw the apparition.

[We have exhausted every means open to us to discover an official or newspaper record of the death in this case. We do not know how to explain this failure ; as Mrs. Chermiside is certain that she has given us Mr. D.'s name correctly, and she can hardly have been mistaken as to his profession. Possibly he had not an official connection with the army.]

§ 2. The next group of cases are more recent ; but some of them lack corroboration ; and some are weakened, as evidence for telepathy, by the fact that the percipient was in more or less anxiety as to the condition of the absent person, or by an absence of definiteness in the coincidence.

(499) From the Rev. W. B. Lindesay, LL.D., The Abbey, Tipperary.

" August 30th, 1884.

" In 1877 I was living in Dublin, and very anxious about my father, who was dangerously ill with congested lungs, in Wales.

" Awaking suddenly one night I distinctly saw him sitting on a chair near me, with his face covered by his hands. When I jumped out of bed he vanished. So startled was I that, next day, I crossed to Wales, and found that he had been delirious for two days.

" When I entered his room he at once said he had gone the day before to tell me where he had left a top-coat that I knew he had lost some time previous to his illness. I went to the house he named in Dublin, and found the coat there.

" W. B. LINDESAY."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Lindesay says :—

" So far as I can remember, my father was still delirious at the time he said he had gone to see me.

" I told no one of the experience at the time, for I was living by myself. I have never, that I can recollect, had any other experience of the kind, and am not subject to any 'hallucination of the senses.'

" I am bound in fairness to tell you that I am an entire disbeliever in the supernaturalness of such experiences. This infidelity may be due to my never having heard of any such experiences which could not be explained on the coincidence principle."

[Mr. Lindesay is of course right in his disbelief of the "supernaturalness" of such phenomena ; but it has not struck him that the

alternative to supposing them *supernatural* is not necessarily to suppose them *accidental*. His concluding comment reproduces the remarks of Lord Brougham, as to which see Vol. I., pp. 396-7. I need hardly point out again that every isolated case of coincidence might be accidental, and that the argument for telepathy is essentially cumulative. This case may perhaps have been *reciprocal*; but we clearly have no proof that the father's experience was anything more than a purely subjective impression or dream.]

(500) From a lady occupying a responsible position, which obliges her, out of regard to others, to withhold her name from publication. Her *vivâ voce* account, given to me in the room where the experience occurred, made it almost certain that she was in a state of normal wakefulness at the time; still, as she had been in bed for some little time, I have placed the case in this chapter rather than the next. 'May 2nd, 1886.

"On the night of the 18th December, 1872, I had retired to bed about 11 o'clock. The bed, I may mention, is so placed that any person entering the room, must pass quite round it before reaching the side on which I lay. I had perhaps been in bed 20 minutes, and had been thinking over the events of the evening, a pupils' concert, when suddenly I saw my husband by the door; he moved swiftly round the bed till he came close to me, when he as suddenly disappeared. So astonished was I, that involuntarily I called him by name. The gas was alight, as usual, in the room; and as I knew that I had not been asleep, and had not heard a sound to alarm me, I had not a doubt, any more than I have at this moment, that the vision was that of my absent husband. On the 30th December of the same year, I received a letter by the Australian mail, from a gentleman, telling me that my husband had met with a serious accident, and on the 4th of March in the following year, I had a letter from the same friend, informing me of his death, and stating that it took place on the 18th December, 1872.

"I had spoken of the incident of the night of the 18th to my children as a dream, but to two ladies I related the fact as it occurred; it was then a week afterwards,¹ and when they knew that my husband was dead, each lady, though neither knew the other, reminded me of the incident, and told me the relation of it had strangely impressed her."

We have confirmed the date of death in the obituary of the *Daily Telegraph*.

In conversation, the narrator informed me that she has never had any other visual hallucination. She described her experience to her children, at breakfast next morning, as a dream, in order not to alarm them. She herself felt no alarm or apprehension whatever. Of the two friends whom she mentions, one has recently died, and she has lost sight of the other. Her husband had been an invalid for years, and as far as she knew was as well as usual.

The narrator's daughter writes, on May 13, 1886:—

"I have searched everywhere I can think of, but without success, in finding the programme of the Pupils' Concert; but my sister and self both agreed as to being *sure* the day was Dec. 18, 1872, and we believe it fell on a Wednesday. [Dec. 18 was a Wednesday.] We also remember perfectly

¹ This refers to the mention of the matter to the *second* friend; to the other the experience was described (the narrator informs me) on the day following its occurrence.

our mother relating the next day what she called a strange dream she had had the night previously ; and have frequently since heard her speak of the same as a vision."

[The Australian letter, which the narrator has preserved, states that the hour of the death was about 4.30 p.m., which would correspond with about 6.30 a.m. in England. If, therefore, the vision occurred on the night of that day, it followed the death by more than 12 hours. But the narrator (without my having suggested this point) wrote, on May 14, 1886, to say that a daughter, who slept with her on the night of the vision, reminds her that on concert nights they always sat up late, and that probably they did not go upstairs till nearly 2. Now this fact would very probably be in the percipient's memory at the time that the news of the death arrived, and its connection with the vision was surmised ; and as she is very positive that the *dates* coincided, it seems at any rate possible that the concert was, after all, on the 17th, and that her vision took place at 2.30 a.m. on the 18th. As against this hypothesis, however, I should mention a recollection which she has that, when talking over the matter with one of the friends mentioned, she remarked on an apparent discrepancy of hours, and the friend (she believes) pointed out that, longitude being allowed for, the hours agreed ; which is just what would seem to be the case if the vision was at 2.30 a.m. on the 19th, and the 10 hours' difference of time was reckoned (as so often happens) *the wrong way*. It is worth noting that even supposing our arbitrary 12 hours' limit to have been exceeded, the vision still fell at what was probably the first season of silence and *recueillement* that had presented itself since the hour when the death occurred. See Vol. I., pp. 201, 329.]

(501) From the Rev. H. N. B. and his sister-in-law, Miss Fagg. The percipient, Mrs. B., is out of health, and must not be troubled for an account. The following is a letter from Mr. B. to his daughter :—

"December 5th, 1883.

"I was at Langtoft, but E. (*i.e.*, Mrs. B.) and Miss Fagg had returned with Ernie to Deal, as he was ordered to go to the sea. There were two rooms at Deal intercommunicating, the inner being only approached through the first room. In the inner room the nurse (Alice) and the baby were sleeping ; in the outer one, E.; Miss Fagg was sleeping downstairs. The bed was curtained. In the night E. was awake by, as she thought, the nurse standing by her bed. Half asleep, without moving, she said, 'What is it, Alice ?' but there was no answer. She said again, 'What is it ? is there anything the matter with baby ?' Still there was no answer. She then roused herself, and saying sharply, 'Why do you not speak, Alice ?' she put back the curtain, and saw your aunt standing there. She was so terrified that she jumped out of bed and ran straight down, as she was, to Nelly [Miss Fagg]. The next day I, at Langtoft, had a letter saying your aunt had died very unexpectedly, at Broxbourne. We did not know she was seriously ill, as she had gone to Broxbourne on a visit. I could not identify the time ; but, as far as I could make out, the (supposed) appearance took place some hours after your aunt's death."

Miss Fagg writes, from Ripple Rectory, Deal, on Aug. 28, 1884 :—

"One night, about 2 o'clock, I believe, my sister, Mrs. B., came into my room saying she had seen Miss Grace B., and she was sure something

had happened. She told me she saw someone in her room, and thought it was the nurse come about the baby. The figure was turned towards the window where the food was kept; and had on a grey waterproof like the nurse. My sister spoke to the figure, and said, 'Why are you getting the food so soon?' My sister was not then frightened, as she quite thought it was the nurse. But the figure then turned round, and it was the face of Miss Grace B., looking full at my sister, but a dead face, with a something white round the head, but curls just like Miss Grace B. used to wear. My sister after that came down to me, and I went into her room, but nothing more was seen. After that we heard that Miss Grace B. was dead.

"ELLEN E. FAGG."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Fagg adds:—

"The date of Miss Grace B.'s death was August 3rd, 1868; the time, I think, between 5 to 6 o'clock in the afternoon. I *fancy* she must have, as it seemed, appeared to my sister the same night after she was dead. We knew Miss Grace B. was ailing; she was, in fact, on a visit at the time of her death; but there was *no* thought of her dying. My sister had had *no* communication with her previously. I am nearly sure that Miss B. must have appeared to my sister the same night that she died.

"My sister *always* has seemed to know things different to other people. She seems to know when any one has died in any room. She seems either to feel, hear, or see the people. On one occasion we lived in an old house in Eastry, near here, and she saw, as it seemed, an old woman looking at her. The next morning when she described it to our cook who had been taking care of the house before we went into it, she said, 'Yes, that old woman once lived here.'" [This, of course, may have been a purely subjective hallucination.]

P.S. by the Rev. H. N. B.—"There is no doubt that the appearance (so-called) took place on the night of the day on the afternoon of which Miss G. B. died."

We have confirmed the date of the death by the Register of Deaths.

[This is apparently a case of delayed recognition, similar to those given in Chap. XII., § 3.]

The next account belongs to the interesting class which suggests a peculiar susceptibility in certain persons to spontaneous telepathic impressions. (See p. 77, and cases 513, 514, 515, below.) One of the three experiences recorded was a dream, but I give it here in order not to break up the series.

(502) From Mrs. W., who prefers that her name should not be published.

"Oxford, 1884.

(A) "In 1874 I was in England, ill in bed; and I distinctly saw my dear mother, who was at that time at Nice, come up to the foot of my bed, and look earnestly and sorrowfully at me; it was broad daylight, and I noticed the shawl she wore, one I had not seen her wear for many years.¹ I started up, and she was gone.² I then knew that her last illness must have come, though I was kept in ignorance of it, as I was so dangerously

¹ See Vol. i., p. 540.

² See p. 91, second note.

ill myself. I wrote to her, and her answer told me what I dreaded was true. I was allowed to recover sufficiently to go out to Nice, and be with her to the end. Also, I ought to say, that the morning her dear image appeared to me, a doctor arrived from London whom she had sent to me by telegraphing to him from Nice, and this doctor was the means of saving my life, as I was at that time so ill that he said I could not have lived more than four hours longer.

(B) "When I was in the South of France, in 1878, I had a dream that a sister, who is especially dear to me, was in a carriage accident, and in my dream I saw her killed, but on reaching her I found her unhurt and as she smiled at me I dreamed I was dying of the agony of mind I had gone through. I never can forget the dream, the suffering was so intense. I awoke with pain in my heart and faintness, and woke my husband and told him. (I think my cries in my sleep awoke him.) I wrote to my sister, and when her answer arrived she gave me in it the account of the danger she had passed through.

(C) "One night I was awakened out of my sound sleep by a voice close to my ear, saying, 'Rise, you have no time to lose,' and words to the effect that the child¹ of this very dear sister was dying, and that she needed my prayers. I cannot remember the exact words, but I felt it was conveyed to me that I had to help her with all the earnestness I could, and there was an awe about it I cannot describe. Afterwards I found that at this very time on that night her most beloved child had passed through the crisis in diphtheria.

"Nothing of importance ever happened to any one very dear to me without my feeling it, though I may be far from them. "C. M. W."

Replying to our inquiries, Mrs. W.'s daughter, Miss E. M. W., writes (on Jan. 23, 1885), in reference to (A), that her mother "does not know anything about the shawl forming part of my grandmother's dress at the time she saw the apparition." She has had no other hallucinations; and she had no reason to suspect her mother's illness. Miss W.'s own testimony is as follows:—

"I clearly remember, in 1874, my mother in her dangerous illness seeing my dear grandmother come up to the foot of the bed. My mother has often told me since that her mother was wearing a certain crimson shawl she was very fond of, that her spectacles had dropped, and she looked over them at my mother, with sad inquiring eyes. My mother gazed at her for a minute, and then cried out when the apparition vanished; and when the nurse came in, having heard her cry, my mother insisted on being told the truth about her mother; for she said she knew that she had come to tell her she was dying, which was indeed the fact, though she lived long enough to enable my mother to see her before she died."

In reference to (B) and (C), Mrs. W.'s sister writes:—

"On one occasion I received an anxious letter from my sister inquiring if anything had happened to me, as she had dreamed of a serious carriage-accident in which I was in danger. This letter was received by me before I had informed her of the danger in which I had been placed,

¹ This slightly differs from the version given at the top of the next page, where there is no mention of the *special person* who was in need.

and the serious consequences which mercifully were averted by the presence of mind of my coachman.

“On another occasion my sister was awakened by a voice which said distinctly, ‘Rise at once. You have no time to lose. One you love is in sore need.’ She did rise from her bed to pray for me, and afterwards knew that my child had passed through the crisis of diphtheria at that very time, and that her life was in imminent danger. “BESSIE S.”

Miss E. M. W. writes :—

“I perfectly remember both these dreams of my mother’s, as she related them to me before receiving the answers to her letters to my aunt.”

In answer to inquiries, she adds :—

“January 23rd, 1885.

“Mother is not in the habit of dreaming of accidents, and as far as she can remember it was the only time she has ever dreamt of an accident. The carriage did not upset. The facts are as follows :—My aunt has a very light cab built by my uncle especially for her, and on one occasion my aunt was driving along a narrow road, when her coachman whipped up the horses, and began driving at a furious pace. My aunt, alarmed, looked through the little window at the back of the carriage, and saw a great dray with a runaway horse tearing after the carriage. Just as it must have run into it and smashed it, the coachman turned the cab into an opening in the road. It was the only place in the road where the cab *could* have stopped, and it was the coachman’s only hope to reach it, and the dray rushed by, leaving the cab unharmed. It did a great deal of damage, and the driver was killed. You see mother did not dream exactly the facts of the case, but only that my aunt was nearly killed by a carriage accident.

“As to the ‘other intimations of danger,’ &c., they are this, that whenever anything happens to those dear to her she always knows there is *something* happening. For instance, I was laid up with a very bad cough and cold when away from her last year, and she wrote me an anxious letter, saying, she knew I was ill, for she had an idea I had inflammation of the lungs. Last month I was suffering dreadfully from toothache, and determined I would go and have two teeth out without saying anything to mother, for fear of worrying her ; she thought I was going for a walk, but all the time I was gone she was so unhappy about me, and S. told me when I had come back that mother had cried and been wretched all the time. You see the things are not big enough to attract much attention, but we in the house know them to be true.”

[It is not quite clear how far the vision (A) coincided with a sudden and marked change in the state of the agent. Also it is possible that the doctor’s visit, or the expectation of it, may have called up her mother’s image to Mrs. W.’s mind, and that her illness may have rendered her specially liable to hallucination. It would remain noteworthy (unless there was special reason to fear the attack of fatal illness) that the apparition produced a true conviction in Mrs. W.’s mind as to what was occurring to her mother.

As to (B), we have no evidence that the dream took place on the night of the day on which the accident occurred ; but to anyone who accepts the general fact of telepathic communication, it will at

least seem reasonable to surmise that the coincidence was not a merely accidental one. The impression of the child's illness (C) is, however, more important, both because it was more than a dream, and because the time-coincidence seems in this case to have been ascertained to be exact.

With regard to the less definite impressions it would be difficult to assign them an evidential value without constant and careful notes, because of the double indefiniteness—the difficulty (1) of deciding what events are of sufficient importance to afford a *prima facie* presumption that the coincident experiences are telepathically connected with them, and (2) of distinguishing clearly a peculiar feeling that something is happening from vague anxiety about absent friends.¹ If persons who show signs of this susceptibility would continuously, for some little time make a note in writing, with as much detail as possible, whenever a feeling of this kind occurred, and afterwards record the confirmation or absence of confirmation, interesting light might be thrown on the subject.]

(503) Obtained through the kindness of Miss C. D. Garnett, of Furze Hill Lodge, Brighton, from a cousin, Mrs. D., who prefers that her own name should not be printed. Miss Garnett says:—

"I may safely say she never before or since had such a vision. She is thoroughly practical and unimaginative, not in the least excitable, and I remember well how puzzled she was for a long time after. When she came to me some time after, she was full of it, and described it to me most graphically. She is almost like a sister to us, and I think discussed this affair more with us than with her own people. Her sister thought she was dreaming, but her father was rather astonished when she told him of the vision the next morning."

"September 15th, 1885.

"Some few years ago the occurrence took place which I am about to relate. I was lying awake one night, my thoughts fixed on no particular subject, when before me seemed to rise the vision of the interior of a cathedral; the details which marked it from an ordinary church being clearly defined. In the open space before the chancel lay a coffin enveloped in its heavy black pall. After a few moments (as it seemed to me) it faded gradually away.² I sat up and roused myself, as the whole scene was so real and strange, and I was convinced I had not been asleep. I had not lain down long before the same scene again repeated itself upon my brain, in every detail exactly as I had seen it before.³ The repetition of the vision (for such I firmly believed it was) filled me with presentiments of trouble, and rousing my sister, who was sleeping in the same room, I told her what I had seen; but as was natural, she concluded I had been dreaming. Next morning at breakfast I related what had occurred, and it was remarked that we knew no one in England whose funeral service would be likely to take place in a cathedral. Shortly after, we received news by telegram of the sudden death of my brother in the West Indies, and the day coincided with that on which I had seen the vision as related. When the letters

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 270, 505; and above, pp. 26-7.

² See p. 97, first note.

³ See p. 237, note.

containing all details arrived, we learnt that he was buried the same day that he died, in the evening, the funeral service taking place in the Colonial Cathedral. Allowing for the difference in time, it appears to have been as near as possible the same time as I in England saw the whole scene represented, the remembrance of which has remained indelibly printed on my memory. "J. D."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. D. says :—

"The date of my brother's death was February 21st, and as far as I can remember I had the dream that evening, but it is so long since that as regards dates I do not like to be too certain. As regards the length of time between the death and funeral, it was, I believe, only a few hours, certainly less than 12. The news of his death reached us by telegram on February 28th, about a week later. I have never had anything in the way of a vision either before or since. I enclose the few lines from my sister on the subject, after having told her that I had written you an account." The sister's words are :—

"I corroborate the statement of my sister's dream of February, 1879, which she narrated to me the morning after it occurred. "S. G."

We find from the *Times* obituary that the death took place at George Town, Demerara, on February 21st, 1879.

[Without more details as to the supposed resemblance between the place seen in the vision and the real place of the funeral, no stress ought, I think, to be laid on this point ; which is one, it will be seen, that telepathy could not satisfactorily account for.]

(504) Received on Oct. 28, 1884, from a gentleman occupying a high public position, who does not wish to give his name or to procure other attestations. He writes, it will be seen, in the third person. French is not his native language.

The account begins with an experience which M. — had during his father's last illness, while taking a brief sleep, after long nursing.

"Pendant le plus fort de son sommeil, M. — se sentit comme très fortement secoué et appelé par son nom. Il se réveilla en sursaut, tout effrayé, sauta de son lit, se dirigeant vers la porte, ayant devant lui comme une ombre, qui disparu dès qu'il fut dans l'entrée. Il traversa le grand salon, et tout l'appartement attenant. Arrivé à la chambre de son père, il trouva la garde-malade debout sur le seuil de la porte, lui barrant le passage. Son père venait d'expirer au moment même.

"L'impression de ce réveil est resté tellement vive dans l'esprit de M. — qu'il n'en a jamais parlé sans ajouter, 'Ce n'était certainement pas la réalité, mais pour sûr c'était plus qu'un rêve.'"

This case alone could not have found a place in our evidence, as M. — was aware of his father's critical condition, and was in a highly anxious and overstrained state. But he continues :—

"Quatre ans plus tard, en l'année 1849, M. — habitait Constantinople ; il était proscrit et l'entrée de son pays lui était interdite. Sa mère, qui était à Bucarest, s'était décidée d'aller s'établir auprès de lui ; elle n'attendait plus que l'ouverture de la navigation du Danube, qui a lieu généralement vers le mois de Mars. Elle avait déjà annoncé à son fils le

nom du bateau de la Compagnie du Loyd Autrichien ser lequel elle devait s'embarquer à Galatz, et le 8 Avril elle devait arriver à Constantinople. Ces bateaux arrivaient toujours dans la Corne-d'or les mardis, vers les six heures du matin.

"Le 7 Avril M. — passa la soirée avec deux de ses amis et parents, et l'on décida que le lendemain les deux amis viendraient le chercher pour aller tous les trois recevoir la dame à bord. Les deux amis arrivèrent le matin à l'heure convenue chez M. —. Grand fut leur étonnement lorsque celui-ci leur dit qu'il était inutile d'aller au bateau, parceque sa mère venait de mourir. Ses amis crurent d'abord qu'il avait reçu des nouvelles, mais ayant réfléchi qu'il n'y avait pas pu avoir eu des lettres depuis une semaine, car il n'y avait eu depuis aucun arrivage—à cette époque le télégraphe était chose complètement inconnue dans ces parages—ils furent inquiets sur l'état de l'esprit de leur ami, qui persistait à leur dire avec la plus grande assurance que sa mère était morte dans la nuit même. M. — venait d'avoir, après s'être endormi, le meme réveil, précisément avec les mêmes circonstances, que dans la nuit du 26 au 27 Novembre, 1844, lors de la mort de son père.

"Le bateau suivant, arrivé le 15 Avril, apportait des lettres annonçant que la mère de M. — avait succombé dans la nuit du 7 au 8 Avril à la suite d'un accès de fièvre bilieuse, après une courte maladie de deux jours."

The narrator stated in conversation that he had never had any subjective experience of the sort.

[The particular form of the second experience may perhaps have been due to the effect of the former one on M. —'s mind.]

(505) From Miss Henrietta Wilkinson, Enniscorthy, Ireland.

"January, 1884.

"I live in Ireland, my nephew in London. At the end of October or beginning of November, 1881, when he was 8 years old, he went one day with his mother and sister to Kensington Gardens. While playing there he had a severe fall on his back; his mother had to call a cab and take him home, then send for the doctor. He was very ill for three or four days, lying in a dark room and kept perfectly quiet. The accident happened on a Saturday, I think. On the Sunday his mother wrote to tell me of it, which letter I received on Tuesday. On the Monday night I was in bed, dropping off to sleep, when I opened my eyes with a start, and saw, quite distinctly, a London street, leading from Kensington Gardens to my nephew's home. All the people, cabs, and horses were running very fast in one direction, towards my sister's house. Amongst them were my sister and her two children, also running. They stopped a cab, got in, and arrived at their own house. I saw no more but exclaimed 'Maurice is hurt!' why, I do not know, as my nephew looked all right in the street. It all seemed to come from outside myself. I thought it very strange, and told it to my family next morning, before my sister's letter arrived. I am not perfectly sure of the day of the week, but know it was the day after the accident my sister wrote, and that it was the night of the day after she wrote that I saw what I tell you.

"I think it was my nephew's thoughts of me that gave me the vision, I being the person he would think of, next to his father and mother.

"HENRIETTA WILKINSON."

Asked whether she had ever, on any other occasion, had a dream of death or accident which had impressed her, she says :—" No, I remember none. It was quite unique. But why call it a dream when I was wide awake ? Had it been a dream I don't think it would have made the same impression on me."

Miss Wilkinson's sister writes on Jan. 8, 1884, from Castle Hill, Enniscorthy :—

" I distinctly remember my sister relating to us (myself and another sister) her vision or dream *before* she got any letter. It made a great impression on her, and she told us with surprise and a little alarm. She told us on Tuesday morning, and the letter telling of the accident arrived soon after.

" MARTHA WILKINSON."

The interval between the accident and Miss Wilkinson's experience is too long for the case to be treated as one of deferred development (see Vol. I., p. 511); but the vision, which seems clearly to have been of a very unusual kind, may conceivably have been due to a half delirious recrudescence of the agitated scene in the mind of the little invalid. The confused and inaccurate character of the vision might be sufficiently accounted for in this way; but might also be construed as the transforming and dream-like investiture which telepathic percipients have so often seemed to supply.

The next case is a singular one, as, supposing it to have been telepathic, there was no personal bond between the agent and percipient. In this respect it recalls cases 459 and 490; but in the present case there was *local* proximity between the parties.

(506) From a lady whose family object to the publication of her name.

" May 24th, 1884.

" Somewhere about three years ago, to the best of my remembrance, I was suddenly awoke in the night by hearing what seemed to me a voice saying, ' You had better get up, someone is dying.' I went to my father's door, but finding all right, returned to bed, but could not sleep again all the rest of the night. The next day one of my servants told me the gentleman next door had died in the night. I was not aware he was likely to die, indeed I knew nothing of him, and he never entered my thoughts. He had been delicate or an invalid ever since we had lived here. I did not mention this dream at the time, not supposing it would interest my father. I have always been a great dreamer."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on March 19th, 1881, at the house next Miss L.'s.

In answer to inquiries, Miss L. writes on June 28, 1884 :—

" I have heard, or seem to have heard, voices at other times, both by day and night, and I think they have invariably had some meaning, except in cases where I have accounted for them in consequence of my suffering from overstrained nerves or illness. I do not remember ever being *awoke* by a voice in this way at any other time, though I have some-

times awoke suddenly thinking someone called me by name. This is the only case I have experienced of being awakened by a *remark*."

[In an interview with Miss L., Mr. Podmore learnt that she had fixed the time of her impression by hearing the clock strike 3 soon afterwards. The servant, from whom Miss L. heard of the death next morning, thinks she was told by a servant next door that it took place at 4 a.m., and is certain it was "in the morning." After hearing of the death, Miss L. wrote and told her sister of her experience; the sister confirmed this. The wall between the two houses is too thick to permit the sound of conversation to pass.]

(507) From Mr. Francis A. Suttaby, 2, Amen Corner, E.C., and 48, Redcliffe Square, S.W.

"March 3rd, 1884.

"*En route* home, in July last, when about in mid-Atlantic, on a certain evening I retired in due course to rest, and in my sleep was suddenly disturbed by a voice (impetuous) calling aloud, 'Frank! Frank!' (I was alone, as I had a berth entirely to myself.) So suddenly did I spring up out of my heavy sleep, that I nearly knocked my head against the berth that was over mine. I replied, 'Yes, yes, what?' No answer coming, I spoke again, hastily, 'I am here—what's the matter?—who called?' No answer being vouchsafed, and supposing there was some mistake on my part, as poor little disturbed Samuel might have done, I addressed myself aloud, 'Francis Arthur, go to sleep—some mistake.' Of course, the next morning, at the breakfast table—the captain had invited me to his table—I made much amusement for him and the ladies and a certain Major Jones, of Kingston, Ontario. I must admit Major Jones seemed more concerned than I allowed myself to be. In fact, I tried to put away the thought, and made light of it. Within an hour of my reaching my dear old uncle's house at Putney (my wife and family being then in France), my aunt informed me of the sudden death of my cousin Nora [Mrs. R.], which was most touching to me; and when I ascertained the day the poor soul died, 'Why,' I said, 'that's the very morning I was disturbed in my sleep,' telling her what I have already described to you. Subsequently, I gathered the hour my cousin died, and that the strange cry of 'Frank, Frank,' as for help, which startled me out of my sleep, was at the very hour when Nora was really, but apparently unconsciously, passing from this lower world; for the difference in time between here and where I was would bring the hour of her flight and evident call to one and the same.

"Perhaps the most extraordinary feature connected with the voice is, that not till I saw her brother Ernest, in Torquay, did anyone think to ask me, as *he did*, 'But whose voice do you suppose it was?' Immediately it dawned on me, 'Why, your sister's—Nora's, without a doubt.' Then he asked, *Why* I thought it was her voice? 'Because I can now distinguish it as her voice. It was hastily spoken, impetuous, as you know she could be.'

"FRAS. A. SUTTABY."

Mr. Suttaby fixed the date of the voice by its occurring in the night (or very early morning), after the *only storm* which they had on the voyage, this storm being noted in his diary. He kindly sent us an extract from the diary, which showed that the weather from July 4, when the "Bothnia" left New York, to July 8 was fine. The extracts for the next 3 days are as follow :—

"9th.—Fine, but rough. Ended with a storm, and retired early, whilst I could stand.

"10th.—Fine and bright all day, but very stormy. Remained in bed *all* day.

"11th.—In my seat at breakfast. Pleasant day, and played 'shuffles.'"

Mr. Suttaby continues :—

"The memorial-card of my cousin states that she died suddenly July 10th. I cannot *now* be certain as to when I heard my name called—whether on morning of 10th or 11th. All I know is that when informed of the death of my cousin, *each day then* being fresh in my memory, I fixed it as an *unquestionable* fact, not supposing I should ever be questioned again as to details, and having no reasons, no motives whatsoever, for fixing the cry of 'Frank, Frank' to the day of my cousin's death.

"What I stated did occur, and no one's voice but that of Nora resembled the twice-repeated impetuous cry."

We find from the obituary of the *Scotsman* that Mrs. R. died suddenly on July 10, 1883. She had no relatives with her when she died. In conversation with the present writer, Mr. Suttaby mentioned that he was the person who, from circumstances, had had most to do with her and her affairs of late years, and he thus regards it as natural that her thoughts should have turned specially to him. Her death was very sudden.

Mr. Suttaby tells us that he has on one other occasion experienced a hallucination, which again consisted in hearing his name called ; but as this took place at a large railway station, it was possibly a real call. With regard to the present case he says :—

"I do not admit what I heard was hallucination. I was fast asleep in my bed, and I was suddenly awaked ; I sat up quickly, and said, ' Yes, yes ! I am here. What ?— Who called ? '—or words to that effect. I never lost the firm conviction that I was really called—that a real voice, as if needing my protection and assistance, called to me."

We have ascertained from Capt. McKay that he does not (in April, 1886) recall Mr. Suttaby's mention of the incident. Major Jones writes, on April 6, 1886, from the Army and Navy Club, S.W. :—

"I cannot tell you more than the fact that one day Mr. Suttaby stated he had awoke in the night hearing a child call, and that he thought it must be a niece (I think) who had died." This last detail cannot weigh against Mr. Suttaby's distinct recollection that the voice at the time was not distinctly associated with his cousin.

[Whether the experience was on the 10th or 11th, it is possible, though not certain, that it fell within 12 hours of the death.]

(508) From Mrs. Hancock, Penarth Lodge, Stoke Bishop, Bristol, a member of the Society of Friends.

" April 14th, 1884.

" In my Northern-Irish home, I received a letter on the 7th November, 1865, from my brother in Warwickshire, saying that my mother was ill, and he wished I would go and see her. I started the same evening by Belfast and Fleetwood. I had been several hours in my berth, on the Irish Channel, and was half asleep, when I was startled by feeling a hand grasp my shoulder and a voice say, in a loud whisper, ' Come quickly.' I

rose up and sat looking round the cabin, but could see no one. I called to the stewardess, but she was fast asleep, and so were all the other ladies. I again lay down, but not to sleep, and in a very short time, not 20 minutes afterwards, the same pressure was put on my shoulder and the same words were distinctly uttered close to my ear, 'Come quickly.'¹ I again called loudly to the stewardess and told her to light the lamp, for I was sure some one must have been standing by me. She declared that no one had been in the cabin, and all around was so still and quiet. I reached the station at half-past 12 at noon, when my brother met me. He said, 'All is over, my mother passed away at 4 this morning.'

"I ought to have stated that when I called to the stewardess and made her light the lamp, immediately after I heard the voice and felt the hand on my shoulder the second time, I then asked her to tell me what o'clock it was, and she said, 'Four o'clock.' I looked at my own watch and it was the same. I being an only daughter and my mother having been a widow the last five years of her life, she was much wrapped up in me and in my children, and the tie between us was of no ordinary kind. I have always looked upon this as a direct voice from herself, just as she was dying and passing into the spiritual world.

"LUCY HANCOCK."

We find from the *Coventry Herald* that the death took place on Nov. 9, 1865. Mrs. Hancock can hardly be mistaken as to having heard the news from her brother on her arrival, *i.e.*, on the day following that on which she started. We may conclude therefore that the 7th in the first line of her account is a mistake for 8th.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Hancock adds:—

"In reply to your question, whether I have at any other time, besides the one described, 'had an experience of the kind, *i.e.*, fancied I heard or felt a human presence when no one was present,' I have to say that I never did.

"My brother has just been here, and says he recollects saying to me 'all was over at 4 o'clock this morning,' on the day he met me at the station, November 9th, 1865; but he does not recollect the particulars of what happened to me on board the steamer. He has at any rate a very bad memory, whereas I have the reputation of having an unusually good one; and to my mind that pressure on my arm, twice, and the words 'Come quickly' are as vivid now as if all had happened last week, instead of 19 years ago."

[The weak point in this case is of course the state of anxiety which preceded the experience; the strong point, if correctly remembered, is the exactitude of the coincidence. Mrs. Hancock had no previous belief in anything like telepathy, and takes no special interest in the subject.]

(509) From Mrs. Sprague, Sunnyside, 275, Coldharbour Lane, Brixton, S.W., who says that "the particulars are plain unvarnished truth."

"Aug. 25th, 1886.

[The narrator's mother, Mrs. Green, to whom she was deeply attached, had promised that, if she died when they were apart, she would let her daughter "know that she was quitting this world."² Soon after Mrs.

¹ As to repetition after a short interval, see p. 105, first note.

² See p. 66, note.

Sprague's marriage, her mother went to keep house for a son, at Major's Creek, Braidwood, N.S. Wales, and the two had not met for 12 years. In the summer of 1868, Mrs. Sprague, who had been in New Zealand, was on her way to pay her mother a visit.] "She was expecting me; and the last letter was cheerful and happy, intensely expectant of my visit; also she was, she said, quite well.

"On Sunday night, the 14th of June, 1868, I retired to bed about 11.30, and slept soundly until 3 o'clock, when I suddenly woke hearing my mother's voice. She stood at the foot of my bed. She said, '*Oh, come! I want you!*' The moon was at the full; and the room as light as day. I threw myself out of bed instantly. *She was gone.* I then realised how far away she was: and a strange supernatural feeling, a feeling impossible to describe, took possession of me: like lightning the compact made in England many years before returned to my mind, and I knew with certainty that she was dying. I looked at my watch; it was 3 o'clock. I lay awake till the morning dawned, and at 12 o'clock that day I had a telegram from my brother, asking me to come on quickly as she had had a fit [late on the Saturday night] and *could not live.* This was Monday. I could not leave Melbourne till the following Thursday, there being only steamers twice a week, so on the Wednesday [corrected in conversation to Thursday] I received another telegram saying she was dead. Her body was kept for 10 days that I might attend the funeral, which I did, travelling post all the time.

"On questioning the nurse who attended her, she said, 'Your mother ceased to breathe on Wednesday, June 17th, but the last sign of life she gave was on the Sunday night, or morning, when at about 3 o'clock, appearing still insensible, she rose up and attempted to stand, but fell heavily forward. With assistance I replaced her in the bed, and she remained motionless till she ceased to breathe.' This was the exact moment that her spirit appeared and called me."¹

In conversation, Mrs. Sprague stated that not only her child, but also her landlady, Mrs. Bellman, was sleeping with her on the night of the vision. We are endeavouring to trace Mrs. Bellman. The brother and the nurse are dead. Miss Alice Sprague stated independently that she distinctly remembers being woke by her mother's exclamation; and she also remembers Mrs. Bellman's remonstrating with Mrs. Sprague for disturbing her; but Miss Sprague has no recollection of being told at the time what her mother had seen.

Mrs. Sprague has had only one other hallucination in her life, which followed the above by nearly 7 years: it was again of the "borderland" type, and represented her deceased mother.

[The fact that the percipient's mind had no doubt been considerably occupied with the thought of her approaching meeting with her mother, somewhat weakens the case; but I know of no other instance where the idea of a happy meeting has originated so abnormal an experience.]

§3. The next little group are first-hand cases which have already been published.

(510) From the *Memoir of the Hon. and Rev. Power-le-Poer Trench, last Archbishop of Tuam* (1845), by the Rev. J. D'Arcy Sirr, D.D.,

¹ See p. 48, note.

pp. 762-3. The account is part of a letter written by the Rev. Samuel Medicott, from Pau. Our attention was called to it by the Rev. Canon Eyre, of Bray, a very intimate friend of Mr. Medicott, who adds that Mr. Medicott had been enabled to go to Pau for his health through the kindness of the Archbishop of Tuam.

"An interesting circumstance connected with the death of the dear servant of God, our late venerated and truly beloved Archbishop, I will simply relate as follows. I was at my brother's house in Wiltshire, whither I made my first move in search of health early in March last year. There at a very early hour on Monday, (I think 4 o'clock,) the dear Archbishop (I shall never forget his sweet face), though pale as death, stood at the foot of my bed and said, 'I am tired of, and I will leave (or I have left) Tuam, and will never return there.' This greatly distressed me, and of course roused me. I thought I had, as it were, seen a vision, and mentioned what I did hear to Mrs. Medicott as soon as she awoke. But how was I disturbed! how painfully cut down, when, in due course of time, the heartrending tidings reached me that on that very day, and at that very hour, his Grace had departed this life."

We find from the *Memoir* that the Archbishop died at Tuam, of typhoid fever, on March 26, 1839, at 3.10 a.m.; the coincidence was therefore probably close to within an hour.

(511) Translated from *Schriften für und an seine Lieben Deutschen*, by E. M. Arndt (Leipzig, 1845), Vol. III., pp. 524-5. (See case 467.)

Arndt describes how, in the winter of 1811, when staying in a friend's house, he was sitting up working one night, after a fatiguing day, and was half asleep in his chair—"when lo! my dear old Aunt Sophia, my second mother, stood before me with a kind smile, holding on each arm a little boy. They were children whom I dearly loved. She held them out to me with a gesture which seemed to say 'Take the children to your care.'" The next day at noon, while Arndt was sitting talking with his friends, "the carriage of my brother William drove up with a letter, saying, 'Brother, come back at once in the carriage; we must cross the water to Buchholz to-morrow, and bury our dear old Aunt Sophia, who died last night.'"

(512) From *Works of the Rev. John Wesley. A.M.* (Edition of 1856), Vol. II., pp. 350-1. The account, on the face of it, is in the words of the percipient; but we cannot be absolutely sure of this.

The passage is from Wesley's Journal for Thursday, June 3rd, 1756.

"I received a remarkable letter from a clergyman with whom I had been a day or two before; part of it ran thus: 'I had the following account from the gentlewoman herself, a person of piety and veracity. She is now the wife of Mr. J. B., silversmith in Cork.'

" "About 30 years ago, I was addressed, by way of marriage, by Mr. Richard Mercier, then a volunteer in the army. The young gentleman was quartered at that time in Charleville, where my father lived, who approved of his addresses, and directed me to look upon him as my future husband. When the regiment left the town, he promised to return in two months and marry me. From Charleville he went to Dublin, thence to his father's, and from thence to England; where, his father having bought him a cornetcy of horse, he purchased many ornaments for the wedding,

and returning to Ireland, let us know that he would be at our house in Charleville in a few days. On this the family was busied to prepare for his reception, and the ensuing marriage, when, one night, my sister Mary and I being asleep in our bed, I was awakened by the sudden opening of the side curtains, and starting up, saw Mr. Mercier standing by the bedside. He was wrapped up in a loose sheet, and had a napkin, folded like a nightcap, on his head. He looked at me very earnestly, and lifting up the napkin, which much shaded his face, showed me the left side of his head, all bloody, and covered with his brains ;¹ the room, meantime, was quite light.² My terror was excessive, which was increased by his stooping over the bed, and embracing me in his arms. My cries alarmed the whole family, who came crowding into the room. Upon their entrance, he gently withdrew his arms and ascended, as it were, through the ceiling.³ I continued for some time in strong fits. When I could speak I told them what I had seen.

“ “ One of them a day or two after, going to the postman for letters, found him reading the newspapers, in which was an account that Cornet Mercier, going into Christ Church belfry, in Dublin, just after the bells had been ringing, and standing under the bells, one of them, which was turned bottom upwards, suddenly turned again, struck one side of his head, and killed him on the spot. On further inquiry, he found he was struck on the left side of his head.” ”

[The death of Mr. Mercier does not appear in the *Dublin Gazette*, which is the only Dublin paper of that date that we can obtain ; and we know of no other publication where it would be likely to be mentioned.]

The remarkable narrative of Elizabeth Hobson, of Sunderland, given by Wesley in his diary, under date May 25, 1768, is too long to quote in full. It is complicated by matter which does not belong to the subject of this book, and by much that looks like subjective hallucination. But it is almost certain that the cases were given in good faith by a witness of good character. The apparently telepathic incidents (which I include under a single evidential number), taken down by Wesley from E. Hobson's lips, are as follows :—

(513) (1) “ John Simpson, one of our neighbours, a man that truly feared God, and one with whom I was particularly acquainted, went to sea, as usual. He sailed out on a Tuesday. The Friday night following, between 11 and 12 o'clock, I heard someone walking in my room, and every step sounded as if it were stepping in water. He then came to the bedside in his sea-jacket, all wet, and stretched his hand over me. Three drops of water fell on my head, and felt as cold as ice. I strove to wake his wife—who lay with me ; but I could not any more than if she were dead. Afterwards I heard that he was cast away that night.

(2) “ A little before Michaelmas, 1763, my brother George, who was a good young man, went to sea. The day after Michaelmas Day, about

¹ These details of the vision are, no doubt, difficult to account for telepathically. It is possible that they were “ read back ” after the reality was known (see the remarks on case 25, Vol. i., p. 206) ; but compare cases 130 and 134.

² See the two following pages, and Vol. i., pp. 437, 550-1.

³ Compare cases 203, 204, 205.

midnight, I saw him standing by my bedside, surrounded with a glorious light,¹ and looking earnestly at me. He was wet all over. That night the ship in which he sailed split upon a rock, and all the crew were drowned.

(3) "On April 9th, 1767, about midnight I was lying awake, and I saw my brother John standing by my bedside. Just at that time he died in Jamaica.

(4) "On Friday, July 3rd, (? 1767), I was sitting at dinner, when I thought I heard someone coming along the passage. I looked about, and saw my aunt, Margaret Scot, of Newcastle, standing at my back. On Saturday, I had a letter informing me that she died on that day.

(5) "When I was about 16, my uncle fell ill, and grew worse and worse for three months. One day, having been sent out on an errand, I was coming home through a lane when I saw him in the field coming swiftly towards me. I ran to meet him, but he was gone. When I came home, I found him calling for me. As soon as I came to his bedside, he clasped his arms round my neck, and bursting into tears, . . . kept his hold till he sunk down and died; and even then they could hardly unclasp his fingers. I would fain have died with him, and wished to be buried with him, dead or alive."

§ 4. The remaining cases are second-hand. I will first give a considerable group where the narrators are very near relatives of the first-hand witnesses, and have no sort of doubt that what is recorded is the genuine experience of their respective informants.

(514 and 515) From Lieut.-Colonel Fane Sewell, care of Messrs. H. S. King and Co., 45, Pall Mall, S.W. "Wolfelee, Hawick, N.B.

"August 4th, 1885.

"My mother and Anne Hervey were schoolfellows together at a Madame Audibert's, in Kensington, and they were bosom friends; and, as was not unusual in those days with young girls, they exchanged rings, with the promise that whichever of the two died first she was to send back to the other her ring.²

"During the following holidays, for which my mother went to her home, North Berwick, Anne Hervey remaining at Madame Audibert's in Kensington, the following incident occurred:—

"My mother suddenly awoke in the night, to find Anne Hervey standing by her bedside, holding out the ring she had given her. The apparition lasted a few seconds, and then faded away. My mother was much frightened, and in the morning told her mother what had happened to her in the night, adding that she was quite convinced Anne Hervey was dead, although she had left her perfectly well a fortnight before at Madame Audibert's.

"The event proved my mother to be right, for in course of post (not so rapid as in these days) a letter reached her from Madame Audibert telling her of Anne Hervey's death from scarlet fever, and enclosing the ring which she said Anne Hervey had begged, on her deathbed, might be sent to my mother.

¹ Compare the last case and case 205.

² As to compacts of this sort, see p. 66.

“The above is exactly as I have received it from my mother’s lips. The ring referred to was in my own possession for many years.

“My mother, when at Bangalore, as nearly as I can remember about the year 1845, was one night awakened by the feeling of something unusual happening, and saw as she thought a very favourite sister of my father’s, my Aunt Fanny (Mrs. John Hamilton Gray), standing in her night-dress at the foot of the bed, with her hair falling loosely round her. There was a peculiar light upon her, though no light of any kind in the room.¹ Another peculiarity about my aunt that my mother noticed was, that a large lock of my aunt’s hair had been cut straight off close to the temple.² The apparition appeared to gaze steadily at my mother for some little time, and then gradually disappeared.

“My mother, to whom such appearances were not altogether unknown, felt so convinced something serious had happened to my Aunt Fanny, that, fearing a shock to my father, she took measures to intercept the letters to my father which she was satisfied must bring him sad news of some sort relating to my aunt. The event proved her right, for in due course of post from home came the letter bearing intelligence of my aunt’s unexpected death at sea (Mrs. Gray was journeying from the Cape of Good Hope to England when she died), on the night above mentioned, and in the letter was enclosed a large lock of my Aunt Fanny’s hair which had been cut off to send to my father.

“I was a child of 5 or 6 years of age when the above took place, and I remember the circumstance distinctly, though not the particulars, which are, however, exactly as I have often heard my mother relate them to different people. I have often heard my mother relate both these experiences, as nearly as my memory will serve me, in the exact words I have used.

“FANE SEWELL.”

In a later letter Colonel Sewell says that he has failed to get the exact dates, and adds :—

“In writing out the two accounts I sent you, I purposely excluded from the second anything of my own personal recollections of the occurrence, which took place at Bangalore, that you might have the story exactly as related to me by my mother.

“Let me reply to your questions as given.

“(1) ‘Did my mother always speak of the incidents as *waking* experiences, not mere dreams?’

“My mother never spoke of either but as ‘*waking* experiences.’ She was *very* distinct upon that point. She was quite sure of having been, in both cases, wide awake when she saw what she described.

“(2) ‘Was I old enough to recollect whether I heard of the *second* experience *before* the news of death arrived?’

“I have a distinct recollection (for the scenes made a great impression upon me) of the news of my Aunt Fanny’s death being taken and broken to my father by my mother; his great grief; and of my mother’s anxiety *before* and about the coming of the letters, and of her depression (she was naturally of a bright, cheerful disposition) *before* the letters came, which I could not at the time understand, but which I have since felt was due to

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 550-1.

² Compare cases 194, 449, and see Vol. i., p. 555.

her anticipation of coming sorrow. I was seldom away from either my father's or mother's side in those days, and must have been about 5 years old, and could well recollect things of a striking character which took place then. My earliest recollection is of the death of my eldest, and, then, only sister, which took place when I was a child of between 2 and 3 years of age. Of this I can of course only dimly remember the circumstances, and merely mention it here to show that I was very impressionable as a child, and began to remember much earlier than the date of my Aunt Fanny's death. I have no doubt in my own mind, therefore, of the phenomenon having occurred to my mother as described by her.

"(3) '(a) Am I aware as to whether my mother was in the habit of having similar visitations or visions which did not correspond with anything? or (b), of her being subject to hallucinations?'

"(a) I am not aware of any such. I do know, however, of one occurrence which took place in February or March, 1857, whilst I was staying, *en route* to India, with my father and mother at Pisa.

"I remember my mother came down to breakfast one morning greatly agitated, and told us (my father and me) that she had been awakened during the night by something unusual occurring, and saw distinctly a curious flame-like light¹ at the end of her bed, which took no definite shape but faded away and left the room again dark. She said she was quite sure that something had happened to a near relative who was then in London. My father tried to reassure my mother, but she was not to be dissuaded from her presentiment of evil. A few days afterwards we received letters from England informing us that the relative in question had had a sudden and dangerous illness—in fact, a dangerous miscarriage—on the night in question.

"(b) I never heard of any other case of vision, or otherwise, occurring to my mother, nor am I aware of my mother having been subject in any way to hallucinations of the senses.

"The occurrences I have mentioned were wide apart as regards time. The first when my mother was a girl about 16 or 17; next, as a woman of about 33; and last when she was 47 years of age."²

Before this account was received, the second of the two incidents had been described to us by a clergyman, distantly connected with Lady Sewell, who had heard her narrate it, and had himself seen the lock of hair. Though correct as to the main fact, his version, when compared with the above, illustrates the difference which intimate connection with the original witness makes in the value of second-hand testimony (see pp. 322 and 539, note). The figure is represented as having appeared "in her shroud, dripping wet, and with her black hair cut quite short"; and "on allowing for difference of longitude, it was found that the hour of the vision corresponded with the hour of the death." Colonel Fane Sewell's account, it will be observed, merely states that the *night* corresponded.

(516) From the Rev. H. C. D. Chandler, Waterbeach Vicarage, Cambridge. His sister, whose experience is recorded, is out of health, and he would prefer not to have her troubled for a first-hand account.

¹ Compare cases 253 and 553, and see pp. 193-4.

² With respect to the occurrence of several telepathic experiences to the same percipient—exemplified in E. Hobson's and Colonel Fane Sewell's cases—see p. 22, note, and p. 77.

“ 1883.

“ The following occurred about 5 o'clock a.m., on October 28th, 1853. My sister, then Eliza Chandler, was visiting friends in the neighbourhood of Killarney, County Kerry, Ireland. Her mind was quite composed, and her health perfectly good. She was surrounded by kind friends and was of a gay and bright disposition, not in the least inclined to morbidness. She had known that her mother was in declining health generally.

“ She retired to rest on the Thursday evening as usual. About 5 o'clock on Friday morning she awoke suddenly, and as it seemed without cause, when she immediately became conscious of her mother's form at the foot of her bed. She sat up and gazed intently. She describes her mother's form as though she had risen from her couch, and the face was fixed with an earnest and loving gaze upon her child. The length of time the form remained I do not remember, or whether that time was mentioned I do not remember. My sister could not rest, but rose and dressed, greatly agitated. She at once wrote to inquire if all was well, and begging to hear from us.

“ At the hour above named, I was watching by my mother's bedside [at Bristol], she having been seized with hernia during a severe fit of coughing. My mother had sunk rapidly, and a letter of mine, stating the nature of the illness and its probable issue, had crossed my sister's letter to me. At the hour of 5 o'clock, I was struck with the change of my mother's appearance, and ran to call a sister, who was sleeping near. On applying a glass to the mouth, we found that the breathing had ceased, and our mother was gone to her rest. The same morning I wrote to Ireland telling the sad news, receiving the next day my sister's letter telling of the strange apparition she had seen.

“ My sister is married and settled in Australia ; but she could add but little more to the above account, for each particular was written indelibly on my memory.

“ H. C. D. CHANDLER.”

In answer to inquiries as to whether he was certain that the apparition had *preceded* the arrival of his letter announcing his mother's critical condition, he replied :—

“ Our letters crossed—mine containing the details of my mother's last days, and my sister's telling the story of the apparition. Her letter must have been written—as far as we could calculate, I remember—the morning after my mother's death, and solely in consequence of the apparition.”

The *Bristol Times* confirms the fact that Mrs. Chandler died on Friday, Oct. 28, 1853.

(517) From Lady Miles, Leigh Court, Bristol.

“ August 1st, 1885.

“ My mother, Lady Roche (wife of the late Sir David Roche, of Carap Croom, County of Limerick, Ireland) was very much beloved by her cousin, the [Right] Hon. John Vandeleur, and at the moment of his death he came to say good-bye to her. She woke from sleep at 4 a.m., and saw him, wrapped up in something black, standing near the lower curtain of her bed. She woke her husband, and said, ‘ Why, there is the Hon. John at the bottom of the bed ! ’ Sir David told her she was dreaming, and to rub her eyes ; but, as she still affirmed it, he got up and pulled the curtain away, lit the candles, and stood where she said the appearance was. She

said, 'I see him now, standing next you, waving his hand in farewell to me.' He faded away, and disappeared. It was afterwards known that this gentlemen died 50 miles off, of a paralytic seizure.

"A brother of this lady, Mr. George Vandeleur, of Ballynamona, Co. Clare, also saw his servant at the moment of his death. The man was sent to Limerick on an errand, got drunk, and fell off a cart, the wheel of which passed over his throat.

"These two cases are quite authentic, and known to many people.
"F. E. MILES."

We find the date of Mr. J. Vandeleur's death given in *Saunders' Newsletter* as November 9, 1828.

In answer to inquiries, Lady Miles says:—

"With regard to my mother seeing the Hon. John Vandeleur. She saw him a few minutes after his death. She was living at a house in Limerick, and he died at Kilrush. I heard the account from my father and mother dozens of times when a girl. My mother was not an imaginative woman, or inventive. She died in 1841. I have been living over 30 years in England, and have a good deal lost sight of anyone who could authenticate all this, though everyone knew about it at the time.

"My uncle who saw his servant is dead. It happened at Carap, Co. Limerick, about the year 1836."

In conversation, Lady Miles told me that her uncle was dressing in the morning, when, looking round, he saw the figure of his servant, with blood about it, and addressed it, thinking it was the man himself. She was in the house at the time, and later she heard the account from her uncle's own lips.

(518) From Mme. Vavin, *née* Girard, a relative of our friend, M. Ch. Richet, who copied the account from a letter addressed to himself.

"1885.

"Ma mère, étant veuve, avait été très aimée et demandée en mariage par un jeune professeur de Caen. Ayant quitté la ville et épousé M. Caillaux, elle avait cessé toute relation avec M. Roger, et n'en entendit plus parler depuis trois ou quatre ans. Une nuit, étant absolument éveillée, elle vit une forme blanchâtre, comme une vapeur,¹ se pencher trois² fois sur son lit, comme pour lui dire adieu. Elle eut alors, sans pouvoir s'en rendre bien compte, le sentiment que c'était M. Roger qui lui disait adieu. Très émue, elle ne parla de la chose à personne; mais, une huitaine de jours après, elle apprit la mort de M. Roger, mort survenue la nuit même où elle avait eu cette apparition. Elle ne le savait pas malade."

Mme. Vavin adds the following experience of her own:—

"Pour moi, mes souvenirs sont plus vagues, étant plus lointains. Mon père est mort à peu près subitement. Je l'avais quitté la veille, au soir, gai et bien portant. Dans la nuit une voix, comme un souffle, et pour ainsi dire sans parole,³ me fit comprendre que mon père était mort. Le lendemain, lorsque on entra dans ma chambre, je me jetai en pleurant dans les bras de ma bonne en lui disant, 'Je sais que papa est mort.' Je n'avais vu ni forme, ni apparition d'aucune sorte.
"MARGUERITE VAVIN."

¹ See case 193, and the first note thereto.

² See p. 229, note.

³ This was probably an instance of the inward and soundless form of hallucination described in Vol. i., p. 480.

(519) From Miss Osborne, 10A, Cunningham Place, N.W. "1883.

"This story I have heard my mother relate, but as she and my aunt (to whom this incident occurred) are both dead, I can only tell it as I remember it. I was a child when it happened. My aunt, Mrs. Fairman, was living in Portugal, and had not been in London for some years. Her half-sister (with whom she had no especial sympathy) married a Mr. Moore, whom Mrs. Fairman had never seen. About a year after that marriage, Mrs. Fairman was making arrangements to give a party. One night she awoke, and saw her sister sitting by her bedside, and a gentleman standing by her.¹ She heard her sister say, 'I shall die, I shall die!' She woke her husband, and told him what she had seen. He, angry at being disturbed, said it was all nonsense. At last she slept, but woke again, seeing the same thing.² She again woke her husband, who used stronger language than before. So impressed was Mrs. Fairman with the feeling she should hear of the death of her sister, that she ordered all arrangements for the proposed party to be stopped; and in the time a letter could reach her, one came to say Mrs. Moore had died at the time she had seen her.

"I think it was about two years after this, Mrs. Fairman returned to England. She had never seen any portrait of Mr. Moore, who was a very ordinary person, with no marked characteristics. She was walking with my mother in Oxford Street, when she suddenly said, 'Mary, that is the man I saw with Julia at my bedside.' It was really Mr. Moore."

[The final incident here recalls the conclusion of the Wynyard case (No. 357), where there is some doubt what the exact facts were; but the point is not one likely to have crept into either narrative without some foundation. The fact that Miss Osborne's mother was a witness of the recognition makes the account a second-hand (not a third-hand) one, as far as that item is concerned.]

(520) From a lady, known to the present writer, who prefers that her own name should not be printed. The evidence is on a par with second-hand (Vol. I., p. 158, note).

"Aug. 25th, 1886.

"My father was a marine officer on board his Majesty's ship ———. Crossing the Atlantic, in the course of the voyage, the medical gentleman told him that his mother had appeared to him and distinctly said, 'Andrew, Andrew, mend your ways, or you will never be where I am.' Sir James Malcolm [the narrator's father] advised him to write down the date and hour, which Dr. Douglas³ did, and afterwards wrote that his mother had died the day and hour precisely as she appeared to him. I have often heard my father mention the circumstance."

Another daughter of Sir J. Malcolm's writes (Sept. 23, 1886), "I have often heard the story of Dr. Campbell's *vision*—it was not a dream—told to Sir J. in the morning, who advised him to note it down." She thinks that the incident took place in the West Indies, in 1806 or not long after, and gives the name of the ship as the "Canopus." We have ascertained from the Record Office that the "Canopus" was in the West

¹ As to the appearance of the second figure, compare case 511 above, and see Vol. i., pp. 545-6.

² Compare case 503, and see p. 237, note.

³ The name seems to have been Campbell. The mistake is due to the fact that Sir J. Malcolm had another medical friend, named Douglas, to whom this incident was known.

Indies at that time, but that no doctor of the name of Campbell was officially attached to her during the years 1806-12.

[We may charitably hope that the words heard were a contribution of the percipient's own mind, and merely betokened a wholesome sense of parental superiority. I have drawn attention to the suspicious exactitude of the coincidence in many of the second-hand cases.]

From Mr. Edward Butler, 7, Park Square, Leeds. I do not number the case, as the evidence is possibly third-hand. "June 21st, 1884.

"The enclosed account of my brother's apparition has been read by my cousin Fanny, a lady of singular accuracy of mind and entire trustworthiness, who was one of the first (if not the first) to hear the tale, from my mother herself, I think. It exactly agrees with her recollection, and may, I fully believe, be relied on as accurate.

"In the year 1857, my brother was in the Civil Service of India, and was stationed in Bengal as a judge or magistrate and collector. For anything we knew he was perfectly well, and had very good prospects in his profession. One morning early—it was the height of summer—my mother was lying awake, and it was clear dawn. She saw my brother stand at the foot of her bed. There was nothing noticeable in his dress. His face wore an exceedingly tranquil and pleasant expression, and my mother felt no fear. I do not know how long the vision lasted. When it disappeared my mother woke my father, and said, 'I have seen Wells.' They made a note of the day and hour. There was no Indian telegraph in those days, and some weeks elapsed before they received from an official source in India news of my brother's sudden death, which must have taken place just about the time of the apparition. My brother's appearance was always regarded by my mother as a merciful and kindly thing. It prepared her for the news, and broke the shock.

"I think my mother was by organisation open to delicate impulses or impacts from subtle exterior agencies, if such there be; for I remember her telling me, amongst other things now forgotten, that once she had an unaccountable conviction that she ought to go and see an old schoolfellow, who had been long separated from her, and whose very name, indeed, she had almost ceased to recall. She subsequently heard that this old schoolfellow had died about that time, and on her deathbed had said, 'Oh, I wish I could see Anne ——,' naming my mother's maiden name.

"EDWARD BUTLER."

We find from the *East India Service Register* and from *Allen's Indian Mail*, that Mr. Wells Butler died on June 20, 1859 (not 1857)—which accords with the above statement that the time was "the height of summer."

Miss Frances Butler, of 11, Gloucester Road, Teignmouth, on being asked whether she heard the account from the percipient's, Mrs. H. Butler's, own lips, replied (on April 19, 1886) that she could not recollect whether she heard it from Mrs. H. Butler or from her own mother, Mrs. H. Butler's sister. A sister of Mr. Butler's tells Professor Barrett that she remembers being told of this incident shortly after it took place. Mr. Butler regrets not having questioned his mother on the subject, but he feared to make her uncomfortable.

(521) From Mr. David Crombie, 2, Breakspear Road, St. John's, S.E.

“ 1884.

“ My eldest brother, John, left home when I was very young, to become an apprentice to Captain Wallace, trading to the East Indies. [He had been away for about three years, but was returning, and was daily expected, when] my mother had a vision in which she saw him, wearing a most careworn and anxious look, enter the bedroom, and so distinct was the vision that she awoke my father, who was sleeping at her side, exclaiming, ‘John,’ (my father’s name), ‘there’s Johnnie.’ He immediately sat up, and subsequently got out of bed, and went out on to the landing to see if his boy had really arrived; finding all quiet, and having gone downstairs to see if the front door were fastened, he returned to bed, not over well pleased at having been sent on this wild-goose-chase.

“ Next night, about the same time, my mother declared she again saw Johnnie, looking so flushed and ill, and again called my father’s attention to the apparition, which, however, he did not see,¹ and on this occasion he did not leave his bed. On the third night she again saw the apparition, this time as white as a sheet; it smiled and passed away. . . . My father saw what a deep impression these visions had made on her mind; and, without her knowing it, he made an entry in cypher on the fly-leaf of the old folio family Bible, to see if it were possible that his death could have been foretold in this extraordinary way.

“ The visions had indeed made an indelible and sorrowful impression on my mother’s mind, and, as the saying goes, she was full of it; and to her immediate and most intimate friends she had related all the circumstances, and her own fears in connection with them. Of those to whom she had communicated the facts were Mrs. and Miss Wallace, mother and sister respectively of the captain with whom my brother sailed; Misses Jarvis, two maiden aunts; Miss Bartlett and Mrs. Lowe, widow of a sea-captain.

“ As time wore on the vessel at length arrived, and shortly thereafter a letter was delivered with a black seal, announcing my brother’s illness and death, which, on reference to the memorandum, occurred at the very time the dreams were dreamed. The captain, in writing, gave an extract from the entry in the log. Then my father, who had no faith in dreams, for the first time in his life was compelled to admit that in this case there seemed to be good grounds for believing in them.

“ On the morning following the announcement of my brother’s death, I was requested to deliver a number of notes with intimation of his death to many of our personal friends; amongst them were those whose names I have given above. On my return home, I was naturally asked what they had said after reading the notes. Mrs. Wallace said, ‘Dear me, then Effie’s’ (my mother’s name) ‘dream has come true.’ A similar remark was made by her aunts, the Misses Jarvis. Mrs. Lowe sent condolences, and said my mother’s fears had been too well founded.

“ As I did not understand what they referred to I asked what they meant, and for the first time I learned all the particulars; and although I could only have been between 6 and 7 years old, [55 years ago] the facts left an impression on my mind that time has not effaced. Of course, the story was often repeated in my presence afterwards, thereby keeping it fresh in my memory, and I can vouch for the truth of the details so far as came under my personal knowledge. “D. C.”

¹ See p. 105, second note.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Crombie says :—

"The parties named are dead from 25 to 40 years ago. My brother died of scarlet fever, which ran its course with remarkable swiftness. The death occurred on the day my mother had the third dream."

[In conversation on July 28th, 1884, Mr. Crombie told me that he remembers seeing the entry in the Bible, after the news arrived, and that it was pointed to as proof of the correspondence of dates. He describes his mother as the very opposite of a visionary. The visions were naturally enough regarded as *dreams* by the persons to whom they were told ; but Mr. Crombie is convinced that his mother was awake, and points to his father's conduct, on being woke, as evidence of this. I must point out that a repetition of the sort here described, on three successive nights, has not been alleged in any of our first-hand telepathic cases ;¹ and it is the kind of detail that may very naturally have got imported into the narrative (see p. 229, note ; but see also p. 237, note). But it is not, of course, vital to the evidence.]

(522) From Miss J. Connolly, of 21, Wickham Road, New Cross, S.E., head-mistress of a high school for girls. "April 4th, 1885.

"One Christmas my father was invited to spend his college vacation with a very dear and valued friend, a Mrs. Brown. However, as he was also invited by my grandfather, he preferred to accept that invitation, glad of the opportunity of meeting my mother. The house was a large one, and full of Christmas guests. One night there was a dinner-party of friends from the neighbourhood. After dinner such a storm arose that my grandmother found herself obliged to provide everyone with beds for the night. . . . My grandmother, to arrange for her unexpected company, gave up the young men's bedrooms to the ladies, and turned the library into a sort of barrack room for the night.

"At 3 o'clock, my Uncle William spoke to my father, who was sleeping near him, and said, 'James, who are you talking to ; what are you saying ?' My father raised himself up, looked at his watch, and replied, 'I have seen a vision. Mrs. Brown has been standing at my feet, and she said, "Good-bye, James ! I wished greatly to see you, to say good-bye to you before I left this world, and I have now come to you. Serve God and be a good man, and He will prosper and bless you. I have loved you so dearly from the time you were a boy, that I had to say good-bye. But let us meet again." She waved her hand and disappeared.'

"Both the young men were much impressed, and in the morning my father told my grandmother of the dream or vision. She advised him to write an ordinary letter, just inquiring about Mrs. Brown and her daughters. Letters then cost tenpence, and were not written on slight

¹ Since this was written, however, I have received an account from Mrs. Perryn, of 27, Adrian Square, Westgate-on-Sea, in which she states that, when crossing the Atlantic in November, 1863, she dreamt with unusual vividness, on three successive nights, that a fire broke out in the cellar of her brother's house, and that he was wrapped in flames—the fact being that on the first of the three nights he was fearfully injured by an explosion of some chemicals with which he was experimenting in his cellar. Mrs. Perryn did not know that he experimented with chemicals ; can recall no other instance of dreams repeated on successive nights ; is not in the habit of having distressing dreams ; and described the accident in writing to her sisters "exactly as it happened," before hearing the news. But a dream-experience is, as we have seen, indefinitely weaker evidence than an analogous case of the "borderland" or the waking class.

occasions. My father did write, but a letter crossed his, saying that at 3 o'clock on the very night of his dream, Mrs. Brown had died, and her last conscious words were regrets that she had not been able to see him to say good-bye.

"My father never much liked telling this story. He firmly believed he had seen a vision. I have heard it from his lips, and I have seen the two letters which crossed each other in the post. My father was the Rev. James Campbell Connolly, Chaplain of Woolwich Dockyard."

In reply to inquiries, Miss Connolly writes, on April 9, 1885 :—

(1) "The two letters that crossed in the post were among my mother's papers, and I have failed to find them. She died when I was quite a child, and I heard her tell the story and show the letters, not thinking that I was listening. My dear father died just two years ago, in the full possession of his faculties, and I heard it twice from his own lips.

(2) "The date is difficult. My father married in 1840, and I should say, judging from his ordination, &c., that it must have been between 1830 and 1835. Mrs. Brown's daughters are both dead—Mrs. Daly, who married the last Warden of Galway, and Mrs. Foley. Both these ladies told me the story. They were present at their mother's deathbed.

(3) "I am certain my father described the apparition as speaking directly to him."

[In no first-hand case has the sensory impression included so long a remark as that here recorded. If accurately remembered, it probably indicates that the percipient was more asleep than awake ; but his experience must apparently have been very unlike an ordinary dream.]

(523) From Mrs. B., an Associate of the S.P.R., whose full name we are at liberty to mention, but not to print. "October 30th, 1884.

"When I was about 16 years old, my father came down to breakfast one morning, and, after saying he had been awake a long time, he said, 'and about 5 or 6' (I forget the exact time) 'I saw old Mr. — ; he came and stood by the bed a minute or two, and then went.' In the course of the day we heard of the death of this old gentleman, of whose illness we had previously known, but whose death we had not anticipated, as it was not thought his complaint was one likely to cause death. On inquiry, we learnt that he had died at the hour that my father had said he had had a visit from him.

"My father was a merry, strong-minded man, with a scientific turn of mind and a great scorn of superstition. He is, alas ! now dead some years, and I don't think we any of us thought more of the circumstance than that it was *odd*, but I remembered it."

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. — died on January 10th, 1866, aged 58, the cause of death being a contused wound on the skin, which brought on erysipelas.

(524) From Mrs. Field, 16, Clifton Road, Brighton. Her mother being old, we did not press for a first-hand account. "June, 1884.

"In the year 1840, my grandfather, Sir L. S., was appointed Governor of the Island of Mauritius ; and my mother went to see him and take leave of him. My grandfather was getting old, and my mother was in a

very delicate and precarious state of health, so the probabilities were strong that she would never see her father again, and so it turned out.

"My mother [who was living at Cheltenham] had been sitting up late one night, writing her Indian letters, intently finishing one to her husband, which for some reason she had rather delayed finishing, and which, as next day was mail-day, must be finished that night. It was winter time, and the fire was burning quite brightly in the grate for some little time after my mother went to bed, which, on account of her Indian letter, she had not been able to do till past 12 o'clock. She was lying broad awake, and the room was lighted quite well by the firelight. She had not been thinking of anything but her Indian letter, and she could not have had the least notion or fear her father was dead, as he had died suddenly, after a kind of seizure, from which he only recovered to speak a few articulate words—but the fact that he had been ill never reached England until the public official news arrived giving the news of his death, together with the usual private letters giving all the details. My mother was wide awake. The bed—an old-fashioned fourpost—faced the fireplace, and on the side next the window the curtains were closely drawn. Suddenly my mother saw a very tall figure of a man (my grandfather was unusually tall) pass the foot of her bed slowly. She called out, 'Who's there?' in great fright, and as she called a hand opened the curtains on the side where they closed, and the same figure was there. My mother sprang out of bed and ran into the next room, where the dear old 'C.' [a head-nurse] slept with my two little sisters, almost babies. One of these little sisters had given the old faithful servant the name of 'Tootoo.' My mother rushed into the babies' room calling out, 'Tootoo, there's a man in my room, please get up and call the servants. There are robbers in the house.'

"After going back with her mistress, and putting her to bed, the nurse got a scrap of paper, and wrote down the hour and minute my mother had rushed into the night-nursery—she, 'Tootoo,' feeling some bad news was coming, and that my mother had seen no living man. The very next Mauritius mails brought the public papers, stating that at such a time, giving the minutes even, the guns from the fort gave notice to the Island that the Governor's late illness had ended fatally. It appeared that his last words had been of his daughter. The time noted down by 'Tootoo' and the official announcement of his death exactly agreed.

"CHARLOTTE E. FIELD."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Field says:—

"1. I have often heard my mother's experience from her own lips; but I was only a child at the time, and she went back to India about three years after, to rejoin my father, who was a Bombay Civilian, and I did not hear her speak of this experience of hers till she came home again. This would be in all quite 10 years after my grandfather's death, but 'Tootoo' used often to talk to me about it, when she was with us, as I have mentioned in the account I sent you. I never saw the entry of date. 'Tootoo' used often to say to me it was a pity perhaps she had not kept it. She did keep it for some little while, but in moving house she lost it. It was just hastily pencilled down on a morsel of paper.

"2. The difference of longitude *was* carefully accounted for. My mother's 'apparition,' or whatever it was, came to her between 12 and 1 at night—nearer 1 than 12.

“3. No, I have never heard that my mother ever saw any other vision. She is, I should say, not an imaginative person, and, besides, as she had no idea her father was even ill, she could not have imagined she saw him, and no one ever mentioned to her the fact of ‘Tootoo’s’ entry of date till the *official date* came home in the public papers; and then my mother remarked to ‘Tootoo,’ who often told me what she had said, ‘Oh, then, ‘Tootoo,’ that must have been my father I saw that night I was so frightened—not a robber as I thought.’ My mother has often told us she had made this remark to ‘Tootoo.’”

The *Army List* confirms the date of Sir L. S.’s appointment, and gives January 2nd, 1842, as the date of his death. The *Mauritius Register* and the *Times* add that he died suddenly.

(525) Mr. Thomas Young, of Elsinore House, Robert Road, Handsworth, Birmingham, sent us an account of the following incident, as “often related” to him by his mother (resident at 71, Highbury Hill, N.). We asked him to apply to her for a first-hand account, which she gave in the following letter to him, and afterwards *vivâ voce* to the present writer. Her version, which was given independently, corresponds exactly with his; which is some proof that the facts have not been distorted, in recent years at any rate, through lapse of memory.

“January 10th, 1885.

“MY DEAR SON,—You ask me to relate Aunt Lucy’s dream? it was not a dream, but a reality. You must know that Uncle Bennet was a small farmer, with a large family of 12 children, consequently some had to go away from home. They lived in a small village, Trelyon, near St. Ives, Cornwall. Now, what I am going to relate is about their daughter Betsy, who had taken a situation—I think at St. Ives. One morning aunt woke up and saw, standing by her bedside, this daughter, with her hair streaming all over her face, dripping wet, and she, poor thing, looking half drowned. Aunt said, ‘Betsy, where have you come from?’ The weather being frightfully bad, she thought she had walked home through the wet. She told her to go and dry herself, but she vanished away. Poor aunt was dreadfully alarmed. They sent to her place, and it appears she would go to Plymouth, and went in a little sailing-vessel, and that very morning the vessel was lost and all hands perished. Now, my dear son, I can vouch for every word being true, for aunt was a true Christian woman. I was a girl when she told me the unhappy incident, but it always made a most vivid impression on me.—Believe me, dear son, your loving mother,

“C. YOUNG.”

In conversation Mrs. Young mentioned that she heard of this incident within a day or two of its occurrence, and that from her aunt’s manner it made a very strong impression on her. She was about 14 at the time, which would make the date about 1825. Her aunt was a busy, practical woman, with no turn and no time for fancies. The cause of the girl’s sudden departure, Mrs. Young thinks, was not known. We have endeavoured to find a record of the accident, but have failed, not knowing the name of the vessel.

(526) From Miss Caulfield, 1, Hyde Park Mansions, N.W. Her father was Commander Edwin T. Caulfield, of Raheenduffe, Queen’s Co., and of Beckford House, Bath.

" December 8th, 1883.

"When my father was at sea in H.M.S. 'Lavinia,' he was very intimate with two midshipmen, John Frederick J., and T. [The full names were given in confidence.] They had as yet formed but few opinions as to the truth of Divine Revelation; although all more or less religiously disposed, and anxious to learn. The fact of there being a future state, and that one of probation or retribution, was more especially under discussion between them. To solve this mystery for the survivors, they pledged themselves to one another, that were it permitted to give an intimation of the reality of an existence after death, the man that died first should show himself to the others.¹

"My father was taken prisoner, and was by great interest placed on his *parole*, during two years in France; and one night,—whether waking or sleeping, he said he could not tell—he saw T. appear. At once he realised the fact that he was dead, and that he had come to redeem his promise. He asked him whether he was happy; to which the apparition replied by slowly swaying his head to and fro, with a sad expression, and a sound as of the clanking of chains accompanied the gesture. He then vanished. How soon afterwards my father received news of his friend, I am unable to say; but he was informed of his having been killed on board ship by the fall of a 'block' from the rigging (I think during action), which caused instantaneous death.

"John Frederick J. had passed his examination, and was a lieutenant at the time of his death. My father was again in bed—whether awake, in a trance, or sleeping, he could not say; he believed he was dreaming, but it seemed like being awake. His friend and shipmate J. appeared to him. At once recognising the fulfilment of the agreement made between them, he knew that he was dead; and asked him the same question as he did his friend T.; to which an exactly similar reply was made, *i.e.*, by the slow swaying of the head, accompanied by the sound as of the clanking of chains. In due time my father was apprised of the death of this friend also; who had had his arm and shoulder blade torn away by a cannon ball, at the storming of Algiers. My sister and I both perfectly recollect hearing this story from our father on several occasions.

" S. F. A. C."

Miss Caulfield's sister also signs her initials, "L. L. A."

From an examination of the ship's books of H.M.S. "Lavinia," at the Record Office, we find that "T." joined that vessel in the same year as Miss Caulfield's father, 1806, and that he was killed by the fall of a top-rail on July 14, 1808. "J." has also been traced on the books of the "Lavinia," and seems to have left that ship in 1810. We have received from the Record Office a certificate to the effect that he was dangerously wounded in the attack on Algiers on Aug. 27, 1816, and that his "left arm was removed at the shoulder-joint." We find from the *Gentleman's Magazine* that his death followed on Oct. 3.

If the clanking of chains² really formed a feature in both these

¹ As to compacts of this sort, see p. 66. On the telepathic theory, the apparent fulfilment of the compact is of course due to a telepathic impulse transmitted before, not after, death.

² I must point out that this sound, being a common feature in ghostly legends, is one not unlikely to get imported into a second-hand version even of a genuine telepathic case. See the remark on the prevalence of the number *three*, p. 229, note.

experiences, it seems an excellent instance of the percipient's investiture of the telepathic impression with his own dream-imagery (Vol. I., p. 539).

The next case ought perhaps to be classed as a dream. But the sense of someone's entrance into the room, and presence by the bed which the perceiver is conscious of actually occupying, is very characteristic of a semi-waking state, and is not, I think, a common feature in dreams which are afterwards distinctly recognised as such.

(527) From the Rev. S. W. Hanks (District Secretary of the American Seamen's Friend Society, and well known to Professor William James, of Harvard, a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R.).

“Congregational House, Boston.

“April 25th, 1884.

“Two of my three brothers were sailors. The eldest (Dwight) went to sea when he was 11 years old, and was at sea most of the time until his death, at the age of 25 years. On one of his voyages he was wrecked, and remained on the wreck nine days without food or drink. After this my mother never saw him, though by a letter from him to my other brother she had heard the particulars about the wreck, from which he was taken off by a passing vessel. On the night of December 5th, 1829, my mother dreamed that he was dead. When she arose in the morning she was much affected, and during the day she was weeping nearly all the time. When asked what made her think that Dwight was dead, she said that in the night he came into her room, trembling, and looking very pale, and said, ‘*Mother.*’ She said, ‘Dwight, what is the matter? I will get up, and do you come and lie down upon my bed.’ He replied, ‘No, mother,’ and walked out of the room. From that time she always spoke of his death with the utmost confidence.

“In July, 1830, my other sailor brother was in New York, where he was met by a stranger who asked him if he knew a sailor of the name of *Dwight Hanks*? He replied, ‘I have a brother of that name from whom I have not heard for a long time.’ The stranger then said to him that a man by the name of *Dwight Hanks*, about 25 years old, a little shorter than himself, and a little lame from having broken one of his legs when he was a boy, as he said, was killed on board the barque, ‘*Four Sons*,’ of a fall from aloft during a storm, on the night of December 5th, 1829. ‘The vessel is now in port, and if you will go with me on board I will tell you just where he fell. We buried him at sea, and his chest is on board the vessel.’ My brother went on board and found the statement of the stranger corroborated. When my mother heard of it she said, ‘This is no news to me. I have never had a moment's doubt about Dwight's death since the time of my dream.’

“These facts are well remembered by myself and my sister, now 80 years old.

“S. W. HANKS.”

Mr. Hanks writes to us on March 27th, 1885 :—

“I inquired of my sister if any memorandum of the date of my mothers's dream was made at *the time*. She informs me that none has

been *preserved*. She informs me that a cousin of ours was visiting the family at the time, who said of the dream : 'This is so remarkable that I will make a memorandum of it.' He did so. He is now dead, and the memorandum is lost. My sister is very confident about the date, as she has letters which she thinks fix it. She is now in such a state of health that she cannot attend to the matter. I did not keep the *date*, but distinctly remember the *fact*."

(528) From Mrs. Monteith Brown, Oak Cottage, Hythe.

" 1884.

"The following is an account told me by my aunt, then Mary Noble, of the appearance of her brother, Edward Meadows Noble, at the time of his death. It took place in the night, and she was awoke by the sound of water dripping,¹ and saw, at the foot of her bed, her fourth brother, a lieutenant in the navy, and then serving in China. She sprang up exclaiming, 'Ned, what are you doing here?' when the figure vanished. In due course of time, the news came of his having been drowned off Amoy, in China, about the time of the appearance.

"E. ADELA BROWN."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Brown adds :—

"I heard the story direct from my aunt, who is since dead. On referring to a naval biography, I find the date of my uncle's death was January 22nd, 1843." This date is confirmed by the *United Service Magazine*.

[This is perhaps a case of hereditary susceptibility (see p. 137, note) ; for Mrs. Brown tells us that her grandfather, Admiral Noble, when flag-lieutenant to Lord Nelson, had a vision, coinciding with death, of his cousin, Jeffery Wheelock, who was serving with the Duke of York in 1794. But this is only family tradition.]

(529) From Mrs. Martin, housekeeper to Miss Anna Swanwick, 23, Cumberland Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W., who considers that her memory is accurate and trustworthy, in spite of advanced age.

" January, 1884.

"When I was about seven years old [about 1807], my cousin, Joseph Newton, a youth of about 17 years of age, whose mother and stepfather occupied a farm near Hawarden, and were tenants of Sir Stephen Glynn, came to visit my mother in Liverpool. He was so delighted with the shipping that he left the farm and entered the establishment of a shipwright. About two years later, his mother, who rarely left home, presented herself at my mother's house and said, 'I shall never again see Joseph. As I lay awake last night, he appeared to me naked and dripping with water. I know that he is drowned.' This proved to be the case. He had gone with a companion to bathe in the Mersey, and had been carried away by the current. Seven or eight days afterwards his body was seen floating in the water, and was picked up by a packet.

"I remember my aunt's visit, and I remember attending my cousin's funeral. I cannot say that I actually heard my aunt relate her dream, but I have often heard my mother tell the story. My mother and aunt are both dead. I never heard that my aunt had any similar dream at any other time.

"SUSAN MARTIN."

¹ Compare the next case, and cases 513, 535, 537 ; and see p. 26.

Mrs. Martin further states that this was the only occasion on which her aunt visited Liverpool.

It has been impossible to trace the date of this death, as it occurred before the days of registration.

[If the narrator has really a recollection of her aunt's visit, which both preceded the news of the death and was a consequence of the vision, her evidence is not very far from being on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148).]

(530) From Miss Jameson, 6, Leamington Villas, Acton. She is the youngest daughter referred to in the narrative, being at the time (1839) 10 years of age. Her father was residing in Norfolk.

“ April 30th, 1884.

“ On a bright moonlight night in January, 1839, an elderly gentleman was lying dangerously ill. He was being carefully watched that night by a daughter. During the hours of from 12 midnight to 2 o'clock, so peculiar were his symptoms, the daughter thought her father dying or dead, and yet there seemed anguish. In the morning, about 10 o'clock, the gentleman came downstairs. His youngest daughter was frightened to see her father so altered, and well remembers his resting his elbow upon the mantelpiece, with his forehead on his hand, and also saying, ‘ May my Lord and Almighty Father in His Infinite mercy grant that I never may pass through another such night.’

“ On the same evening in Boulogne, the eldest son of the above thought he would go home early that night ; bright and moonlight ; retired to rest (but not to sleep) shortly after 12 ; the room quite light. Not feeling sleepy, he half reclined, resting his head upon one hand. Presently he saw his bedroom door gently open. He roused himself to look and see who could be coming so quietly into his bedroom, when he saw his father in his night-dress, with a silk handkerchief, which he *distinctly recognised*, bound round his head. His father came to the foot of the bed, and stood and gazed at his son, who steadily looked at him, pained to see his father looking so ill. The father quietly withdrew, the door closed, the son jumped out of bed, and dressed himself quickly, walked about the streets of Boulogne with the watchman, to whom he related occurrence, at 6 a.m. returned home, and wrote immediately to his sisters to inquire how his father and all at home were. The letter caused great surprise, as it was an unusual one. Some months after, he came home upon a visit, when he alluded to letter, related above incident, and said ‘ Wait one minute. Just recollect which silk handkerchief father had round his head. I will tell you which I saw, and then you will see if I am right.’ And he was right. My father was never told of it. My brother died over 10 years since.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Jameson wrote :—

“ The handkerchief which was round my father's head was, as well as I can describe it, of an undecided pattern—colours blended—scarcely a scroll, and yet a scroll pattern is the best name I can give ; an Indian style ; a border round, with the colours less mixed ; red and yellow, but not glaring ; it had been given him at High Wycombe. No two handkerchiefs the same pattern. I remember two others very well ; both larger in size ; one used to be called brindled ; no decided pattern, but the colours woven in ; a lady would understand by my saying something of a Paisley

shawl pattern ; perhaps you will understand me better if I say the colours were so mixed as to somewhat resemble the tapestry curtains of the present day—where there is not a decided pattern.

"E. M. JAMESON."

In conversation Miss Jameson told me that she distinctly remembers the arrival of this letter, and the sensation it caused. It was the fact of its arrival that impressed on the minds of the family the coincidence of the father's distress and the brother's anxiety. Miss Jameson gave a vivid description of her father's aspect and words.

Miss Jameson has forwarded to us the following letter from her sister, Mrs. Large.

"Grange Cottage, Taplow.

"November 15th, 1884.

"In answer to your request about dear father and William, it was this, as near as I can remember. One night William woke up, whether from any noise or influence I do not know, and saw a figure at the foot of his bed, like father, with a countenance of *extreme misery*. He was frightened, and covered himself up with bedclothes till daylight ; whether he slept or not I know not. Upon comparing notes when he wrote to know how we all were, it seems *that night* was the one father *suffered so intensely* with the abscess, and thought he should not live. I remember when he came down in the morning how haggard he looked ; he quite upset us. But he roused no one in the night—why I do not know. From a remark he made, he was thinking of William during the night. That is all I know.

"M. LARGE."

Miss Jameson adds :—

"I think my own version is correct, for I am singularly correct in all things bearing upon events of my childhood. I was 10, my sister 18. I think the impression made upon my mind was more unmixed, as my brother was anything but timid ; the covering himself up, I think, is mixed with another matter.

"E. M. J."

(531) From Mrs. Harvey, 1, Rochester Road, Camden Road, N.W.

"February 26th, 1884.

"On February 8th, 1882, my eldest brother died at Croydon, at a quarter past 6 in the morning. About 6 o'clock in the evening I received notice of his death. I wrote that same evening to my aunt and uncle, at Billericay, in Essex. My letter was received by them the next day. In the following July, I visited my aunt, and on speaking of my brother's death she said :—

"On the morning before I received your letter I was lying awake, when I distinctly saw the form of a tall man appear at my bedside, and slightly bend over it.' I said, 'Did you really?' She said, 'That I certainly did, and I awoke your uncle, and told him ; I could not discern features, but I saw the form of a man as plain as could be. I did not know what to think it meant.' My aunt had not heard of his illness, for it was not made known to even his wife that it was so serious ; his death was therefore unexpected.

"M. HARVEY."

We have confirmed the date and place of death by the Register of Deaths.

We are requested not to publish the aunt's name. Mrs. Harvey, at my request, wrote to ask her some questions, and I have seen the reply, in which Mrs. Harvey's uncle, speaking of his wife, says, "All she can say is that it was so"; but he expresses the strongest dread and dislike of the whole subject.

(532) From the late Mr. G. Wadsworth, the narrator of case 496 above.¹

"October 21st, 1882.

"In 1837 my uncle was living in Birmingham. My father, then living in Jersey, one morning got up in great perturbation, having seen his brother dying, and said to my mother that he must go at once to Birmingham. Communication was at that time not very convenient, and, moreover, expensive, so that my mother naturally dissuaded a journey upon such an extraordinary assumption; but so convinced was my father of the force of his vision, that he packed up his portmanteau ready for the summons which he felt certain to receive; and when a few days after he got a letter from me, and a parcel from the executor notifying the death, he at once started by return steamer.

"My uncle at the time, and for some short time previously, was known to be ailing—not what could be called really dangerously. The cause of his death occurred after I left him in the evening, and before my calling in the morning, so that he may be said to have died suddenly, so far as was known in Jersey."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place, very suddenly, on July 29, 1837.

[Here again it is possible that the experience was a dream; but the impression made by it seems to have been of a very unusual kind.]

(533) From Mrs. Harnett, a near relative of our friend, Miss Porter, who thinks that her memory may be fully trusted; but the case is very remote.

"Hollybank, Kenley, Surrey.

"December, 1884.

"Having been requested to write down the particulars of an event which occurred in the lives of my parents, I do so.

"In 1820, my father and mother, both being under 50 years of age, and in perfect health, were staying in Liverpool (their residence being at Whitehaven, in Cumberland), names, Joseph and Ann Mondel.

"One night, the latter, sleeping peacefully, was awoke by the former calling out:—

"'Ann, I feel sure Anthony Mathers is dead.'

"'What makes you think so?'

"'He has just been at the bedside, and laid an icy-cold hand on my cheek.'

"'You must have been dreaming.'

"'Oh, but my cheek is still cold.'

"The old and much-esteemed friend was, at the time, sojourning in one of the West Indian islands. The season was known to be more than usually sickly, so the thought of his danger might have engendered morbid

¹ These two cases perhaps afford an example of family susceptibility (p. 132, note).

feelings. My father, as well as my mother, was content to rest in that hope, during the weeks that must elapse ere the news of that night's occurrences in Jamaica could reach England. News did arrive, and stated that on the night referred to Mr. Mathers succumbed to a sudden and most severe attack of yellow or other West Indian fever.

"As a child I first heard the tale, but often in my presence was it repeated or referred to, later in life, without any change or amplification of detail.

"JANET HARNETT."

[We have failed to trace the exact date of the death.]

(534) From Miss Crommelin, 1, Edinburgh Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.

"April, 1883.

"My brother, when at school, having gone to bed one summer's night in a dormitory with several other boys, heard young C——, who slept next to him, call out, 'Crommelin! Look, there is my sister standing at the foot of my bed—see!' My brother saw nothing, though he sat up.¹ It was after nine, but still light, if I remember rightly. Young C—— still persisted he had seen her, in white. Next day came a telegram: the child in question had died of heart disease, whilst saying her prayers at that very hour—she had presumably also been wearing her white night-gown. As my brother is now dead, and as we have no knowledge of the schoolfellow in question, this cannot be more fully authenticated.

"MAY CROMMELIN."

In conversation, Mr. Podmore learnt that the boy's name was Close, but Miss Crommelin does not know to what family of Closes he belonged. The incident took place in 1858, or about that date, when her brother was 12 years old, and she a little younger. She heard of it from her brother soon after the event.

(535) From Mr. Arthur Bedford, Ant's Hill, Laugharne, St. Clears, S. Wales. This account might have been included with the first-hand evidence, but is placed here on account of its resemblance to the last.

"March 10th, 1884.

"At a large public school, one winter's morning, about dawn, all in our dormitory were roused up by a fearful cry from one of my schoolfellows, who declared that his father, dressed in a pea coat, with high boots on, had appeared at his bedside, dripping wet. Some days afterwards an account of the foundering of the vessel he commanded in Yarmouth Roads reached him, and, as well as could be ascertained, the time of the loss of the vessel corresponded with the appearance of this double of my schoolfellow's father at his bedside. The body was recovered and found to be dressed as described. I would like to give name and other circumstances, but the widow of my schoolfellow is alive, and I do not know her present residence, to ask permission for disclosing it.

"ARTHUR BEDFORD."

(536) From Mrs. Gardiner, 30, Skene Street, Macduff, N.B., who heard of the incident from her sister soon after its occurrence. The account was written in 1883. After narrating that about 40 years before, when her father was tenant of Mill of Boyndie, a large farm about two miles west of Banff, three men who had left his service one morning got

¹ See p. 105, second note.

drunk, pushed out to sea in a boat, and were drowned, Mrs. Gardiner continues :—

“In the meantime nothing whatever of the movements of these men was known at the Mill of Boyndie ; but all the household retired to rest at the usual hour. My sister, as was her custom, locked all the doors, and placed the keys on a table beside her bed. She was awakened in the middle of the night by one of the domestics coming to her, and asking for the key of the kitchen door, as two of the three lads who had left in the morning had just looked in at her bedroom window, as if they were in want of something. She said she had asked them what they required, but they had returned no answer, and having slowly moved down, left the back of the house, where they were joined by the third one. [The premises were searched without result.] A messenger arrived early next morning, saying that the three young men had been drowned. My sister is now dead, but I am certain, if she had been alive, she would have corroborated the whole of the foregoing statement.”

[The evidence here of course depends, not on the mere tale of a frightened servant, but on the assurance of Mrs. Gardiner's sister that the fright related to the apparition of certain persons whose death was not known of till next day. A mistake of identity seems improbable ; as though a servant, startled from sleep in the middle of the night, would be likely enough to mistake friends seeking admittance for tramps or burglars, she would not be likely to mistake tramps or burglars for friends. It must be observed, however, that a joint apparition of three persons who were all dying at the same time is not a type of which we have any first-hand specimens ; and though such an event would quite admit of a telepathic explanation, it suggests a certain infusion of the mythical element. Clearly, a genuine telepathic incident may be unconsciously exaggerated and improved, just as much as a spurious one.]

§ 5. The remaining second-hand cases are from narrators who were not relatives of the original witnesses, but for the most part were thoroughly intimate with them. None of the cases are the mere recitals of stories casually picked up without any warranty as to their *bona fides*.¹

(537) Mr. Colchester, of Bushey Heath, Herts, sends us the following case from a MS. work entitled *Reminiscences of the Bermudas*, written by his late father, who at the time of the occurrence narrated was assistant-surgeon in the Royal Artillery. The names of the two officers, Lieutenants

¹ At the same time, these are specially the cases in respect of which the drawbacks to transmitted evidence, which were described in Vol. i., pp. 149-57, must be carefully borne in mind. For example, the narrator of the last case described to us how a friend of hers, the late Dr. Smith, of Banff, when a medical student, woke and “distinctly saw a brother,” who, it proved, died at the time. But we afterwards obtained an account from Mrs. Findlater, of Dufftown, N.B., a daughter of the percipient, in which it was stated that he always expressly denied having seen any apparition, or recognisable form. He was only conscious of his bed-curtains shaking, and of a shadow passing before him. The point remains that a strong impression of his brother's death was conveyed to him (though the death was quite unexpected), and that he rose and marked the time in writing, and next day mentioned his experience to a friend, Mr. Falconer. Still the case, already second-hand and remote, is so much weakened by the correction that we do not include it in our evidence.

Creagh and Liston, were given in initial in the MS. The author heard of the occurrence from Lieutenant Creagh (whom he describes as "a highly honourable man"), and made a written note of it, some months, or perhaps a year, after it happened. The account is somewhat abridged.

"The passage from Bermuda to Halifax is in certain seasons hazardous, and in 1830 a transport, containing over 200 men, foundered at sea between these two ports. Two officers of the regiment to which the detachment had belonged had, in a half-jesting way, made a sort of promise that whoever died first should come back if he could, and let the other know whether there was another world.¹ This conversation was heard by the narrator, as it took place in his presence, perhaps a year before the events happened, though not remembered till afterwards. Liston embarked in charge of the detachment, and had been gone about a fortnight, when Creagh, who had one night left the mess early and had retired to bed, and was beginning to close his eyes, saw his door open and Liston enter. Forgetting his absence, and thinking he had come to pull him out of bed (for practical joking was then more common in the army than it is now), he cried, 'No, no; d——n it, Liston, don't, old fellow! I'm tired! Be off!' But the vision came nearer the bed foot, and Creagh then saw that Liston looked as if very ill (for it was bright moonlight), and that his hair seemed wet, and hung down over his face like a drowned man's. The apparition moved its head mournfully; and when Creagh in surprise sat up, rubbed his eyes, and looked again, it was gone. Still Creagh avers that all this time he had no idea of its being a spectre, and believing that he had seen Liston himself, he went to sleep. In the morning he related the occurrence, when he recollected, but not till then, Liston's absence on duty from the island. He asserts he had not lately been thinking of Liston; neither had the vessel been away long enough, nor had bad weather occurred to cause fears for her loss to be entertained. That he was wide awake, or at least not dreaming, is shown by his sitting up and addressing the apparition."

We find from the Army List that Lieut. Liston was "lost on passage home from Bermuda, on board the brig 'Bulow,' April, 1831," not 1830.

[It is impossible to say whether the vision occurred at the hour, or even on the day, that the transport foundered.]

(538) From Miss Ann Hunt (a member of the Society of Friends), 9, Brunswick Square, Bristol.

"May 15th, 1884.

"At the time of Joan Pince's death, her son was in the employ of Philip D. Tuckett, of Frenchay. I well remember hearing this son, John Pince, relate how he had been aroused by the sound of his mother's voice, calling him by name. It was early in the morning, but so strong was his impression that his mother's decease was thus notified to him, that he got up and went into his employer's room, saying that his mother was dead, and that he must go at once to her home. At first endeavours were used to dissuade him from his purpose, but finding how strong an impression had been made on his mind, P. D. Tuckett kindly acceded, and John Pince set off for his mother's residence, which was, I believe, in Devonshire. On arriving, he found the event had taken place as he apprehended. I

¹ See p. 66, and p. 489, first note.

hoped to procure a written account of this circumstance, as a granddaughter of his, now living in Bristol, thought she had it in the handwriting of her mother, who is lately deceased. She has been unable to find it, but fully confirmed the particulars I have given.

“John Pince died in 1854, aged 87 years; and it may have been 7, or possibly 10, years before that I heard him relate the occurrence”—at which time, as Miss Hunt has stated in conversation, he was in complete vigour, with senses unimpaired, and an excellent memory.

The following account of the same incident is from Miss Bowden, a cousin of Miss Hunt’s.

“One night in March, 1793, my grandfather, John Pince, was awoken by a voice, which he believed to be his mother’s, calling him by name, ‘John, John!’ He was so impressed by the feeling that his mother, Joan Pince, whom he dearly loved, was ill or dying, that he immediately arose and went to the Friend with whom he lived, and told him he must at once set out for home, stating his reason for doing so. On reaching Newton Bushel, he found that his mother had departed this life after a few hours’ illness, at the time which he had heard her call.

“These few particulars are all I know about the occurrence, but I believe them to be correct, having heard them from my mother and aunt, daughters of John Pince.

“E. BOWDEN.”

Miss Bowden has in her possession a letter written to Mr. Tuckett by a friend of Joan Pince’s, describing her short illness, and requesting that her son’s mind may be prepared for the intelligence of her death. It is thus evident that he was not aware of her danger.

(539) From the Rev. Chas. C. Starbuck, M.A., Andover, Mass., U.S.A., who wrote in January, 1884. The account was communicated to him by the late Hon. Richard Hill, of Jamaica, a Privy Councillor of the island, the most eminent naturalist of the West Indies. Mr. Starbuck mentions Mr. Hill’s having quoted to him, with just gratification, a sentence from a letter which he had received from Charles Darwin—“you are an observer after my own heart.”

“When Mr. Hill was yet young, he began to work against African slavery, the curse of his native West Indies. Among others he visited the Duke of Kent, in the hope of securing his influence; and I may remark that he lived to receive from the Duke’s daughter, as his sovereign, the Companionship of the Bath, as a token of appreciation of his many and signal services both to science and humanity.

“Being a Jamaican born, and of mixed blood besides, he soon found that it would be as much as his life was worth to return to his native island. For a number of years he was an exile. White Englishmen, however, though zealous abolitionists, though liable to much persecution, and sometimes in considerable danger, could manage somewhat better to keep their hold in the island. There was one friend and colleague of Hill, an Englishman, I believe, named Lundy,¹ who was working in Jamaica, when his friend started from England in a sailing vessel for St. Thomas,

¹ I may remark that, as it is easier to be sure of facts than names, I give the latter only as they lie in my memory.—C. C. S.

intending to proceed to Hayti. Hill and the captain occupied the main cabin together, having their state-rooms on each side of it. One evening when the vessel was about in the latitude of the Azores, the captain and he were both in their state-rooms, while a large globe-lamp, swinging over the table, partially lighted each. Hill was lying still awake, when he heard a step in the cabin, which, he told us, he recognised the instant he heard it. It passed through the cabin, and his friend Lundy appearing in the door of his state-room, came up to the berth, and leaning on it, said: 'Well, Hill, I have served the cause as long as I could be useful; and now it has pleased God to take me.' He remarked that the words sank ineffaceably into his mind, and the more so as they afforded so pleasing an evidence of Lundy's readiness to go. The next morning the captain said to him: 'Why, Hill, you look as if you had had a day's hard raking.' But his passenger kept his counsel.

"Just as they landed at St. Thomas, a vessel came in from Kingston, and a young friend of Hill's sprang ashore. Saluting him, Hill said: 'I need not ask how Lundy is, for I know he is dead.' 'Why,' exclaimed his friend, in astonishment, 'how could you know that? I had but time to see the funeral company into the church, and as the wind was fair, I was obliged to hasten off to the vessel without going in.' 'No matter how I know it,' replied Hill, 'you see I know it.' They soon parted, and Hill, having completed his visit to Hayti, returned to England.

"Some two years later, Mr. Hill met in England a gentleman who first had been a missionary in Jamaica, and subsequently in Africa. They fell into talk about Lundy, and this gentleman remarked, 'I was with Lundy when he died; and I remember that his last words were: "The only wish I have left is, that I might be permitted to see Hill once more, and say to him—'Well, Hill, I have served the cause as long as I could be useful; and now it has pleased God to take me.'"'¹ It seems that his wish was granted, and that he was permitted to go to Heaven by way of the Azores."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Starbuck writes to us:—

"Feb. 22, 1884.

"The narratives [this and another] are throughout communications made to me directly by Mr. Hill. And I saw him so frequently and so familiarly during my 10 years' stay in Jamaica that they may be relied on as thoroughly accurate reports.

"CHARLES C. STARBUCK,

"Ten years missionary in Jamaica in connection with the American Missionary Association."

(540) From Mr. F. J. Jones, Civil Engineer, Heath Bank, Mossley Road, Ashton-under-Lyne.

"March, 1884.

"The following story was told me by an old friend [name given], to whom it happened when an undergraduate of Peterhouse College, Cambridge. I will try and put it in his own words as nearly as possible.

"I had arranged to stay up part of the long vacation to grind in quiet, and to make the best of lost time.

"The event occurred on a Tuesday, in 1843, and I well remember

¹ It will be observed that the evidence for this remark of the dying man is *third-hand*; and the exact correspondence of part of it with what Mr. Hill heard is the sort of point which is very likely to creep into a story of this class as it passes from mouth to mouth.

feeling very lonely and wretched, for the weather was miserably wet, and all friends had gone down the day before. My greatest chum, a man named Bohun, I had seen off by the London coach, on his way to Dover, from whence he was to cross the Channel, to visit the friends of the girl to whom he was engaged. When saying good-bye, I little thought we should never meet again, at all events in the flesh. The first 24 hours of my solitude passed well enough, for I had a lot of lost time to make up. The evenings, however, hung very heavily on my hands.

“ ‘ On the second (Tuesday) evening, I turned in about 10 o’clock, meaning to get up early to work the next morning. Instead of undressing, I threw myself down on my bed in my clothes, and soon fell asleep. How long it lasted I don’t know, but before very long I woke with a sudden sense of chilliness,¹ and was startled to hear a sort of choking sound at my back. Turning round quickly, I was surprised to see, by the light of the reading lamp, my friend Bohun, half sitting up in my arm-chair beside the bed, and apparently gasping for breath. For a few seconds I looked at him in bewilderment, and then called him by name. In an instant the chair was vacant, and jumping off the bed I found the door locked, and the oak sported, as I left them.

“ ‘ Thinking it only a dream, though even then I must confess I was considerably startled by the vividness of it all, I undressed and got into bed, dozing off again in a few minutes. My sleep cannot, however, have been of long duration, and a second time I woke with the same curious sensation, and again saw Bohun gasping in the chair beside my bed.² Moving cautiously to that side of the bed, I made a sudden dash—at nothing: for a second time he was gone.

“ ‘ Now thoroughly awake, and, I must confess, not liking it all, I left my room, and calling the porter, we went through the empty place, only to find everything right and secure. The man seemed to think I had been taking rather more than perhaps was wise, and, much to my disgust, hinted it rather plainly; so in him I found only a Job’s comforter. Being unable to sleep any more that night, I made up my mind to read for the remaining hours before daylight.

“ ‘ The next day nothing transpired, and I began to feel I had rather made a fool of myself, and did not at all relish the porter’s inquiries after my health. Wednesday passed, and a lot of reading was accomplished, and on Thursday I walked out a short distance to meet the London coach, which brought my weekly papers. After a short chat the driver suddenly said “Have you heard, sir, of poor Mr. Bohun’s sad death? As he was going on board the packet at Dover he slipped on the gangway, falling into the water, and was never seen again.”

“ ‘ The shock to me was so great that for several weeks I was laid up in my room, and in my delirium I was afterwards told I was always raving about my poor friend and his mysterious visit to my rooms.’

“ F. J. J.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Jones says :—

“ My friend about whom you ask has been dead now about nine years. He first told us the story in the year 1867, and has since often alluded

¹ See p. 37, first note.

² Compare cases 503 and 519, and see p. 237, note.

to it." In conversation I learnt that this friend was Mr. Jones's tutor, living in the same house, for several years, and was most deeply respected by him. We have ascertained that he was at Peterhouse in 1843; but the name Bohun does not appear in the Cambridge Calendar of that date, and is probably a mistake. We have not been able to discover any public notice of the accident, and the death was probably not registered.

[It ought to be observed that the percipient was probably falling ill at the time of his vision; and that in his subsequent delirium the order of events may have become confused. Still, it seems unlikely that his recollection of the anxiety that succeeded the vision and preceded the arrival of the news is a piece of pure imagination.]

(541) From Mr. George M. Barker, Brynderw, Dolgelly.

"July, 1884.

"Travelling by train from London to Brighton in company with my tutor, we sat opposite an elderly lady, who seemed to doze. About half-way, she awoke with a cry, and was much agitated. My tutor soothed her, and asked her what was the matter. She stated that she had seen her son (who was in the navy) drowning before her eyes, and that it was so horribly real, even to the minutest detail of dress, &c., that she could not believe that she was travelling in a railway carriage. She vowed that she had not been to sleep. My tutor, with her permission, called upon her next day, and an acquaintance struck up, which lasted for some time. About a fortnight after the scene in the carriage, news duly arrived of the death of the son at sea, while rowing from the ship to the shore. This event occurred in the year 1870 or 1871.

"GEORGE M. BARKER."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Barker says:—

"I am unable to furnish you with the address of my old tutor. His name was Alfred Downes, 64, Upper Brunswick Place, Brighton, but I have heard recently that he has left Brighton. The name of the old lady I heard mentioned by my tutor years ago, but I have no recollection of what it was, or where, exactly, she lived. The bald facts are, therefore, all that I can give you. To me, at the time, this event was of considerable interest. I may mention that I am a thorough disbeliever in everything unnatural and ghostly.

"I have no doubt that the time was *exactly* the same, and for this reason: my tutor and I were travelling by a very fast train between London and Brighton, the total journey only occupying 1hr. 10min.; we were just passing, or had just passed (I really forget which) Redhill Station, which is about half way, so that we could easily fix the time. My tutor, seeing the condition of the poor lady, asked, and was allowed, to call upon her to inquire after her state, and it was during one of these calls that the news was confirmed. The time of the upset of the boat was, allowing for the change between the two distances, as nearly corresponding as possible."

We cannot trace Mr. Downes; the postmaster at Brighton has no later address than that given.

(542) From Mr. S. Alfred Steinthal, The Limes, Nelson Street, Manchester.

“ March 21st, 1884.

“ A lady of my acquaintance, Mrs. Ashton, now deceased, the wife of Mr. Alderman Ashton, of this city, had a son who was the Unitarian minister at Glossop, in Derbyshire. One night she distinctly saw her son in his night-dress in her room (she lived then at Cheetham Hill, Manchester), and woke her husband, telling him what had occurred. Neither she nor her husband knew of anything being wrong with their son, but next morning they were informed that he had been taken suddenly ill, and had died at the time when Mrs. Ashton saw the appearance she described. Neither Mr. Ashton nor Mrs. Ashton were Spiritualists.

“ S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Steinthal adds:— “ April 1st, 1884.

“ Both Mr. and Mrs. Ashton are now deceased. I heard the story, a short time after the death, from Mrs. Ashton. It was told me in the presence of her husband, who confirmed the part of the story that she had awakened him, and had told him of the appearance she had seen. Mr. Ashton died about seven years ago, but I cannot give you the exact date. I am sorry I cannot be more definite.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the Rev. Frederick Ashton died at Glossop on April 15, 1878.

(543) From the late Mr. Myddleton, Leasingham Hall, Sleaford.

“ September 1st, 1884.

“ Mrs. Onslow was suddenly awakened one night by her son, who was in the Royal Marines, and afloat on board a man-of-war. She awoke suddenly and saw her son standing at the foot of the bed. She exclaimed to her husband, ‘ Oh! Onslow, here is —— ’ (the son’s name) ‘ come back.’ Onslow awoke, but the son (or vision) had disappeared. They noted the exact hour, &c., and when time allowed them to hear from him (his ship was off Madeira or St. Helena) a letter arrived saying he was dead, and had died at the very time he had appeared to his mother.

“ This is to certify that the above is a perfectly correct account, as I have heard Mrs. Onslow often relate; but alas! both she and her husband have long been dead, and I cannot ask for a written confirmation.

“ RD. WHARTON MYDDLETON.”

(544) From Mrs. Bryant, Ladymeade, Tyndall’s Park, Bristol. The evidence is of the sort which may be regarded as on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148); but it cannot be regarded as certain that the figure seen represented the supposed agent.

“ 1881.

“ One morning one of the upper servants came to my father, Captain Beadon, R.N., and in my presence said that she felt sure he would soon hear of a death in the family, for in the night she awoke to find an old lady standing by her bedside, and gazing steadfastly at her. She was dressed in her shroud, and Stapleton (the maid) especially noticed the fine old lace on her cap. My father laughed at her, and jokingly asked a description of her features, which Stapleton gave. I said, ‘ That is so like Aunt F.’ (Stapleton had never seen Mrs. F.) The maid said at first she was frightened, and covered her head with the bedclothes; but she was a religious woman, and prayed for courage to ask the spirit what it wanted.

On looking again, she found the old lady still there. Stapleton spoke to her, and gradually and slowly the figure faded away. The next day's post brought news of the death of my father's aunt, Mrs. F.

In May, 1884, Mrs. Bryant writes :— "GEORGINA BRYANT."

"I have sent my father your letter, and asked him to write out the story, and see if I have remembered it correctly. I have not compared notes with him in any way. I don't think it is worth much in point of evidence—however, what there is to be relied on.

"In answer to your questions :—

"(1) The date would be nearly 40 years ago.

"(2) I do not at all know if the servant is living.

"(3) I do not know if she had ever seen anything of the kind before.

"(4) She said : 'A noble-looking old lady with her night-dress on and beautiful lace on her cap.'"

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mrs. Franklin died on March 8, 1846.

On May 26th, 1884, Captain Beadon wrote to Mrs. Bryant as follows :—

"Creechbarrow, Taunton.

"DEAR GEORGINA,—When we lived at No. 8, Pavilion Place, Battersea Fields, Sarah Stapleton, who lived with us as housemaid, informed your mother and me that an old lady was sitting on her box in her bedroom when she was getting out of bed in the morning, about 7 a.m.

"The apparition remained some time, and did not disappear until she addressed it in the name of the 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' She said she did not know any person like the apparition, but, from her exact description I said it was my aunt, Mrs. F., whom I then supposed to be living at No. 5, Hammett Street, Taunton.

"The next post brought me a letter from my cousin, Robert Beadon, stating that Mrs. F. had died about the time of Stapleton's vision. I do not remember the exact date of Mrs. F.'s death. Stapleton was a very respectable, steady young woman—a Wesleyan. Your mother often said after, she was the best servant she ever had ; she married a young artificer, then employed at Woolwich Dockyard, in 1845 or 1846. I have never heard of, or from, her since.

"I lived some two years with my aunt.—I am, your affectionate father,

"GEORGE BEADON."

[If the death was on the night preceding the apparition, as Captain Beadon stated in conversation that he believed it was, the news probably arrived not by the "next post," but (as Mrs. Bryant says) by "next day's post" ; but Captain Beadon cannot be absolutely certain that it did not occur before night on the preceding day.]

As to the next case, see the remark which prefaces case 527 above. The standing "at the foot of the bed"—it will have been observed—is a point which occurs in a large number of these borderland cases.

(545) From Mrs. Harper, Cotham, Bristol.

"December, 1883.

"I was at school at Miss Smith's, Portland Street, Kingstown, with the

daughters of the Hon. James P., of Jamaica. He was expected home, and a house in Cotham Park, just opposite my present residence, was being prepared for him. One night, Hannah P. woke screaming, saying her father was dead. Miss Smith asked her why she said so, and she stated that her father had come and stood at the foot of her bed, and then went and looked at her sister Isabel in another bed. The father died at that time, and it seems he had a presentiment that he should not live to return, and had ordered a quantity of rum to be put on board to preserve his body in if he should die on the way."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Harper adds :—

"I was at school with Hannah P., but not at the time the occurrence took place to which you allude, so of course was not in the room. I heard of it afterwards from a young lady that was in the room, and saw her distress; she was a proud reserved girl, about 17, and very unlikely to make a display of feeling unless greatly moved. The younger girl sleeping in the same room did *not* see her father, although Hannah said that he went from her to look at Isabella. I cannot say how long it was after she went that I heard of it; it might have been a year. We were not allowed to speak of it to Hannah. "S. J. HARPER."

We find from the *Gentleman's Magazine* that the death occurred on Sept. 4, 1825, after a 4 days' illness.

(546) From Mr. E. Keep, who first wrote from abroad, and later from 25, Phillimore Gardens, W. We owe the case in the first instance to the Oxford Phasmatological Society. "1880.

"Some years ago, Mr. Charles F. Smith, a gentleman living in Melbourne, became very unwell, and was recommended to go on a sea voyage. A captain of a merchant vessel going to Java offered him a berth upon the ship on very moderate terms; but Mr. Smith's finances being at a very low ebb, a few of his friends clubbed together and presented him with £100, and Mr. Smith started on his voyage.

"One of the friends subscribing to the fund was a Mr. Bowman, a very old friend of Mr. Smith, and some time after Mr. Smith's departure, Mr. Bowman met me in the street, and said, 'Oh, Mr. Keep, I saw Charley Smith either last night or the night before; he appeared at the foot of my bed dressed in a long black robe; and bursting into tears vanished.' I said, 'Are you joking? One reads of these things in the *Night Side of Nature*, and such rubbish, but one doesn't expect to hear of them in actual life.' 'Oh,' said Mr. Bowman, 'these things are often occurring to me—you will find Mr. Smith died last night.' I stepped into my office, and made a note of the conversation and date, and said that Mr. Bowman was not certain if his dream were last night or the night before.

"In about a month the steamship 'Hero' arrived at Sydney from Java, and reported that a passenger, Mr. Charles F. Smith, of Melbourne, had died at sea on one of the dates specified by Mr. Bowman.

"EDWARD KEEP."

At our request Mr. Keep wrote to Melbourne, to get confirmation of this narrative; but he found that the diary in which he noted the incident had been burnt, and his friends knew nothing of Mr. Bowman. He adds that he thinks the occurrence was in 1869.

We have received the following letter from Messrs. Gibbs, Bright and Co., of Melbourne:—

"April 28th, 1886.

"In reply to your letter of 20th Feb., we have interviewed Capt. Logan, who was commander of the s.s. 'Hero' at the time of the death of Mr. C. F. Smith; and he advises us that, as well as he can remember, Mr. Smith died on the day after leaving Batavia, in Dec., 1886,"—apparently a slip for 1868, in which year, as we have ascertained by a search in Sydney papers, the "Hero" was trading from that place.

(547) From Mademoiselle Glinka, 1, Rue Lincoln, Champs Elysées, Paris. "1884.

"My brother had the habit, when he went to Wiesbaden, to visit an old servant maid, who had been for 15 years in our family, when we were children, and who now lives on a pension. She is very much attached to our family. Lately she had met with an accident, having fallen from a staircase, and was laid up in her bed for several weeks, with compresses on her face. She knew of my brother's last illness, but was not aware of its gravity.

"One day, when lying in her bed in a half doze, she saw my brother enter her room, clad in his grey coat as usually. Quite confused that he should see her in that state, she exclaimed, 'Why, Excellency, I am ashamed that you have come into my room to find me here in my bed.' He answered, 'Do not mind it, Bienchen' (the name we called her by), 'have you not been sitting at my bedside hundreds of times when I was a boy?' She begged him to be seated.¹ Then he looked at her with a long, fixed gaze, and disappeared at the door. Frightened and amazed, she rang for her landlady, and asked her why she had let Mr. G. enter without announcing him. The woman protested that nobody could have entered without her knowledge, as she had been on the ground floor, and that she had not seen his Excellency or anybody else. A few days later she heard of his death. But the day and hour she had seen him, and talked with him, my brother had had his arm amputated, being *chloroformed*. "J. G."

In answer to inquiries, Mademoiselle Glinka adds on March 7th, 1886:—

"Jacobina Riekes told me of this experience within a week after its occurrence. It had greatly astonished her, as she had never had any hallucination in her life. She was certainly awake, as she was in the act of altering the arrangement of some compresses on her face. She told the landlady of her experience immediately after it occurred; but I did not myself speak to the landlady on the subject. My brother died two days after the operation. The event occurred at Easter, 1884. My brother was in Frankfort."

This case is the only one in our collection where the supposed agent was under the influence of an anæsthetic; but it may be compared to cases where the condition has been fainting or coma (see Vol. I., p. 563, note).

¹ See p. 460, second note.

The next case resembles No. 505, above, in representing a complete scene which seems to have been conveyed to the percipient's mind some little time after its occurrence, but at a time when the agent's thoughts (certainly in this case, and presumably in the other) were directed to the percipient, and also occupied with a mental renewal of the scene itself. In the present case, however, the interval between the enactment of the scene and the percipient's experience was probably little, if at all, more than 12 hours; and it would be quite possible to regard the case as one of deferred development (Vol. I., pp. 139, 511).

(548) Slightly abridged from the account of Miss Millicent A. Page, sent to us by her brother, the Rev. A. Shaw Page, Vicar of Selsley, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire

“I was staying with my mother's cousin, Mrs. Elizabeth Broughton, wife of Mr. Edward Broughton, Edinburgh, and daughter of the late Colonel Blanckley, in the year 1844, and she told me the following strange story:—

“She awoke one night and aroused her husband, telling him that something dreadful had happened in France. He begged her to go to sleep again and not to trouble him. She assured him that she was not asleep when she saw what she insisted on then telling him—what she saw in fact. First a carriage-accident, which she did not actually see, but what she saw was the result, a broken carriage, a crowd collected, a figure gently raised and carried into the nearest house, and then a figure lying on a bed, which she then recognised as the Duke of Orleans. Gradually friends collecting round the bed, among them several members of the French Royal family—the Queen, then the King—all silently, tearfully watching the evidently dying Duke. One man (she could see his back, but did not know who he was) was a doctor. He stood bending over the Duke, feeling his pulse, his watch in his other hand. And then all passed away: she saw no more. As soon as it was daylight, she wrote down in her journal all she had seen. From that journal she read this to me. It was before the days of electric telegraph, and two or more days passed before the *Times* announced ‘The Death of the Duke of Orleans.’ [Visiting Paris a short time afterwards, she saw and recognised the place of the accident, and received the explanation of her impression. The doctor who attended the dying Duke was an old friend of hers; and as he watched by the bed, his mind had been constantly occupied with her and her family. The reason of this was an extraordinary likeness—a likeness which had often led to amusing incidents—between several members of the Broughton family and members of the French Royal family who were present in the room.] ‘I spoke of you and yours when I got home,’ said the doctor, ‘and thought of you many times that evening. The likeness between yourselves and the Royal family was, perhaps, never so strong as that day when they stood there in their sorrow, all so natural; father, mother, brothers, sisters, watching the dying son and brother. Here was the link between us, you see.’”

The detailed account of the death of the Duke of Orleans was in the *Times* of July 15, 1842. The carriage accident took place at 12.30 p.m., on July 13. The Duke was carried into the nearest house, and attended by Dr. Bawnes and Dr. Pasquier. The King, Queen, and Duc d'Aumale arrived at the spot almost immediately; and the account in *Galignani's Messenger* for July 14 shows that other members of the Royal family and officials of distinction were present. The death occurred shortly after 3 p.m.

[This case is so exceptional in character as to excite some mistrust. It seems very possible that the scene has assumed a more dramatic completeness in the narrator's memory than the original description would warrant; but if, as alleged, the record was immediately made in the percipient's diary, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the correspondence was of a very striking kind.]

(549) In *Recollections, Political, &c., of the last Half Century* by the Rev. J. Richardson, LL.B. (1856), Vol. I., pp. 65-8, there is a circumstantial account of the appearance of Mr. John Palmer (an actor, who died suddenly on the stage at Liverpool, on the 2nd August, 1798), on the night of his death to a person in London, named Tucker. Tucker was a hall-porter, and habitually slept on a couch in the hall which Mr. Palmer passed at night, when he let himself in with a latch-key. The account was given by Tucker himself to Mr. Richardson, who, though a gossiping writer, does not seem to be an inaccurate one.

"The fact of his absence from London was known to Tucker, but he was not aware about his arrangement for his return. On the night just mentioned, Tucker had retired at an earlier hour than usual; but the company in the drawing-room were numerous, and the sound of their merriment prevented him from falling asleep; he was in a state of morbid drowsiness, produced by weariness, but continually interrupted by noise. As he described the scene, he was sitting half upright in his bed, when he saw the figure of a man coming from a passage which led from the door of the house to the hall. The figure paused in its transit for a moment at the foot of the couch, and looked him full in the face; there was nothing spectral or like the inhabitant of the world of spirits in the countenance or the outline of the figure, which passed on, and apparently went up the staircase. Tucker felt no alarm whatever; he recognised in the figure the features, gait, dress, and general appearance of John Palmer, who he supposed had returned from Liverpool, and having the *entrée* of the house, had, as usual, availed himself of his latch-key. . . . Next morning, in the course of some casual conversation, he informed Mrs. Vernon that he had seen Mr. Palmer pass through the hall, and expressed a hope that his trip to Liverpool had agreed with his health. The lady stared at him incredulously, said he must have been dreaming, or drinking, or out of his senses, as no Mr. Palmer had joined the festivities in the drawing-room. His delusion, if delusion it were, was made a source of mirth to the people who called in the course of the day. He however persisted in his assertion of having seen Mr. Palmer, and on the arrival of the post from Liverpool on the day after he had first made it, laughter was turned into mourning, and most of the guests were inclined to think there was more in it than they were willing to confess."

The following case is perhaps worth quoting, as parallel, in the form of the impression, to Nos. 175, 176, and 190; but it cannot receive an evidential number, being third-hand, and handed down by persons not likely to feel any special sense of responsibility with respect to it.

From *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron, with Notices of his Wife*, by Thomas Moore (1830), Vol. I., p. 193.

"Lord Byron used sometimes to mention a strange story, which the commander of the packet, Captain Kidd, related to him on the passage [to Lisbon, in 1809]. This officer stated that, being asleep one night in his berth, he was awakened by the pressure of something heavy on his limbs, and there being a faint light in the room, could see, as he thought, distinctly, the figure of his brother, who was at the time in the Naval Service in the East Indies, dressed in his uniform and stretched across the bed. Concluding it to be an illusion of the senses, he shut his eyes and made an effort to sleep. But still the pressure continued, and still as often as he ventured to take another look he saw the figure lying across him in the same position. To add to the wonder, on putting his hand forth to touch this form, he found the uniform in which it appeared to be dressed dripping wet. On the entrance of one of his brother officers, to whom he called in alarm, the apparition vanished; but in a few months afterwards he received the startling intelligence that on that night his brother had been drowned in the Indian Seas."

[The alleged touching of the clothes and feeling them to be wet is just one of those details which are met with in traditional narratives of the kind, and for which we have no first-hand evidence.]

I append a translation of a narrative which occurs in a Russian work, "*Prostaia Riétch o Moudrionnykh Viéstchakh*," or *Simple Discourse on Difficult Subjects*, (Moscow, 1875), by the late Professor Pogodine, of Moscow, a well-known historian. It is given as from certain "memoirs" of Kelsiéff, a Russian man of letters; but as the exact title of the original work is not mentioned, and the account is professedly *abridged*, I do not number it as evidence.

"Many years ago I was a pupil of the School of Commerce (St. Petersburg), and lived near it. My father with my mother and other children lived at Vasilievney Ostrov. He was a man of business, and very much occupied, and his visits to me were very rare. One evening I was lying on my bed, reading a book. Suddenly my door opened, and I saw my father, pale and *triste*, enter my chamber, and approach my bed saying to me, 'God bless you, my son! Don't forget this!' And by the same way he went out. I was not in the least surprised, for I was sure that it was really my father who came to me. In a short time I locked the door and went to bed. Soon I heard a knock at my door. I opened it and saw my father's coachman; he told me that my father had expired about an hour before. It was at the time when I saw him visit me."

CHAPTER V.

VISUAL CASES.

§ 1. I WILL again begin with evidence which is first-hand or on a par with first-hand. The following is a group of death-cases.

(550) From Mr. Joseph A. Chamberlain, High Garrett, Braintree, Essex.

“ December, 1884.

“ About 12 or 14 years ago, a little scholar in my school, named James Harrington, was very ill with diphtheria. I had been to a village about three miles off, to give a lesson on the pianoforte, and was returning on a dark night, about 7 o'clock. I was walking in a narrow footpath between two hedges, and on coming to a stile, I saw a luminous figure float over the stile,¹ meeting me, and gradually disappear at my left hand. I started, and said to myself, ‘That’s Jimmie,’ then stamped my foot on the ground and said, ‘How foolish I am to-night.’ I reached home about 7.30 to attend to my evening school, and judge of my surprise, on entering the school, the caretaker met me at the door, saying, ‘Jimmie is dead.’ ‘When?’ I said. He answered, ‘About half-an-hour ago.’”

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death occurred rather longer ago than Mr. Chamberlain imagined—on Oct. 28, 1867.

In answer to questions, Mr. Chamberlain says:—

“(1) The vision in a general way resembled James, especially as to size. The features were not clearly defined, but more like a magic-lantern view not properly focussed.

“(2) I knew that he was ill, but not that he was likely to die.

“(3) I was attached to him, but I cannot say I was particularly anxious about him. As far as I remember, I went to the house every evening, as his father and mother kept the coffee-room of which I had the superintendence; so my mind was occupied with his condition; but he was not in my thoughts before I saw the luminous figure.

“(4) I did mention it to our minister, the Rev. A. Macdougall, but I cannot say whether it [*i.e.*, the mention] was at the time or near the time—certainly not on the same evening. The fact is, I was rather afraid of being laughed at.

“I only wish I had been more careful in recording the facts. I shall

¹ As regards the movement, compare cases 203, 204, 512; as regards the luminosity, see Vol. i., pp. 550-1.

never forget the shock I received on entering my evening school half-an-hour afterwards, and learning from the caretaker that James had died about half-an-hour before."

Mr. Chamberlain mentions that he has had one other visual hallucination in his life ; but this was much less distinct, and occurred at a time when he was "unstrung by constant nursing and watching."

[Here the coincidence seems to have been very exact ; but we cannot with certainty exclude the supposition that the hallucination was due to the observer's anxiety as to his pupil's condition.]

(551) From the Rev. C. C. Wambey, now of Paragon, Wilton Road, Salisbury, the narrator of case 129.

"April, 1884.

"My father, who was an Indian officer, retired from the service at an early age, owing to partial loss of sight, which eventuated in total blindness. He was somewhat eccentric. Among other things, he was in the habit of frequently sitting up all night, retiring to bed when the servants came down in the morning.

"We, that is my father, mother, and their six children, were living at Crossway Green, in the parish of H., 12 miles from the city of W. One morning,—how well I remember it ! I was but a young child then,—a neighbouring farmer called at our house, and requested to see Mrs. W. immediately. He was shown into the drawing-room and, when my mother joined him, he mysteriously closed the door, and in an excited manner asked if it were all well with the 'Captain.' My mother replied that he was quite well when her eldest son, who had been reading the newspaper to him in his room, left him about half-an-hour ago. The farmer shook his head incredulously, and took his departure. Shortly after this, one of the servants having been guilty of misconduct, my mother, taking me with her, went to my father's room to acquaint him with the matter. As soon as she had opened the door, she started back in horror, saying to me, 'My ——, here is your father.' Stretched on the floor, his head against the bedstead, there he lay, DEAD !

"He was evidently in the act of preparing to dress (for a stocking was firmly grasped in his hand), when he was seized with a fit of apoplexy, death apparently having been instantaneous.

"After the funeral, the farmer disclosed to my mother this startling event, which from motives of delicacy, he forbore to mention to her sooner :—

"On the morning of his visit, he and his carter were with a waggon and team of horses crossing the common. Suddenly my father, his hand pointing to our house, appeared in front of the horses (which commenced snorting and plunging furiously), and as suddenly disappeared. When the horses had been calmed, the farmer, leaving them in charge of the carter, hastened to our house, and, as already related, requested to see my mother instantly.

"CORNELIUS C. WAMBEY."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Wambey says :—

"My father's death occurred when I was in my seventh year. It was the subject of conversation between my mother and myself from time to

time till her death in 1866, so that the apparition was no mere dream of childhood.

“I saw the farmer come into the house, and am under the impression that I was present at the interview between my mother and him, but am uncertain on this point. However, my mother forthwith mentioned to the elder children the purport of the farmer’s visit; but at the time she did not attach importance to it, as my father was in his usual health when my eldest brother left him, about half-an-hour previously.

“All my brothers and sisters are dead, except one sister whom I have not seen, and from whom I have not heard, for a long time.”

[Though the percipient here did not actually *describe* his experience before he heard of the death, Mr. Wambey’s remembrance of his strange visit assimilates the case to those reckoned as on a par with first-hand. (Vol. I., p. 148). In conversation he mentioned his very strong impression that he was himself in the room during this visit.]

(552) From Mrs. Rooke, Rawdon College, near Leeds.

On September 28, 1884, Mrs. Rooke wrote that, “About October, 1882, at 9 p.m.,” she had had “a visual impression of an intimate friend who was dead, though at the time the fact was unknown to me.”

In answer to inquiries, she adds :—

“Our dear friend had only died within a very short time of my seeing him. He was in Australia, and we heard of his death a few days over six weeks after I saw him. He went there for his health, but the last news we had of him was so good that we were not at all anxious. I was sorry afterwards that I had not kept a note of the exact day, but I had always so scoffed at ghost tales and such like things, that I was most unwilling to believe I had seen him. The gas was full on at the time; there was no light about the figure; he was as natural as in life, but as I came near to him vanished. I was going down a corridor, and the vision was certainly ‘external and palpable.’ I should think I saw him for half a minute quite, and expected him to come forward and speak. He was very much attached to us, as we were to him. “AMELIA M. ROOKE.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Rooke adds :—

“I am sorry to say that I did not mention the subject of the apparition to any one at the time I saw it; indeed, not till many months² after our friend’s death. There is nothing at all inconsistent with the supposition that the time of the ‘vision’ corresponded with the time of death. I always thought it probably did so. The dress was a suit and cap I knew well,¹ but he died in bed. I have never had a hallucination.”

[Here the coincidence is of course doubtful. It would remain a remarkable one, even if the interval exceeded the 12 hours’ limit laid down for the cases in this book.]

(553 and 554) From Mrs. Forsyth Hunter, 2, Victoria Crescent, St. Helier’s, Jersey, who sent us the accounts in 1882.

¹ See Vol. i., p. 540.

² This seems to be a mistake: see the “Additions and Corrections” at the beginning of the volume.

Mrs. Hunter had had a friend from whom she had parted in coldness, and whom she had not since seen or corresponded with. "Poor Z." (the real name was privately given) "was very far from my thoughts, when one night, in the winter of 1862 or spring of 1863, I had just got into bed. The fire burned brightly, and there was my usual night light. I was placing my head on the pillows, when I beheld, close to the side of the bed, and on a level with it, Z.'s head, and the same wistful look on his face which it had worn when we had parted years before. Starting up, I cried out, "What do you want?" I did not fear; anger was my feeling. Slowly it retreated, and just as it disappeared in the shadow of the wall, a bright spark of light shone for a few seconds, and slowly expired.¹

"A few days after, my sister wrote, 'You will have heard of poor Z.'s death on his way to the South of France.' I had heard nothing about him for years. Special reasons prevented my inquiring particularly into the precise moment of his death. Strange to say my bedfellow was his great pet among my children; she, however, slept through this strange interview."

We find from the *Medical Register* and the *Scotsman* that "Z." died at Hyères, on Nov. 17, 1862.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Hunter adds:—

"At Melrose, where I was a stranger, I could not have mentioned such a thing; but my sister paid me a visit about Easter, and I told her. No doubt she will confirm; but I would rather not recall the event."

"A daughter of mine in India was expecting her confinement to happen at the end of November, 1872. I was not anxious about her; indeed other important family events were occupying all my thoughts. On the 23rd of October, at noon, I was alone. All at once, a cold shivering feeling came over me, and I turned suddenly, and beheld a slight bending figure, standing near the closed door, covered over with a loose glistening robe or sheet of an ash grey colour. It looked such a sad little drooping figure, and the attitude and outline were strangely familiar to me; yet I never thought of *her* in connection with it. On the 19th November we had the startling news that she had died (eight days after giving birth to a son) on the 23rd of October, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. It was not for some days after that I thought of what I had seen in London at that hour on that day; I have never since for a moment doubted that it was she. I was in London, and she in India; our noon was the afternoon there, and her appearance must have been at the moment of dissolution."

We have confirmed the date of death in *Allen's Indian Mail*.

[In both cases the degree of exactitude in the coincidence must be regarded as uncertain, in the absence of proof that the date of the vision was accurately noted at the time. Mrs. Hunter has had at least one, and possibly a second, purely subjective hallucination of vision (Vol. I., p. 535, and p. 211, above).]

¹ As regards the truncated appearance—a head only—see p. 33, note, and compare case 572 below. As regards the light, see Vol. i., pp. 550-1, and p. 479 above; and as regards the gradual disappearance, see p. 97, second note.

(555) From Mrs. Perryn, 27, Adrian Square, Westgate-on-Sea.

“April 1st, 1885.

“In 1870 my mother was dangerously ill, but just before her death seemed to be rallying. I was aware of the improvement. One evening, on retiring to bed, about 10 o'clock, I was astonished to see the figure of my mother just beside my bedroom door. I immediately told my husband about it, and he made a note of the date (September 22nd). My mother died in Canada early on the morning of the 22nd of September. The figure looked as though enveloped in a faint smoke.¹ It was not recognisable in feature; but I immediately identified it as the appearance of my mother. The attire was the same in which I had last seen her several years before.²

“F. A. PERRYIN.”

In answer to the question whether she had ever had any other hallucination of the senses, Mrs. Perryn replies, “This experience is quite unique in my life.” She adds, “I have looked for the note but cannot find it.”

Mr. Perryn writes :—

“At this length of time I cannot feel justified in corroborating the above circumstance. I cannot find any note of the event, though I think one was made.

“R. H. PERRYIN.”

(556) From Mrs. Richards, Spring Wood, Godalming.

“July 3rd, 1883.

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

“We slept in a large dormitory in which were several beds, the two sisters occupying a double bed. On a certain night, most of the girls were asleep, and myself in the next bed to one of the sisters, who was already in bed, and, like myself, anxious to be quiet and allowed to go to sleep; but we were hindered by the frolicsomeness of the younger sister, who sat outside the bed and facing the door at the end of the room, which, I remember, was not quite dark, either owing to moonlight or the time of year. As the elder sister was urging her to be quiet and to get into bed, the younger one suddenly exclaimed, and putting her hands over her face, seemed greatly agitated. As there seemed no cause for this sudden excitement, we, thinking it was only another form of her nonsense, and fearing the noise would bring up the governess, who also slept in the room, scolded her well, upon which she got into bed. Turning again to look towards the door, she uttered another cry, directing her sister's attention to the door; but she saw nothing,³ and still thought the younger one was joking. But the latter buried her head under the clothes, and I, being very tired, went to sleep and thought no more about this disturbance.

¹ Cf. case 210, where the figure was “surrounded by a light sort of phosphorescent mist;” and see Vol. i., p. 526, first note.

² See Vol. i., p. 546.

³ See p. 105, second note.

“Next morning no notice was taken of it, and no impression seems to have been made on my mind or that of the other girls; probably, as I now think, owing to our being accustomed to the volatile disposition of the younger sister. However, about two days afterwards, the sisters were summoned into the room of the ladies of the school to receive letters. Shortly after, I was sent for, and found them in floods of tears, having just heard the news of their mother’s death. Being their chief friend, I was excused from lessons that I might be with them, and try to console them. As we were approaching our room, the younger sister stopped us suddenly, and grasping my arm with violence, she said, ‘Oh, do you remember the other night when I was frightened? I believe it was dear mamma that I saw. Let us go back and ask more about it,’ or words to that effect. We went back to Miss Horn’s apartment, and on referring to the letter, we found that their mother had died, as nearly as we could calculate, at the same hour that the incident in the dormitory occurred.

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

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

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

We find from Boyle’s *Court Guide* that Mrs. and the Misses Horn lived at 41, Cadogan Place, Chelsea, from 1836-8. Mrs. Richards has therefore antedated the incident by a year or two.

[The case is remote; but when the central fact, narrated by an eye-witness of the scene, is so precisely like that of numbers of more recent and corroborated cases, the hypothesis that it has been unconsciously invented does not seem specially probable.]

(557) The narrator of the next case objects to publicity, and takes no interest in the subject.

“November 6th, 1884.

“When I was about 10 or 12 years old, I was sitting one evening, towards dusk, at the piano practising, when I saw an old lady, the grandmother of one of my schoolfellows, enter the room. I was in the habit of seeing her frequently, and recognised her perfectly. She was very old, and to the best of my belief had never entered our house at all, so that I was greatly surprised to see her. I heard the next day she had died on the evening I saw her. I never had any other hallucination.

“MARY C.”

In conversation, Miss C. explained to Mr. Podmore that she did not actually see the figure enter the room. She looked up suddenly, and found it standing by her side. The figure was in ordinary indoor dress, with, as she particularly noticed, a large white cap, of muslin and lace, such as the old lady usually wore. The figure vanished suddenly as she

looked at it. The room, though dusk, was not dark, and she was able distinctly to recognise the features.

She cannot be certain whether she told anyone of what she had seen. She probably told the friend (the granddaughter of the lady who died) from whom she heard the news of the death next day. The time of the death she does not remember.

She knew the old lady well, and was in the habit of running in to see her nearly every day. But at this distance of time she cannot recollect whether the death was regarded as imminent.

She has lost sight of her friend, and can get no further particulars. The incident occurred about 1852; but the name of the lady who died being a very common one, our efforts to obtain the exact date have failed.

The next case seems to illustrate the heightening of the percipient's susceptibility at the approach of death. It is, of course, very rarely that there is a chance for this to be observed; as it can only comparatively rarely happen that death (or some event of critical interest) happens to A's friend or relative at a distance, at the particular time that A is dying. But I may refer to cases 372 and 416.

(558) From the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, formerly of Manchester, and now of Rhyl. The evidence may fairly be regarded as first-hand from the percipient's daughter.

“September, 1878.

“During the last illness of Mr. William Jackson, of Otley, who for 50 years had been a consistent member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, the little son of his daughter sickened and died. Wishing not unnecessarily to disquiet the good man, this sad event was withheld from him. He was full of holy joy, and recognised the presence in his chamber of a number of his relatives who had departed this life in the triumph of faith. He pointed them out in succession—this is so-and-so, and there such another. In the course of this proceeding he suddenly started with surprise, for he discovered his grandson also among the heavenly company. Then turning to his daughter, he said, ‘Well, never mind, he is all right.’

“His daughter, Miss Jane Jackson, certifies this. She says, ‘It is perfectly true; I was in the room with my lamented father at the time.’”

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Macdonald writes:—

“As to the case of William Jackson, his daughter did endorse it to me as noted in the quotation marks, but I destroyed her letter, never dreaming of a Society for Psychical Research, and I do not know now where to find her. The family evidently knew that the grandson had died, but kept that knowledge from the dying man. The information I received from the wife of Mr. Town Councillor Myers, of Hull.” Miss Jackson is since deceased. We learn that Mr. Jackson died on Jan. 12, 1876.

[The central incident in a case of this type seems reasonably explicable by thought-transference from one of the bystanders (*cf.* case 379)—though many would of course be unwilling to regard the vision of the other relatives as purely subjective. I have referred more than once to the difficulty of making quite sure that a piece of important news, which is abroad in a household, has not reached ears for which it was not intended.]

(559 and 560) From Mr. Hickman Heather, Postmaster of Retford. The evidence in the first case is second-hand, but in the second is on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148).

“February 18th, 1885.

“In my early boyhood I have frequently heard the following story from both my parents. I may preface the story by saying that, in 1835, my father, Thomas Heather, was a miller, occupying a windmill in Westthorpe Fields, in the parish of Southwell, his house being at Westthorpe, about one mile distant from the mill. My grandfather, John Heather, occupied a farm under the late Sir Richard Sutton, at Goverton, in the parish of Bleasby, about 3 miles distant. My father, who had been working his mill until past midnight, locked up his mill and went home. On his way the apparition of his mother crossed his path, and was so clearly seen that he marked the dress, one which had been commonly worn, and on his arrival at home he at once reported the circumstance to [his wife] my mother, saying that ‘he had never seen his mother more plainly in his life.’ Early next morning, a man rode in with the sad news that my grandmother had been found dead in her bed.

“A second case occurred under my own notice, although the apparition was not seen by me. In the year 1854, my father, who then lived at Goverton, Bleasby, was building a house and a yard for pigs. The building and the yard were on a slope. My father was standing at the lower end with his arms resting upon the wall; the entrance to the house from the yard was directly opposite, and was open, the door not having been hung. I was in the farmyard at some little distance, but having a clear full view of my father and the building, when I was startled by my father exclaiming, ‘Jack, just see what your Uncle Ned is doing in the pigsty.’ I at once went, although I knew it to be impossible that my Uncle Ned could be there, he being seriously ill at the time. Having searched the place, my father told me that he had distinctly seen my uncle cross the doorway, and would scarcely believe that he was not to be found inside. In about a couple of hours, a messenger brought the tidings that my uncle had died.

“I beg to add that in the case of my grandmother there was no previous illness, she having gone to bed in apparently perfect health.

“JOHN HICKMAN HEATHER.”

We have procured a copy of an inscription of a tombstone at Bleasby, which confirms the fact that Mrs. John Heather died in 1835 (May 2).

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Edward Heather died on Nov. 28, 1853, not 1854.

Mr. Heather’s wife writes on May 22, 1886, to confirm these accounts, which she herself “heard from the lips of both Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Heather.”

The narrator of the following cases is the brother of the narrator of No. 232; it is possible therefore to suppose some degree of family susceptibility (p. 132, note). The first case may have been an illusion, and I give it no separate evidential number.

(561) From the Rev. H. A. H., The Vicarage —.

“December 19th, 1885.

“The following occurrences took place three years ago, and had reference to parishioners here who were much on my mind, and whom I was visiting in their last illnesses.

“One was a farmer’s wife who was much afraid of giving me trouble. I had given her the Holy Communion during the afternoon, and when I left, promised to come again next day. She said she should be very glad to see me, but did not like to be such a trouble, as it was some distance and I was going every day. I said it was no trouble, but the reason why I was here, and I should be sure to come.

“That evening I had a mission service, 2 miles away, in quite another direction. Mrs. H. was with me. We were walking home together, and had joked about not meeting anyone on the road. I said, ‘You see if you had been alone, you would actually have met no one to alarm you.’ It was rather dark, but you could see a form 15 or 20 yards away. We walked on, talking about various things, and then I saw someone coming. I said ‘Here we meet someone at last.’ She said, ‘I don’t see anyone.’ ‘*There,*’ I said; ‘look, *there* comes an old woman, and she is twisting her shawl round her neck.’ My wife, however, could see nothing,¹ but I thought to myself she will see her plainly enough directly. However, it melted away. There was no one. I said, ‘It is very odd; I certainly *did* see an old woman. Let us go into C.’s house’ (the village carpenter’s) ‘and see if there is anyone dead.’ We went in, and he said, ‘I have just got orders to make a coffin.’ I looked at Mrs. H. and said, ‘Indeed, who is it for?’ He said, ‘For Mrs. B.,’ naming the farmer’s wife I had seen that very afternoon. I said, ‘There must be some mistake. I only left her at 4 o’clock, and there were no signs of immediate death.’ ‘No,’ he said, ‘it is so.’ I went next day, and found she had died from a sudden stoppage of the heart, about half-past 8, and that almost the last words were, ‘I am sorry to give Mr. H. the trouble of coming again to-morrow.’

“The other occasion was about two or three months afterwards. A very respectable young farmer broke a bloodvessel on the brain, and I visited him some three or four times. The last time he was quite unconscious, and evidently could not live long. He was very anxious to see me as much as possible before becoming unconscious, often saying, ‘Send for the vicar.’ On the morning that he died, I was awake by what I thought was Mrs. H. in her white dressing-gown. We were sleeping, for some reason, in separate rooms that night. I was very sleepy when awake, and said, ‘Is it time to get up? I must have another 10 minutes,’ and fell asleep again. I did not look at the face of the form, being very sleepy and feeling *sure* it was Mrs. H. However, by-and-bye, Mrs. H. *did* come in, and said, ‘Young R. is dead; the girl who brings the milk brought word.’ I said, ‘Is it very long since you *first* woke me?’ Then she assured me it was the first time she had been in the room. He had died about 5 that very morning, just as I fancied I had been called by Mrs. H. My regret is, I did not look at the face, but, being tired and sleepy I only saw the figure up to the waist, and went off to sleep with it standing there, never imagining it was not my wife. This is my last hallucination. I have visited scores of deathbeds since, but have had no further visions.

¹ See p. 105, second note.

“I may add I am in no way nervous, but a strong, middle-aged man, in excellent health, and very temperate in eating as well as drinking. I don't quite know how to account for these things, except that both these people were much in my mind, and both of them people for whom I had much respect and sympathy.

“H. A. H.”

In conversation, Mr. H. mentioned that he has had two experiences of apparently subjective visual hallucination; but these both occurred when he was a boy. He adds in subsequent letters:—

“I may add, as regards the first of the two curious visions, that I was very constantly walking that road at that hour, as I had a weekly service; but that was the only occasion my eyes misled me. When I first saw the figure, it appeared to be crossing the road, but in our direction, like a person changing from the footpath to the middle of the road. It was, of course, somewhat shadowy, as a person is in the dusk. Still, it had the look of an old woman; I could distinguish the sex. The road is a country one, but on nearing the village there are some lamp-posts, but we were some distance from them. It was a cloudy and rather windy night, and there were, of course, shadows from clouds and trees cast about; it was not *deep* dark, but more than dusk. I am so accustomed to these walks that it would be difficult for any natural object to have caused such an illusion. I was quite sure that an old woman was there, in the middle of the road—*so* sure that I did not keep my eye upon her, and as we came up she was gone. Mrs. H. has ordinary eyesight, much like my own, neither remarkable for great acuteness of vision nor the reverse.

“I may add, too, regarding the second case, that I was fully awake, though heavy with sleep, and did not *dream* Mrs. H. awoke me. I am personally convinced of this, for I wondered, as I went off to sleep again, that Mrs. H. *did not go*, and thought she would tell me in another minute or two that I really *must* get up. I fell asleep with the sensation of her presence after my eyes were closed again.”

Mrs. H. writes:—

“December 23rd, 1885.

“As you wish to have some corroboration of two curious statements of facts made to you by my husband, I write a few lines to tell you my remembrance of the occasions. We were walking home from a week-night service, from a hamlet some distance from here, when I remarked I would not walk here alone for anything. Mr. H. said, ‘It is curious we have never met anyone.’ Not long afterwards, as we were nearing the village, he said, ‘Well, here comes someone at last; who is it?’ I said, ‘I don't see anyone.’ He said, ‘Oh you must, by the lamp-post’ [there is a discrepancy here from Mr. H.'s account]; ‘she is putting a shawl over her head, and coming to meet us. Do you know her?’ I said, ‘Certainly not, for there isn't anyone.’ He said, ‘Anyhow she is coming quickly towards us; then you must see.’ In another minute we were both sure it must have been some appearance, and went into the carpenter's close by to see if we could hear anything, and his first words were, ‘Well, sir, I have orders for a coffin for Mrs. B.’ We both said, ‘Impossible! she seemed nicely this afternoon.’ I know she was anxious to spare my husband any trouble, as it was a long walk, and we naturally connected it with this.

“As regards the young farmer, he had been much on our minds, as it

was a distressing case in many ways. Word was brought early in the morning that he was dead; but owing to one of the children not being well, and having to be in my room, Mr. H. was in an adjoining one, and I would not disturb him until later. When I went in I said, 'Well, poor J. R. is gone.' He said, 'I knew he would be; but why didn't you tell me when you came in before?' I said, 'I have not been in before.' He said, 'Yes, when you came in to wake me, and I begged for at all events 10 minutes more.' He then told me what he had said to me—as he thought, and he was surprised I did not answer. It must be three or four years ago, but I remember these facts distinctly. "E. H."

[Neither of these cases would be very striking alone, but they are of interest as occurring to the same percipient. There can hardly be a doubt that the experience in the second instance was a hallucination, not an illusion; and the same account of the first experience is rendered to some extent probable by the fact that Mrs. H. did not share it, though any moving object should have been as visible to her as her husband. And if the experiences were hallucinations, the improbability that Mr. H. should subjectively evolve the only two hallucinations of his adult life at those particular moments remains enormous, however much allowance be made for the fact that he was aware that his two parishioners were in a dying state.]

In the following case the percipient was a young child. It is a phantasmal case which may be compared to the merely impressional cases, Nos. 47 and 48, and the dream-case, No. 456. See also cases 345, 352, 607, 634, 652.

(562) From Mrs. Skyring, Admiralty Offices, Spring Gardens, S.W. The account was procured for us by Mr. A. W. Lafone, M.P., of Hatton, Bedford.

"June, 1883.

"In or about the year 1832, my husband, Captain Skyring, R.N., left England on a surveying expedition in command of H.M.S. 'Etna'; our little son, Willie, was about 2 years old at the time of his departure. The child was very fond of carrying about a miniature portrait of his father, and on the 23rd of December, 1833, the child being about 3 years old, he was playing in a curtained recess in the nursery when I heard him call out in an excited tone 'Papa, papa, come to me.' On my questioning him he declared he had seen his father, and was so agitated that I was afraid to allude to the subject again. Shortly afterwards I received news from the Admiralty that Captain Skyring had been murdered by the natives at Cape Roxo on the day in question. My son, who is now dead, lived to be a man, but had no recollection of this episode.

"I may add that Captain Skyring, when lieutenant of H.M.S. 'Beagle,' related that his mother appeared to him as he was lying in his cot, and that he entered the occurrence in his log-book at the time; and discovered, on his return to England, that she had died on the date of the apparition. "S. L. SKYRING."

[This case is again very remote; it is, moreover, impossible to be sure that independent note was taken of the date of the cry. But the incident of the child's agitation is not likely to have been unconsciously imagined

and the coincidence must have been, at any rate, close enough to excite remark. The last paragraph in the account once more suggests that the capacity of percipience was hereditary ; but the detail as to the log-book is not one that can be relied on (Vol. I., p. 161, note).]

(563) Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood took down the following deposition, in September, 1876, from Jane Barford, the confidential servant (since deceased) of a friend, Miss Stephen.

“My father died the 11th January, 1848. My mother had sent me away to an aunt, who lived about two miles off, in order to be out of the way while my father was so ill. On the morning of his death I was called at 6 o'clock, intending, as usual, to help my cousins in the dairy. About a quarter before 7, I was going downstairs with my candle in my hand, when I met my father in his night-shirt coming up. He put out his hand, as if to take the candlestick, which I dropped in my fright, and was left alone in the dark. I knew it could not be my living father, and was convinced that he was dead, and had come to bid me good-bye. I told my cousins what had happened, and said that I must immediately go home. They tried to persuade me to stay till after breakfast, saying it was only my fancy, but I set off at once, and on my way I met my aunt, who had been sitting up with my father, and was coming back to tell me of his death, which had taken place just at a quarter before 7.

“JANE BARFORD.”

[The cousins cannot now be traced ; and as Miss Stephen has no clue to Jane Barford's family, the date of the death cannot be independently verified. The case is one which could have had little force, since the percipient had no doubt been in anxiety about her father (Vol. I., p. 509), but for the extreme closeness of the alleged coincidence.]

(564) From Mrs. Poulter, wife of a retired Baptist minister at Leeds.

“1883.

“When I was a young woman, I lived for some time at Sevenoaks, and attended a Wesleyan class conducted by an elderly lady to whom I became warmly attached. After that (in 1835) I went to live at Bourne, in Lincolnshire, and one day, while sitting in my front room, I was startled at seeing my dear old friend from Sevenoaks pass the window, and go towards the front door. I hastened to receive her, but on opening the front door there was no one to be seen in the whole length of the quiet street. I afterwards learnt that at that hour my friend died.”

Mrs. Poulter's son-in-law, Mr. J. L. Cherry, of Rowley Park, Stafford, writes to Professor Barrett:—“It is some 20 years since Mrs. Poulter first told me the story, and since I had the pleasure of seeing you, she has certified to the accuracy of the draft which I submitted to her.”

[The account is very incomplete ; but Mrs. Poulter is old, and must not be troubled further.]

(565) From Mr. Louis Lyons, 3, Bouverie Square, Folkestone.

“October 8th, 1883.

“In 1854 we resided in Hanau. We kept two servants. One winter's

evening, just before going to bed, Gretchen came pouncing into the dining-room where we were sitting, in great excitement, declaring that her father, whom she had left in good health at Gellnhausen, had just appeared to her with such dejection in his countenance that she must go to him that moment; and off she started in the snow, and reached Gellnhausen in time to close her parent's breaking eyes. I cannot procure further evidence."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Lyons says:—

"It made a deep impression on me, and is now quite fresh on my mind. I certainly was in the room, and there is not a shadow of doubt in my mind."

(566) From Mrs. Morris, Pentrabach, Trecastle, Breconshire.

"September 17th, 1884.

"Early in 1881, I had just returned from a drive with my aunt, whom I had seen off by train to what we felt sure was the death-bed of a little cousin. It must have been about 6 in the evening. I was standing at my dressing-table taking off my hat, when I heard someone try my door. I crossed the room and opened the door at once and saw, standing in the doorway, the figure of little G., looking very, very white, and dressed in a white night-dress. What struck me most was that his hands were crossed, and in the fingers of his right hand were two lilies and a leaf. The face smiled at me; and, as I stood looking, the figure disappeared.

"The following day I went up to join my aunt, and heard that G. had died about 4 o'clock the afternoon before, and that she had seen him soon after her arrival. I immediately asked if he had lilies of the valley in his hand, and she said, 'Yes.' I then described his figure, as I had seen it, and she said it was precisely as he looked and was lying at the time; that his sister had bought him, at a florist's, the lilies, and sent them up to him; that he had been delighted with them, and had held them until he died; and that they were now in his hand.

"Of course, my mind was full of him, and wondering whether my aunt would find him alive, &c. But if that would have made me imagine I saw him, why should it have caused me to imagine lilies of the valley in depth of winter (it was the time of the deep snow), and of which I had not heard?"

"MARY ETHEL MORRIS."

We find from two obituary notices that the child died on Jan. 26, 1881, aged 7 years.

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Morris writes, on October 22, 1884:—

"I will write to my aunt and ask her to confirm my account of my little cousin's appearance, as I feel sure she will not hesitate to do so.

"I *did* distinctly see lilies of the valley in the child's hand."

Mrs. Morris's aunt writes, in a portion of a letter enclosed to us on Nov. 7, 1884:—

"As regards poor little G., I quite remember your saying that you saw him outside *your* door, and I do remember something about your saying you saw him with the lilies. I have *an idea* you said so, but it was such a sad thing altogether that things are misty. "MARY SELWOOD."

Mrs. Morris adds, on Jan. 26, 1886:—

“As far as I can recollect I did not mention my seeing my cousin at the time. I was alone in the house with two very nervous servants, so that I hardly think it likely I should speak to them about anything ‘ghostly.’ But I told my aunt, describing the child’s appearance, *before* she had told me any particulars of the death, the flowers, &c.”

Mrs. Morris has had two other hallucinations representing a figure, which in both instances was unrecognised; one of these occurred at the moment of waking; the second may have been due to nervousness or expectancy, as another member of the household had been similarly affected just before. But Mrs. Morris is certainly not of a nervous or fanciful temperament.

[It is no doubt possible that the hallucination in this case was purely subjective, and connected with anxiety on the child’s account; but it is difficult to believe that the correspondence of the lilies was accidental. Mrs. Morris is certain that there was no association in her mind between the child and this particular flower; and the idea of getting the lilies for him had been a sudden one.]

(567) From the late Mrs. Amos, Hythe.

“October, 1884.

“I was living at Faversham at the time when my mother was taken ill, who lived at Hythe, Kent. I went to see her on a Friday and returned home on Tuesday. On Thursday I retired to rest at about 10 o’clock, when, on looking at the foot of the bed, I saw my mother standing dressed in white; her features were very distinct. I spoke to my husband and asked him to look at the foot of the bed, as mother stood looking at me. He said, ‘I don’t see her; can you see her now?’¹ My reply was, ‘Yes.’ After that she vanished slowly away. My husband said it was very odd, and at breakfast he asked me if I was afraid to be alone. My reply was, I would rather be by myself. The next day we had a letter to say my dear mother was at rest. I can still see her as plain as at that time. The date was November, 1846. I have never had another vision but this one.

“SARAH AMOS.”

We find from the obituaries in two Dover papers that Mrs. Amos’ mother, Mrs. Wiles, died on Nov. 21, 1846.

Our friend, Miss Porter, who knew and questioned Mrs. Amos, says:—

“I am quite persuaded of the truth of her statement. In describing the apparition to me, she told me that the room was quite dark, but that there seemed to be a sort of cloud of light behind the figure which enabled her to see it distinctly.² She was very particular in telling me that it remained all the time she was talking to her husband, and that she looked at it fixedly the whole time. She thinks that it must have remained several minutes.”

[The percipient’s previous state of anxiety has again to be noted, as possibly the cause of the hallucination.]

(568) Quoted “from the *Memoirs of V. Th. Engelhardt*,” in the work of Professor Pogodine, of Moscow, *Simple Discourse on Difficult Subjects*,

¹ See p. 105, second note.

² See p. 459, note, and compare case 210.

mentioned on p. 508. We have been unable to procure the original *Memoirs*; and Mr. T. Bruhns, of Simferopol, a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R., who has translated the passage, has been equally unsuccessful.

“ In 1858, I lived in Moscow, and was ordered to go for some time to Arkhangelsk. On February (5th-17th,) before leaving, I wrote a congratulatory letter to my mother in Petersburg, who was about to celebrate (on February 8th-20th) the 80th anniversary of her birthday. I congratulated my dear mother, and entreated her to bless me for my long journey. Without her blessing I feared that my journey would be unhappy. I sent my letter and departed. Up to Iaroslavsk the road was tolerably good. In this town I spent a day. But from Iaroslavsk to Vologda the road became so terribly bad that I was obliged to stop at one station, to rest till the morning. Having taken out my pelisse, I lay dressed on the sofa. I don't belong to that happy class of men who fall asleep as soon as they lie down. I took a book and tried to read, but my fatigue was so great that I could not read. I rose from the sofa and extinguished the candle, thinking that in darkness I should fall asleep more quickly. Scarcely had I again reached my bed when I saw, to my great astonishment, my mother with her sister, who had died in 1846,¹ standing a few feet from me. Vividly impressed by this extraordinary vision, I looked, motionless, at these dear ones. My mother was standing before me as though alive, and she blessed me with a sign of the cross. But her sister, though perfectly recognisable, had, so to speak, a more light, ethereal aspect. I took the matches and lighted the candle—but the apparitions had already faded away. This incident took place in the night of 12th-24th, 13th-25th February, 1858, between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning. About a week after my arrival at Arkhangelsk, I was informed by my brother-in-law that my mother expired in the night of 12th-13th February.”

§ 2. In the next group of cases, first-hand or on a par with first-hand, the conditioning event or state on the agent's side was something other than death, though in two of them death was rapidly approaching.

(569) From Mr. Algernon Joy, 20, Wilton Place, S.W.

“ August 16th, 1883.

“ About 1862, I was walking in a country lane near Cardiff by myself, when I was overtaken by two young colliers, who suddenly attacked me. One of them gave me a violent blow on the eye, which knocked me down, half stunned. I distinctly remembered afterwards all that I had been thinking about, both immediately prior to the attack, and for some time after it. Up to the moment of the attack, and for some time previously, I was absorbed in a calculation, connected with the Penarth Docks, then in construction, on which I was employed. My train of thought was interrupted for a moment by the sound of footsteps behind me. I looked back, and saw the two young men, but thought no more of them, and immediately returned to my calculations. On receiving the blow, I began speculating on their object, what they were going to do next, how I could best defend myself, or escape from them; and when they ran away, and I

¹ As to the appearance of a second figure, see Vol. i., pp. 545-6.

had picked myself up, I thought of trying to identify them, and of denouncing them at the police-station, to which I proceeded, after following them till I lost sight of them. In short I am positive that for about half an hour previous to the attack, and for an hour or two after it, there was no connection whatever, direct or indirect, between my thoughts and a person at that moment in London, and whom I will call 'A.' Two days afterwards, I received a letter from 'A,' written on the day after the assault, asking me what I had been doing and thinking about at half-past 4 p.m., on the day previous to that on which he was writing. He continued: 'I had just passed your club, and was thinking of you, when I recognised your footstep behind me. You laid your hand heavily on my shoulder. I turned, and saw you as distinctly as I ever saw you in my life. You looked distressed, and, in answer to my greeting and inquiry, "What's the matter?"' you said, "Go home, old fellow, I've been hurt. You will get a letter from me in the morning telling you all about it." You then vanished instantaneously.'

"The assault took place as near half-past 4 as possible, certainly between 4.15 and 4.45. I wrote an account of it to 'A' on the following day, so that our letters crossed, he receiving mine, not the next morning, as my double had promised, but on the succeeding one, at about the same time as I received his. 'A' solemnly assured me that he knew no one in or near Cardiff, and that my account was the only one that he received of the incident. From my intimate personal knowledge of him, I am certain that he is incapable of uttering an untruth. But there are reasons why I cannot give his name, even in confidence.¹

"ALGERNON JOY."

[Mr. Joy having received an account of the phantasm written *before* the news of his accident reached the percipient, his evidence is on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148).]

(570) From Mrs. McMullin, formerly Miss Hammill (now in India).

"9, Southwick Place, Hyde Park, W.

"1883.

"Many years ago an old nurse, Mary Vivian, who was living with us, thought she saw one of the De Lancys, whom she had lived with, walk through our nursery. She was so certain she had seen him that she was quite overcome, and said she was sure some harm had befallen him. Some time after, she heard that on his way to the Crimea (I think, but am not quite sure when it was,) this young De Lancy had jumped overboard to save the life of a soldier who had fallen overboard, and had been nearly drowned, the very same evening she thought she saw him in our nursery; and he told her he had thought of his old nurse when he was in the water."

Mrs. McMullin adds, "I know it was told me at the time."

Lady Bates, of 2, Sussex Place, Hyde Park, writes:—

"March 14th, 1885.

"Twenty-eight years ago an elderly woman, named Vivian, lived as nurse in the service of Mr. Hammill, police magistrate, at 34, Sussex Gardens, Hyde Park. She had previously been for many years in the

¹ These reasons have been privately communicated.

family of Colonel De Lancy, one of whose sons in May, 1857, was on his voyage to India with his regiment, the 22nd. One evening, towards the end of that month, Vivian told Miss Constance Hammill (then about 18) that when sitting in the nursery, between 6 and 7 p.m., she had seen Oliver De Lancy enter and pass through the room, and that she felt sure that some misfortune had happened to him. I heard of the occurrence the next day, and well remember, even at this distance of time, the words in which it was related to me:—‘Vivian has seen a ghost in the nursery, and it has made her so ill that she is not able to do her work and has gone to bed.’ Some weeks after, Mr. Priaulx, young De Lancy’s uncle, called to tell Vivian that a letter had been received from him, in which he said that he had nearly lost his life in an unsuccessful attempt to rescue a private soldier of the 22nd, who had fallen overboard between Gibraltar and Malta, adding:—‘When I was in the water I thought of old Vivian.’ He gave no date, but Mr. Priaulx, at Vivian’s request, inquired at the War Office, and found that the man had been drowned on the 27th of May—the day on which, according to a note made at the time, she had seen the apparition.

“Captain De Lancy and Vivian have been long dead; and Miss Constance Hammill is married now in India; but I have written down the story exactly as I remember to have heard it. “M. M. BATES.”

The following notice is from Hart’s *Army List* for 1865:—

“Captain Oliver De Lancy received the medal of the Royal Humane Society for gallant conduct in endeavouring to save the life of Private Dempsey, of the 22nd Regiment, who fell overboard between Gibraltar and Malta, on the night of May 27th, 1857.”

Miss Ewart, of 3, Morpeth Terrace, Victoria Street, tells us that when Lady Bates related this incident to her, near the time when it occurred, she mentioned that Vivian had gone to make inquiries of Mr. Priaulx the day after her vision, having received special permission from Mrs. Hammill to do so. But Lady Bates, though she says this may probably have been so, does not now remember it.

Dr. Scott, late headmaster of Westminster School, who heard of the incident soon after its occurrence, has given us an independent and substantially concordant account of it.

(571) From Mr. H. Wooderson, 2, Little Queen’s Road, Teddington.

“1881.

“Like the rest of my brothers and sisters, I have always had the capacity of seeing spirits in a clairvoyant way.¹ When I was a youth of 14, I ran away from Hampton Court, where my parents lived, and I went into service as under-gardener with Captain Emmett, Ditton House, the next estate to Lord St. Leonards’, at Long Ditton on the other side of the river. One night, about 1857, when it was my turn to look after the fires in the hot-house, just as I was going down into the stoke-hole, I saw my mother standing on the top of the stoke-hole in her night-dress, and

¹ Mr. Wooderson explains these “spirits” to be hallucinations representing living persons, which he has regarded as premonitory of their actual approach. His wife confirms the fact that his prognostications of this kind have often been fulfilled; but no accurate record has been kept.

her head bound up as in a turban, as if she was ill, which much frightened me ; and on joining the foreman of the houses, a Scotchman, he said, ‘ You look frightened.’ I told him I had seen my mother ; he remarked that I had seen her wraith, and ought to go home, to which I agreed. It was then about half-past 1 o’clock. We used the Captain’s boat that was in the boathouse to set me over the river, and I ran home. I arrived at home at 2 o’clock, and found my mother lying in bed just as I had seen her in my vision. She said, ‘ I knew I should bring you.’ She recovered from her illness.

“ Some time after this, I was employed as guard on the G. E. Railway, and I and my mate, who worked the down train while I took the up train, shared the same lodgings at Selby Street, Waterloo Town, Bethnal Green. We used to cross each other at Bishop’s Stortford, where we would exchange a few words. One night I felt very heavy as if some misfortune was about to happen to my family. I spoke to my companion when I met him at Bishop’s Stortford, and said I was sure that something was wrong with my mother. My companion made light of it, and said I should be all right when I went to work. The impression, however, remained with me, and when I saw my companion at night he told me there was a telegram waiting at home for me from Hampton Court. The telegram was to warn me that if I wished to see my mother alive, I must set off at once. I started as soon as I could, after showing the railway authorities the telegram, and taking the first train to Hampton Court, I arrived about 12 o’clock, and found my mother awaking from half-an-hour’s sleep, which she had had after long wakefulness from fever. When she saw me she said, ‘ I could not depart till I had seen you, but now it is all right.’ She then lay down and passed away during the day without any trouble. This was in the summer of 1866. “ H. WOODERSON.”

We find from a newspaper obituary that Mrs. Wooderson died on Aug. 20, 1868 (not 1866).

[As Mr. Wooderson recollects the turban as the special feature in his vision which suggested to him the idea of illness, it is not so easy as it would otherwise be to suppose that he wrongly read back the turban into the vision after he had seen it in reality ; and the case may be compared to those in Chap. XII., § 8, where some real feature of the agent’s aspect seems to be conveyed. The case, however, besides lacking corroboration, is of course much weakened, from an evidential point of view, by its opening sentence.]

(572) From a lady who has a dread of publicity.

“ September, 1884.

“ In 1857, during church service, I had an impression of something being close to my face. I opened my eyes, and saw distinctly the face of a friend.¹ It appeared quite solid, and I could recognise all the markings in the face. Being startled, I closed my eyes, when it was no longer visible ; on re-opening them it was still present. I cannot now remember whether the news of my friend’s death reached us that evening, or early the following morning. He died during the day (Sunday) on which I had the vision ; but I never heard the *exact* hour. “ H. C.”

¹ Compare case 553, and see p. 33, note.

On being interrogated by our friend, Miss Porter, of 16, Russell Square, Miss C. added that when she was first aware of something being near her and opened her eyes, the vision was within an inch or two of her face, too close for recognition till she drew back a little.¹ It seemed to remain stationary. She cannot say how long it remained, but described how a feeling of horror came over her that it would always be there before her eyes. It was also long enough for her to make up her mind that her friend was dead, and she was not at all surprised when the news came. It disappeared suddenly—did not fade, but was there one moment and gone the next.

On inquiry, Miss C. told the present writer that she knew her friend to be ill, but was in no apprehension of his death. She preferred not to give his name, but undertook herself to ascertain from the *Times* obituary whether she was right in her recollection that he died on a Sunday. The result showed that she was not, and that he died on a Wednesday.² He had however been very ill, and delirious, for 3 or 4 days previously; and as she has never had a hallucination on any other occasion, a remarkable coincidence remains.

(573) From Mrs. Beaumont, 1, Crescent Road, S. Norwood.

“February 24th, 1885.

“One day in the '40s, when I was living in the Rectory at Marlborough, my father's house, my mother and sister had gone out, and I was lying on a sofa in the drawing-room; at about 3 p.m. I was reading a book, when the light seemed to be slightly darkened, and looking up I saw, leaning in at the window farthest from me, about three feet from the ground, and beckoning, a gentleman whom I had only seen once, about a fortnight or three weeks previously. Supposing that my father wanted me to sign my name (as a witness to a lease, or something of that kind), I got up, went out of the window (which led down into the garden), and passed along in front of the house, and up six steps into my father's study, which was empty. I then went into the yard and garden, but found nobody; so I returned to my sofa and my books. When father came in, two hours afterwards, I said, ‘Why did you send Mr. H. to call me, and then go away?’ My father replied, ‘What are you talking about? H. is down in Wales.’ Nothing more was said. I did not like to dwell on the subject to either of my parents, and I did not mention the occurrence to any one for several years. About a fortnight afterwards, I was told by my mother that Mr. H. had written, proposing for my hand (some property of his adjoined some property of my father's in Wales). I cannot fix *exactly* how close the coincidence was; but my strong impression is that the letter was received within 24 hours of my experience. Before I was told of the contents of the letter, I remember that I found the blue envelope of Mr. H.'s letter (with T. H. on the corner, and with the coat-of-arms on his seal, and with the postmark Llandilo) on the floor in my father's study. When the news was told me, I seemed to receive some explanation of my vision.

¹ See Vol. i., p. 522, note.

² As regards the liability to exaggerate the closeness of the coincidence, see Vol. i., pp. 140-6, and the examples given in Vol. i., pp. lxxv-vii.

“I have never had any hallucination or vision at any other time, except when I saw the ‘little brown lady’ at Kintbury.¹ “C. BEAUMONT.”

[Here we have the points that the hallucinatory vision of a recognised figure was unique in the percipient’s experience; and that the supposed agent’s thoughts must have been much occupied with her at the time. But we have no proof that, on his side, the particular time at which the phantasm was seen stood out in any way from the hours and days that preceded and followed it; and the coincidence therefore lacks precision.]

(574) From Mr. J. H. Jevons, 182, Elm Grove, Brighton.

“August, 1884.

“Whilst I was dressing, the other morning, the form of a friend passed amongst some trees opposite to my house, and so little doubt had I as to the form being his, as he looked up to my window, that I waved my hand to him to ‘go on’ up the road where we frequently walked. I followed in a minute or two, but only to find that I could not find him, high or low, up or down that road, or along any of three others. At length I went along an accustomed road, to a point in the town where we not infrequently met, or separated, as the case might be. But *non est inventus*. Subsequently I called at his house, and found him very ill indeed, as he still remains.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Jevons says:—

“September 8th, 1884.

“I think that in cases of this sort one cannot be too careful as to identity, because I know practically how apt the imagination is to outrun the judgment. But of this particular instance under notice, the most I can say is, that if it *was* one of self-deception or mere subjectiveness, I was most completely deceived indeed. Certainly I had reason to expect my friend, as he came past my place nearly every morning at about 11 o’clock, looked up at my window, and when I saw him, I waved my hand in the direction in which I implied I would follow him. As I did so on the morning to which I am referring, I saw him and nodded to him two or three times, never for an instant doubting that the figure was his. I saw, through the leaves and branches of the trees, on the walk opposite to my house, his white hat, silver-rimmed spectacles and dark grey beard, as well as his peculiar contour and gait. He is 72 years of age, tall, slow of movement, and not very quick of sight; and as he appeared at first to hesitate, I waved my hand again, when he indicated, by his head, in his usual way, that he understood me, and then he walked on. I was but a few minutes in my effort to join him; and it was when I found I could not see him, or anybody like him, in any direction, that I was struck with the remarkable-ness of the occurrence, and I stood fairly puzzled, as I must have shown, for I noticed a passer-by looking at me in a sort of wondering way.

“The illness was quite sudden, and neither my friend nor myself had any reason, prior to his seizure, to suppose that we should not meet, as customary, on the morning mentioned. The case has been my *only* experience of a visual hallucination, with the exception of one (of a different character) I had in my very youthful days. “JOHN H. JEVONS.”

¹ This was an apparition frequently seen by the residents in a particular house.

[It is against the hypothesis of mistaken identity, that Mr. Jevons remembers that the figure seemed distinctly to recognise his greeting. Still it may have been a hallucination due to expectancy. See Vol. I., p. 516.]

(575) From a lady, Mrs. W., who desires that her name and address may not be published, as she has a near relation who would much object to their appearance.

“February 20th, 1885.

“When a resident near Portsmouth, during a visit made by my late mother to London in the summer of 1858, the year preceding her death, I distinctly saw her walking in the back garden at noon-day. I was not at the time thinking of her, but happening to look from my chamber window, I beheld this figure, which, but for my parent's absence from home, I should have supposed her veritable self. This incident led me to conjecture something was amiss; and this idea was confirmed when the next morning's post brought me information that my mother had sustained a severe fall, and was so badly hurt that at first fatal results was feared; and at the moment I fancied I saw her, her thoughts were bent on telegraphing for me to go to her.”

The following incident is perhaps worth quoting, as having occurred to the same person:—

“A few years prior to this, when a girl of 16, an engagement was formed between myself and a young naval officer, about to sail for the African coast. He had promised my mother and self that he would write us from Ascension. It chanced, some time after his departure, I accompanied a friend in a long country walk, when all at once a strange feeling possessed me that this young officer was near. I seemed to feel the clasp of his hand upon my wrist, yet I saw nothing, I had only *felt* a presence. My companion asked why I looked so pale. I made an evasive reply, and on returning home told my mother that ‘Tom was dead!’ She tried to laugh away my fancy; nevertheless, she noted the date of the occurrence; and when a brother of my own, then homeward bound from the coast of Africa, arrived, the first words he spoke, after an exchange of greetings, were, ‘Oh, that poor fellow you sent letters by for me is dead! He died three days' sail from Ascension, and is buried on the island.’

“M. W.”

We learn from Mrs. W. that she has not had any hallucinations which there is reason to regard as merely subjective. She adds:—

“I cannot, owing to the many years that have passed since the occurrences mentioned, furnish any dates; my mother calculated that the singular impression I received was as near as possible to the time of our young friend's death. My brother who brought the tidings has been deceased several years.”

(576) Obtained through Mrs. Pears, of Walton, Clevedon. The narrative was written down from the dictation of Mrs. C.—a relative of Mrs. Pears, a daughter of the well-known Mrs. Fry, and a member of the Society of Friends—who will not allow her name to be published, and entirely declines to be further questioned on the subject.

“March 10th, 1884.

“On 14th November, 1837, or about that time, Mrs. C. was lying on a

sofa in her drawing-room, reading attentively ; the sofa was facing the light. Suddenly lifting her eyes from the book, she saw distinctly, standing at the foot of the sofa, the figure of a person whom Mrs. C. knew by sight, though she was *not* personally acquainted with him. She observed how the figure was dressed, and even counted the buttons on his great-coat ; five were visible above the rather high end of the sofa. The figure was opaque ; Mrs. C. noticed that she could not see the piano through it. After a few seconds, the figure disappeared as suddenly as it had come.

“ A quarter of an hour afterwards, Mrs. C. received a visit from one of the clergymen of the town, who came to tell her of the death, by drowning at sea, of the person whose apparition she had just seen. The clergyman had left the widow’s house to come straight to Mrs. C., and *at the moment* the apparition was present with Mrs. C., had been listening to the widow’s request that he would enlist her sympathy on behalf of herself and her children.”

[The remoteness of the case is again a serious weakness ; and the coincidence is of a very singular type. At the same time the fact of the news following immediately on the apparition is a striking one, hardly likely to have been unconsciously imported into the narrative.]

The two following cases seem to fall into the class illustrated in Chap. XIV., § 7, where persons are phantasmally seen or heard very soon before their actual appearance in the flesh. I have explained (p. 96) that it is to some extent uncertain whether this is a genuine telepathic type ; but the examples are worth recording ; and doubly so where the time-coincidence is fortified (as here and in case 262) by the further point that odd or unfamiliar details of appearance are alleged to have been noted, and have proved to correspond with reality.

(577) From Dr. Campbell Morfit, 132, Alexandra Road, N.W.

Writing on July 4th, 1885, Dr. Morfit first describes a couple of business visits which he received at New York, in the year 1859 or thereabouts, from a gentleman named Metarko, who then departed to his home in the West.

“ For a time that disappearance took him entirely out of my world ; but one evening, nearly two years subsequently, I had been passing an hour or two at a friend’s, listening to some fine music. On my return, in good health and spirits, I felt unusually wide awake, as recurs to mind even at this moment, and in fact quite free from any susceptibility to hallucination. Nevertheless, scarcely had I got into bed than there, at the side, stood Metarko, looking as when he last was with me, but having two new features, one a kind of excrescence on the cheek, and the other a necktie of striking pattern. At first this sudden presence amused me as a freak of the imagination, but became an annoyance when it would not leave on my trying to dismiss it. The good part done him forbade the idea that he had come to haunt me reproachfully, yet I was somewhat disquieted ; and as my brother slept in a distant room upon the same floor, I called to him through the open doors of the intermediate sitting-room,

without receiving any answer. The apparition persisted, and I turned my face from it to the wall, by way of exorcism; and a few minutes later, seemingly, though actually perhaps only seconds, found that it had vanished.

“Seeking an explanation of the occurrence by reflecting upon it, I arrived at the conclusion that Metarko had died that night at his distant home, and the apparition was a psychological incident to announce the fact to me, though for what reason was beyond my imagination. The circumstance, however, so absorbed my thoughts all the next day, that when evening set in, I felt the need of diverting influences, and went out visiting. On re-entering, about bedtime, I was greeted by my housekeeper with the information that a stranger gentleman had called in my absence, to request that I would allow him a consultation at 9 o'clock the following morning. His name, she said, was on the slate, and there I found it—to be that of Metarko!—in his own unmistakable handwriting. This fact, astounding for the moment, recalled, vividly, the apparition of the previous evening, so as to render me impatient for the actual interview; and when, at the appointed hour next day, he came in the flesh, profound was my astonishment to find him then exactly as he appeared in the vision 34 hours previously.

“After listening to the statement of his case, I asked him to call again in the evening. He agreed to this arrangement, and left, but did not return as promised; and from that moment to the present I have never seen or heard of him. Heralded by a spectre like itself, he departed.

“The incident noted was the only one of a ‘psychical’ character that ever occurred to me.

“My brother being an unimpressionable man, and not sharing my interest in the matter, has forgotten, most probably, all that I may have told him about it at the time. But my housekeeper, a woman of considerable intelligence and sympathetic nature, might remember. She was even then, however, 20 years my senior, and if not now dead is a very old woman, whose whereabouts has dropped out of my knowledge, and it would be difficult to find her at present.

“CAMPBELL MORFIT.”

(578) From the Hon. Mrs. Pigott-Carleton, Greywell Hill, Winchfield, Hants. The percipient, Lord Dorchester, is deceased; but we have his daughter's evidence to the fact that the anxiety which his experience produced was obvious *before* he heard what *her* experience had been.

“July 5th, 1883.

“Early in September, 1872, I was with my father and husband at the former's shooting lodge in Co. Tyrone. An old friend, Captain M., was also staying there, and one afternoon it was arranged that I should accompany this gentleman and a keeper on a fishing expedition. My husband had some engagement, but my father walked a short way with us. He never cared to have me long away from him, and, upon turning back, remarked, as he left me, ‘Don't get too far from home.’

“It was a brilliantly fine day; I had a book with me, and often sat down to read while the others fished. We were about four miles down the river, when, chancing to look up from my novel, I perceived a heavy cloud rising into sight above the mountains opposite. I saw we were ‘in for’ a drenching, thought how it would fidget my father, and wished myself at

home with all my heart. In a few minutes the storm burst upon us. Shelter there was next to none, and as soon as the deluge had somewhat abated, we made for the lodge, looking as though we had all been barely rescued from a watery grave. When nearly home, we were met by my father, my husband, and several men employed about the place. It seemed to me singular, not to say absurd, that my father should have turned himself and party out in such weather. Still more to my surprise, my father evidently could not get over his disturbance, spoke little that evening, and went off to bed earlier than usual.

"The next day he told me that some little time after his return from the river, he sat down to read, with his back to the (western) window; that suddenly *a shadow fell across the page*; that, turning his head, he saw me standing at the half open window, my arms resting upon the push-down sash; that he said, 'Hallo! Back already!' that I made no reply, but apparently stepped down off the low outer window sill and disappeared; that he put a mark in his book, got up, and looked out of the window; that, not seeing me, he first went to the servants and asked if I had come in at the back door; and then went out on to the little terrace before the lodge and looked around for me; that he suddenly caught sight of the coming storm-cloud; that his bewilderment changed to uneasiness, and that my husband just then coming in they speedily started in search.

"HENRIETTA PIGOTT-CARLETON."

[This may, of course, have been a purely subjective experience; but it cannot well be attributed to any special expectation in the percipient's mind; and its coincidence with his daughter's thought of him, and desire to be at home, is at any rate striking. If the detail of the shadow on the page is correctly reported, the case well exemplifies the development of a phantasm in two stages (Vol. I., p. 520).]

§ 3. A large group of second-hand cases remains. For convenience, I will again divide them into accounts received from near relatives of the percipients, and from others.

(579) From Mr. J. N. Maskelyne, originally printed as part of a letter in the *Daily Telegraph*.

"Egyptian Hall.

"October 21st, 1881.

"SIR,—Having for many years been recognised by the public as an anti-Spiritualist and exposé of the frauds practised by spirit media, it may surprise some of your readers to learn that I am a believer in apparitions. Several similar occurrences to those described by many of your correspondents have taken place in my own family, and in the families of near friends and relatives. The most remarkable one happened to my wife's mother some years ago. Late one evening, whilst sitting alone busily occupied with her needle, a strange sensation came over her, and upon looking up she distinctly saw her aged mother standing at the end of the room. She rubbed her weary eyes and looked again, but the spectre had vanished. She concluded it was imagination, and retired to rest, thinking nothing more of the vision, until the next day brought the

news that her mother, at about the same time the apparition had appeared, had fallen down in a fit and expired.

“JOHN NEVIL MASKELYNE.”

In answer to our inquiries, Mr. Maskelyne writes that he regrets not to be able to get this case from his wife's mother in her own words. “She was a little vexed with me,” he says, “for giving publicity to the circumstance. I have written it exactly as I have often heard her relate it.”

(580) From a gentleman who prefers that his name should not appear.

“October 31st, 1884.

“An occurrence which happened to my father, and which I have several times heard him mention circumstantially, was as follows:—

“My father, Lieutenant W. C. B., was in command of a gunbrig stationed to keep off slavers on the West Coast of Africa, in 1834. In the October of that year, he was alone in his cabin when he noted distinctly, as he thought, my mother appear to him. He noted down the circumstance in his logbook,¹ giving time and date; but the effect on his mind was so great that on his return to England at the close of the year from ill-health, he called for a file of the *Times* directly he landed in Portsmouth, and looked to the month in question, and there found that my mother had died that very night that the appearance came to him, but which he had no means of learning earlier, owing to the difficulty of communication by letter in those days.”

We find from the *Times* obituary that our informant's mother died on October 11, 1834.

(581) From Mr. E. Stephenson, School House, Market Weighton, Yorkshire. His mother's signature, attached since the account was placed in its present position, makes it really first-hand.

“November 25th, 1884.

“I am master of the boys' school and organist of the parish church at Weighton. My mother's maiden name was Jane Cooling. Several years ago (about 10 or 12) she told me a remarkable story which sank deeply into my mind. I got her to tell me the whole of her story again, and it was exactly the same as that she had told years before. I cross-questioned her, but always got the same answers. My mother is 65 years of age. Her mind is quite clear and her memory very good. The affair happened when she was about 16 or 17 years old, and she maintains that even yet she can see (in imagination) her brother as fairly as she saw him then.

“The following is the story, which I have recently taken down carefully from her own lips. Having subjected my mother to some very close questioning, I feel sure that you may depend upon the statements being trustworthy.

“Henry Cooling, the brother of Jane Cooling, was a sailor, and had gone on a long voyage. Jane was living in Hull in the house of Mr. Kitching, Mytongate. There was a large cupboard in the house, which was on a kind of landing, approached by two or three steps. Just as she was about to go up to it, she saw distinctly, about 5 p.m., her brother

¹ See Vol. i., p. 161, note.

Henry standing in front of the door. His eyes were fixed on her for a short time, and then he disappeared towards the left. He was dressed in his seaman's drawers and shirt. The strings of his drawers were loose; his feet were bare; his hair was untidy; and his whole appearance was like that of one roused suddenly from sleep.

"After the vision had vanished, as soon as she recovered herself, she went home to her father, and told him what she had seen. He said it was all nonsense, and told her to take no notice of it. However, some days later, a letter came from the captain of the ship, stating that Henry Cooling had been washed overboard during a gale in the Bay of Biscay, just as he was called on deck to assist in working the ship, and the time he gave as about the time of the accident corresponded approximately to that at which my mother saw the vision.

"Since the above was written, I have found the exact date of my uncle's death—March 27th, 1836. My mother would, therefore, be 17 within a few days.

"E. S."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Stephenson writes, on Dec. 2, 1884:—

"I remember my mother telling us the story several years ago, while her father was living in our house, and I have no recollection of anything but his fullest assent to what she told. You will remember that in my previous letter, I stated that she told her father what she had seen, several days before they knew what had happened. I could almost swear that I have heard him affirm, but will not do so as I do not exactly recollect the occasion, and do not wish to give you anything but the purest evidence in such a matter.

"My mother confidently affirms that she saw the vision at that hour, 5 p.m., and, as far as she can remember, the letter from the captain of the vessel several days afterwards confirmed her statement as to the time, and the being called from his berth. We cannot find the captain's letter.

"My mother has not, when completely awake, had any other apparition or hallucination, except the one furnished you." [The words "when completely awake" simply reproduce the form in which the question was asked.]

"(Signed as correct) JANE STEPHENSON."

(582) From Mrs. Ricardo, 8, Chesham Street, S.W.

"April 6th, 1885.

"I can only recollect the story rather imperfectly, though I have often heard my father, the late Colonel Campbell, of Skipness, tell it.

"On a fine summer's evening, between 8 and 9 o'clock (still quite light in the Highlands), about 40 years ago or more, my father was walking to the old ruined castle of Skipness, which was a short distance from the more modern house. He had fitted up a turning lathe and workshop in one of the old rooms, and was going to fetch some tool which he had forgotten in the day. As he approached the gate of the courtyard he saw two of the fishermen (brothers), Walter and John Cook, leaning against the wall rather stiffly. Being in a hurry he merely nodded, said something about its being a fine evening and went on. He was surprised that they did not answer him, which was very unlike their usual custom, but being in a hurry did not think much of it, and when he returned, they were gone. That night a sudden gale sprang up in the middle of the night. Next

morning, when my father went out to see what damage had been done, he met some fishermen carrying up a dead body from the beach. He inquired, 'Who is it?' They said, 'Walter Cook, and they are just bringing his brother John's body too. Their boat capsized when they were out with the herring fleet last night, and they were both drowned.' My father said, 'It can't be, they never went to the fishing, for I saw them and spoke to them between 8 and 9 last night.' 'Impossible, laird! for they both sailed with the rest of the fleet between 3 and 4 in the afternoon, and never returned.' My father never believed in second-sight or wraiths, but said this completely puzzled him. It must have been second-sight, as the men were not yet dead when he saw them,¹ though it was absolutely impossible that they could have been on land at the time. This, as far as I can remember, is the story, but I cannot be *quite* exact as to date and hours.

"ANNETTE RICARDO."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Ricardo writes:—

1. "Colonel Campbell never had any other experiences of the kind, and always laughed at any superstitions or fancies of the kind.
2. "His sight was remarkably keen and long; a splendid shot, &c. [He was known as a spirited writer on Indian field sports.]
3. "He was always quite certain that the men were the Cooks, and recognised and spoke to them by name.
4. "It was well known that the Cooks went with the rest between 3 and 4 o'clock; every boat is seen and recognised as it leaves the bay, and they could not possibly return without its being also known.
5. "The place was not a usual one for the fishermen to lounge, being the walls of our old castle, in the grounds, and the men's attitude was so stiff that Colonel Campbell imagined they had been drinking.

"I have just been talking to an elder relation of the family, who had heard my father tell the story, and he corroborates these facts, only not

¹ If the men were in a perfectly normal state when the phantasms were seen, the incident could not be properly included among the telepathic cases in this book (Vol. i., p. 140). But the evidence is quite uncertain as to hours; and there seems at any rate an appreciable probability that the deaths coincided with or preceded Colonel Campbell's experience.

This suggests a more general remark. In Vol. i., p. 122, when contrasting telepathy with various beliefs which have been, or still are, *popular superstitions*, I included among these the belief in the prophetic gift of "second-sight." But a careful study of the recorded cases will show that the *prophetic* character which popularly attached to them was not infrequently a pure assumption. The time of the *occurrence* of distant events was apt to be confused with the time of *hearing* of them; and visions and impressions are described as having preceded, and been fulfilled by, events which, for aught that appears, they may have coincided with or shortly followed. (See, e.g., the narratives given in *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland*, by Walter Gregor, p. 205; in *Howells' Cambrian Superstitions*, p. 57; and in the *Treatise on Second Sight*, by Theophilus Insulanus (1763), p. 60; and see also p. 59.) In days when no distinct conception of psychical transference had been formed, and when supersensuous influences were regarded as necessarily supernatural, it is not surprising that effects *produced backwards*, so to speak, by events still to come, should have been as readily accepted as the *coincidental* impressions of what we should now call spontaneous telepathy: if the prophetic idea seemed the more marvellous, that would only be an inducement to give it the most extensive application. Not that I would attempt to save the credit of these cases by representing any of them as *conclusively* telepathic; as a rule, the reports on which they rest have had too many chances of being distorted and exaggerated to serve any evidential purpose whatever. But it is of interest to note here (as before in some of the alleged incidents connected with witchcraft, Vol. i., p. 119) that the residue of fact which might remain, after exaggeration, baseless assumption, and wrong inference had been allowed for, is such as the telepathic explanation would go far to cover.

quite sure whether the fleet went at 3 or 4, and thinks the apparition was seen about 9 in the evening.

“My brother-in-law (Captain Macneal, of Ugadale, Losset Park, Campbeltown, Argyllshire) encloses his statement. There are many others who have heard the story from Colonel Campbell. I do not know if the accident was *seen* to happen, or if only the boat and dead bodies were found. I have always believed that the accident occurred between 12 and 1, or 1 and 2 in the morning.”

Captain Macneal writes, on April 18, 1885 :—

“I have heard Colonel Campbell frequently relate the story regarding the Channel fishermen, just as his daughter has related it to you.

“H. MACNEAL.”

[We have received two other independent accounts of this occurrence from persons who had heard Colonel Campbell narrate it. These agree with the above in the fundamental point of the apparition of the fishermen occurring at or near the time of their death ; but one of them differs in a good many details, and adds an incident which, from the fact that we have never met with it in first-hand narratives, we should judge to be improbable—namely, that the apparition was seen again at the same spot after a considerable interval—when Colonel Campbell was returning home. If this really occurred, it would suggest that either the real men were seen, (which however is impossible, if the hours are correctly stated by Mrs. Ricardo,) or that a real object was mistaken for them. The phantasmal representation of *several* dying persons is unexampled in our first-hand evidence ; but see case 536. As might be expected, it is a feature that is met with in the more legendary records ; see, *e.g.*, Sacheverell’s *Account of the Isle of Man*, (1702), p. 14.]

(583) From Dr. Frank Comer, 79, Queen’s Gate, South Kensington, S.W.

“October 5th, 1885.

“In the year 1820 or 1821, my grandfather, Geo. Miller, M.D., who was a physician practising in Newry, Ireland, emigrated with his family to Canada and settled in the town of Niagara, Upper Canada. On their way to Niagara from Quebec, having reached the town of Prescott, which is above all the rapids of the St. Lawrence River, they then embarked on a sailing vessel commanded by a Captain Patterson. As the voyage from Prescott to Niagara in those days would probably occupy about a week, the passengers would undoubtedly become pretty well acquainted with the captain of the little vessel. About 6 or 8 weeks after the arrival of my grandfather and his family in Niagara, my grandmother (who, by the way, was a lady of more than ordinary sound practical common-sense, and not at all visionary) was walking in an orchard at the back of her house, about 3 o’clock in the afternoon, when Captain Patterson passed close by her and looked straight in her face. At first she was dumbfounded, not having heard his footsteps, but recovering from her surprise she extended her hand to shake hands with him ; but he merely smiled and passed out of sight behind a small out-building.

“Upon my grandfather’s return home, my grandmother told him of the occurrence, but he smiled and said she must have been dreaming, as Captain Patterson and his vessel were then at the other end of the Lake (Ontario) ; but she insisted that she was wide awake, that it was a clear

bright afternoon, and that she certainly had seen him or his apparition. A few days later the vessel arrived in Niagara, and the mate who was in charge reported that the Captain (Patterson) had been washed overboard during a gale at the lower end of the Lake. Upon inquiry it turned out that it was the same day, and (as nearly as could be judged) the very same hour, that grandmother Miller had seen his apparition in the garden. My mother, Mrs. J. F. R. Comer, was a girl of 10 or 11 years at the time, and remembers her mother and others talking about the occurrence at the time and afterwards, and she herself still remembers Captain Patterson. She is now in her 76th year, and is again living in Niagara, Ontario, Canada.

“FRANK COMER.”

Dr. Comer sent us the original of the following extract from a letter written by his mother :—

“In one of my letters I gave Frank an account of the drowning of Captain Patterson, on his second voyage up from Prescott, in a storm, and of my mother seeing him pass near the black cherry-tree. It was written on a separate sheet of paper. Did you not get it? I mean the second voyage after he brought my father’s family from Prescott to Niagara.”

(584) From Mr. T. L. Moore, 6, Downshire Hill, Hampstead.

“September, 1884.

“My father, Major-General George Frederick Moore, whose death took place on the 8th of this month, has frequently related to me and to others the following incident. When in India, in the year 1848, very shortly before the siege of Mooltan, he occupied a bungalow at some place in that neighbourhood (the name of which I cannot give with certainty), and had a household consisting of the usual number of native servants. Among these was a woman who was a laundress, and part of whose weekly duty was to bring my father’s clean linen to the bungalow, and deposit it in his bedroom for use.

“This woman met with an accident, which ended in *tetanus*. One day, it being fully light, my father was lying on a sofa in his sitting-room, the woman being somewhere in the compound, and *in extremis*, as he knew, from lockjaw. The door was open, and, as he lay on the sofa, he could see down a passage, which ended in another door (also open), leading to the compound. This latter was the main entrance to the bungalow, and anyone coming up the passage would go either into the sitting-room, or, turning at right angles, down another passage which led to the bedroom and adjoining bathroom. While lying on the sofa, in full view of the entrance-passage, my father was astonished to see his laundress enter from the compound, pass up the passage, carrying, as was her custom, his clean linen.¹ Upon reaching the sitting-room door she turned down the corridor, leading, as before explained, to the bedroom. He immediately rose and followed her, knowing that she must be in either the bed or the bath room, from which there was no exit save by the way she had come, but no one was to be seen. Much perplexed, he repaired to the compound and found her lying dead, having at that moment expired. My father described her appearance as perfectly definite in every way, wearing the same clothes and bangle ornaments which she used to do when alive; and

¹ As to the projection of the hallucinatory figure with familiar dress or appurtenances, see Vol. i., pp. 539-40.

her apparition was so palpable that it was the knowledge of her impending death which caused him to follow her into the bedroom and bathroom.

“That this appearance was not that of any *living* person is proved by the fact of there being no exit from these two rooms save by the passage down which the apparition walked.

“TEMPLE L. MOORE.”

Mr. Arthur G. Hill, of 47, Belsize Avenue, Hampstead, writes:—

“September, 1884.

“The late General Moore narrated the above account to me in the presence of his son a few weeks ago, very shortly before his death, and had no doubt whatever of the reality of the ‘wraith.’ He had intended to dictate an account, at my request, specially for the S.P.R. He was the most unimaginative and strong-minded man imaginable.”

[Mr. Hill mentions that this was not General Moore’s solitary experience of hallucination, as he had once seen the figure of his brother, two days after his brother’s death.]

(585) From Mr. H., a journalist, who desires that names may not be published. The account has been submitted to the first-hand witness, who is perfectly willing that it should appear, and may be taken to admit its correctness.

“November 12th, 1883.

“Many years ago, my father had an intimate and dear friend, a doctor, who had to pass every winter in Madeira. One night my father was going to his rooms, in the Strand, when, on the stairs, coming down, he met, as he thought, poor Dr. G. So vivid was the illusion, that he held out his hand, and, I believe, spoke. Of that I am not certain. The ghost, or whatever it might have been, looked at my father, and passed down the stairs. Some little time afterwards, my father received news of his friend’s death. It happened, I believe, on the very day my father met with his little adventure. This is the story as I have heard my parent tell it.

“Visitations or warnings of this kind are common enough, and I remember perfectly well that the affair, hallucination or not, impressed my father very much—not that he is by any means a superstitious man.”

[The percipient cannot remember the precise date of the occurrence, which took place more than 30 years ago.]

(586) From Colonel V., who writes, in a letter dated March 11, 1886, “The account was written by me from a statement made to me by my father, the late Capt. J. H. V., in 1864. The words are my father’s, and I wrote them as he related them to me.” Names were given in confidence.

“One of my [*i.e.*, Colonel V.’s, not his father’s] grand-aunts was Mrs. F., married to an officer, Major or Colonel F., of the Dragoons, serving in George III.’s time in America. He was killed at the battle of Saratoga. My aunt lived at the time in Portland Place, W., and was entertaining a large party one evening. Suddenly they remarked she seemed to be in great pain and agony, exclaiming quite aloud to her guests, ‘Oh, do go home. I have seen a most fearful sight, and am compelled to break up the party.’ Some of her most intimate friends asked her what she had seen. She replied that she was certain ‘her husband F. had been killed in a battle, and that she most distinctly saw his body being carried to the rear by his soldiers.’ She remained in great anxiety for weeks, when the sad news confirming her vision arrived from America, and that at the hour she made the exclamation to her guests, her husband, F., of the Dragoons

(allowing for difference of longitude), was killed in an attack made on the enemy at the battle of Saratoga.”

Colonel V. adds, “An aunt now deceased, told me she was, when a girl, present at the time when [her aunt] Mrs. F. called out ‘that F. had been shot, and that she saw his body being carried off the field of battle.’”

We find from *Burgoyne's Campaign*, by Charles Neilson (Albany, 1844), that Brigadier-General F. was wounded at the battle of Saratoga, at 2 p.m. on Oct. 7, 1777, but did not die till 8 a.m. on Oct. 8. From *Letters and Memoirs relating to the American War of Independence*, by Madame Riedesel (Translation, New York, 1827), we learn that he was carried to Madame Riedesel's hut at about 3 p.m., which would correspond with about 8 p.m. in London; and that during the afternoon, while he was lying mortally wounded, he frequently uttered his wife's name.¹

[We have no means of judging whether the vision of the soldiers carrying the body was of the clairvoyant type, or whether the scene was merely a setting supplied by the percipient's own mind. Nor can we judge how far the experience was an externalised hallucination. (See Vol. I., p. 545, note.)]

(587) From Mrs. Hackett, 10, Steele's Road, Haverstock Hill, N.W.

“September 26th, 1883.

“The incident which I have often heard my father [James Dawson] speak about was that one of the men on board my grandfather's ship was ill, and could not be induced to eat anything. He said if he could have a piece of game-pie, he thought he could eat that. When grandfather got home (the ship was then in dock in London), he found a hamper had arrived from Yorkshire and in it was a game-pie. My father at once begged to take a piece to the man. He had it tied up in a cloth, to be able to hold it more securely in going up the side of the ship. When nearly at the top of the ladder, he said he distinctly saw his sister dressed in white. It so unnerved him that he dropped the pie into the water. His sister was living in Yorkshire, near Flamborough Head. As soon as a letter could be had in those days, they heard this sister [Jane Foster] died at that time, and he was the person she spoke of last. I never heard my father say he had seen anything of the kind before or afterwards.

“C. J. HACKETT.”

¹ I append the following version of the same incident (received from a lady of sense and great practical ability), as illustrating what I have before emphasised (Vol. i., p. 149)—the difference in evidential value between a record given by a person nearly connected with the original witness, and having command of the circumstances, and a story casually picked up from an acquaintance. The essential point of a telepathic vision remains; but almost every detail is altered; and, as so frequently happens in such cases, the chain of evidence is shortened, and the narrator's informant is represented as the person to whom the experience occurred. She was really the “aunt now deceased” of Colonel V.

“March 14, 1884.

“Mrs. V., whose husband was in the Artillery in India, told me the following occurred to herself. The story is well known in her family. She has been dead some years, and it occurred when she was comparatively a young woman. I heard it from her 23 years ago last Christmas, at Southampton. One evening, sitting in her drawing-room, she saw distinctly a military funeral procession pass at the further end of the room. The coffin borne on a gun-carriage; the men with arms reversed. Directly it passed away, she noted the circumstance, writing it down, and passed some months in the greatest anxiety. It was before the days of overland route. She heard of her husband's death, which had occurred that day, and allowing for the difference of time, the funeral had taken place at the moment she had seen the vision, death and burial following each other within a few hours in India.” The “arms reversed,” the “overland route,” and the remark about “death and burial,” show that a report is not more likely to be accurate for being circumstantial.

[No one, perhaps, will imagine that a fictitious narrative would take such a form as this—the apparition coming in as a mere episode in the pie’s history. But the incident is remote, having occurred, Mrs. Hackett thinks, before 1830. She last heard the account from her father about 1850. She told Mr. Podmore on April 18, 1886, that a surviving aunt of hers remembers hearing the account from Mr. Dawson, but is too old to be applied to for dates, &c.]

(588) From Mr. J. H. Redfern, 20, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, the narrator of case 214.

“1882.

“The following narrative I give you as I have had it often from the lips of my wife. The circumstance took place a number of years ago. She repeated it often. I have ridiculed it, made fun of it, &c. It had no effect upon her. She was a quiet, thoughtful, upright woman; and so far as the thing appeared to her, all who knew her would be satisfied as to the accuracy of the statement as given by her. She was a native of Worksop, Notts. A Mr. Drobble, an old friend of her father’s, residing not far away, was fond of her even as a child, and as she grew up, petted and made much of her; this continued, and she always regarded him as an intimate and dear friend. In winter, or at any time going from home, he wore an old-fashioned great-coat of drab cloth. I mention this as it was of peculiar make, and the only one of the kind about that part of the country. [She left home, and was staying at Stockport.] In that town, in a street called Underbank, is an old-fashioned mansion with a large courtyard in the front. It was (and is now) a branch of the Manchester and Liverpool District Bank. Being one day about noon there, and chancing to look through a window into the street, she saw on the footpath opposite the bank, and looking up at the building, Mr. Drobble. He had on his drab overcoat, and appeared as if he was upon the point of coming through the gateway into the courtyard. She saw him (she said) face to face. She instantly stepped out of the bank, across the courtyard—expecting to meet him—into the street. He had disappeared. On each side of the bank were shops. She fancied that he must have gone into some of them. She followed, as she thought, but could see nothing of him. She felt much disappointed; but gradually the thing was in a great measure forgotten.

“Fifteen or eighteen months after, she went home to Worksop. After some days, incidentally she asked her mother how Mr. Drobble was. Her mother stared at her at first, and then asked her what ever she was talking about? Mr. Drobble had been dead for more than 12 months. My wife, in her turn, protested that she saw him, face to face, in broad daylight; that it was impossible that she could be mistaken in the matter; and to this she adhered to her dying day.

“Upon further inquiry it appeared that Mr. Drobble had died at about the time of the day when she believed that she saw him, and so near as they could get at it, on the same day; and that he had been confined to bed for something like 9 or 10 months previous to his death.

“It appeared also that they had never sent word of his death, and she had never learned it until in the way, and at the time, here told.”

Mrs. Hannah Lees, of Clifton Crescent, Rotherham, writes to us:—

“I can confirm the truth of Mr. Drobbles death when sister Redfern was away. I was with her at home, when, as described by Mr. Redfern, she asked about him, and only then learned of his death. Nothing could shake her belief in the fact of her having seen him at the time, and in the manner described.”

[Mr. Redfern assures us that he had not exchanged a word on the subject with Mrs. Lees for years, and that her testimony has been given without his having in any way refreshed her memory. But the degree of closeness in the coincidence is uncertain; and the case may possibly have been one of mistaken identity.]

The next case is perhaps an example of the rare type where the operative idea in the agent's mind was of the place in which (rather than of the person by whom) the phantasm is seen. (Vol. I., p. 268.)

(589) From the Rev. W. S. Grignon, The Grove, Pluckley, Kent.

“24th October, 1882.

“The date was between 1820 and 1830. My father made a journey from Montego Bay to Spanish Town, to attend the session of the ‘House of Assembly’ of Jamaica, of which he was a member, and passed a night *en route* at the house of a friend whose name I cannot now remember. The family consisted of his friend, his friend's wife, and the wife's sister, a Miss R. (we will call her so; I know the name but have perhaps no right to give it). This young lady was out of health, and in a very depressed state. After dinner the ladies left the room, and my father shortly after strolled out of doors in the very brief twilight of a tropical day. To his surprise he saw Miss R. going along a path from the house towards a clump of trees not far from it; he was not very near her, but called out to her. She proceeded on her way without taking any notice of him; supposing that she wished to be alone, he turned off in another direction, and shortly after returned to the house. On entering the drawing-room he found his friend and his wife there, and Miss R. also there, reclining on a sofa. When he came in she rose and left the room. He said to his friend's wife, ‘Do you think it safe for your sister to go out of doors so late, with a heavy dew falling? I met her outside a few minutes ago.’ ‘You must be mistaken; she came in here with me from the dining-room, lay down on the sofa, and I am quite certain, did not leave it till just now on your entrance. I have been here the whole time.’ They were all puzzled by his certainty that he had seen Miss R., and some time having passed without her returning to the room, she was looked for and not found in the house. On further search outside, she was found dead, having hanged herself on one of the trees in the clump towards which my father had seen her, or the appearance of her, moving.

“It must be remembered that the servants about the place were all negroes or brown people. Had such a thing happened in England it might be thought that some female servant, sufficiently like Miss R. in figure to be taken for her at a little distance, had been seen. There this could not have been. Probably the poor girl was, while reclining on the sofa,

thinking, with an intentness which the sane mind cannot easily conceive, of her purpose of suicide and the place she had chosen for it. Could this have had the effect of visibly projecting the appearance of her form towards the place?

“W. S. GRIGNON.”

[In spite of the special reason suggested for rejecting the hypothesis of mistaken identity, we can scarcely feel, in so remote a case, that we realise the circumstances with sufficient completeness to justify confidence on that point. If the vision was not flesh and blood, it is certainly difficult to resist the conclusion that it was of telepathic origin.]

(590) From a teacher in the Gymnasium of Tver, Russia, whose name we are asked not to print. The first-hand account was sent by Mr. Vladislavleff, of Tver, to Mr. Bruhns, who translated it for us.

“1883.

The narrator begins by saying that about 1856, when a boy of 12, he was a collegian of the first Moscow Gymnasium, and that his parents lived about 250 miles from Moscow. “One morning in the beginning of April, I went as usual to the Arkhangelsk Cathedral in the Kremlin. The liturgy had already commenced. The church was, as usual, full of worshippers. At the beginning of the liturgy I accidentally turned my head, and to my greatest surprise saw in the crowd of worshippers my mother, praying, and with her eyes directed to the holy images, like other worshippers round her. She was dressed in her usual dress. My astonishment was very great, for I knew very well that my parents were then at home. I spent the whole liturgy in looking at her, and in thinking of the incident. Meanwhile the liturgy had come to an end, and the worshippers began to kiss the cross. Among others, my mother approached the priest. Fearing to lose sight of her, I went through the crowd of worshippers which surrounded the priest with the cross, and when she, after having kissed the cross, went to the door, I went after her. She went out of the door, advanced some feet, and then stopped at the corner, formed by the wall of the cathedral itself and the wall of the altar, and in such a manner that her face turned towards the crowd which was passing by her. Going after the worshippers, I approached her. I saw her looking at me and weeping, her tears flowing down her cheeks. I stopped momentarily, but the crowd continued to pass by us, and I all at once understood that I saw before me something extraordinary—something that was visible to me alone. An inexpressible terror seized me, and I cannot remember how I reached our lodging. But I told nobody of the incident.

“The summer came. We went home to our parents. When we arrived, we heard of our mother’s death: she died precisely at the beginning of April. Our father did not inform us about this death fearing the sorrowful news might disturb our May examinations in the University and in the Gymnasium.”

[If this report is accurate, the case does not look like one of mistaken identity. But the extraordinarily prolonged character of the apparition suggests exaggeration (compare case 300); and the more so when the youth of the percipient is remembered.]

§ 4. The cases in this section are narrated by persons not closely related to the respective percipients.

(591) From Dr. de Wolf, Providence, R.I.,—a letter to Professor Barrett.

“August 28th, 1884.

“I have been for many years a practitioner of medicine in this city; my birthplace was the town of Bristol, some 15 miles distant, where I resided for more than 30 years, and for the greater part of that time was a next-door neighbour of Right Rev. A. V. Eriswold, Bishop of the Eastern Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and who died some 40 years ago. He was, as all Churchmen in this country know, greatly esteemed for his talents and piety.

“For what follows the Bishop himself was my informant. He told it to others, and I heard it frequently spoken of by different members of the family.

“One afternoon, while standing at his desk writing in his study, a door opened¹ from an adjoining room, and Mr. Collins, his son-in-law, entered, and passed slowly through the room and out of another door; the Bishop said he had not been thinking or talking of Mr. Collins, and had not heard from him for some time. He knew that he could not be within a thousand miles of him, and yet he had distinctly seen him pass through the room. This of itself was a very remarkable occurrence, but what follows renders it still more so.

“When the mail from Charleston arrived some 3 or 4 days after (there were no telegraphs or railroads at that time), a letter was received announcing the death of Mr. Collins, on the very day and hour when the Bishop saw him apparently pass through his study.

“The good Bishop (who was no believer in ghosts, necromancy, or anything of the sort) said it was a most remarkable and singular circumstance, the coincidence rendering it still more remarkable, and he could not account for it, but supposed it must be some sort of a hallucination; for, as he was standing at a high desk, he could hardly have been *dreaming*.

“JOHN J. DE WOLF, M.D.”

Dr. de Wolf has kindly inspected the tombstone of Mr. Collins, which shows that he died on July 4th, 1807. Dr. de Wolf has also endeavoured to find some other person who has heard the account direct from the Bishop; but in this he has failed. The Bishop's grandchildren have all heard of the occurrence, but not at first hand. One of them told Dr. de Wolf that the Bishop himself was disposed to say very little about it.

(592) Copy of part of a letter from Miss M. A. Ewart, of 3, Morpeth Terrace, Victoria Street, S.W., to Mrs. Sidgwick, dated April 4, 1886.

“I waited to write until I had seen Mr. Henry Clarke, who was brother-in-law to Mr. Guthrie, Vicar of Calne, in Wilts, who told me at dinner at Bowood, about 1860, of the apparition of Lord Kerry, as I described it to you. Mr. Clarke had no recollection of having heard Mr. Guthrie tell the story, and did not know it; but he said that Mr. Guthrie was greatly attached to Lord Kerry, who was his pupil, and that Lady

¹ Compare cases 530 and 537. This form of hallucination is met with also in purely subjective cases.

Lansdowne was always very grateful to Mr. Guthrie for the influence he had over her son. Lord Kerry died in 1836. Mr. Clarke could not say that he died at Bowood.

"It was in the beech avenue, approaching the house at Bowood, that Mr. Guthrie told me he met Lord Kerry, when he was going to the house to see him, knowing him to be unwell and shut up. When he reached the house, the servant told him that Lord Kerry had died a few minutes before, and, as Mr. Guthrie believed, at the moment he had met him, walking briskly, and surprising him so much that he did not attempt to stop him. Lord and Lady Kerry lived in a house I know well, close to Bowood (where Mr. Clarke's sister, Mrs. Warren, now lives), but Mr. Clarke says that they may have been at Bowood at the time of his death. Mr. Clarke was then in China. I am sorry that I cannot tell you more.

"M. A. EWART."

[This narrative belongs, no doubt, to a type which as a rule is untrustworthy—having been told to our informant by an acquaintance, not a relative or intimate friend, and on one occasion only. But the facts, it will be seen, are of the very simplest kind, and are presented without any attempt at ornament or detail; and Miss Ewart's acquaintance with the locality would naturally tend to fix the simple lines of the picture in her mind.]

(593) From Mr. P. H. Berthon, F.R.G.S., 20, Margaret Street, W. The narrative was sent to Professor Barrett in 1875.

"Some years ago, when residing at Walthamstow, in Essex, my wife and self became intimate with a lady and gentleman who had become temporarily our near neighbours. On one occasion, when they were dining with us quite *en famille*, my friend and I, on repairing to the drawing-room, not long after the ladies had left us, were surprised to find that his wife had been suddenly taken with a kind of fainting fit, and had been obliged to return home accompanied by one of our female servants. My wife, as a matter of course, went the next day to inquire after her friend, who then told her that the cause of her sudden indisposition had been the appearance, as if in her actual person standing before her, of one of her two sisters, who were then residing with their mother at Beyrout, in Syria, which had greatly alarmed her. Communication by telegraph had not then been established, and by post it was much slower than at present. Many days had therefore elapsed before the lady received letters from Beyrout, but on their arrival they conveyed the intelligence that her sister had died on the day and, allowing for the difference in the time, at about the hour of her appearance to our friend."

In conversation, Mr. Berthon told the present writer that the lady, Mrs. de Salomé, was playing the piano when she saw her sister's figure at her side. Mr. Berthon did not hear of the incident from Mrs. de Salomé herself, but was at once told of it by his wife, and was also told at once of the arrival of the news. He frequently saw Mrs. de Salomé during the interval. He says also that his daughter, who was 12 at the time, distinctly remembers hearing of the circumstances at the time. Mrs. de Salomé died soon after the occurrence, which took place in the autumn of 1853. Mrs. Berthon is also deceased.

(594) From Dr. H. T. Berry, 29, Pembroke Crescent, Bayswater.

“ December 29th, 1884.

“ Although living now at Bayswater, I have been in practice in the North of London for nearly 40 years. The following account I can vouch for in every particular, but remember I draw no inference from it.

“ Some five or six years since, I was attending Mrs. A., in the neighbourhood of Gray’s Inn Road. The lady became so ill that she sent for her mother, residing nearly one hundred miles from town, to nurse her. Some eight or ten days after, I made my usual morning call, and found Mrs. A. improving, and her mother quite well. About 3 o’clock in the afternoon of the same day, I was hastily summoned to Mrs. A.’s house. When I arrived, Mrs. A. was no worse, but her mother had suddenly dropped down dead in a fit. I telegraphed to the husband [Mrs. A.’s father] to come to town directly, not telling him of his wife’s death, fearing to alarm him too suddenly. When the husband came up (he was a very intelligent man, about 70) he told me he was not surprised to find his wife dead when he arrived in town. For, about the time of her death, he was returning to his home, through a field, when he distinctly saw his wife cross the field a few yards from him. As he went home he called at a friend’s house, and said, ‘ I am sure my wife is dead. When I reached home I found the telegram asking me to come up directly ; but I felt certain my poor wife was dead.’ As I said in my note, I make no theory to explain the above. The facts I know of my own personal knowledge.

“ H. T. BERRY.”

In a subsequent letter, Dr. Berry says, “ The old man told me himself, within 24 hours of the vision. I don’t think he is living now.” He adds that the incident occurred in the summer of 1880 ; and that he attended the inquest.

He has given us, in confidence, the name and address of his patient, but does not allow us to apply to her. As he does not remember her mother’s name, we have had some difficulty in obtaining confirmation of his account. We applied to the coroner of the district, who found no inquest recorded in his books ; but he kindly inquired of a grandson of the deceased lady, from whom he learnt that she had died in the summer of 1880, and that there was no formal inquest. No doubt (as the coroner suggests) Dr. Berry used the word “ inquest ” for the informal consultation at which he assigned the cause of death.

(595) From Miss Eliza Mortlock, Tivoli Lodge, Clevedon, who does not remember when it was that the account was written.

“ At Wiesbaden we were acquainted with a clever good man, Professor Ebenau, whose old sister kept his house, &c. He told us he had a friend residing 40 or 50 miles off—likewise a professor—who was very poor, and had a large family. On hearing that the wife was dying, Mr. E. went to see them, and brought back their eldest boy, for whom a little bed was put up in Mr. E.’s room.

“ One morning, about 10 days after, Mr. E. called and asked me, ‘ Do you believe that at the moment of death, you may appear to one whom you love ? ’ I replied, ‘ Yes, I do. ’ ‘ Well,’ he said, ‘ we shall see. I have noted the day and the hour ; for last night after I went up to bed, the

child said sweetly (in German), "Yes, dear mamma, I see you." To which I replied, "No, dear boy, it is I, I am come to bed." "No, he said, "it is dear mamma, she is standing there smiling at me," pointing to the side of the bed.' On his next visit, Mr. Ebenau told us that he had received a letter saying that at that time, and on that evening, the wife had breathed her last.

"ELIZA MORTLOCK."

[This event happened in the spring of 1854, and Miss Mortlock has lost sight of Professor Ebenau ; but it will be seen that she herself was informed of the vision before the death was known. The boy seems to have been sufficiently awake at any rate to understand and reply to Professor Ebenau's remark, and Miss Mortlock is sure that the Professor believed him to have been awake. But he may have been in a state favourable to subjective hallucination, from knowledge of his mother's critical condition.]

(596) From Mr. Wicks (a Temperance Missionary), 87, Southfields, Leicester.

"July, 1884.

"In Devonport, in the year 1884, I was acquainted with a Mrs. Flaherty, an Irish widow, who occupied two rooms in a house which accommodated several poor families. She had three sons, the eldest of whom, Garland, a lad of about 17, who was steward on board one of Her Majesty's ships, was her main support. This lad had been ashore on leave, and had bade his mother farewell to return to his duty. She, soon after parting with him, set about cleaning the doorway of the house. Looking up from this occupation, she saw him returning up the street, and she exclaimed, 'Why, goodness! he has lost the boat. Whatever will he do?' She rose up and surveyed him as he approached her, identifying his face, hair, figure, gait, dress, and even the bundle of clothes he had carried away. She called out to him, but he made no answer, walked past her into the house, and went up into her rooms. She followed, but finding nobody there, she called out chidingly, 'Garland, don't play with me. Tell me, why haven't you gone aboard?' Her excitement brought in her neighbours, who asked what was the matter; to which inquiry she responded, 'Indeed, I don't know. By the Holy Mother, I never saw Garland in my life if I didn't see him just now come in at the door and go upstairs before me.' 'Are you sure, now, he is not hiding in some of your rooms?' They soon satisfied themselves by search that this was not the case, and told Mrs. Flaherty she must have been mistaken. To this she answered positively, 'Don't I know my own boy—my own Garland? bless him! and didn't I see him come up the street, and come into this house? Yes, and up over the stairs: and didn't he pass me without speaking? the likes of which he never did before at all, at all. Something must be the matter with him.'

"In this she was right. It turned out that in trying to get from the boat on to the ladder lying over the ship's side he missed his foothold, fell into the sea, and was drowned. This happened at the very time his mother saw his apparition.

"I had this story, as it is here given, from Mrs. Flaherty's own lips, and have frequently since heard it from her second son, John Garland Flaherty, who was my companion for over 10 years.

"WILLIAM WICKS."

(597) From the late Miss Elizabeth Jacob, who wrote down the account, some years ago, for Mrs. Saxby, of Mount Elton, Clevedon. The date of the incident is now irrecoverable; Mrs. Saxby, writing on March 11, 1886, says that she thinks it "must have occurred full 20 years ago."

The narrative begins by describing how one John Miller, an old blind man whom Miss Jacob and her sister, Mrs. Russell, used to visit in London, died unexpectedly at a time when his son-in-law was seeking employment in the country. "The second night after the death, Mrs. Miller and her daughter had gone to bed, but they were unable to sleep for thinking of him, when, to use her own words, 'I heard something strike against the window, ma'am, and I started up and found that it was someone throwing up stones against it. So I jumps up, throws my flannel petticoat over my shoulders, and opens the window. "Who's there?" says I. "It is I, mother," says Jem, "come home." "Oh, Jem," says I, "father's dead." Says he, "I knowed it, and that's why I come home." So, ma'am I was struck all of a heap, as you may guess, and I whipped on my clothes and let Jem in, and then he told us all how it was.' He had been in Buckinghamshire, towards Oxford, and he was walking by a ploughed field in a country place, when, looking up, he saw his father [in-law] coming towards him. He was quite sure it was his father [in-law]. He felt startled, but was just going up to speak to him when he passed away over the ploughed field without turning, or speaking, or looking at him. Jem felt so awe struck that he could neither move nor do anything, but he thought directly that it was a sign that something was wrong, so he turned and walked back to London as soon as he could, and very footsore and tired he was when he arrived."

Mrs. Saxby tells us that Miss Jacob heard old Mrs. Miller relate this incident a few days after Jem's return; and adds, "They found that it was exactly at the same hour that the old man died, that his son-in-law saw him glide past him in the ploughed field."

[This case depends on the evidence of respectable, though uneducated, witnesses; and the fact of the son-in-law's return, and the reason he alleged for it, are not matters on which memory would become untrustworthy in a few days. At the same time, the exactitude of the coincidence may easily have been exaggerated. As Mrs. Miller was cognisant of Jem's unexpected return before he heard of the death, and must have heard of the vision that caused his return in almost the same breath as he heard of the death, her evidence may perhaps be reckoned as on a par with first-hand (Vol. I., p. 148).]

(598) The late General Campbell, of Gwalior House, Southgate, informed us that a relative of his, Major Hasell, had seen the apparition of a brother at the time of the latter's death, and that the only authority whom he was at liberty to quote was a common relative of his own and of Major Hasell's—General Orchard. At our request he wrote to General Orchard, who replied as follows:—

"Woodville Gardens, Barnes, S.W., Surrey.

"May 17th, 1884.

"The event took place during June, 1849 (the precise date I cannot say); it took place on his voyage home, on medical leave. Hasell (48th

Ben. N.I.) told me it was in the Red Sea that his brother died, on the way to Suez. Hasell further stated that on seeing his brother's apparition he looked at his watch, and noted down the date and time his brother appeared to him, and by his calculations it was exactly the time intimated as to his demise, which he afterwards received. The name of the ship I do not know; however, that can be easily ascertained from the India Office, as well as the actual date and where he died. The particulars that I have not been able to give have quite escaped my memory, although at the time they must have been mentioned to me.

"Hasell was in India with his regiment, and his brother going to England on medical leave at that time. "J. W. ORCHARD."

General Orchard writes to us on May 24, 1884 :—

"I cannot bring to mind *when* Major Hasell told me of the occurrence.

"The apparition appeared in the afternoon, but the hour has escaped my memory. It showed itself to Major Hasell, and he told me it was visible for a second or two, and then faded away. He made the calculation as to the time, which agreed with that of his brother's death."

General Campbell says that Major Hasell struck him "as being a very straightforward, practical sort of man."

We learn from the India Office that Captain William Lowther Hasell, attached to the 44th Bengal Native Infantry, died at Cairo, on his way home, on the 13th June, 1849. The vessel in which he embarked from India was the P. and O. steamship "Oriental," Captain Powell.

(599) The following narrative, received from an intimate friend of Mr. Myers and the present writer, is third-hand, and is admitted only by special exception (see Vol. I., p. 158, note).

"1883.

"My grandfather, Sir J. Y., was drowned by the upsetting of a boat in the Solent, in or about the year 1830.

"On the day of his death Miss Manningham, a great friend and connection of his, was at one of the Ancient Concerts in Hanover Square Rooms. During the performance she fainted away, and when she came to, declared that she had seen a corpse lying at her feet, and though the face was turned away, she knew the figure to be that of my grandfather. Communication in those days was not of course as easy as now, and her fears were not verified till some days after the event.¹ Such is the family story, which I heard often from my father, and had verified by my mother when last I saw her."

In answer to an inquiry, the narrator adds, "I have always understood that my father heard it from Miss Manningham; my mother heard it from my father."

The following account of the same incident occurs in *A Portion of the Journal kept by T. Raikes, Esq., from 1831 to 1847*, Vol. I., p. 131 :—

"Wednesday, 26th, December, 1832.—Captain——recounted a curious anecdote that happened in his own family. He told it in the following words :—It is now about 15 months ago that Miss M., a connection of

¹ The journey from Southampton to London only took one day at that time; but Miss Manningham may not have been immediately informed of the news.

my family, went with a party of friends to a concert at the Argyll Rooms. She appeared there to be suddenly seized with indisposition, and though she persisted for some time to struggle against what seemed a violent nervous affection, it became at last so oppressive that they were obliged to send for their carriage and conduct her home. She was for a long while unwilling to say what was the cause of her indisposition; but on being more earnestly questioned, she at length confessed that she had, immediately on arriving at the concert-room, been terrified by a horrible vision which unceasingly presented itself to her sight. It seemed to her as though a naked corpse was lying on the floor at her feet; the features of the face were partly covered by a cloth mantle, but enough was apparent to convince her that the body was that of Sir J. Y. Every effort was made by her friends at the time to tranquillise her mind by representing the folly of allowing such delusions to prey upon her spirits, and she thus retired to bed; but on the following day the family received the tidings of Sir J. Y. having been drowned in Southampton River that very night by the oversetting of his boat, and the body was afterwards found entangled in a *boat-cloak*. Here is an authentic case of second-sight, and of very recent date."

We find from the *Hampshire Telegraph* that the fatal accident occurred at about 4 p.m., on May 5, 1831.

It will be seen that the accounts present a discrepancy in the name of the building where the vision was seen—the "Argyll Rooms," according to the older version, the "Hanover Square Rooms" according to the later. We find from the advertisements of the *Morning Post* that "the celebrated Russian Band" was that week giving daily concerts, at 3 p.m., at the Argyll Rooms; and from Crickley's *Picture of London* (1831), p. 93, we learn that "the Argyll Rooms, Regent Street, burnt down in the early part of last year, have been again restored to their former splendour. They are devoted to concerts, balls, and exhibitions, and are much frequented by persons of rank and fashion." It is therefore probable that Miss Manningham was present at the afternoon concert at these Rooms. The Hanover Square Rooms were also used for concerts at that time; and as the title "Argyll Rooms" has long ceased to suggest a high-class concert-hall, one easily sees how it may have been unconsciously replaced in the mind of our friend's parents by the more apparently suitable appellation.

The newspaper-account shows that the bodies of Sir J. Y., and of two friends who were drowned with him, were "completely enveloped in their cloaks and greatcoats"; and therefore the detail of the boat-cloak in the vision, if correct, is interesting; but as we do not know at what hand the older account is given, it is impossible to rely on such a point.

(600) From Mr. James Cox, (mentioned above, p. 235).

"Admiralty House, Queenstown.

"March 18th, 1884.

"When I was serving in China in 1860, during the war, a military officer, who was serving there at the same time, while crossing Talienwhau Bay, was capsized and drowned. One of his brother officers informed me that at the time of the accident he distinctly saw his apparition while riding across the country.

“ I cannot now remember the names of these officers, as this happened more than 20 years ago. ”

“ JAMES COX.”

In reply to the question whether he heard of the event immediately after its occurrence, Mr. Cox says :—

“ March 25th, 1884.

“ The fact of the officer in question having been capsized and drowned was known to us all, I think, on the day the sad event happened ; as the fleet was anchored in the Bay of Talienwhau, and the troops were encamped on the shores of the Bay, so that the army and navy were in constant communication. But the next day, I believe, while I was returning from the camp, where I had been on a visit, the military officer who had seen the apparition spoke to me of it.”

We find from Mr. R. Swinhoe's *A Narrative of the North China Campaign in 1860*, that the officer who was drowned, as described, was Lieutenant H. L. G. Gordon, of the Madras Engineers. His death took place on July 11th, 1860.

Sir Peter Lumsden, K.C.B., who was in the boat with Gordon, and Colonel W. H. Edgcome, R.E., who was in the Madras Engineers in China at the time, tell us that they never heard of the apparition.

[Mr. Cox is a careful informant ; and the fact that he was on the spot, and heard of the incident immediately on its occurrence, seems to justify an exception to the rule of not admitting accounts from persons who had only a slight acquaintance with the original witness.]

(601) Mr. F. L. Brine, Finsbury Distillery, E.C., sent us a letter from his sister, Mrs. F., containing the following passage :—

“ February 29th, 1884.

“ I remember, as if it were only yesterday, staying at the Miltons. It was Mr. Milton's custom to go into the cellar, to turn the gas off at the meter. When he came up he was looking unusually pale, and he said, ‘ Where is the scoundrel ? ’ Of course it frightened us, as we thought he meant a burglar ; and he would not believe, for some time, that his son, Harry, was not having a game with him ; as he saw him quite plainly in the cellar. A few weeks after, they had a letter from the captain of the ship, to say he died in Hobart Town Hospital, on the very night he appeared to his father.

“ S. F.”

[Mrs. F. dislikes the subject, and we can obtain no further details from her. We have written to Hobart Town, to obtain a certificate of the death, but have not received it in time for insertion here.]

(602) From an article in *Church Bells* for March 20th, 1885, by the Rev. J. Foxley, Vicar of Market Weighton, Yorkshire.

“ There is now living in the parish where we write—she was at church last Sunday—a widow now in her 78th year, but in full possession of all her faculties, who has more than once told us, with all the fulness of detail, and subject to all the cross-questioning which we could devise, how she was at service some miles from home during her father's last illness, and that one Thursday she felt unable to go on with her work, and after a while, about 1 o'clock, saw a vision of her father ; that it turned out afterwards that her father died at that very time, and that just before his death he had been speaking of her ; that a letter sent to inform her of his being worse failed to reach her ; and that though she knew he was

ill, she was not aware that he was in immediate danger ; but that she was so impressed with her vision that she set off home the Saturday following, and learnt¹ on the way that her father was dead, and that his funeral was to take place that very day, so that she arrived only just in time. We have verified one subordinate part of the above narrative ; for by reference to the parish register we find that the burial took place on the 31st of May, 1823 ; and as the Sunday letter for that year was E, which is the letter for the 1st of June, the burial turns out to have been, as stated, on a Saturday. Our informant was then, as shown by the register of her baptism, 25 years old."

In sending the above, Mr. Foxley writes, October 24th, 1884 :—

"The enclosed cutting from *Church Bells* has the advantage of having been read over to Mrs. Pollard, and accepted by her as a faithful statement of what occurred to her. She was buried here, February 14th, 1884. She could read well. The '1 o'clock' mentioned was in the *day*-time. I recollect her mentioning *dinner*-time. The place was some out-building, I think a summer-house, but of that I am not certain. She always told the story under the impression that she was wide awake."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Foxley adds :—

"I cannot recollect whether she said she mentioned the apparition to anyone *before* the news of the death arrived. But she told me that the apparition was one cause, if not *the* cause, of her asking leave to go home to see her father. I cannot say in whose service she was.

"All I can add is, that I cross-questioned Mrs. Pollard repeatedly, in every way I could think of, and that I could not shake her story. But then she may have told it so many times that it had become truth to her, like George the Fourth's presence at the battle of Waterloo."

[Here the impression seems to have been so vivid as to prompt a very decided line of action. But on the other hand, the percipient was probably in anxiety as to her father's condition, which diminishes the improbability that her hallucination was purely subjective.]

(603) From Mr. Norris, (Barrister), Dalkey, Ireland. The account was written down before 1868 : we received it in 1882.

"In or about 1850, and for some years previous and subsequent, there lived at Hampton Court, near Douglas, Isle of Man, a gentleman named Abbott with a family, consisting of Mrs. Abbott, five daughters, and one son. Mr. Abbott being fond of the sea, kept a small yacht, but particularly desired his son never to go out in it without his permission. About the time above mentioned, while he was himself absent in Dublin, his son obtained his mother's permission, and with two young companions crossed the Channel to Kirkcudbright on the opposite Scottish shore. On Mr. Abbott's return, he was annoyed to find the boys had gone out without taking a sailor with them, and this annoyance was not lessened by the receipt of a letter saying they could not return until they received a remittance. Mr. Abbott at once went into Douglas, a distance of four or five miles, and posted a letter to his son with the necessary enclosure. He had scarcely done so when, turning round, he saw his son at the opposite side of the

¹ At a wayside inn, now a cottage, at Arras, on the Beverley-road, about three miles from Market Weighton, but in the parish.—J. F.

narrow street, looking at him with a very sorrowful expression. Just at that moment he was too much annoyed to speak to him, so he went home and told Mrs. Abbott that he had had all his trouble for nothing as John was in Douglas. He added that he was too much annoyed to take any notice of him, but he supposed he would be in for dinner. In vain they waited. At the very time, his father (from whose lips I had the story) saw him in Douglas he was drowned in Kirkcudbright Bay by the upsetting of his boat. This was about noon or a little earlier. I know not whether Mr. Abbott be now alive, nor can I give the address of any of his family; but he told me the story as I have stated it, with his own lips.

“THOMAS J. NORRIS.”

Mrs. Tandy, a daughter of Mr. Norris, writes to us from 1, Tempé Terrace, Dalkey, Ireland, that she was 14 at the time of this occurrence, and perfectly remembers hearing Mr. Abbott's account of it. She then narrates it just as it is given above.

[We have failed to find any newspaper-account of this accident; and the death was not registered—registration in those days not being compulsory. But we learn from the collector of H.M. Customs at Douglas, and from the sexton at Kirkcudbright, that several residents at these places remember the event.]

(604) From the Rev. R. L. Loughborough, Pirton Vicarage, Hitchin.

“January 25th, 1884.

“I was visiting a poor woman, Mrs. Abbiss, far gone in consumption, and wishing to draw her thoughts to the certainty of approaching death, I asked her certain questions about her relations and her mother. I had no sooner named her mother than she exclaimed, ‘Ah, sir, there was a strange thing happened at the time of mother's death; but I'm thinking you would hardly believe me if I were to tell it ye.’ ‘I do not know,’ I said, ‘I hear of too many strange things to be much surprised at what you could tell me, or to doubt the truth of what you may say.’ ‘Well, sir, the truth of it was this. I was but a girl at the time, and mother being very ill, suffering from the same complaint as mine, we had a woman to help me. Mother kept her bed. And one morning when we had made her comfortable and given her her breakfast, we thought she seemed a little better, and came down stairs to have our breakfast; but, sir, we hadn't sat very long before the door opened, and in came father looking all *skeered* like, and sat himself down in that very chair where you are now sitting. ‘Oh, father,’ I said, ‘how you *fritted* me, what's the matter?’ ‘How's mother?’ he said. ‘Why, we gave her her breakfast, and she seemed quite comfortable like when we left her not many minutes since.’ ‘Then run and see how she is now.’ I went up, and would you believe it, sir, we found mother was dead? When I asked father what made him come up in that frightened way, he said, ‘Why, I was hoeing in Mr. W.'s field, and just as S— clock was striking 9, I see your mother standing at the end of my hoe. I was struck all of a heap like, and threw down my hoe, and ran home as fast as I could.’”

“The father's name was John Wilson. You may place the fullest reliance on the narrative, as my impression is still most vivid as to the whole circumstance of the relation. The poor woman was well known to me from my frequent visits. She was too simple-minded to romance upon

the matter, and there was a sort of dramatic earnestness in her manner as she told me, which convinced me that she realised again the strange look of her father when he returned to inquire about his wife.

“R. LINDSAY LOUGHBOROUGH.”

Mr. Loughborough has ascertained from the Register that Mrs. Wilson died in January, 1850, aged 41; her husband in January, 1853, aged 48; and Mrs. Abbiss in September, 1856, aged 32. He thinks it most probable that Mrs. Abbiss gave him the account in the early summer of 1856. She must have been at least 25 (though she says “but a girl”) at the time of the incident.

[The evidence is of the same class as in case 597, Mrs. Abbiss having been a witness of the unusual demeanour of her father, due to the vision—though she did not actually hear the vision described—before the fact of the death was known to him.]

(605) From Mrs. Laurie, Fiesole, Bathwick Hill, Bath. We owe this case, in the first instance, to Mr. G. J. Romanes, F.R.S., who sent us a letter containing an account which Mrs. Laurie had dictated in June, 1883; but the following account, dictated in 1885 to Mr. L. G. Fry, of Goldney House, Clifton, is a little fuller.

“General Kennett was travelling home to his wife, who was staying in some part of India, from Bombay, and was intending to break the journey for a week at my husband’s (Mr. Laurie) house at Baroda. He declined to sleep in the house, saying that he would have his tent pitched near, and preferred it, as cooler. Next morning, however, he came in in a very agitated state, saying that he hoped we would excuse him, and that he had ordered his tent to be struck, as he intended to resume his journey immediately. When we asked what was the matter, he replied that his wife had appeared to him, saying that if he did not return home immediately he would never see her alive. I suggested that it was a dream, but he said ‘No,’ he had really seen her. My husband said ‘Well, General, I am sorry you’re going, I hope you’ll find her quite well.’ General Kennett started immediately, and on arriving home he wrote to us stating that she was dead, and that he found her in the dress in which he had seen her in his tent. She died a few minutes before his arrival, and therefore four or five days after the vision—as he had a long distance to travel. When he had left his wife, she appeared in good health, and he had no message to say she was ill. The fact that he found her *dressed* would seem to suggest that she died very suddenly.

“CAROLINE EMMA LAURIE.”

General Kennett and Mr. Laurie are both deceased.

[This is, of course, a very inconclusive case; for the dress may probably have been a familiar one; and if the death was so sudden that no premonitory symptoms had been felt four or five days before, there would be no strong reason for regarding the vision as telepathic rather than as a purely subjective hallucination. But the death was not by an accident—it at any rate took place from some morbid physical cause; and it must not be forgotten that the approach of death from such a cause may conceivably be discerned in a way which is out of the range of consciousness as we understand it. (See Vol. I., p. 231.)]

(606) The following letter was published in the *Banner of Light* of January, 1878. We wrote to make inquiries of the writer, Mr. Alwis, but have since been informed by the Colonial Office that he died in 1878.

“Colombo, Ceylon.

“It was a fine, clear evening, many years ago, a day after I had gone to Negombo, to act for Mr. John Selby as District Judge of that place, that I joined that gentleman at a game of cricket. We finished our game, and were, in the dusk of the evening, coming to the Government House, where we all lived, when Mr. Selby, who was behind us, came rushing past us, and beckoned me to come fast. He was rather excited, and desired me to be good enough to consult my watch and tell him the time. I did so. He then sat down at my writing-table, took a sheet of note-paper, and wrote down, ‘*My wife died 13 minutes to 6 o’clock*’ (month, &c., which I forget). This slip of paper he put into an envelope, sealed it, and got me and another gentleman then present to put our signatures to the fact therein stated. We did so. And he then explained to us that his wife, who had been long ill in England, had appeared to him at the time above indicated, under the shadow of the big banian, and that he had not the slightest doubt that she had died at that hour, and that it was her spirit¹ which he had seen. In consequence of this persuasion, Mr. Selby, who was to leave Ceylon in a few days for England, postponed his trip for a short time. And when the mail had arrived, a month or more after the date above given, he showed me his private letters, and they fully confirmed the prediction of his wife’s death, within a few hours, as I remember, of the time he stated he had seen his wife under the tree.

“JAMES ALWIS.”

Mr. S. C. Obeyesekere writes to us from Colombo, on July 18, 1885:—

“You are correctly informed as to my being a son-in-law of the late Hon. James Alwis. On inquiry from Mrs. Alwis and several of his friends, I learn that the extract from the report appearing in the *Banner of Light* forwarded to me is substantially correct, and accords with their recollection of Mr. Alwis’ account to them of the incident referred to in it.

“Both Mr. John Selby and his brother, Henry Collingwood, who was Queen’s Advocate of Ceylon, are dead, and I do not know whether there are any relations of theirs in the Island, except a son-in-law of Thos. H. C. Selby—Mr. Frank Byrde, of Avissawelle. Mrs. Selby [*i.e.*, Mrs. H. C. Selby]. I believe, is still alive at Bath, in England, and you might get some information from her about what you refer to. The other gentleman who, with Mr. Alwis, witnessed Mr. Selby’s memoranda, I am informed, was a Mr. Macartney, of the Police, who is also dead.

“Mr. Alwis acted for Mr. Selby as District Judge of Negombo from 13th April to 24th May, 1863. [We have received confirmation of this fact from the Colonial Office.]

“I have not succeeded in tracing out any written memoranda of the event at the time of Mr. Alwis; if I do succeed in tracing them out, I shall with pleasure forward you their copy. “S. C. OBEYESEKERE.”

¹ As regards this word, which occurs again in the introductory paragraph to the following case, see p. 48, note.

Mrs. H. C. Selby writes to us, from 2, Vale View, London Road, Bath, on May 28, 1886 :—

“ We have heard of the circumstances to which you refer, with regard to Mr. John Selby ; but not having seen him when he was in England, after the death of his wife, we are unable to give you any information.”

Mr. Frank Byrde has kindly written to us, saying that the account given “ substantially agrees ” with what he had heard before, but that he has no written record of the incident. He has also given us the means of tracing Mrs. John Selby’s death, which took place, as the Register shows, on May 14, 1864. The *month*, it will be seen, agrees with the above evidence ; but the *year* there given is 1863. The mistake, if it be one, probably occurs in some record to which Mr. Obeyesekere and the officials of the Colonial Office both had access ; but possibly Mr. Alwis acted as substitute for Mr. J. Selby more than once.

(607) The following case was reported by the late Serjeant Cox to the Psychological Society, in February, 1879, on the authority of Surgeon Harris, of the Royal Artillery ; who, with two of his daughters (one of whom became Serjeant Cox’s wife), was a witness of the occurrence. The narrative has been already published in a book called *Spirits before our Eyes*, by W. H. Harrison, pp. 64-5.

“ A party of children, sons and daughters of the officers of Artillery stationed at Woolwich, were playing in the garden. Suddenly a little girl screamed, and stood staring with an aspect of terror at a willow tree there. Her companions gathered round, asking what ailed her. ‘ Oh ! ’ she said, ‘ there—there. Don’t you see. There’s papa lying on the ground, and the blood running from a big wound.’ All assured her that they could see nothing of the kind. But she persisted, describing the wound and the position of the body, still expressing her surprise that they did not see what she saw so plainly. Two of her companions were daughters of my informant (one of the surgeons of the regiment), whose house adjoined the garden. They called their father, who at once came to the spot. He found the child in a state of extreme terror and agony, took her into his house, assuring her that it was only a ‘ fancy,’ and having given her restoratives, sent her home. The incident was treated by all as what the doctor had called it, and no more was thought of it. News from India, where the child’s father was stationed, was in those days slow in coming. But the arrival of the mail in due course brought the information that the father of the child had been killed by a shot, and died under a tree. Making allowance for difference in the counting of time, it was found to have been about the moment when the daughter had the vision at Woolwich.”

[If here, as in so many other of the second-hand cases, the details and the alleged accuracy of the coincidence must be doubted, the main fact of a striking coincidence of the sort alleged may still be reasonably accepted as probable.]

I have more than once spoken of *nautical* evidence as likely to be coloured by superstition, or modified and exaggerated in the way natural to oft-repeated “ yarns.” But it may be reasonably supposed that the first-hand witnesses in the two following cases really had

some such experience as is described, and that the coincidence was not a pure invention.

(608 and 609) From Mr. William Dunlop, Engineer, care of Messrs. Windsor, Redlock, and Co., Bangkok, Siam.

“ Feb. 17th, 1883.

“ A relation of mine, named Richard Jones, was apprentice pilot in the Mersey. One day he boarded an inward bound vessel, and took charge. The captain of the vessel was sick, and the mate had command ; he seemed to be very low-spirited, and would hardly answer my cousin when he spoke to him. They walked the deck in silence for a long time, when at last the mate suddenly asked my cousin what sort of weather they had had about the coast for the last month or so. My cousin said the weather had been very bad. The mate then asked if my cousin knew anything about a certain brig ; he answered that he *did*, but that he wished to know why the question was put. The mate then said : ‘ My brother was captain of that vessel, and I’m uneasy about him, because, as we were coming down the Mediterranean this trip, I saw my brother aboard of this craft. At 8 bells (noon) I went below to dinner ; when I came on deck again I took a look up to windward to see what the weather was like, and, standing close against the bulwarks I saw my brother. I went over to him, but as I got close to him he disappeared. I turned round and saw him on the other side of the deck ; I went towards him with my arms stretched out ; when I got near him I made a sudden clasp at him, but he disappeared again.’ My cousin asked the mate to give him the date of this appearance ; the mate did so, and my cousin answered, ‘ On that day, and as near as I can judge, at the same hour, your brother’s brig was lost with all hands.’ ”

[We discovered a recent address of Mr. (now Captain) Richard Jones ; but he had left, and we have been unable to trace him.]

“ From the 7th of October, 1867, till the 14th April, 1871, I was shipmate with Mr. F. L. Murphy, aboard the ss. ‘ Riga,’ of Leith, of which vessel he was second officer. Mr. Murphy, in spite of his name, was an Englishman ; he belonged to the middle class, was very well educated, but very superstitious. Never mind that, he was as truthful as man could be, hated lies and liars, and no man could be braver. His death showed what manner of man he was, for when the ss. ‘ Hong Kong ’ was lost in the Red Sea about 8 years ago, he gave his place in the boat to another man and stayed on the wreck, well knowing that it was death to do so. The other man had a family, Murphy had none, so he sacrificed himself.

“ I think it was somewhere about the year 1863, that Murphy was before the mast on board the ‘ Sultana ’ of South Shields, on the run home from Bombay to England. Off the Cape of Good Hope they were running with dirty weather, and towards nightfall it looked very nasty, so the captain determined to heave to. At 8 bells it was all hands to close reef the main topsail. Now when a man is bearing a hand to reef a main topsail, with something like a gale of wind blowing, he has not much chance to fall a-dreaming. If you have been to sea you know what it is ; if you have not, just fancy yourself some 70 or 80 feet up in the air, swung from port to starboard, from starboard to port like a stone in a sling, with

the great sail slatting and thundering below you. Well, Murphy was aloft fisting the sail, when he happened to look forward, and saw someone on the fore topsail yard. He shouted to the man next him, 'Who's that on the fore topsail yard?' His mate gave a look forward and answered, 'Why, there's no one there, we're all on the yard here.' Murphy looked along the main topsail yard and counted the hands; sure enough they were all there. He looked forward again, and saw that the man on the fore topsail yard was his cousin Stevens, who was in England at the time. When the ship was brought to the wind, Murphy, before turning in, entered in his private log the date and hour of the apparition.

"On arriving in England he found that his cousin had died on the same day he appeared aboard the 'Sultana,' but between the hour of his death and the hour of the apparition, there was a difference for which the longitude did not account."

[The last sentence may be taken as in some measure an indication of accuracy in the narrative.]

(610) From Mr. Francis Dart Fenton, formerly in the native department of the Government, Auckland, New Zealand. He gave the account in writing to his friend, Captain J. H. Crosse, of Monkstown, Cork, from whom we received it. In 1852, when the incident occurred, Mr. Fenton was "engaged in forming a settlement on the banks of the Waikato."

"March 25th, 1860.

"Two sawyers, Frank Philips and Jack Mulholland, were engaged cutting timber for the Rev. R. Maunsell, at the mouth of the Awaroa creek, a very lonely place, a vast swamp, no people within miles of them. As usual they had a Maori with them to assist in felling trees. He came from Tihorewam, a village on the other side of the river about 6 miles off. As Frank and the native were cross-cutting a tree, the native stopped suddenly and said, 'What are you come for?' looking in the direction of Frank. Frank replied, 'What do you mean?' He said, 'I am not speaking to you; I am speaking to my brother.' Frank said, 'Where is he?' The native replied, 'Behind you. What do you want?' (to the other Maori). Frank looked round and saw nobody; the native no longer saw anyone, but laid down the saw and said, 'I shall go across the river; my brother is dead.' Frank laughed at him and reminded him that he had left him quite well on Sunday (five days before), and there had been no communication since. The Maori spoke no more, but got into his canoe and pulled across. When he arrived at the landing-place, he met people coming to fetch him. His brother had just died; I knew him well."

In answer to inquiries as to his authority for this narrative, Mr. Fenton writes to us:

"December 18th, 1883.

"I knew all the parties concerned well, and it is quite true, *valeat quantum*, as the lawyers say. Incidents of this sort are not infrequent among the Maoris.

"F. D. FENTON,

"Late Chief Judge, Native Law Court of New Zealand."

This case, if faithfully reported, is an interesting example,

vouched for by an educated European, of telepathy occurring among an uncivilised people.

§ 5. I will conclude this chapter with three cases, which are respectively one, two, and three centuries old, but of which the first and second, at any rate, may fairly receive an evidential number.

(611) From the *Life of Mrs. Mary Fletcher*, by Henry Moore (1818), Vol. I., pp. 208-209—an extract from Mrs. Fletcher's diary.

“October, 1784.—As I was retired this morning at my 10 o'clock hour, I was called down to Mary G. She gave me a strange account which I shall insert as she related it:—A short time ago, she said, she was one day going out to work in the fields, but thought she would first go upstairs to prayer. While on her knees, praising God for the care He had taken of her children, she was amazed to see her eldest son, about 21 years of age, standing before her! She started up—but thought, ‘Maybe it is the enemy to affright me from prayer.’ Casting her eyes up again to the same spot, she still saw him there; on which she ran down into the kitchen, calling on the name of the Lord. Still, wherever she looked, she saw him standing before her, pale, and as if covered with dirt. Concluding from this that he was killed, she ran to her mother, who, on hearing the account, went directly to the pit, determined to have him home if alive. On her drawing near the pit, she heard a great tumult; for the earth had fallen in on him and two other men, and the people were striving to dig them out. At length he was got up alive and well, and came home to his mother pale and dirty, just as she had seen him! She then fell on her knees, and began praising that God who hears and answers prayer.”

(612) From *The World of Spirits*, by R. Baxter (1691), pp. 147-151. Abridgment of a letter to Baxter from Mr. Thomas Tilson, Minister of Aylesworth, in Kent.¹

“July 6th, 1691.

“Mary, the wife of John Goffe, of Rochester, being afflicted with a long illness, removed to her father's house at West Mulling, which was about 9 miles distant from her own; there she died, June 4th, 1691.

“The day before her departure she grew impatiently desirous to see her two children, whom she had left at home, to the care of a nurse. She prayed her husband to hire a horse, for she must go home to die with her children.

“Between 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning she fell into a trance. One widow Turner, who watched with her that night, says that her eyes were open and fixed, and her jaw fallen; she put her hand on her mouth and nostrils, but could perceive no breath; she thought her to be in a fit, and doubted whether she was alive or dead. The next day this dying woman told her mother that she had been at home with her children. ‘That is

¹ This letter, which must be presumed to be correctly quoted, cannot be impugned on the ground of Baxter's own credulity and prejudice in respect of many of the matters dealt with in his book; as to which see Hutchinson's excellent remarks, *Historical Essay concerning Witchcraft* (London, 1720), pp. 79-101.

impossible,' said the mother, 'for you have been here in bed all the while.' 'Yes,' replied the other, 'but I was with them last night while I was asleep.'

"The nurse at Rochester, widow Alexander by name, affirms and says she will take her oath of it, before a magistrate, and receive the sacrament upon it, that a little before 2 o'clock that morning she saw the likeness of the said Mary Goffe come out of the next chamber (where the elder child lay in a bed by itself, the door being left open), and stood by her bedside for about a quarter of an hour; the younger child was there lying by her; her eyes moved, and her mouth went, but she said nothing. The nurse, moreover, says that she was perfectly awake; it was then daylight, being one of the longest days in the year. She sat up in her bed, and looked steadfastly upon the apparition; at that time she heard the bridge clock strike 2, and a while after said, 'In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what art thou?' Thereupon the appearance removed and went away; she slipped on her clothes and followed, but what became of it she cannot tell. Then, and not before, she began to be grievously affrighted, and went out of doors, and walked upon the wharf (the house is just by the river-side) for some hours, only going in now and then to look at the children. At 5 o'clock she went to a neighbour's and knocked at the door, but they would not rise; at 6 she went again, then they rose and let her in. She related to them all that had passed; they would persuade her she was mistaken, or dreamt; but she confidently affirmed, 'If ever I saw her in all my life, I saw her this night.'

"One of those to whom she made the relation (Mary, the wife of J. Sweet) had a messenger who came from Mulling that forenoon, to let her know her neighbour Goffe was dying, and desired to speak with her; she went over the same day, and found her just departing. The mother, amongst other discourses, related to her how much her daughter had longed to see her children, and said she had seen them. This brought to Mrs. Sweet's mind what the nurse had told her that morning; for, till then, she had not thought fit to mention it, but disguised it rather, as the woman's disturbed imagination.

"The substance of this I had related to me by John Carpenter, the father of the deceased, the next day after the burial—July 2. I fully discoursed the matter with the nurse and two neighbours, to whose house she went that morning.

"Two days after, I had it from the mother, the minister that was with her in the evening, and the woman who sat up with her last that night. They all agree in the same story, and every one helps to strengthen the other's testimony.

"They all appear to be sober, intelligent persons, far enough off from designing to impose a cheat upon the world, or to manage a lie; and what temptation they should lie under for so doing I cannot conceive.

"THOMAS TILSON."

[This case may possibly have been reciprocal; but proof is lacking that the dying woman's sense of having seen her children was anything but purely subjective.¹ See p. 156.]

¹ Mr. Tilson's case finds a curiously close parallel in the following narrative, abridged from the words of the late Mrs. Charles Fox, of Trebah, Falmouth, (a lady well known to Mr. Myers,) who had heard the account from one of the percipients. The Fox family

Theodore A. D'Aubigné, in his *Histoire Universelle* (1616-20), Vol. II., p. 143, relates the following incident, as told to him privately by the King of Navarre.

“Le Roi estant en Avignon, le 23 Decembre, 1574, y mourut Charles, Cardinal de Lorraine. . . . J'affirme sur la parole du Roi le second prodige [the first was a violent storm]. . . . c'est que la Roine [Catherine di Medici] s'estait mise au lit de meilleure heure que de coutume, aiant à son coucher entr' autres personnes de marque le Roi de Navarre, l'Archevesque de Lyon, les Dames de Rets, de Lignerolles et de Saunes, deux desquelles ont confirmé ce discours ; comme elle estait pressée de donner le bon soir, elle se jetta d'un tressaut sur son chenet, met les mains audevant de son visage, et avec un cri violent appella à son secours ceux qui l'assistoient, leur voulant monstrier au pied du lit le Cardinal, qui lui tendoit la main, elle s'escriant plusieurs fois, ‘Monsieur le Cardinal, je n'ai que faire avec vous’ ; le Roi de Navarre envoie au mesme temps un de ses gentils hommes au logis du Cardinal, qui rapporta comment il avoit expiré au mesme point.”

[The Queen was probably aware that the Cardinal's death, of which she had been very desirous, was imminent.]

was one in which such a tradition as this would be likely to be soberly preserved ; but the youth of the original witness, and the loss of the contemporary records, make it impossible to reckon the case as evidence.

“In 1739 Mrs. Birkbeck, wife of William Birkbeck, banker, of Settle, and a member of the Society of Friends, was taken ill and died at Cockermouth, while returning from a journey to Scotland, which she had undertaken alone—her husband and three children, aged seven, five, and four years respectively, remaining at Settle. The friends at whose house the death occurred made notes of every circumstance attending Mrs. Birkbeck's last hours, so that the accuracy of the several statements as to time as well as place was beyond the doubtfulness of man's memory, or of any even unconscious attempt to bring them into agreement with each other.

“One morning, between 7 and 8 o'clock, the relation to whom the care of the children of Settle had been entrusted, and who kept a minute journal of all that concerned them, went into their bedroom as usual, and found them all sitting up in their beds in great excitement and delight. ‘Mamma has been here!’ they cried, and the little one said, ‘She called, “Come Esther!”’ Nothing could make them doubt the fact, and it was carefully noted down, to entertain the mother on her return home. That same morning, as their mother lay on her dying bed at Cockermouth, she said, ‘I should be ready to go if I could but see my children.’ She then closed her eyes, to reopen them, as they thought, no more. But after 10 minutes of perfect stillness she looked up brightly and said, ‘I am ready now ; I have been with my children’ ; and then at once peacefully passed away. When the notes taken at the two places were compared, the day, hour, and minutes were the same.

“One of the three children was my grandmother, *née* Sarah Birkbeck, afterwards the wife of Dr. Fell, of Ulverston. From her lips I heard the above almost literally as I have repeated it. The eldest was Morris Birkbeck, afterwards of Guildford. Both these lived to old age, and retained to the last so solemn and reverential a remembrance of the circumstance that they rarely would speak of it. Esther, the youngest, died soon after. Her brother and sister heard the child say that her mother called her, but could not speak with any certainty of having themselves heard the words, nor were sensible of more than their mother's standing there and looking on them.”

CHAPTER VI.

AUDITORY AND TACTILE CASES.

§ 1. MOST of the following cases are on first-hand testimony; but some of them are remote in date; in some a certain amount of anxiety may have predisposed the percipient to hallucination; and in others the degree of exactitude in the coincidence is not certainly established. I will give first a group where the impression was of distinct words.

(613) From Mr. M. P. Stephenson, 8, Southfield Road, Cotham, Bristol.

“January 31st, 1884.

“On or about the 11th November, 1882, I was awakened by two or three knocks at my bedroom door,¹ and a voice called, ‘Pa! pa!’ I called out, ‘Who’s there?’ but no answer came. (I was sleeping alone, as my wife was ill, and slept in an adjoining room with a daughter.) At breakfast I inquired if either of them had called me; they had not done so. ‘Then,’ said I ‘someone else did, and I fear we shall have bad news from New Zealand,’ where our two sons were living.

“I awaited anxiously the arrival of the next mail, which came in the middle of December, and then we had what I believed to be the solving of the mystery. Our eldest son, on the 21st October, 1882, was going to see his son at Palmerston, a town some 60 or 70 miles from Dunedin, and midway the train got off the line; some carriages were smashed. He was severely shaken, but felt nothing seriously the matter until two days after the mishap, on his return home. He was taken with cold shivering, and the doctors said they were afraid of erysipelas and blood-poisoning setting in. Such was the account of the case in our first letter. We looked with great concern for the next mail which was due on the 2nd January, 1883, although in my own mind I seemed sure he was dead; and on Christmas Day I said to a friend, who dined with us, that I believed he had been in his grave six weeks, which was the fact. The news came that our son died on the 11th of November and was buried on the 14th.

“M. P. STEPHENSON.”

¹ Where the rousing from sleep is as sudden as this, an impression which follows it may perhaps fairly be reckoned a *waking* experience.

We find from the obituary of the *Bristol Mercury and Daily Post* that Mr. Stephenson's son died in New Zealand on November 11, 1882.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Stephenson adds :—

“I have been very sorry that I did not make a note of the exact time of the voice and raps at my bedroom door. I have been trying to calculate it exactly, but my experience of memory is that in old age we can recollect things that occurred 50 or 60 years ago more distinctly than events which happened two or three months back. My firm impression is that what I heard was about 6 o'clock in the morning of the 11th November, and his death took place at 11 or 12 o'clock on the 11th, New Zealand time. I have searched for the letter which stated the time, but have not been able to find it.”

[If Mr. Stephenson is right as to the day of his experience, and as to the hour of the death, the sounds followed the death by 5 or 6 hours. In an interview with Mr. Podmore, he stated that both his wife and daughter clearly remember the incident; but on religious grounds they decline to give written testimony.]

(614) From Mr. and Mrs. Roberts, of New Berlin, Chenango Co., New York.

“March, 1884.

“During the Civil War in America a young man of the name of George Roberts enlisted on the Union side. He was with those troops when Port Hudson, Louisiana, was attacked, and in an assault made upon that place on Sunday, June 14th, 1863, he was killed. He fell about 10 o'clock that morning.

“His parents, living in Chenango Co., State of New York, knew that he was in the neighbourhood of Port Hudson, and that there might be a battle some time, but nothing more.

“On Sunday, June 14th, 1863, Mrs. Roberts was getting ready for church, and the first bell that rings a quarter before 10 had just ceased, when Mrs. R. heard George's voice calling to her, ‘Mother! Mother!’ It was perfectly distinct and clear, as though in the room. The fright and conviction of her son's death affected her so much that she became ill.

“Shortly after this, came the news of the death of George before Port Hudson, at the very hour that his mother heard his voice in her room calling her.

“These statements are correct, as they occurred, June 14th, 1863.

“JONATHAN ROBERTS.

“MARTHA ROBERTS.”

The Rev. R. Whittingham, of Pikesville, Maryland, a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R., who procured this narrative for us, vouches for Mr. and Mrs. Roberts as “extremely respectable, worthy, well-to-do people”; and says:—

“I know Mr. Roberts said that his son was shot just at 10 o'clock; for he spoke to me of *his* having a strange feeling of someone being behind him in the church tower as he was ringing the first bell at, or for, 10 o'clock, and he said that was the hour that George was shot. This being

only a feeling, or impression, on his part, I did not think it worth mentioning, as it could be easily imagined afterward; but it fixed the time of George's death on my memory. That was the solitary instance of hallucination that they have ever experienced. They are by no means imaginative or credulous in temperament or habit."

[If the coincidence here was as close as is alleged, the case is of some weight, even though the mother's mind may have been to some extent pre-occupied with the thought of her son.]

(615) Extract from a paragraph in the *Times* of Sept. 11, 1876, which recorded the funeral, at Aleppo, of Mr. George Smith, the eminent Assyriologist.

"A most striking coincidence may here be mentioned without comment. A young German Assyriologist of the highest promise, Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, is now, for the second time, in this country, having been sent, as on his former visit, by the King of Saxony to study the arrow-headed inscriptions in the British Museum. During his former stay here last year, which was noticed at the time in our columns, Dr. Delitzsch and Mr. George Smith naturally became fast friends, and the Leipzig savant and his brother Hermann were chosen by Mr. Smith to introduce to German readers his *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, which has accordingly just been published at Leipzig under their joint editorship.

"On the 19th ult., the day of Mr. George Smith's death, Dr. Delitzsch was on his way to the house of Mr. William St. Chad Boscawen, who is also a rising Assyriologist. Mr. Boscawen resides in Kentish Town, and in passing the end of Crogsland Road, in which Mr. George Smith lived, and within about a stone's throw of the house, his German friend said he suddenly heard a most piercing cry, which thrilled him to the marrow, 'Herr Dr. Delitzsch.' The time—for as soon as he got over the shock he looked at his watch—was between 6.45 and 7 p.m., and Mr. Parsons gives the hour of Mr. Smith's death at 6 p.m. Dr. Delitzsch, who strongly disavows any superstitious leanings, was ashamed to mention the circumstance to Mr. Boscawen on reaching that gentleman's house, although on his return home he owns that his nervous apprehensions of some mournful event in his own family found relief in tears, and that he recorded all the facts in his note-book that same night. Dr. Delitzsch told the story at our informant's breakfast-table, with all the circumstances mentioned above, including the hour at which he heard the shrill cry. He distinctly denied having been thinking of Mr. George Smith at the time."

In January, 1885, (having failed to elicit from Herr Delitzsch any reply to several previous applications,) we sent him a copy of this extract, telling him that we proposed to state, in reprinting it, that it had been first forwarded to him, with a request that he would contradict it if it did not truthfully represent the facts. No reply has been received; and Mr. Görtz, of the British Museum, tells us that Herr Delitzsch expressed to him a reluctance to write on the subject. We may presume, however, that, had the statement been substantially inaccurate, he would have said so.

[If the hours are correctly given, the cry was heard about 3¼ hours after the death.]

(616) From Miss Bushell, Hythe, Kent.

“1885.

“On the evening of Feb. 18, 1863, I distinctly heard myself called, and recognised the voice as that of Dr. Harding, a retired physician, who lived in the same town [Ramsgate, and in the next street]. The voice seemed to come from the staircase. I was walking along a passage, and turned towards the stairs, so real did it appear; though I could hardly imagine Dr. Harding to be in the house. I knew him slightly. He was a kind, friendly man, and he always spoke to me if we met in the streets, addressing me as ‘Bushell’—which is the name I heard that evening. The next day, I heard that Dr. Harding had died the preceding afternoon or evening. I cannot fix the precise hour. Though out of health, he was not confined to the house, and I had met him out of doors about three days before the occurrence, so that I was not by any means expecting his death.

“This is the only hallucination of the senses that I have ever experienced.

“MATILDA BUSHELL.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that Dr. Harding died (aged 50) on Feb. 20, 1863. Miss Bushell is certain (and this is a point which would be likely to be rightly observed at the time) that her experience was on the evening before the morning on which she heard of the death—that no longer interval elapsed; and she has no separate recollection of the date of her experience. It is probable, therefore, that the “18th” in the first line of the account is wrong, and that the coincidence was a close one. Not, however, so close as was at first represented; for Miss Bushell’s later impression is that the death took place in the early hours of the morning—*i.e.*, some hours after her evening experience of (presumably) Feb. 19. In answer to an inquiry, she says that she did not mention what she had heard to anyone before the death was known.

(617) From Mrs. Fagan, Elfanwalt, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot.

“1883.

“I was residing in England, while my son [who was one of the percipients in case 310] was a chaplain in India. I one day experienced a prayerful and earnest desire, in going up to the altar one Easter Day, that somehow, I knew not how, my son might be permitted to communicate me; and as I received without raising my eyes to the celebrant, I felt my desire granted. In due course of post, my son asked me if I could explain what had occurred to him at about the time when he knew I must have been making my Easter Communion. While preparing for the evening service, and not thinking of me or home, he heard me call him by name, not as though in any distress, but with a tone of great urgency. Instantly remembering how I was then occupied, he was with me in spirit, and, though unconsciously, was permitted to satisfy my longing. After this, though he knew there was no one in the house, he made diligent search to prove to others that it was no delusion. The fact that Cardinal Borromeo, while preaching elsewhere, had communicated the dying Pope was not known to me for many years after.”

In answer to an inquiry, Mrs. Fagan says that she made her Easter Communion between noon and 1 p.m.; which would synchronise with 6-7 p.m. in the place where her son was. The year, she thinks, was 1874.

[This clearly must not be reckoned as a *reciprocal* case, since there is no reason to suppose Mrs. Fagan’s own impression to have been anything

but subjective. That impression is, however, of importance, as indicating the intensity of her feeling at the moment. Her son has occasionally had subjective auditory hallucinations, but not sufficiently often to diminish appreciably the force (such as it is) of the present coincidence. The case is of course not one on which much stress can be laid.]

In the following example, the fact of non-recognition tells against the supposition that the hallucination was due to anxiety. As for the sense of *feeling* someone's presence, I have already pointed out that a faint auditory impression is sufficient to account for it;¹ and even the "feeling someone stooping over" (which occurs again in the next case) need not imply any distinct hallucination of touch.

(618) From Miss Summerbell, 140, Kensington Park Road, W. (mentioned in Vol. I., p. 507). As the more distinct part of the impression seems to have been received after she had not only been woke, but had herself uttered a couple of sentences, the case may be fairly reckoned in the *waking* class.

"1882.

"A lady, to whom I was much attached, and who had had partial care of me during some part of my early youth, had for some years suffered from a complaint which at last necessitated a surgical operation. This operation was performed early in August, 1877, by Dr. Spencer Wells; my friend was in a house, chosen by Dr. Wells for the purpose, in Seymour Street. The operation was successful, and we had the assurance of Dr. Wells, and of the other doctor who attended her, that she was doing well. I was staying with her nephew, at Weybridge, at the time. Every day we heard better accounts of the patient. On Saturday evening, Mr. T., with whom I was staying, received a letter saying that his aunt was out of danger, and appointing the following Tuesday for him and me to go and see her.

"We went to bed in excellent spirits, and I slept at once. I was awakened, in the dim dawn, by feeling someone stooping over me. Thinking it was Mrs. T. who had come into the room for some purpose, I said, aloud, 'Is that you, Annie?' I received no answer, but I *felt*, though I could not see, someone close to me. I spoke again, and I distinctly heard a voice whisper, 'Soon will you and I be lying, Each within our narrow bed.' I was terrified. I looked at my watch to see if it was nearly time for people to be moving about. It was 4 o'clock. I could not sleep. I felt horrified and miserable, but oddly, I never thought of my friend. When I went down in the morning, my friends remarked that I was silent and dull. I said I was sure something was going to take place, and at length I told them what had happened. Of course they laughed. I went to church with Mr. T., and the first hymn sung was the one I had fancied I heard in the night, beginning 'Days and moments quickly flying.' This made me more depressed, but I still did not think of my friend.

"On Monday we went on the river in a small boat, and I told Mr. T. I knew we should be drowned because of my presentiment. We

¹ See Vol. i., p. 528 second note; and compare case 172.

however, arrived safe at home at 7 p.m., when Mr. T. found a letter, saying that at 10 on Saturday night, his aunt had suddenly exhibited bad symptoms, and that she died at 4 o'clock on Sunday morning.

“L. D. SUMMERBELL.”

[The *Times* obituary records that the death took place, in Somerset Street (not Seymour Street), on Aug. 4, 1877. This was a Saturday, not a Sunday; therefore, if Miss Summerbell is correct as to the hour of her impression, the coincidence was less close than she represents, as the death must have taken place before midnight.

We cannot obtain Mr. T.'s corroboration, as he died in the year following the occurrence.]

The next two records seem to illustrate the occurrence of several similar telepathic experiences to the same percipient (compare No. 279). The cases not being strong ones, I have included each set under a single evidential number.

(619) From Mrs. E. M. Maunsell, Ballywilliam, Rathkeale, Ireland, who says of herself, “I am neither nervous nor superstitious, but a very matter-of-fact person.”

“October 27th, 1884.

“My eldest sister was paying us a visit, when she was taken ill with internal cramp; she called to me in a peculiar choking voice; we used remedies, and she soon recovered. About a year afterwards, she was staying with another sister, when one night I was awakened by a distinct impression of my sister stooping over me, and calling ‘Eliza’ in the same choking voice. I sleep very soundly, but I started up wide awake, and again the voice seemed to call me from the open window, faint and choking, ‘Eliza.’ I am a rather stoical person in times of danger or fright, so I merely said to myself ‘Isabella is ill,’ and was soon again fast asleep. The next time I saw my sister, she told me that the very night I had heard her call, and nearly to the hour, (for I had heard the clock strike 12) she had been taken ill, and had been only able to stagger out of bed to call for help. This was my first experience of this kind, that I can remember; I was then a young girl. I was not particularly attached to my sister, for she had married young and left home; but she always looked up to me and considered me a great authority on most points.

“The second instance also concerned my eldest sister. My father, at the time of which I write, was living in Limerick, as did also my sister. One evening about 8, I left the room to make the tea; passing the foot of the staircase, I heard my sister's voice, hushed and distinct, call ‘Eliza.’ I listened, but the call was not repeated. I thought at once, ‘Isabella is ill, and will send for me.’ I hurried, and prepared tea, and I well remember taking a second slice of bread, for, I thought, I may be up with her all night. Less than half an hour after a note was brought my father, I watched him, and when he had read it asked, ‘Is Isabella ill?’ ‘Yes,’ my father replied, ‘she is very ill, and is calling for you.’ My father, who was a doctor, accompanied me to her house; we doctored her, and she recovered after an illness of four or five days.

“My father is long dead; so is my eldest sister. The events occurred over 20 years ago, many years before my marriage.”

On Dec. 19, 1885, Mrs. Maunsell wrote :—

“ On another occasion, when living with my father and mother, I heard my mother call me ; I found her ghastly pale, and very ill ; but she assured me she had *not* called me ; as indeed, she was too faint to raise her voice. On another occasion, my brother-in-law, who had gone to London, and was very ill, though it was kept a secret, had returned on his way home, as far as Dublin. I was not thinking at all about him ; but, one day in this house, I was walking from the office to the back door of the dining-room (mid-day), when I heard him call loudly his wife’s name, ‘ Martha.’ I wrote at once to her (she had not accompanied him) to make inquiries. She had received a letter that morning, [to the effect that] he would return next evening, Saturday, and was quite strong after his trip. The following Tuesday I received a letter from my cousin saying that Mr. Caswell [the brother-in-law] was found *dead* in his armchair, partly dressed, at his lodgings in Dublin, on Sunday morning. I had not known he was ill at all.

“ ELIZA MAUNSELL.”

In answer to an inquiry, Mrs. Maunsell states positively that she has never had any hallucination of the sort except on these four occasions, (and possibly one other, when what she heard may have been a real call). She adds :—

“ I regret extremely that I can procure for you no corroborative evidence about my brother-in-law. My sister is far too nervous a person for me to have told her at the time. The event [*i.e.*, the death] occurred on the 9th of August, 1874.”

[We have verified this date in the *Freeman’s Journal*, which describes the death as having been rather sudden. Mrs. Maunsell heard the voice 3 or 4 days before ; and though her brother-in-law was probably at that time in a somewhat abnormal state, the accuracy of coincidence which (if correctly remembered) would justify us in regarding the former experiences as very probably telepathic, is lacking to this one.]

(620) From Mr. J. Augustus Edmonds, 16, Waterloo Road South, Wolverhampton. The evidence is third-hand, and is admitted by special exception (Vol. I., p. 158, note). Mr. Edmonds received the account of the second of the two incidents narrated from both his father and brother.

1883.

Mr. Edmonds first describes a very serious illness which attacked his father (the Rev. T. C. Edmonds, pastor of the Baptist Church, St. Andrew’s Street, Cambridge,) in the year 1831. During the illness a letter was received from a friend of his father’s, the Rev. Josiah Wilkinson, of Saffron Walden, Essex.

“ It was to this effect. I don’t vouch for the perfect verbal accuracy. It was addressed to my mother.

“ ‘ I have been made aware¹ of the alarming illness of your dear husband, but I have the happiness to assure you that his sickness is not unto death.’ The note concluded with a message of love, when my father

¹ Mr. Edmonds does not know whether Mr. Wilkinson had heard of the illness in any normal way, or whether the *first* intimation of this fact, as well as the assurance of recovery, was communicated in the abnormal manner afterwards described. The assurance of recovery may easily, of course, have been subjectively imagined, and in no way concerns us here.

should be able to receive it, and of sympathy to herself. This note arrived when my father was to all appearances as near his end as at any period of his illness.

“When my father was able to see a few friends, Mr. Wilkinson came over and urged him, as soon as he was permitted to move, to come with my brother Cyrus, his second son, and visit him, which they did. These three being alone, my father mentioned this note and said it very much surprised him, on account of the singularly confident manner in which his recovery was spoken of. To which Mr. Wilkinson replied that in several instances he had been told by an audible voice of some fact specially concerning his interests or welfare, a voice which none but himself heard, and there was no visible presence. These intimations, he said, had always been made to him during his family worship, and (I believe I am right in saying) that they had never been mentioned out of his own family. He said, however, ‘I will relate one such case.

“I was kneeling at prayer one morning with my family, when a voice said, ‘Your brother is dead.’¹ I had but one brother, to whom I was greatly attached, who lived at the West End of London. The shock was so great that I sank on the floor in a swoon. On recovery I desired my wife to put the needful things into my portmanteau, and send to stop the Cambridge coach to London, a short distance from the house, telling her that my brother was dead, and that I must go to London. On arrival I drove to the house, found the blinds closely drawn, and on coming to the door the servant expressed great relief at seeing me, saying that his master had died suddenly in the night and his mistress was in a most sad condition.

“‘Now,’ Mr. Wilkinson said, ‘on the morning on which I wrote that note to your wife, at morning prayer with the family, a voice said, ‘Your dearest friend is very ill, but his sickness is not unto death.’ I heard no more, but as soon as our worship was concluded I wrote that note.’

“J. A. EDMONDS.”

§ 2. In the next two cases, the impression, if really a hallucination, seems to have represented a sound which was actually in the agent’s ears at the time.

(621) From Mrs. Malcolm, Wribbenhall, Bewdley, (mentioned above, p. 79).

“August 5th, 1885.

“During the commencement of the year 1849 (I being then a young girl), I had a tedious illness. On one occasion, to relieve a congested lung, I had a blister applied, and, in consequence, was prevented on that night from obtaining sleep. One of my brothers was with the army in the Punjab at that time, and my thoughts were constantly with him, and doubtless I followed the events of the war with intense interest. On the night in question, being, as I have said, wide awake, I was astonished by hearing the report of big guns. I raised myself in bed with some difficulty, and then continued to hear the distant firing of cannon, sometimes nearer, sometimes remote. At length the guns ceased, but were succeeded by a sharp and rapid discharge of musketry. The sounds lasted altogether about four hours. My great anxiety was that some one should hear these strange sounds of battle as well as myself; but I was forbidden at the time

¹ Compare cases 153 and 234.

to leave my room, and hearing my father coughing in his bedroom opposite, I pacified myself with the assurance that he must be awake and would hear what I heard. Great was my mortification in the morning to find that neither he nor my mother were aware of anything unusual having occurred in the night past. Then my old friend the doctor came in, inquiring laughingly whether I was growing fanciful (having been told my story). I also laughed and replied, 'You shall know if my battle is mere fancy when the next news comes from the seat of war in India.'

"Whether this was my first connecting of the sounds I had listened to with an Indian battle, or whether I had done so during the continuance of those sounds, is a point I am not now clear upon. But although the doctor, when out of my hearing, desired that I might not again be left alone at night, it is observable that neither then nor at any later time was I rendered the least nervous by my strange experience, nor did I apprehend evil to the brother engaged in the campaign. In due time, tidings of the severe battle at Goojerat reached us—the day on which it was fought, and hours, allowing for difference of time, exactly coinciding with the date of my prophetic¹ battle. My brother was in the thick of the fight, but escaped unhurt.

"GEORGINA MALCOLM."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Malcolm says:—

"I send you a written testimony from one of my sisters, as to my having spoken of hearing the battle at the time of the occurrence. The hours during which the sounds continued were from 1 to 5 o'clock a.m. in the morning as far as my recollection serves. At the time of the occurrence I was living in my father's house in a very remote part of Warwickshire. The nearest soldiers' quarters to us would be at Coventry or Birmingham, at a distance of between 30 and 40 miles."

The sister's corroboration, dated October 9, 1885, is as follows:—

"I remember the incident about the battle of Goojerat. You were ill at the time, and in the morning you told us you felt as if you had been in a battle, as you had heard continual firing and report of cannon for a long time. I cannot say what time of the night it was when you heard it.

"I think you made a note of it, and we heard afterwards from Frank that the battle began on the following morning. "LUCY DICKINS."

From the *London Gazette* for April 19th, 1849, it appears that the battle, which took place on Feb. 21, lasted from 8.30 until midday, after which the pursuit of the enemy commenced, lasting until dusk. 8.30 a.m. at Goojerat would correspond to about 3.30 a.m. in England.

Mrs. Malcolm has experienced no other auditory hallucination, except that twice, when overstrained by nursing a relative in a fatal illness, she had the impression of hearing her name called.

[The fact that the sounds were not heard by others, though at least one other person seems to have been awake at the time, is rather a strong proof that the experience was a hallucination; and if so, there is at least an appreciable chance that it was telepathic. I have mentioned a case of subjective hallucination of the same character in Vol. I., p. 494, second note. The long duration of the impression is, owing to its "rudimentary" character, less remarkable than that alleged in cases 300 and 590.]

¹ As to the tendency to regard impressions corresponding with unknown reality as prophetic, see p. 535, note.

(622) From a lady, Mrs. M., whose name and address it seems right to suppress, though she made no stipulation on the subject. The account was received in August, 1884.

Mrs. M. describes how, in July, 1874, while spending her holiday happily in the vale of Leven, and in perfect health, she "was awakened suddenly with a cry of distress ringing in my ears, and it was twice repeated after I became wide awake. The last time it seemed partly suppressed and further away. It seemed very near at first, and I recognised the voice as poor little Tom's. [Tom was a child between 2 and 3 years of age, one of several of whom she had been in charge, and whom she had known to be considerably ill-used by the lady who was acting as his guardian.] I sprang out of bed and looked out. It was a lovely still night, not a movement nor a sound disturbed the air, and it was so light that I could see the time on a small silver watch which was lying on the table. It was 12.45."

The effect on Mrs. M. was so great that she mentioned the experience next morning to the aunt with whom she was staying, and resolved to return at once to the scene of her duties, but was prevented by a telegram giving her other instructions. When she did return, she learnt from the servants that, on the Sunday night when she had heard the cries, Tom's guardian had had him in her room all night; and that they "heard cries and moans until they fell asleep, and at midnight were awakened by three successive cries that rang through the house—the last a suppressed echo of the others." Next morning the servants found marks of cruel ill-usage on the child, which Mrs. M. found still very apparent.

[We have not received the aunt's corroboration, though Mrs. M. promised to try to obtain it for us. The correspondence of the *three* cries is a detail not unlikely to have been subsequently imagined. See p. 229, note.]

§ 3. The following is a group of non-vocal cases, of an entirely rudimentary type (see above, pp. 125-32).

(623) From a gentleman who does not feel justified in allowing his brother's, the agent's, name to appear, and is therefore obliged to withhold his own from publication. The percipient has died since 1883, when the account was written.

In the autumn of 1874, the narrator's brother, W. M., a resident in Edinburgh, was staying, with a sister, some 18 miles from that place. "He had been subject, at irregular intervals, to attacks of illness of a severe character, but, at this date, was in fair health, and attending to business.

"Two or three days after his arrival at our sister's house he was quite unexpectedly seized, late one evening, with serious illness, hematemesis supervened, and within two or three hours from the first seizure he was a corpse. The late hour, and distance from the railway station, prevented any communication during the night with our household in Edinburgh.

"Between 11 and 12 o'clock that night, my mother, aged then 72, but active and vigorous in body and mind, as indeed she is still, was alone in her bedroom and in the act of undressing. She occupied this room alone, and it was the only sleeping apartment on the dining-room flat which wa

in use that night, the only other bedroom there being the adjoining room, then untenanted, owing to my own absence in the North. My father, eldest brother, and sister-in-law occupied rooms on the flat above. The servants' accommodation was in the under or sunk flat beneath, shut off from the upper by a swing door at the foot of a flight of steps. A small dog, the only other inmate of the house, slept that night, and indeed always, in the kitchen. My mother was in her usual good health, her faculties perfectly preserved, and her mind untroubled with any apprehensions of evil tidings. She had read, as usual, a portion of her Bible, and was in the act of undressing, when she was suddenly startled by a most extraordinary noise at the door of her room, which opened directly into the inner lobby. It was as if made by a person standing directly outside and close to the door, but it was utterly unlike any ordinary summons or alarm. In her own words, it was like nothing so much as the noise of someone hastily and imperiously lashing the door with a heavy riding whip, demanding admittance. It was loud, and repeated three or four times, as if insisting on attention, with brief intervals between. Then it ceased.

"My mother, though possessed of considerable coolness, was startled; but with a resolution which many might envy, she proceeded to light a candle, knowing the hall lights were extinguished, the whole of the inmates having before retired for the night, and went to the door. 'I knew,' she said, 'that it was no one in the house seeking admission. Such an imperative summons would never have been made at my door.' On opening it, nothing was visible, the various doors opening on the lobby were closed, and the fastenings of the front door undisturbed. Much surprised, though retaining self-possession, my mother debated with herself as to rousing the other members of the family, but ultimately resolved not to do so unless the sound was repeated, which it was not. It was about midnight, but my mother did not note the precise hour and minute. Early next forenoon, my father and sister-in-law having left, the news came that my brother had expired at midnight, 18 miles off by road from Edinburgh.

"It may be noted that nothing in or near the door could possibly have occasioned the noise in question, the material being old, well-seasoned timber, not liable to warp or crack. It afterwards appeared that the noise in question had not been heard by anyone in the house save by my mother, which no one will wonder at who knows how perfectly 'deafened' old-fashioned stone houses in Edinburgh invariably are.

"Speaking for my own part, I would not have placed so much reliance on the narrative which I have from my mother's own lips, had it come from any other person in the house. The others might have been imaginative or nervous, or wise after the event, or possibly wholly mistaken. But with my mother's clear and balanced judgment, little affected by matters which powerfully sway others, I have no room for hesitation whatsoever. I believe, as firmly as I believe in the fact of my own existence, that the circumstances happened exactly as she narrated them."

[The entry in the Register of Deaths, which is probably correct, shows that the death occurred on September 2, 1875 (not 1874), at 4.50 a.m., not at midnight. The coincidence was therefore not so exact as the narrator imagined. Still, if the mother's experience was a hallucination—and it

certainly does not seem easy to explain it otherwise—the identity of night makes the case a striking sample of its kind.]

(624) From Mrs. Callin, of whom her mistress, Miss Rosenberg, of Gabarrie Villa, Sarsfield Road, Balham, says:—

“I can vouch for the accuracy and trustworthiness of Mrs. Callin, the narrator of the incident described.”

“December, 1882.

“Mr. J., employed as agent by my mistress, Miss C., resident in the Royal Avenue, Chelsea, had long suffered severely from asthma, and on Miss C. going to see him one day, when he had been unable to go out for many weeks, some time in November, 1879, he remarked he should go to see her on her birthday (having always done so for many years), if he had to take a cab for it; his wife rejoined, ‘I do not think you will,’ meaning his state of health would not allow him to do so, and he replied to her, ‘Yes, I *will*.’

“Miss C. retired to bed as usual on the night of December 7th. I slept in the same room, which was the front one on the first floor, with folding doors into the small dressing-room behind, no other person being in the house. In the early morning of next day (8th, and her birthday) Miss C. was awoke by a loud knock at the folding-door, and, listening, it was repeated: she then called me, but before she could rouse me, heard it again, the third time.¹ I then got up, and looked outside both the doors with a light, and could see no one; I also looked at the time, which was a quarter past *four*. We then both went to sleep again, I thinking my mistress had dreamt this, but she always persisted she heard the knocks distinctly.

“After breakfast we heard that Mr. J. had died at *four* that morning, and Miss C. said to me that he came to tell her, having so certainly promised to go to her on that day.

“Miss C. died the following March, aged 94, but having all her faculties clear to the last, and often alluding to Mr. J.’s visit on her birthday. His age was about 60 only, and he had frequently said he should die before her, and she used to reply ‘Don’t wait for me out of politeness,’ being always ready with a joke. “M. CALLIN.”

We find from the *Times* obituary that Mr. J. died on December 8, 1879.

[It may be conceived that Mr. J.’s previous promise of a visit on that day worked itself out in the percipient’s mind, when the day arrived, in the form of a hallucination; but such accurately-timed development is, as far as I know, quite unexampled, except in some rare hypnotic cases of commands and promises à *longue échéance*.]

The following experiences—if hallucinations, and not due to some undiscovered physical cause—are of interest as having taken precisely the same form.² It is one that is likely to raise a smile; but I must repeat that it is quite open to hallucinations of the senses to take peculiar forms, and that there is no reason why telepathic specimens should have an immunity in this respect (Vol. I., pp. 503, 547). Moreover, the particular form here described may without improba-

¹ See p. 229, note. ² See p. 35.

bility be traced to early associations in the percipient's mind. The grounds for doubting the telepathic origin of the impressions are, not their oddness or triviality, but (1) the fact that they did not in any way suggest the supposed agent, which always greatly diminishes the force of the time-coincidence; and (2) in one case the lack of precision in the time-coincidence itself. The narrator, Miss H., is, in her own words, "of a matter-of-fact disposition, and not a believer in things out of the way," and she attaches no importance whatever to these incidents. She withholds her name from publication out of deference to what she thinks would be the wishes of her relatives.

"N—— Vicarage, October 26th, 1884.

(625) "A few years ago [in 1874] I was staying with some relatives at Folkestone, who had taken a house there for a few weeks and had occupied it all the previous summer. We were a merry party, with young people and children. I slept in a large room on the first floor. I was awakened one night by the sound of many mice pattering over the floor; they appeared to be running swiftly and then out at the door. Much astonished, I looked around to see where they could have come from, but no trace appeared. In the morning I inquired of the nurse, who came to call me, if she had heard anything, 'No,' was the reply. I foolishly said, 'Well, I do not mind mice, but in our family the sound of them means death or ill luck.' I complained to the landlady, who said 'she had never seen a mouse in her house'; she sent in a new trap, but nothing more was heard of the intruders. Three or four days after this, came the sad news of the death of a very dear relative from an accident, whilst abroad. The event happened a few minutes before the noise of the mice had disturbed me.

"In December, three years after this, I was at St. Leonards-on-Sea, with a relative who had been seriously ill, and on the night of the 31st December I sat up in my own room at the top of the house, to see the old year out and the new one in. I have referred to a diary kept by my sister, and I find I had spent a most quiet day. I was in good spirits, for my invalid was much better, the fire in the room was bright, and I certainly was not thinking of mice; but just before 12 o'clock came the sound of many mice sweeping over the floor. I heard it distinctly and with some trepidation, but no one dear to me was ill. I noted down the fact, and, having relatives abroad, awaited with some impatience the colonial mail. I received the following note from my brother:—

"DEAR L.,—I write to tell you a piece of sad news. Whilst you were probably welcoming the new year, a few minutes before it arrived I went down my garden, to receive the corpse of my eldest son; he had broken his neck by a fall from his horse three hours before.'

"I had been in the house where this occurred several times before, and have stayed there several times since, but I have never seen or heard real mice there.

"I may add that my mother regarded the sound of mice as an omen of disaster, but she never would tell me why, looking upon it probably as a superstition she wished her children to be free from."

In answer to a request for her sister's corroboration, Miss H. replies :—
 "I regret to say that on religious grounds Mrs. L. will not write a confirmatory note ; of course she says she perfectly remembers the circumstances, and that a mouse-trap was immediately purchased for my room. That's practical."

In conversation, Miss H. informed me that she has had no other hallucination, unless hearing some unaccountable knocks on one occasion, when others heard them, be so counted. On the first occasion, in a lodging, the boards were bare to a great extent. The second time the room was carpeted. The noise was loud as well as distinct. Miss H. has since heard real mice, and was glad to identify the sound again. Her mother's superstition as to mice foreboding trouble had been constantly brought before her mind, during her mother's life : it was much on her mother's brain, so to speak.

The *Army List* shows that the death in the first case took place on July 22, 1874.

We find the accident in the second case described in a local paper for January 3, 1877, as having taken place on December 31 ; and the death is reported as having taken place "about midnight"—*i.e.*, allowing for longitude, nearly 12 hours before Miss H.'s impression. Without extenuating this element of weakness in the case, I may remind the reader how frequently the emergence of telepathic percipience seems to be deferred until a season of solitary *recueillement* (Vol. I., p. 201).

§ 4. The following are tactile cases.

(626) From Mr. W. B. Clegram, Saul Lodge, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire.

"January 15th, 1884.

"I well remember a singular circumstance I have often heard my father (one of the early civil engineers of this country) relate, which occurred to himself. He was a man of very strong mind, and more free from fancies and superstitions than most people. At the time of the occurrence he was about 30 years of age.

"He was in the habit of lying with his right hand extended out of bed, and one morning, about 5 o'clock, when wide awake, he felt a firm hand grasp his, so much like the grasp of his father's hand that he immediately told my mother 'that his father had taken his hand as he usually did when saying "good-bye."' His father died at that time that morning, somewhat suddenly. My father did not know he was ill. His father died near Sunderland ; my father at that time was living in Sussex.

"W. B. CLEGRAM."

Mr. Clegram mentioned in conversation that his grandfather had a particularly firm and strong clasp of the hand, which was also a characteristic of his father, the percipient. The latter was a strong, practical man, as far removed as possible from superstition. The incident made a deep and lasting impression upon him.

(627) From Lady Belcher, 25, Cumberland Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.

"April, 1884.

"During the great French war, when Napoleon I. was overrunning

Holland, and after the unfortunate Walcheren expedition, our fleet was ordered to the Scheldt, I believe in the severe winter of 1813. The sailors and marines from the various ships were landed in parties to man and defend the dykes. So severe was the cold that long wooden sheds were erected, and large fires kept up for the watch parties. All the officers in turn landed to keep the men to their posts.

“On one night when my father, Captain Peter Heywood, landed with his men from the ‘Montague,’ the line of battle ship he commanded, and the watch had been set, the officers stretched themselves down on some mattresses, the first lieutenant near him, then the Master of Marines. All was quiet, when the last mentioned officer cried out that some one had laid a cold hand on his cheek! Silence was ordered. Again in a few minutes he made the same complaint and challenged the lieutenant, who peremptorily ordered silence. A third time he made the same outcry, jumped up and rushed from the spot in terror. The whole party were thoroughly roused, and my father considered the circumstance so peculiar that he noted it with the date and the precise hour at which it had occurred.

“Weeks after, when the despatches and letters arrived from England, the Master of Marines received the news of his father’s death and the hour of his departure, which tallied exactly with the note which Captain Heywood had made. Up to the period of my dear father’s death I have heard him mention the fact, but never reasoned on it. He possessed a calm judgment and a very religious mind. “DIANA BELCHER.”

We learn from the Admiralty that Captain Peter Heywood was in command of the “Montague” from July, 1813, to March, 1814; also that there is no such officer as “Master of Marines,” but that the Masters (now styled Staff-Commissioners or Navigating Lieutenants) were George Dunn and J. Sanford.

[This case is very remote; and even if correct in the central fact, cannot be relied on in details—*e.g.*, as to the absolute exactitude of the coincidence, and as to the *three* occurrences of the sensation, the favourite legendary number (p. 229, note).]

(628) From Mrs. Spenser, 36, Portland Street, Southport, a member of the Society of Friends.

September 1st, 1871.

“I formerly had two aunts. One, my aunt De Mierre, residing at Putney, had been confined three weeks. My aunt, Mrs. Williams [who lived in London], being an invalid, was in the habit of taking a warm bath at night. When her maid had placed her in it, she retired, until the time appointed for leaving her had expired; but one night, soon after she had left, she was much alarmed by sounds of great distress from her mistress, which led her hastily to ring for assistance and summon her master, for her mistress’s weeping and agitation were uncontrollable. As soon as her husband entered the room, Mrs. Williams exclaimed, ‘Susan is dead. She has been to take leave of me. Her kiss was like a waft of cold air upon my cheek.’ Her husband did his best to allay her agitation, telling her she had fallen asleep in the bath and dreamt it. He also told her that he had, that afternoon, seen one of her brothers who had told him that her sister was so remarkably well that her husband was going to the play that

night, with other members of her family. But nothing soothed her until he promised to send to Putney the next morning to inquire.

"The groom received orders to leave by 6 o'clock, so as to bring the answer back by 8 o'clock. When the groom arrived at the house the servant said, 'My mistress is dead. She was taken suddenly ill while sitting up, and was dead before my master got home. She died at half-past 10 o'clock'—the exact time that her sister was thrown into such distress by her appearing to take leave of her. I remember the occurrence well.

"LUCY SPENSER."

Mrs. Spenser writes on March 18, 1886: "I think my aunt died about 1804. I am the only one living who heard the fact related at the time; and often, in after years, without any variation." And later, "I remember with unclouded clearness the particulars respecting my aunt's death—the first in the family that I knew of and cared about. It was a great event in the family, and the impression made on my mind was indelible." We have failed to discover the exact date of the death: Mrs. de Mierre does not seem to have been buried at Putney. In conversation Mrs. Spenser stated that she thinks that there was an appearance, as well as the sensation of the kiss.

[The narrator, who wrote the above 15 years ago, shows even now no sign of impaired memory; but the case is again far too remote for details to be trusted.]

(629) From the Rev. George Brett, The College, Weston-super-Mare, who heard the account from the percipient, a very near relative of his own.

"January 26th, 1885.

"About 40 or 45 years ago, a Miss Sophia Wallace was engaged to a Mr. Wilson. They were much attached to each other, and he seems to have been a man whose mental constitution was of a kind to make him capable of exerting a very real influence upon those among whom he was known. He died of consumption before the time proposed for their marriage; naturally, his *fiancée* was very anxious, and much saddened when it became evident that he would not live. On the evening of his death she was passing along a darkened passage in a house where she was staying, not more than 2 or 3 miles (perhaps less than 2) from the house of Mr. Wilson, when she felt a cold hand clasp hers. Upon comparison of time afterwards, she found this had occurred at the time of Mr. Wilson's death.

"GEO. BRETT."

[The anxiety here, of course, allows it to be supposed that the experience was purely subjective (Vol. I., p. 509).]

I will conclude this chapter with a case which suggests the same sympathy of physical condition as we have encountered in certain hypnotic cases (see above, pp. 330-1), where the transference is from the "subject" to the operator. The exceptional *rapport* (established or increased by a course of hypnotism) which existed between the two persons concerned has been mentioned in Vol. I., p. 316, and must be borne in mind in the judging of the present incident.

(630) From Mr. F. Corder, 46, Charlwood Street, S.W.

“December, 1882.

“On July 8, 1882, my wife went to London to have an operation (which we both believed to be a slight one) performed on her eyes by the late Mr. Critchett. The appointment was for 1.30 ; and, knowing from long previous experience the close sympathy of our minds, about that time I, at Brighton, got rather fidgety, and was much relieved—and perhaps a little surprised and disappointed—at not feeling any decided sensation which I could construe as sympathetic. Taking it therefore for granted that all was well, I went out at 2.45 to conduct my concert at the Aquarium, expecting to find there a telegram, as had been arranged, to say that all was well. On my way I stopped, as usual, to compare my watch with the big clock outside Lawsons’ the clockmakers. At that instant I felt my eyes flooded with water, just as when a chill wind gives one a sudden cold in the eyes, though it was a hot, still summer’s day. The affection was so unusual and startling that my attention could not but be strongly directed to it ; yet, the time being then 11 minutes to 3, I was sure it could have nothing to do with my wife’s operation, and, as it continued for some little time, thought I must have taken cold. However, it passed off, and the concert immediately afterwards put it out of my mind.

“At 4.0 I received a telegram from my wife ‘All well over. A great success,’ and this quite took away all anxiety. But on going to town in the evening, I found her in a terrible state of nervous prostration ; and it appeared that the operation, though marvellously successful, had been of a very severe character. Quite accidentally it came out that it was not till 2.30 that Mrs. Corder entered the operating-room, and that the operation commenced, after the due administration of an anæsthetic, at about 10 minutes to 3, as near as we could calculate.

“F. CORDER.”

[If telepathy is a reality, there seems at any rate a fair probability that this incident was telepathic. But it is no doubt possible to suppose that the occupation of Mr. Corder’s thoughts with his wife’s condition had induced a sympathetic liability to the peculiar affection recorded, and that the reason why it came to a head at that particular time was simply the change of physical condition involved in going out into the open air. It will be observed, however, that the day was hot, which rather tells against this hypothesis.]

CHAPTER VII.

CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES.

THIS chapter contains some further cases in which the senses of sight and hearing were both affected.

(631) From the *Story of my Life*, by Colonel Meadows Taylor, Vol. II., pp. 32-33.

“This determination [to live unmarried] was the result of a very curious and strange incident that befell me during one of my marches to Hyderabad. I have never forgotten it, and it returns to this day to my memory with a strangely vivid effect that I can neither repel nor explain. I purposely withhold the date of the year. In my very early life, I had been deeply and devotedly attached to one in England, and only relinquished the hope of some day winning her when the terrible order came out that no furlough to Europe would be granted. One evening I was at the village of Dewas Kudea, after a very long afternoon and evening march from Muktul, and I lay down very weary ; but the barking of village dogs, and the baying of jackals, and over-fatigue and heat, prevented sleep, and I was wide awake and restless. Suddenly, for my tent door was wide open, I saw the face and figure so familiar to me, but looking older, and with a sad and troubled expression ; the dress was white, and seemed covered with a profusion of lace, and glistened in the bright moonlight. The arms were stretched out, and a low plaintive cry of ‘Do not let me go ; do not let me go !’ reached me. I sprang forward, but the figure receded, growing fainter and fainter till I could see it no longer, but the low sad tones still sounded. I had run barefooted across the open space, where my tents were pitched, very much to the astonishment of the sentry on guard, but I returned to my tent without speaking to him.

“I wrote to my father, I wished to know whether there was any hope for me. He wrote back to me these words : ‘Too late, my dear son—on the very day of the vision you describe to me, A. was married.’”

Miss Meadows Taylor, the editor of the book from which this passage is quoted, writes to us :—

“6, Phillimore Terrace, Kensington, W.

“December 5th, 1883.

“I have received your letter on the subject of the vision mentioned in

my father's, Colonel Meadows Taylor's, 'Life.' I have heard him mention it very often, and he always related the incident precisely in the same manner, and exactly as it is in the book. I can throw no further light upon it; nor can I add any further particulars. The lady is dead, and I am not aware that she ever knew of the circumstance.

"ALICE MEADOWS TAYLOR."

[We have discovered a certain amount of inaccuracy in another narrative told in the same book; otherwise the present one would not have been relegated to the Supplement. Miss Meadows Taylor's remarks show, however, that the experience was distinctly imprinted on her father's memory. The detail as to the lace, it will be observed, is of a sort very likely to have been "read back" into the vision after the news arrived which would seem to make it appropriate.]

(632) From the Rev. J. Hotham (Congregational Minister), Port Elliot, South Australia, who told us (in 1884) that the account was given to him by some friends, Mrs. Leaworthy and her daughters, and was written out by him the same evening "in nearly the same language in which it was given, and submitted to Mrs. Leaworthy, who corrected it." It may therefore be taken as her account. Mr. Hotham has since died, and his son says that no more information can be obtained.

The account first describes the rescue, in 1841, of the crew of the French ship, "L'Orient," off the coast of Devon, mainly by the exertions of Mr. Leaworthy.

"The captain, during his stay in the neighbourhood, was a constant visitor at our house, and became quite a favourite. After he had recovered from his cold and wetting, he told us that he was sure something serious had happened at home. When asked why he thought so, he said that just before the storm came on, he had seen his wife standing close beside him, and that she had said: 'Do not grieve for me.' Well, we all tried to put this melancholy idea out of his head. We told him he was low-spirited at the loss of his ship, and that nothing but imagination had made him fancy this thing.

"Of course the captain wrote directly home, giving an account of the loss of his ship and cargo, and anxiously awaited a reply. He was detained some weeks among us, and during that time we became very intimate. In due time he received a letter informing him that his wife had been confined, and mother and child were both doing well. We then joked him about his fears, and congratulated him upon the good news he had received. During the weeks he further remained with us, we set to and made up a box of presents—small things, &c., for the baby. After completing all his arrangements, he bid us good-bye, and started for home. A letter from him, however, informed us that the presentiment was too truly fulfilled. His wife died on that night; but when his friends received his letter mournfully detailing the loss of his vessel, they were afraid to send him word about the loss of his wife, and so replied as we have said."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hotham added:—

"Mrs. Leaworthy, senior, has recently died. Her daughters are still living—one, Mrs. Lindsay, only a short distance from me; and the other,

who married Mr. John Hindmarsh, only son of our first Colonial Governor, has removed to New Zealand.

“In answer to your questions—(1) The account was given me at the house of Mr. Jno. Hindmarsh, near Port Elliot, South Australia. (2) Yes. By ‘died on that night’ I mean on the night he saw the apparition—the night the storm began. “JNO. HOTHAM.”

(633) From the late General Craigie, who told us (March 11, 1883) that he had heard the facts from Colonel and Mrs. —, the parents of the percipient.

General Craigie began by describing how, in 1868, he became acquainted with Colonel — and his family, resident at Mussoorie, and at their house saw a good deal of some relatives of his own, Mr. and Mrs. B.

“The year 1868 had come to a close. With the termination of the season, of course all European visitors had returned to their homes in the plains. In the ordinary course of relief, my regiment was ordered to Cawnpore, and from that time I lost sight of Mr. and Mrs. B., whom I left behind at Meerut. I cannot, without referring to friends at a distance, give the dates of what follows; but I believe that it was in the beginning of 1869 that society was shocked by hearing that Mr. B. had [in consequence of domestic unhappiness due to his own conduct] shot himself. He shot himself at Meerut, at about 8 o’clock in the evening.

“On that night Colonel —’s wife and daughter were together in a bedroom at 10 p.m. The former had already got into bed; the latter was brushing out her hair by her cheval-glass, and in her night attire. Suddenly the girl exclaimed: ‘Oh, mamma, there’s Mr. B!’ ‘Where?’ cried the scandalised mother, clutching and pulling up the bed-clothes.¹ ‘There, mamma! Do you not see him? There—he says: “*Good-bye, Sissy—good-bye!*” There, now he’s going—now he’s gone!’ An immediate alarm was given; the room, the house, the garden were carefully searched, without obtaining any satisfactory clue to so extraordinary a scene in a lady’s bedchamber. Colonel — closely questioned the girl, who not only positively adhered to her previous declarations, but now detailed the clothes worn by Mr. B. as he appeared to her.

“Two days afterwards, the post, and newspapers, brought to Mussoorie the news of the suicide of Mr. B. Colonel — and his wife did not communicate the fact to their daughter for some days, as they thought that since the night when she seemed to have seen Mr. B. she had been strangely depressed. When the fact was gently broken to her, it had such an effect that never from that day was any allusion ever made to the occurrence.

“H. C. CRAIGIE,
“Major-General.”

We find from the East India Company’s Register that Lieut. B.’s death took place on Nov. 6, 1868, at Meerut.

[Colonel — is dead. We have applied to his widow for her recol-

¹ This is almost certainly an illustration of that unfortunate tendency to give spurious vividness to a scene, by which second-hand evidence is so apt to be disfigured. But it is often rather in adding details than in altering essential points that this dramatising tendency finds its chance; and thus the distrust which it excites, though legitimate, may easily extend too far.

lections of the incident, but have not as yet received a reply. We have ascertained that Colonel —— was on furlough in 1868.]

(634) Dr. Spencer T. Hall, a well-known writer on forestry, &c., in his *Days in Derbyshire* (1863), pp. 85-6, relates as follows:—

“ Philip and his first wife, Martha, who was a cousin of mine, having no children of their own, adopted the little daughter of a young woman, who went to live at Derby. The child called them father and mother as soon as she could speak, not remembering her own parents, not even her mother. While yet very young, she one day began to cry out that there was a young woman looking at her, and wanting to come to her, and, according to her description of the person, it must have been her mother. As no one else saw the apparition, and the child continued for more than half an hour to be very excited, Philip took her out of the house to that of a neighbour; but the apparition kept them company, talking by the way. They then went to another house, where it accompanied them still, and seemed as though it wanted to embrace the child: but at last *vanished in the direction of Derby*—as the little girl, now a young woman, describes it—in a flash of fire.

“ Derby is about 14 miles distant from Holloway, and as in that day there was neither railway nor telegraph, communication between them was much slower than at present. As soon, however, as it was possible for intelligence to come, the news arrived that the poor child’s mother had been *burnt to death*; that it happened about the time when it saw her apparition; and, in short, that she was sorrowing and crying to be taken to the child during the whole of the time between being burnt and her expiration.

“ This is no ‘idle ghost story,’ but a simple matter of fact, to which not only Philip, but all his old neighbours can testify; and the young woman has not only related it more than once to me, but she told it in the same artless and earnest manner to my friend, the late Dr. Samuel Brown, of Edinburgh, who once called at the cottage with me, repeating it still more clearly to Messrs. Fowler and Wells, on our recent visit.”

In answer to inquiries, the narrator (since deceased) wrote to us:—

“ I, Leopold Grove, Blackpool.

“ November 14th, 1884.

“ It is now a generation since I resided in Derby, and most of those known to me there are now dead or the addresses forgotten. Philip Spencer, my cousin, died long ago, and his second wife too. I have forgotten the young woman’s name, but she may be married, or have left the neighbourhood. My poor dear friend, Dr. Samuel Brown, is dead. If anybody is living at Holloway likely to remember all the particulars of the case you mention, my cousin, Mrs. Sarah Buckle, may, but I cannot tell. [We wrote; but the lady appears to have left the place, and our letter was returned.] You may, however, refer to me as to the accuracy of the narrative in my book. Anything more carefully or clearly attested than what is written I never heard, and I could have had no motive for inaccuracy.

“ SPENCER T. HALL.”

[One may surmise that this was very possibly a case of telepathic hallucination, without placing reliance on the details.]

(635) From Mrs. Walsh, of The Priory, Lincoln. The percipient refuses a first-hand and signed account; she has risen in life, and is very sensitive as to anything which may recall her former dependent position. The Rev. J. J. Lias, who procured the narrative for us, tells us that he first heard it in the lifetime of Mr. Walsh, who "was by no means a credulous man, but a man of the world."

"February 18th, 1884.

"Some time in the year 1862 (I think) I was living with my husband and family of little children, accompanied by our English nurse, in apartments in the city of Brussels. The house we occupied was a large one, and we rented the drawing-room and the floor above. The ground floor was occupied by the owner of the house, a Belgian, and his wife and little children. We had no intercourse with this family; we had our own kitchen on the drawing-room floor, and the upper floor consisted of nursery, with nursery bedroom opening from it. We had a Flemish general servant, who went home about 9 every night. Our English nurse was a very clever girl, about 22 or 23 years of age. She read a good deal, and taught herself French. She was very matter-of-fact, and handy and useful in every way. She had been with me 5 or 6 years. Her parents were labouring people in the neighbourhood of London, and by reading and culture she had raised herself a good deal out of their sphere. We had been about 12 months away from England, when the circumstance I write of happened. M.'s mother, after having a large family—the youngest being about 9 or 10—did not tell M., nor did any of the family, that she was again expecting an addition. The wife of our landlord had been confined two days, so was in her own room, on the ground floor of the house we lived in.

"One night my husband and myself had been out to dinner. On returning, a little after 10 o'clock, my husband was amazed to find our apartments in darkness, and he ran up to the nursery floor to complain to M. of her inattention; as the other servant had gone home it was her place to light our room. My husband found the nursery lighted, but empty, and going towards the children's room he met M. coming out. She began, 'Oh! I am so glad to see you; I have been so frightened that I was obliged to sit on Willie's bed till you came in.' I was in the room by this time, and inquiring into the cause of fear. M. said, 'After I put the children to bed I sat down in the nursery to my work, when I heard someone coming up the stairs. I went to the door, and on the first landing by your room, I saw, as I thought, Madame N. carrying something heavy. I felt that she ought not to be out of her bed, and I called to her in French: "Je viendrai vous aider," running down the stairs to where I supposed she was. When I got there it gave me a queer sensation to find no one. However, I said to myself, it was a shadow, and made myself go back to my work. I had scarcely seated myself when a voice called: "May, May, May" (the name my children called her). I got up, went to the door, and seeing someone, ran halfway down the stairs to meet the woman, when a terrible dread came upon me, and I rushed back to the nursery and sat on one of the little beds, feeling that being with even a sleeping child was better than being alone.' My husband laughed at her, told her the *vin ordinaire* was too strong; that she had been dreaming, &c. We none of us thought much of it, till the first post from England

brought M. a letter to say her mother had been confined, and she and the child had died within an hour after. Then we all felt convinced that M.'s mother had been able to come and see her daughter.¹

“HARRIET WALSH.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Walsh says :—

“At the time, I am sure she did not connect the appearance with her own mother, nor did she recognise the voice. All she told us was that she thought it was Madame Nyo. May's mother was very much the same sort of person in appearance as Madame Nyo,² without there being any likeness ; they were about the same age, figure, and position in life. We only connected May's story with her night of terror, when she received the news from England.”

[We cannot now ascertain the exact times of the apparition and of the death ; but they probably occurred within a few hours of each other. If, as seems nearly certain, the call of the Christian name, as well as the visual experience, was a hallucination, that point is decidedly in favour of the telepathic explanation of the case.]

(636) From Mr. Louis Lyons, 3, Bouverie Square, Folkestone.

“1882.

“Madame Laramea Espéron, of Nantes, since dead, told me the following some 16 or 17 years ago. She had an only son, fond of fishing, which recreation he indulged in during the forenoon, and had been for some years most punctual to be home for dinner at 12 o'clock. One day he did not make his appearance at the usual hour. His mother opened the window to look out for him, when she heard him call her several times, and on turning round she saw her son coming through the wall, and making his exit through the opposite wall.³ An hour or so afterwards, a message was brought to her, that her son fell over the pier an hour ago, and was drowned. Madame Espéron was a most worthy woman, and told me her story bathed in tears. A mother weeping for her only son tells *no* lies.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Lyons adds :—

“Madame Espéron was in mourning for her son when she told me the sad story. I was very intimate with her, and my daughter, who went with me to Nantes, was a frequent visitor at her house.”

(637) From Mr. John Williams, 99, Wellington Road, Dudley.

“April 7, 1884.

“On December 3rd, 1849, my mother died, between the hours of 9 and 10 p.m. Her sister, living from 3 to 4 miles away, saw her on the top of the staircase, she having just gone to bed, at the same time that mother expired. Such was the effect, that she sent a messenger next morning to see if her sister was really dead.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Williams states that his mother died at The Hays, Old Swinford, Worcestershire. His aunt (Sarah Piper, formerly

¹ See p. 48, note.

² As to the mis-recognition, compare cases 170, 171, and 676.

³ See Vol. i., pp. 432 (note) and 573.

of Netherton, Dudley) is now deceased. He heard of her experience from his sister, Mrs. Raybould, of Stourbridge (aged 14 at the time), who, he says, "well remembers aunt coming in the afternoon, after the return of the messenger, and telling father and her as to seeing her sister at the top of the staircase. I was not at home when she (aunt) called, so I heard it from my sister, or father, when I got home the same evening of aunt's visit. My sister well remembers what her aunt said, and to-day (February 16, 1886) she told me that aunt said, mother called her by name (Sarah) 3 times;¹ so she not only saw, but heard her.

"J. W."

The Register of Deaths confirms Dec. 3, 1849, as the date.

Mrs. Raybould writes, on April 7, 1886 :—

"I remember well the night of December 3, 1849, it being the night of my dear mother's death, which happened about 9.40 p.m. On the following day my aunt, mother's sister, Sarah Piper, came to our house in the afternoon, and said she knew that my mother was dead, for she saw her at the top of the stairs in her bedroom, and heard her call 'Sarah,' 3 times. This, from the time she stated as having seen and heard her, was as near the time mother died as possible.

"MARY RAYBOULD."

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Williams says that his aunt knew nothing of her sister's illness—puerperal fever after a premature confinement—"so could not be expecting her death."

(638) From Mrs. Say Thomson, 47, Albany Villas, Brighton.²

"February, 1886.

"I will relate the incident that occurred to my late husband, Colonel Thomson, as I was with him at Brussels at the time. Colonel Thomson was with the King of the Belgians, at Brussels, and his brother, the Count de Flandres—and, I believe, very few others in the room. He was writing down instructions from the king about the volunteers that Lord Heaton and he had brought over. Someone leant over him, and said, 'Your brother wants you'; he answered, 'Tell him I am now engaged with the king, and impossible to leave him; but ask him to wait.' Being very much engaged writing down the king's directions, he said he *half* looked round, and saw a man in *his* volunteer uniform; he hardly gave him a glance, but said he would come as soon as he could. Directly he was disengaged, he went into the ante-room, and asked the many he knew there if they had heard anyone asking for him, as he heard his brother had arrived in Brussels. Of course all questions were asked, privately, and on parade, but all wearing his uniform *denied* having called him. Moreover, the two sentries who were on guard, outside the room the king was in, said it was *impossible* that any volunteer had passed in without their knowledge. In the course of a few days he heard of his brother's death.

"I cannot tell you *day* and *date* of Mr. John Sinclair Thomson's

¹ See p. 229, note.

² A very incorrect version of this occurrence was given in No. 13 of "Volunteering, Past and Present," by "Ancient," in the *Volunteer Service Review*, July 1st, 1882.

death, but I have no doubt my sister-in-law can supply you with correct information on that point. Colonel Thomson was commanding the Tower Hamlets Rifle Brigade, consisting of three corps; but at Brussels Lord Heaton and he took over, I think, at least 800 volunteers to Belgium. Colonel Thomson died the next year, June 8th, 1870. He was at Brussels in August or September the year before. I never heard of my husband seeing or hearing anything supernatural¹ before.

“ W. S. THOMSON.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Thomson writes on March 7th, 1886 :—

“ The hour my husband heard the voice, telling him his brother waited for him, was noon. The news of his brother’s death did not come until the next day. But whether the hours of hearing the voice and the death occurred at the same time I am unable to say. We hardly ever spoke of it, as it was not a subject Colonel Thomson cared to discuss.”

We learn from Miss Kate Thomson, a daughter of Mr. John S. Thomson, that her father died at about 8 p.m., on Saturday, Sept. 11th, 1869, at Aitechuan House, Ardrishaig, Argyleshire; and we have verified the date by an obituary notice in the *Scotsman*.

Mr. Podmore writes, February 9th, 1886 :—

“ I called on Mrs. John Sinclair Thomson, of 18, Gloucester Walk, Campden Hill, W., on the 9th February, and heard the narrative, as here given, from her. Her husband’s death was quite unexpected,—the illness being only a sudden attack of gout; and she thinks it is certain that Colonel Thomson did not even know that his brother was ill. She herself did not see Colonel Thomson in the interval before his own death in the following June; but shortly after that event she heard, for the first time, of the above occurrence from a Dr. Walker, of Peterborough, who had received an account of it from Colonel Thomson himself. She has subsequently heard the full details from Mrs. Say Thomson.”

[If the letter announcing the death really arrived at Brussels, from Scotland, on the day following Colonel Thomson’s experience, the death must clearly have preceded that experience by more than 12 hours. But Mrs. Thomson admits that she has no distinct recollection of the interval that elapsed before the arrival of the letter, and indeed spoke of it, in the first letter in which she mentioned the occurrence to us, as “ a few days ”; and though her son, Mr. J. F. Alison Thomson, of Croxton Lodge, Clarendon Street, Leamington, mentions having heard from his father that the letter arrived “ on the following morning after the warning,” he adds a sentence showing that he conceives this to be tantamount to saying that the days of the death and of his father’s experience were the same; and his evidence, therefore, cannot be held to decide the point.]

(639) From Mr. Williams, Summerfield, Rhyl.

“ November 23, 1885.

“ About 46 years ago my father went to a place near Utica, in America, leaving my mother with myself, then six years of age, a younger brother, and a baby sister at home at Bontuchel, in North Wales. In his corre-

¹ See p. 48, note.

spondence with my mother he described the country to which he had gone, and intimated his purpose to return home and sell his property at Bontuchel, and take us all out to live there. We all slept in a two-bedded room, with windows facing each other. My brother and I were together in one of the beds, asleep, before my mother came to bed with the baby. After putting the lights out she heard a noise resembling the flapping of a bird's wing against the windows. It was a moonlight night. She got up and looked out of the window, but seeing nothing returned to bed. Immediately after this she saw my father standing in the room, dressed in his usual clothes, and looking at her and at the child lying beside her. As soon as she caught his eye he turned his back upon them, and looked at us as we lay in the other bed. My mother called him by his name, and got out of bed to go to him, fully believing that it was he, but he instantly vanished. So terrified was she now that she left the house the next day, and went to her parents, who lived at Ruthin, taking us with her. About six weeks after this removal, a letter came sealed with black, written by a friend of my father's, detailing the circumstances of his illness, of his death and burial, and specifying the time of his demise. My mother had carefully recorded the time of her vision, and now found that, allowing for difference of longitude, it corresponded exactly to that of his death. I remember my mother's sudden removal from Bontuchel to Ruthin, and heard her repeatedly relate the particulars here given. I cannot say that I heard her relate the particulars before she received the letter; but I remember distinctly that she said she gave them to her parents, at the time of her removal, as the reason why she came to them so suddenly. My brother and sister, still living, can corroborate this testimony.

“W. WILLIAMS.”

[The brother's and sister's corroboration has not been received in time for insertion.]

The following is the only instance known to me in which telepathy seems actually to have aided the course of the law. The story is remote, but we have the contemporary evidence; and there seems no reason to doubt that a coincidence of the kind alleged took place.

(640) The *Buckingham, Bedford, and Hertford Chronicle* for Nov. 1, 1828, states that on Saturday, Oct. 25, 1828, William Edden, market gardener (called Noble Edden), was found dead on the road between Aylesbury and Thame, with several ribs broken. He was discovered by Mr. Taylor, miller, who was returning from Aylesbury, and gave the alarm. At the adjourned inquest, on Nov. 5, a verdict of murder was returned against some person unknown.

The *Buckingham Gazette* of August 22, 1829, gives an account of the apprehension of a man named Sewell, who had stated in a letter to his father that he knew who had killed Edden. He accused a man named Tyler, and both were tried at the Aylesbury Petty Sessions, August 22, before Lord Nugent, Sir J. D. King, R. Browne, Esq., and others. On the first day of the examination, Mrs. Edden, wife of the murdered man, gave the following evidence:—“After my husband's corpse was brought home, I sent to Tyler, for some reasons I had, to come and see the corpse.

I sent for him five or six times. I had some particular reason for sending for him which I never did divulge. . . . I will tell my reasons if you gentlemen ask me, in the face of Tyler, even if my life should be in danger for it. When I was ironing a shirt, on the Saturday night my husband was murdered, something came over me—something rushed over me—and I thought my husband came by me. I looked up, and I thought I heard the voice of my husband come from near my mahogany table, as I turned from my ironing. I ran out and said, ‘Oh, dear God! my husband is murdered, and his ribs are broken.’ I told this to several of my neighbours. Mrs. Chester was the first to whom I told it. I mentioned it also at the Saracen’s Head.”

Sir J. D. King: “Have you any objection to say why you thought your husband had been murdered?” “No! I thought I saw my husband’s apparition and the man that had done it, and that man was Tyler, and that was the reason I sent for him. . . . When my neighbours asked me what was the matter when I ran out, I told them that I had seen my husband’s apparition. . . . When I mentioned it to Mrs. Chester I said: ‘My husband is murdered, and his ribs are broken; I have seen him by the mahogany table.’ I did not tell her who did it. Mrs. Chester answered, I was always frightened, since my husband had been stopped on the road. [The deceased Edden had once before been waylaid, but was then too powerful for his assailants.] In consequence of what I saw, I went in search of my husband, until I was taken so ill I could go no further.”

Lord Nugent: “What made you think your husband’s ribs were broken?” “He held up his hand like this” (holds up her arm), “and I saw a hammer, or something like a hammer, and it came into my mind that his ribs were broken.”

Sewell stated that the murder was accomplished by means of a hammer. The examination was continued on August 31 and September 13; and finally both prisoners were discharged for want of sufficient evidence. Sewell declared that he had only been a looker-on, and his accusations against Tyler were so full of prevarications that they were not held sufficient to incriminate him. The inquiry was again resumed on February 11, 1830, and Sewell, Tyler, and a man named Gardner were committed for trial.

The trial (see *Buckingham Gazette*, March 13, 1830,) took place at the Buckingham Lent Assizes, March 5, 1830, before Mr. Baron Vaughan, and a Grand Jury; but in the report of Mrs. Edden’s evidence, no mention is made of the vision.

Sewell and Tyler were found guilty, and were executed, protesting their innocence, on March 8, 1830.

Miss Browne, writing to us from Farnham Castle, in January, 1884, gives an account of the vision which substantially accords with that here recorded, adding:—

“The wife persisted in her account of the vision; consequently, the accused was taken up, and, with some circumstantial evidence in addition to the woman’s story, committed for trial by two magistrates, my father Colonel Robert Browne, and the Rev. Charles Ackfield. The murderer was tried and convicted at the Assizes, and hanged at Aylesbury.

“It may be added that Colonel Browne was remarkably free from superstition, and was a thorough disbeliever in ‘ghost stories.’ He came home, and said, laughing, ‘We have had a ghost called in, in court to-day. We shall see how the story is confirmed!’”

The following narrative may be compared to the *arrival* examples in Chap. XIV., § 7. But if we found a difficulty, in any case, in regarding the mere fact of impending arrival as the occasioning condition of a telepathic transference (p. 96), the difficulty is intensified when the arrival is of someone with whom the percipient is in daily association, and who has only been away an hour or two on ordinary business. I think, therefore, that the chance that the experience here described was purely subjective is too appreciable to allow the account to be numbered as evidence.

A letter written to the *Spectator* by the late Rev. W. L. Clay, of Rainhill Vicarage, under date Feb. 9, 1869.

“On a Sunday afternoon, about 30 years ago (the precise date I cannot recollect), my mother and eldest sister, then about 8 years old, were sitting together in the dining-room. No one else was in the house except a younger child and his nurse, and another servant; all the rest of the family were . . . at church, and my father, John Clay, of Preston, was at the gaol. He was due home in about half an-hour, it then being nearly 4 o'clock. The afternoon was very wet, but very still, the rain pouring in torrents, but with an even, steady downpour. While sitting thus my mother heard footsteps approach, and presently some one opened and passed through the yard-door. (This yard-door faced on the road. . . . The nearest house was full 500 yards distant, and any one going to the front door would have to pass this yard-door, the dining-room windows, another window, and then turn round the corner of the house, through a gate in the garden.) She was a good deal startled, more especially as this door, according to domestic regulations, ought to have been locked. She roused herself to listen with all her might, and heard distinctly—all the more distinctly as the house was so quiet—the person who had opened the yard-door enter the house by the back door, traverse a passage in the basement storey, open the door at the foot of the back stairs, mount the back stairs, and enter the front hall. But by this time she was completely reassured, for she had recognised my father's footsteps. He put his umbrella into the stand, with a rattling noise, took off his top-coat and shook it, and then came through the inner hall into the dining-room. The hall-door and dining-room door were both ajar, so she easily heard all this. He went up to the fire, and resting his elbow on the mantel-piece, and one foot on the fender, stood there for a few moments drying himself. At length she said, ‘You must be very wet; had you not better go and change your clothes at once?’ ‘Yes,’ he replied, ‘I think I had better do so,’¹ and so he turned, left the room, and went upstairs to his dressing-room.

“As he did not come down again for more than half-an-hour, my

¹ See p. 460, second note.

mother followed him to see what was the cause of his delay. To her astonishment, she found his room empty, and no sign of his having been there. She searched all through the rooms on the same landing, but could not find him, and at length came down puzzled and frightened; but trying to calm herself with the supposition that, although she had not noticed his departure, he must have left the house again for some purpose or other. But while she sat there, still flurried and uneasy, she heard again the same footsteps approaching, the same opening of the yard-door, the same entrance by the back door, the same traversing of the passage downstairs, and mounting by the back stairs into the hall, the same putting down of the umbrella, and shaking of the coat, and then my father came into the room, walked up to the fire, and placed his elbow on the mantel-piece, and foot on the fender, just as he had done before. 'Why, where have you been?' exclaimed my mother, as soon as she could speak after the first gasp of amazement. 'Been?' he said, turning round and noticing for the first time her excitement and distress, 'I have been to the gaol as usual.' 'Oh! you know that's not what I mean. I mean where have you been since you came in by the back door just as you have done just now, rather more than half-an-hour ago?' 'I don't understand you at all; I have come straight from the gaol and have never been in the house since I left this morning.' 'Oh, it's too bad playing jokes like this to frighten me, when you know I am not well.' (My mother was in delicate health at the time.) And then, in answer to his amazed questions, she poured out the story I have told you.

"I believe the incident happened exactly as I have narrated. I have heard my father tell the story repeatedly, and he was singularly accurate and truthful. My mother's account, too, tallies precisely with his. My sister cannot now, I think, distinguish between what she recollects and what she has so often heard related. But my father at the time questioned her as to what she had heard and seen, and her account was that 'I saw mamma get up suddenly, and go into papa's dressing-room, and then she went into all the rooms upstairs as if she was looking for something, and then she came down and looked as if something was the matter, but she wouldn't answer me when I asked her what it was.'

"When my mother told her story my father instantly recollected that as he left the gaol the thought occurred to him, when he saw how heavy the rain was, that if he found the yard-door unlocked he would go in that way—a thing that he very seldom did—to avoid going round the corner to the front door, and the thought having once occurred he mentally rehearsed the circumstances of his entrance—doing in spirit precisely what he afterwards did in the body. The distance from the gaol to our house at East Cliff was rather more than two miles, and . . . this corresponds with my mother's 'rather more than half-an-hour.'

"W. L. CLAY."

Mrs. Clay, widow of the Rev. W. L. Clay, and a friend of Professo Barrett's, writes on 24th September, 1883:—

"I have more than once heard the story related and discussed in my mother-in-law's presence by her husband. There is no doubt *she* firmly believed in the vision. My impression is that *he* thought it had been a very vivid dream.

"E. J. CLAY."

CHAPTER VIII.

RECIPROCAL CASES.

THE following specimens, or possible specimens, of this rare type seem worth presenting, though for the most part far from complete from an evidential point of view.

(641) From a clergyman in Yorkshire, who desires that his name may not be published.

“January, 1885.

“The following experience took place nearly 25 years ago, but there is no doubt of its correctness in every detail. I became acquainted with a young lady in London, who, I may say without vanity, fell violently in love with me. There was a strange fascination about her which attracted me to her, but, although very young, I was far from reciprocating her affection. By degrees I discovered that she had the power of influencing me when I was away from her, making me seem to realise her presence about me when I knew that she was some distance away; and then that she was able, when I saw her, to tell me where I had been and what I had been doing at certain times. At first I thought that this was merely the result of accident—that some one had seen me and reported to her—until one day she told me that at a certain hour of the day I had been in a drawing-room, which she described, when I knew there had been no chance of collusion, and that no one could have told her of my visit to the house.

“She then told me that when she began intently to fix her mind on me, she seemed to be able to see me and all my surroundings.¹ At first she fancied it was only imagination, until she saw by my manner that what she described had really taken place. I had several opportunities afterwards of testing this power, and found she was correct in every instance.

“I need scarcely say that when I had satisfied myself of this, I kept out of the way of such a dangerous acquaintance. We did not meet for about 10 years, and had drifted so widely apart as to lose sight of each other. One day I was walking with my wife on the West Cliff at Ramsgate, when a strange feeling of oppression came over me, and I was compelled to sit down. A few minutes afterwards my old acquaintance stood before me, introducing me to her husband and asking to be introduced to my wife.

¹ See Vol. i., p. 268.

"We met several times while they stayed at Ramsgate, and I learned that she had been married for some years, and had several children ; but I have seen nothing of them since, and have no wish, even if I had the opportunity, of renewing the acquaintance. No reference whatever was made to the past, and I did not learn whether she had still the strange power she formerly possessed."

This may probably have been a reciprocal case, though we cannot now ascertain whether the impressions which suggested to each of the two parties the other's presence were simultaneous. The only other case in our collection where a prolonged course of reciprocal action is alleged to have occurred is the following.

(642) From Miss L. A. W. (the narrator of case 140), whose only reason for withholding her name from publication is that she is sure that her family would object to its appearance.

She begins by saying that when she was 19 or 20, she had a spell of indifferent health, caused, it was thought, by over-study. During this time, from March in one year till June in the next, she was much troubled at intervals by singular dreams, which she recorded in a note-book, and also described to one of her sisters. The main feature in these dreams was the appearance of a particular person. "I was not in love, nor indeed had I been ; and certainly no feeling but that of a mysterious repugnance (and at the same time an inability to avoid or escape from the influence of the person of whom I dreamt) actuated me. He was someone I had never in all my life wittingly seen, though I had reason to think afterwards that he had seen me at a Birmingham musical festival. On that occasion I had *apparently* fainted, and it was attributed to the heat and the excitement of the music. I hardly knew if it were or not. I only knew I felt all my pulses stop, and a burning and singing in my head, and that I was perfectly conscious of those around me, but unable to speak and tell them so. To return to my dreams. I always knew as I slept *when* the influence was coming over me, and often in my dream I commenced it by thinking, 'Here it is, or here he comes again.' They were not always disagreeable dreams in themselves, but the fascination was *always dreadful* to me, and a kind of struggle between two natures within me seemed to drag my powers of mind and body two ways. I used to awake as cold as a stone in the hottest nights, my head having the queer feeling of a hot iron pressing somewhere in its inside. I would shiver and my teeth chatter with a terror which seemed unreasonable, for there was, even in the subjects of my dreams, seldom anything *wicked* or terrifying."

The dreams ceased after a course of medical treatment. In the next year but one Miss W. was visiting in Liverpool. "I had enjoyed two or three good dances, and was sitting out one, by the lady of the house, when *not suddenly*, but by degrees, I felt myself turning cold and stony, and the peculiar burning in my head. If I could have spoken I would have said, 'My dreams ! my dreams !' but I only shivered, which attracted the notice of my companion, who exclaimed, 'You are ill, my dear. Come for some wine, or hot coffee.' I rose, knowing what I was going to see, and as I turned, I looked straight into the eyes of the fac-simile of the being

who had been present to my sleeping thoughts for so long, and the next moment he stepped forward from the pillar against which he was leaning behind the lace curtain, and shook hands with my companion. He accompanied us to the refreshment room, attended to my wants, and was introduced to me. I declined dancing, but could not avoid conversation. His first remark was, 'We are not strangers to each other. Where have we met?' I fear I shall scarcely be believed when I say, that (setting my teeth, and nerving myself to meet what I felt would conquer me, if I once submitted in even the slightest degree) I answered that I never remembered meeting him before, and to all his questionings returned the most reserved answers. He seemed much annoyed and puzzled, but on that occasion did not mention dreams.

"I took an opportunity of asking my sister if she remembered my description of the man of my dreams, and upon her answering 'Yes,' asked her to look round the rooms and see if any one there resembled him, and half-an-hour later she came up, saying, 'There is the man, he has even the mole on the left side of his mouth.'"

Miss W. subsequently met this gentleman at almost every party she went to. "He was sometimes so gloomy and fierce at my determined avoidance of any but the most ordinary conversation, that I felt quite a terror of meeting him. He frequently asked if I believed in dreams; if I could relate any to him; if I had never seen him before; and would say, after my persistent avoidance of the subject, 'I can do nothing, so long as you will not *trust* me.'"

Miss W. says that she has several pages, in her note-book, of entries of dreams in which she seemed to be accompanying her visitor in a flight through the world.

"When conversing with him in the flesh, he asked me if I had 'ever travelled.' I said 'No.' He showed surprise, and began to dilate on the wonders of such and such a place or scene, all of which I felt sure I had seen with him, and entered in my note-book. It was deeply interesting, and I was totally absorbed in his recitals, time after time, when he abruptly stopped, saying, 'But have you *never* had scenes such as these before you?' and I replied, 'Yes, in my dreams I have.' Such, or similar remarks, I know I have noted down, and his eagerness to make me admit similar experiences was at times almost fierce. I had a great longing at times to tell him everything, but an innate sense that by so doing I should be as completely his slave and tool as I had been in dreams, always stopped me."

The effort of these conversations was so exhausting to Miss W. that she wrote home to get herself recalled—a fact which her strange acquaintance seems to have intuitively divined, and for which he bitterly reproached her. She has never seen him since. She says, in answer to inquiries:—"You are right in your conjecture that he inferred [? implied] he had seen me in dreams. He often talked as if he were perfectly aware that I knew it, but that I would not go beyond a certain limit in admitting anything." She adds that her sister remembers all the circumstances—the dreams, their frequency, and the correct description of the man subsequently met; but we have not been able to procure the sister's written confirmation. Miss W. says that she cannot spare the time to make extracts from her diary for publication.

[If the details here are quite accurate, it would be reasonable to explain the case telepathically. But it is possible to suppose that the dream-figure assumed the distinctness which made it seem the counterpart of the real figure, only after the real one was seen; and that Miss W. herself led the conversations in the directions where they seemed to confirm her dream-experiences. Without an independent account from the gentleman himself, the interpretation of the case must remain dubious; and as Miss W. is unwilling to mention his name, no more can be done. Should the account ever meet his eye, it is to be hoped that he will communicate with us.]

In the next case it is impossible to tell how closely the two experiences coincided.

(643) From Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood, 31, Queen Anne Street, W.

“ February 10th, 1886.

“ I send you a well-authenticated dream of my daughter-in-law, Mrs. Alfred Wedgwood, with the vouchers. You will see that she told it immediately after the occurrence to Mrs. K., and to me a day or two afterwards, on her return to Queen Anne Street. I have a strong recollection that it was on that occasion that she explained her noticing the ring, by saying that in her dream the stranger leant his hand on the bedside as he stooped over her. She expressed great confidence that she should know him again if ever she saw him, and I told her to let me know if ever she did. However, she never mentioned to me the fact of her having fallen in with him that autumn, and she only mentioned it incidentally, when she was with me last Christmas, as a matter well-known to me.

“ If I had known it at the time, we might perhaps have been able to ascertain how far the dreams were synchronous. It is not likely that they were absolutely so, as hers was in the afternoon.

“ H. WEDGWOOD.”

“ In June, '84, I went to Folkestone to look out for a house, and slept for a night or two at the West Cliff Hotel. The second day I was there, being a good deal tired, I went up in the afternoon to my room, locked the door and fell asleep upon my bed, having undressed myself and merely covered myself with the sheet, it being a warm day. After a while, I was startled out of sleep by dreaming in a very lively way that a gentleman, whom I had never seen before, was stooping over me. He was dressed in a dark grey tweed suit; he wore on his little finger a cornelian ring, and a small cameo pin which was a veiled figure. I observed that one of his eyes drooped a little. There were a number of Zulus standing behind him. When he bent down towards me he put out his hand and said, ‘ Poor thing, you seem tired.’

“ The impression was so vivid that I jumped off the bed to see whether the door could have come open, but I found that it was locked as I had left it. I got up and dressed, and went to tea with Mrs. K.; I told her my dream, saying I was sure I should recognise the man if ever I saw him. Having found a suitable house, I returned to my father-in-law's in Queen Anne Street, and told him my dream, as I had done to Mrs. K. In the middle

of August we moved to Folkestone, and not many weeks afterwards, as I was going down the Military Hill leading from the camp to Sandgate, I met the gentleman whom I had seen in my dream, wearing the same clothes. He stopped, and looked at me, and said, 'I think we must have met before.' I said, 'Yes'; then introduced myself, and told him of my dream. He wore the same pin, but not the ring. I called his attention to it. He said he had not worn the cornelian ring for some years, as he preferred his brother's, but that he had been looking at his old ring. He had dreamt of seeing me lying down in a white gown. The day he met me, I had on a white dress. He also told me he had been at the Cape, and once belonged to the Mounted Rifles when first established.

"M. R. WEDGWOOD."

"I believe I did not hear of my wife's dream until after she had met with the gentleman she had seen in her dream. Very soon after that meeting I was told the story.

"A. A. WEDGWOOD."

Thinking it possible that Major M. had unconsciously noticed Mrs. A. Wedgwood's appearance during the days when she was in Folkestone in June, I asked her how she was dressed during that short stay. She replied:—

"At the time I was down here for the two days, I wore a black silk gown, as I well remember my friend Mrs. K. admiring it when I went and drank tea with her. I told her of my dream at the same time."

Mrs. K. writes:—

"December 28th, 1885.

"I remember quite well the circumstance you allude to. Mrs. Alfred Wedgwood told me about it the same evening, when she was sitting with me at Meadowbank, but I think she said she saw this vision of a man looking at her, *not in a dream*, but on suddenly *awaking from sleep*, and that he vanished as she looked at him. She told me that she particularly noticed a stud or breast-pin he was wearing, and that during the short time the figure was visible she saw other figures in the background, like Zulus with their spears passing behind him. This, at the time, made us wonder if the room at the West Cliff Hotel she was then using had been at any time occupied by someone who had died in the Zulu War. Some-time after this, Mrs. Alfred told me she had seen an officer at Shorncliffe who resembled the man of her vision, and that he was wearing a pin just like the one she had observed, and she wondered who he was. I do not remember that after this we ever spoke of the matter again; and I never heard that she had afterwards met him to speak to, or that he had told her that he had had a corresponding vision or dream of her.

"M. A. K."

The following account is from Major F. F. M. :—

"February, 1886.

"As nearly as I can recollect, some time in June, 1884,¹ I met Mrs. Wedgwood coming down the Military Road from Shorncliffe Camp. I had

¹ Mr. Wedgwood says, "It must have been in August or September.

a confused idea that I had met the lady before, and therefore turned to look at her. Mrs. Wedgwood asked me some question, and introduced herself, when, in conversation, I remarked that some time previously I had dreamed I had seen her, and that she was dressed in a white gown.

“Mrs. Wedgwood replied that she also had dreamed she had seen myself, and described the dress I wore, and also a scarf-pin and ring that I possess. The latter she could not possibly have seen, as I had not worn it for some years, and consequently it was locked up in a secret drawer in my chest. The accurate description of the ring and pin seemed to me to be very remarkable.

“F. F. M.”

In answer to inquiries, Major M. writes, on Feb. 18, 1886 :—

(1) “I feel sure I had never seen Mrs. Alfred Wedgwood before I met her coming from Shorncliffe Camp, after the dream you refer to, and I had no reason for connecting the dream with her [*i.e.*, at the time that it was dreamt].

(2) “I do not think my dream was sufficiently vivid to enable me to recognise the features of the lady.

(3) “The dream occurred, I believe, in the second week in June, 1884.

“I may say that I did not look upon my dream as at all peculiar, and should have thought no more of the circumstance had not Mrs. Wedgwood informed me of her dream, which I thought very remarkable, inasmuch as she described accurately some articles of jewellery belonging to me, which she could not possibly have previously seen.”

He adds that Mrs. A. Wedgwood was correct in saying that he had served for many years in South Africa ; but that he had not recently returned from that country.

Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood writes on Feb. 2, 1886 :—

“Major M. says that when he saw Mrs. A. Wedgwood in her white gown, he instantly recognised her by her figure. The date of her dream was the 13th June, which she fixes by something about a photograph.”

[It is impossible here to be sure that Major M.'s sense of having seen Mrs. A. Wedgwood before he met her was really due to his dream. But if the case is not reciprocal, it is at any rate strongly suggestive of telepathic clairvoyance on Mrs. A. Wedgwood's part.]

The next example may, no doubt, have been an accidental coincidence ; but both experiences seem to have been of an unusual kind, unlike ordinary dreams. If telepathic in character, the case may not improbably have been reciprocal, without—it will be observed—suggesting anything of the nature of clairvoyance. Each percipient has the impression of the other as present in the percipient's own environment.

(644) From Mrs. White, 10, Hope Terrace, Walham Green, S.W.

“1883.

“On one occasion my husband [since deceased—for many years con-

ductor of the *Ballymena Observer*] complained of a slight indisposition ; but being very averse always to the attendance of a doctor, he desired me to see that some cooling drink was left in his bedroom, and that we should all retire as usual. I occupied a room on the floor above him, and after seeing that everything necessary was left on his dressing-table, and everything comfortable and as he wished, I, at his urgent request, went to bed, and being particularly fatigued fell into a deep sleep ; in which state I became acutely conscious of the condition I had left my husband in, and mindful of my own secret resolve to visit him during the night and see if he had taken his drink or if he slept, &c., though I had studiously avoided telling him so, lest he should think I was making a fuss. I was quite conscious of all this in that peculiar way we see and know during sleep. I also seemed to know I was in a deep sleep, and I longed to burst my bonds and carry out my intention. Simultaneously with this wish, I now became aware of my husband's presence at the door of my room, then of his presence filling the chamber and slowly and solemnly crossing to the bed where I lay. In that flash of conscious thought which made me aware of this, I thought he must be very ill and come to reprove me for this torpor of sleep that still so enchained me that I couldn't speak to him, though longing with all my heart and soul to do so. This all, swift as thought, passed while he seemed to bend over me *as if to find did I sleep* ; then with the same slow, solemn presence filling the room, again he passed away. Then, with one shrill cry, I burst the suffocating bonds that held me, and my maid, who slept in the next room, was beside me at once. She asked, was I frightened ? I said not at all, but to follow me to her master's room ; that I had intended seeing to him through the night, but had fallen fast asleep and neglected to do so.

"When I cautiously entered his room, the maid behind me, I found him awake and a keen, almost reproachful look on his face. I dismissed the maid, and then explained what a heavy sleep I had just awoke from, which had prevented me coming sooner, &c. 'Will you tell me,' he now inquired, 'what object you have in trying to conceal from me that you were here a few moments ago ?' I then fell on my knees, and assured him that I had not risen from my bed until this present moment, and that it was owing to a strange, silent, and secret visit from him that so disturbed and alarmed me, that I was there now. 'Ah,' he said, 'something like this happened to me before, but this is the most remarkable experience of all—because happening to each of us at the same time.' He then narrated how, a few minutes before, I had stolen, as it were, up to his side, arranged the clothes, kissed him on brow and cheek, and then glided away ; that my visit had a soothing effect, and that he was consequently irritated at my appearing to forget it, when I came the *second* time."

[In conversation, Mrs. White particularly described to me the sense of *entrance* and of the *movement* of the presence. There was light enough for her to have seen any visible figure, but she saw nothing. She also described the effect upon herself, before she reached his room, as very overpowering, depriving her of the power of speech. Her *viva voce* account agreed in every detail with the above account which had been written about a year previously ; and she gave me an impression of accuracy. As an instance of her unwillingness to believe marvels, she told me how incredulous she

had been as to the genuineness of experiments in hypnotism which her husband used sometimes to carry out.]

I will conclude this chapter with two cases which, as reported, seem to have been collective as well as reciprocal.

(645) From Mrs. T., who does not wish her name to be published. The account was written in January, 1879.

"I have myself had an exceedingly interesting experience of the apparition of the living, viz., my own appearance at the supposed death-bed of my sister, when we were 3,000 miles apart. She was attended on this particular night by another sister, who distinctly saw me go into the room, and lean over my darling young sister. The latter was too ill to speak, but she whispered, 'Mary is here; now I am happy.' I ought to mention that my elder sister is not given to vision, and is, indeed, a very practical, matter-of-fact person; but she has always declared that she saw me from my knees up,¹ and that the very dress was plain to her, too.

"At this time I was just recovering from my confinement with my son, who is nearly 17. He was between four and five weeks old, when, one night, I fell asleep thinking how much I should like to see this sister. I knew of her illness, and that she was not likely to recover, and of her intense desire to see me. Between us the most tender attachment had always existed, and it was thought that her illness was much increased through her grief at our separation.

"On the night referred to, I had a most vivid dream of seeing her, in a bed *not in her own room*, and of seeing my other sister in attendance. I leaned over her and said, as I thought, 'Emma, you will recover.' I told my husband that I had been home when I woke, and my impression that she would recover. This dream comforted me very much, and from this night there was a change for the better in my sister, and she gradually recovered from what was supposed to be an incurable illness. When we came to compare dates, we found that my dream, and my appearance to my two sisters, occurred at as nearly as possible the same time. I was so life-like to my younger sister that she thought I had really arrived on a visit; but, as I said before, to my eldest sister I was shadowy below my knees, but perfectly natural in appearance. She afterwards remembered that I did not notice her as I passed into the inner room, although in my dream I saw her, nor did I seem to see anything but the one object of my love."

Mrs. T. wrote to us, on Oct. 3, 1883:—

"Neither of my sisters wrote me, but a member of the family to whom the occurrence was told on the following morning. Unfortunately I have not kept this letter, and cannot date the time, except from my son's birth, which took place on the 4th March, 1862. I changed my bed, still keeping the same room, when he was a month old, and it was within a night or two of making this change that I had my dream. When the letter came, which was like a repetition of my dream, I went back in my mind to the time (not more than three weeks before), and was myself satisfied that the times were coincident. It was nearly 10 years after,

¹ See p. 33, note.

before I had an opportunity of talking with my sister of the occurrence, which was only one of several very startling things connected with my younger sister's illness, and I found we agreed in all substantial things. I found them both disinclined to talk of what had happened during Emma's illness, and, indeed, their memory of all the circumstances of my manifestation was less clear than mine."

Mrs. T. is unable to communicate with her family respecting this case, as they all have an extreme dislike to the subject. In conversation, she explained that she had left America about nine months at the time of this vision, and that her sister recognised her as wearing a print dress of a very decided blue, which she had left behind her in America.

She has further answered the following questions :—

Did Mrs. T. dream of herself as in the blue dress ?

"I cannot now remember. My impression is that I did not recollect my dress on waking."

Had the sisters ever seen the blue dress ?

"Yes. I had worn the dress in the morning during the previous early summer time."¹

Was the invalid sister really in a room *not her own*? And if so was its arrangement, "inner room," &c., really represented in the dream ?

"My sister was not in her own room, but in a room on the ground floor (an inner room), exactly as I had seen her in my dream."²

Had Mrs. T. ever seen the room before ?

"Yes."

Mr. T. cannot remember any of his wife's experiences in detail ; he says :—

"I am unable to recall the particular circumstance to which you refer. This may be due to the fact that for several years previous to, and since, the date referred to, my wife has related to me numerous remarkable incidents in her experiences, together with their subsequent verification.

"W. T."

[It is unfortunate that the evidence here is second-hand from the side on which the more striking experience occurred. If that experience is correctly recorded, the fact that two percipients shared in it is a strong indication that it was telepathically produced. The proof of the *reciprocity* of the case depends greatly on the detail in the dream as to the changed room, on which it is impossible entirely to rely, in the absence of a written note made before the actual fact was known.]

(646) From Mr. J. Cotter Morison, 30, Fitzjohn's Avenue, N.W.

"June 18th, 1883.

"My mother and grandmother were together in the dining-room of their house in the Isle of Wight, occupied on some domestic matter which made the exclusion of chance visitors desirable. A sudden knock at the door caused my grandmother to hasten to it with a view to taking the

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 540-6, and 569-70. The dress, it will be seen, was one which the sisters in America would be specially likely to associate with Mrs. T.'s aspect, since she had worn it a good deal when she was last with them ; while there is no reason to suppose that it had any prominence in *her* memory.

² Compare case 465.

stranger into the drawing-room. The knock was heard by both mother and daughter. On opening the door with the least loss of time possible, my grandmother was surprised to find not only no one there but no one even in the long corridor which led to the dining-room. My mother distinctly remembered the look of astonishment in her mother's face as she returned from the door. Nothing more was said on the subject, but in a short time afterwards a letter was received from London from my grandmother's sister, or rather her family, saying that she (the sister) had been most seriously ill, at death's door indeed, but was now a little better, and wished my grandmother to come and see her. The latter went up to town and found her sister still very ill, but slowly recovering. After the mutual endearments natural to such an occasion, my grandmother said:—

“Do you know, such a strange thing occurred, exactly at the time, it seems, when you were supposed to be dead or dying.”

“‘I know what you are going to say,’ said the other. ‘When I was in the trance which was mistaken for death, I thought I went to your house in the Isle of Wight and knocked at your dining-room door. You opened it instantly and looked much affrighted at not seeing me or any one, though I saw you.’”

“The singular point in the story is the anticipation by the one sister of what the other sister was going to say.

“No theory or inference was ever deduced by my relations from the circumstance, and it was only mentioned as an odd coincidence by them and their friends, who, as well as my mother, have often told me the story.

“JAS. COTTER MORISON.”

Mr. Morison writes of his grandmother:—

“She was a person of a strong understanding, as I have often heard from people who knew her personally. She had an aversion to what she called superstition, belief in ghosts, &c.; so the facts of the story were unwelcome to her rather than otherwise.”

Though the sound here seems to have corresponded with a distinct impression of the agent's, there is no conclusive *proof* of reciprocity, as her sense of visiting her relatives' house may have been purely subjective. At the same time, the idea of knocking at a door and having it opened, yet being oneself invisible to the person who opens it, appears so unlikely a one to occur even to a dreaming mind, that the hypothesis of telepathic clairvoyance on the agent's part seems (as the facts stand) eminently defensible. It must be noted, however, that the description of this side of the occurrence comes to us at *third* hand.

CHAPTER IX.

COLLECTIVE CASES.

§ 1. OF the collective cases which remain to be presented, the large majority, like the cases in Chap. XVIII. above, are waking affections of sight and hearing. I will begin, however, with three outlying instances, of which the first had no sensory element at all, the second is a dream-case, and the third concerned the sense of touch only. They agree in the fact that the two percipients were not in each other's company at the time of the experience (see Chap. XVIII., § 2).

(647) From Mr. Charles Ede, Wonersh Lodge, Guildford, a medical man, to whom the incident was related by both the percipients. The account was sent to Professor Barrett on Aug. 29, 1877.

"Lady G. and her sister had been spending the evening with their mother, who was in her usual health and spirits when they left her. In the middle of the night the sister awoke in a fright, and said to her husband, 'I must go to my mother at once; do order the carriage. I am sure she is taken ill.' The husband, after trying in vain to convince his wife that it was only a fancy, ordered the carriage. As she was approaching her mother's house, where two roads meet, she saw Lady G.'s carriage. When they met, each asked the other why she was there. The same reply was made by both. 'I could not sleep, feeling sure my mother was ill, and so I came to see.' As they came in sight of the house, they saw their mother's confidential maid at the door, who told them, when they arrived, that their mother had been taken suddenly ill, and was dying, and had expressed an earnest wish to see her daughters.

"The foregoing incident was told me as a simple narrative of what happened, both by Lady G. and her sister. The mother was a lady of strong will, and always had great influence over her daughters.

"CHARLES EDE."

Writing on June 25, 1884, Mr. Ede says, "Both Lady G. and her sister are dead, although at the time of my writing the account the former was living." He cannot fix the date of the occurrence. He communicated the names in confidence.

(648) From Mr. R. S. Pengelly, 33, Ingestre Road, Stafford, who first published the narrative in a magazine. On Feb. 26, 1884, he wrote to us to confirm it, and to supply the names of the parties.

Mr. Pengelly narrates that, some time in the years 1863-1866, his father, then unmarried, went on a voyage to Colombo as mate of the 'Adela,' belonging to Messrs. Cobbold and Co., of Ipswich. Some weeks after his departure, his *fiancée*, Anne Symons, who had been looking out for a letter from him, had a vivid dream of an Eastern seaport. Lying to the left of the picture she was startled to see a vessel, which she instantly recognised as the 'Adela,' of which her father was captain, and which she knew well. There on deck were several Orientals, lightly clad, at work, and by their side was James Pengelly. Suddenly she saw him walk a step forward, and the next moment he was struggling in the waters. She was in agony, but strange to say, the excitement did not at once awake her, and she saw him throw up his hands and sink, and he appeared no more. At this point she awoke, deeply impressed with the realistic nature of her vision. Strange to relate, however, the next night she went through the same series of mental tortures, her lover fell, struggled wildly, but was drowned. When she arose that morning, she confided her dreams, and the anxieties they had aroused in her breast, to her aunt.

"Several days later, Anne received a letter from her lover's mother, who, it happened, was also her aunt, and who, with her husband, lived about 130 miles away, in another part of the country. The letter, to her intense surprise, asked whether any news had been received of the arrival of the 'Adela' at Colombo, the writer giving as a reason for her solicitude for her son a dream which she had had a few days before (giving the date). She also had dreamed on two consecutive nights that she had seen her son fall overboard and rise no more, and so powerfully had she been affected by the visions that after the repetition she had the next morning written the letter received. The days upon which Mrs. Pengelly had dreamt of her son's death were the very ones upon which Anne herself had been so agitated. They could only wait and pray, and after some weeks their anxiety was relieved, and their prayers rewarded, by the receipt of a letter from James, announcing his arrival at Colombo a few days before the date of the letter, after a long and tempestuous passage. He went on to tell, to Anne's great astonishment, how narrow an escape he had recently had from drowning. 'The day after our arrival,' he wrote, 'I was standing on a plank from the hatchway to the bulwarks, watching the coolies discharging her. While so standing I almost unconsciously stepped forward, and the plank, one end of which was resting on the bulwarks, at once tipped up, and I was in the water. Being unable to swim, my danger was great, and I had sunk once before the boatswain with a boathook caught me, and held me up till they brought the boat around.' Most wonderful to relate, a comparison of dates showed Anne that it was on the very day of her first dream that her lover's life was so nearly lost, and his mother was no less surprised than Anne. However, 'all's well that ends well.' James came home, and he and his cousin were married."

Mrs. Pengelly, the mother of James Pengelly, writes:—

"10, Gloucester Place, Littlehampton.

"April 19th, 1886.

"I am sorry to say I cannot remember the exact date of the dream only that, as near as I can recollect, it was in or near 1864. My son was

then mate in the 'Adela,' the ship of his uncle, whose daughter he afterwards married. She dreamt, one night, that her cousin was climbing from a boat into the ship, when he slipped his foot and fell in under the ship; when they took him up, he was nearly dead. She wrote to tell me her dream, and by that I found she had dreamt the same dream the same night as I had. When my son came home, upon questioning him, I found that he had fallen into the water at Colombo, and, as near as he could tell, the same day as I dreamt he did. My daughter-in-law, I am sorry to say, is now dead; if she were living she would be able to tell you more particulars.

"E. PENGELLY."

[Mr. Pengelly justly draws attention to the fact that a dream due to apprehensions of danger and disaster would not be very likely to take the form of "drowning in a quiet harbour"; but the amount of detail in his narrative is more than can be safely relied on, in the absence of written notes. It will be seen that Mrs. Pengelly senior's account of her daughter-in-law's dream does not exactly agree with Mr. Pengelly's. Mr. Pengelly kindly tried to obtain for us an account of the accident from his father, but found that "he, a plain sea-captain, had little recollection of what happened 20 years ago, during his absence."]

(649) From the papers of the late Psychological Society. The original document is in the handwriting of the late Mr. Serjeant Cox. No names are given, and the MS. bears no date.

"The following remarkable case is taken from the lips of the parties to whom it occurred, and for whose veracity I can vouch.

"J. P., wife of Colonel P., says: 'In July, 1871, I was at Weymouth, sleeping with my daughter. I was wakened in the night by a cold kiss upon my lips. I concluded that my daughter had kissed me, and wondered much why her lips were so corpse-like. I fell asleep again, and on the following morning, on awaking, I asked my daughter why she had kissed me, and what made her lips so cold. She said that she had not done so. Soon after this conversation a messenger arrived to say that my mother, who was in another house in Weymouth, was very ill, and requested my immediate attendance. I had left her on the previous evening in perfect health, so that I had no sense of alarm for her to account for a mental impression. I found her seriously ill, and she died in three weeks.

"Two days before her death, I received a letter from my sister, Mrs. C., who was on a voyage to America, written from the ship, then off Halifax, dated the day after the night on which I had felt the cold kiss, in which she said, "I am sure there is something wrong with mother; she is either dead or ill; for last night I felt a cold kiss on my lips, as I lay in my berth." As far as we could afterwards trace, this had occurred to both of us almost at the same moment. My mother and sister had been extremely attached. They were then parted for the first time.'

"This narrative of Mrs. P. was confirmed to me by her daughter, who was sleeping with her on the night in question, to whom she had made the inquiry why she had kissed her, and what had made her lips so cold.

"EDW. W. COX."

[If this record is accurate, and the coincidence was more than a very curious accident, there still would be a doubt as to the agency. It seems so improbable that hallucinations, originating in a telepathic impulse

from the mother, should independently take the same very rare form in each daughter's experience, that I should certainly prefer to suppose one of these experiences to have been in some measure the source of the other. It is eminently a case where it is difficult to derive the form of the impression from the original agent's (the mother's) mind, as even if she thought of kissing her daughters, she would not think of the kisses as cold or corpse-like. See Vol. I., pp. 539-40.]

§ 2. To pass now to the visual examples—I will first cite cases where there is ground for supposing the hallucination, in its inception, to have been more than subjective, and due to the unusual condition of an absent person. And in accordance with the order adopted before, in Chap. XVIII., I will begin with the few remaining cases where the percipients were not in each other's company at the time of their experience.

(650) From Mrs. Forsyth Hunter, the narrator of cases 553 and 554.
"1882.

Mrs. Hunter's husband had had a Scotch wet-nurse of the old-fashioned sort, more devoted to him than even to her own children. Soon after her marriage, Mrs. Hunter made acquaintance with this nurse, Mrs. Macfarlane, who paid her several visits during Mr. Hunter's absence in India. In June, 1857, Mrs. Hunter, who was travelling to a health-resort, confided to Mrs. Macfarlane's keeping a box of valuables. One evening in the following August, Mrs. Hunter was entertaining some friends; but having occasion to return to the dining-room for a moment, she passed the open door of her bedroom, and felt irresistibly impelled to look in; and there on the bed was a large coffin,¹ and sitting at the foot of it was a tall old woman steadfastly regarding it. "Returning to my friends, I announced the vision, which was received with shouts of laughter, in which, after a time, I joined. However, I had seen what I have described, and, moreover, could have told the very dress the old woman wore.

"When my friends left, and I had paid my usual last visit to the nursery, my nurse looked odd and *distracte*, and to my astonishment followed me on to the landing. 'O ma'am,' she began, 'I feel so queer, such a strange thing happened. At 7 o'clock I went to the kitchen for hot water, and when I came out I saw a tall old woman coming downstairs, and I stopped to let her pass, but, ma'am, there was something strange about her, so I turned to look after her. The hall door was wide open, and she was making for it, when in a moment she melted away. I can swear I saw her, and can tell you her very dress, a big, black poke bonnet and a checked black-and-white shawl.'" This description of the dress exactly corresponded with what Mrs. Hunter had herself seen.

Mrs. Hunter laughed the matter off, and did not even think of connecting her own vision with the nurse's. About half an hour afterwards, when in bed, she heard a piercing scream from her little daughter, aged 5, followed by loud, frightened tones, and she then heard the nurse

¹ As usual, the form of the hallucination can be paralleled in the purely subjective class; see Vol. i., p. 503.

soothing the child, "Next morning little E. was full of her wrongs. She said that 'a naughty old woman was sitting at the table and staring at her, and that made her scream.' Nurse told me that she found the child wide awake, sitting up in bed, pointing to the table, and crying out, 'Go away, go away, naughty old woman!' There was no one there. Nurse had been in bed some time, and the door was locked.

"My child's vision I treated as I did her nurse's, and dosed both. However, a day or two afterwards, I received a letter from Mrs. Macfarlane's son, announcing her death, and telling me how her last hours were disturbed by anxiety for my husband and his family. My nurse, on being told the news, exclaimed, 'Good Lord, it was *her* I saw that night, and her very dress!' I never ascertained the exact hour of her death. My letter of inquiry and condolence was never answered, though my box was duly sent to me."

Mrs. Hunter writes to us that, after reading this account in the *Fortnightly Review* (where it was first published), the "little E." of the story wrote to her, "I *well* remember my part of that story." Mrs. Hunter adds, "I can truly say that she had never been spoken to about it all these years."

We find from the obituary of the *Glasgow Herald* that Mrs. Macfarlane died on August 31, 1857.

(651) From the late Mr. B. Coleman, who wrote as follows to the Editor of the *Spiritual Magazine* :—

"48, Pembridge Villas, Bayswater.

"January 14th, 1861.

"I was recently staying at the Victoria Hotel, Southport, kept by Mr. Salthouse, an old and respectable inhabitant of that town. [I learnt that] Mr. Salthouse was a firm believer in apparitions, founded on an incident which occurred in his own family. I accordingly asked Mr. Salthouse to tell me the particulars, and he related the following story :—

"Some years ago my eldest son, Thomas, shipped as a sailor on a voyage to India. After he had been absent a month or two, I was surprised one summer morning to see him standing by my bedside in his sailor's dress. I extended my hand to greet him, and inquired the cause of his unexpected return. The figure remained for an instant mute and immovable, and vanished from my sight.

"Excited and perplexed by this unlooked-for incident, I rose and prepared to make my usual visit to my farm, which is two miles distant from Southport, reasoning myself into the belief that I had been under a delusion. On reaching the farm my servant, William Ball, who still resides there, asked me if Master Tom had returned home. I said, "No; why do you ask?" "Well," he said, "I certainly saw him cross the farmyard early this morning. I ran to open the gate and could not see where he had gone, but I am as sure as I live that I saw him in his sailor's dress." This statement corroborating my own experience of the morning, I made sure that some disaster had befallen my son, and in due time this proved to be the case. He had died that very day and hour, of dysentery, on board ship, before reaching Bombay.'

"BENJAMIN COLEMAN."

A son of Mr. Salthouse, to whom we sent the account, writes to us as follows :—

“91, Railway Street, Southport.

“June 12th, 1884.

“From what I can remember I believe the account is correct. I showed this paper to my brother-in-law, and he told me that my father always said so.¹ I have heard Ball [now deceased] tell the tale many times.

“JOHN SALTHOUSE.”

Later, Mr. Salthouse writes to us that he finds that Mr. Thomas Salthouse's ship left Liverpool on June 3, 1846, and that he was taken ill between Bombay and Hong Kong, on Nov. 23. We learn from the General Register of Shipping and Seamen that he served as third mate on the ship “Inglewood,” of Liverpool, from June 3 to Dec. 13, 1846, on which latter date he died at sea. The words “summer morning” and “before reaching Bombay” in the above account are therefore incorrect.

The following case is a sort of comedy of errors. Only two of the four hallucinations which it includes represented the absent agent ; as to the two which did not, I shall hazard no further supposition than that their coincidence with the others was not accidental.

(652) From Mrs. Fagan, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot, the narrator of case 617.

“1883.

“Captain Robert Fagan, late of the Bengal Artillery, while in charge of the bridge of boats at Lahore, was in the district on the river collecting boats. One morning, during his absence from home, his eldest boy, of about 6 years old, seeing his mother just dressed for breakfast in a coloured muslin, begged her to take it off and put on a black dress, saying, ‘Because papa is dead.’ The mother, after diverting his thoughts for a short time, said, ‘Shall I put on a black dress now, Charlie?’ ‘Oh, no,’ he answered, ‘papa is not dead now,’ and ran away.

“On leaving her room, she was met by the head nurse, a Scotch-woman, with the inquiry if she had heard from the master that morning. When told his usual letter had not come, she said, ‘Something very uncanny has happened to him, for looking out of the window just now, I saw Annie, the under-nurse, and the gardener go up to master's favourite rose-tree and gather a flower, and before she could have got in from the garden, I found her in the night nursery, which she had never left, finishing bathing the children.’

“Not thinking much of this, Mrs. Fagan passed on to the breakfast-room, where she expected to find her visitors, Captain and Mrs. Reveley. Not doing so, she went to Mrs. R.'s room, whom she found still at her toilet, for which unpunctuality Mrs. R. apologised, saying she had had a dreadful fright, having seen Mrs. Fagan standing in front of the chest of drawers, who, when asked how she had come unobserved into the room, turned round and then deliberately vanished through the chest of drawers and the door behind it.²

¹ The form of expression here would convey the idea that Mr. J. Salthouse had not himself heard of the incident from his father. But in conversation I learnt from him that he had heard his father mention it several times, in a manner which showed him to have been much impressed by it.

² See Vol. i., p. 432, note. The present case is not one of those there referred to.

“This third strange remark led Mrs. Fagan to relate all three at the breakfast-table to Captain Reveley. She could not help observing how unlike his usual manner was his brusqueness in cutting short the conversation, as soon as he had heard all particulars. Five days passed without any information—private or official—from Captain Fagan; but at the end of that time he arrived home looking ill, and saying that, on the morning of which we have been speaking, he was with difficulty resuscitated from drowning, the boat in which he was having capsized. This was naturally taken as the solution of the mystery. Captain Reveley, turning to Mrs. Fagan, said, ‘I must apologise for my brusqueness of manner that morning, but I feared to alarm you by seeming to attach any importance to what had happened, and lest I should be induced to tell you of the greater fright I had myself had than any of you. For, Fagan,’ addressing the Captain, ‘as I passed from your office, where I had been reading with the Moonsee, and going through the drawing-room, I distinctly saw you sitting in your usual chair.’”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Fagan adds :—

“As to the story of those who saw my husband and me and had impressions that he was in danger, it is now so long ago that my son could hardly remember it. Captain Reveley, of the Bengal Infantry, who saw him, his wife, who saw me, and the two women, the Scotchwoman, by name Ann Kenny, and the Irishwoman, by name Annie Robertson, both *then* wives of privates in the Bengal Artillery, I fear, could hardly be traced as witnesses; but I give you their names.

“It occurred at Anarkullie, Lahore, Punjaub, about the year 1850.”

In conversation with Mrs. Fagan, Professor Sidgwick learnt that Mrs. Reveley did not connect the apparition of Mrs. Fagan with Captain Fagan. Mrs. Reveley, who is now living near Montreal, has been lately applied to for an independent account; but no answer has been received up to the time of going to press.

(653) From Mrs. Heckford, 6, The Crescent, Minorities, E.

“1884.

“When I was a child 6 years old, my mother died after a short illness, in Germany, and one of her two unmarried sisters came from Ireland to take charge of my two elder sisters and of me, leaving my other aunt in the country house which had for years been their home. Within a few days of a year from the death of my mother, my eldest sister, a remarkably healthy child, died of scarlatina, also in Germany. When I was a girl in my teens, my surviving sister and I were one day talking about apparitions, in the spirit of absolute disbelief in such appearances which had been carefully fostered by those who educated us, including my aunt; when, somewhat to my astonishment, she recounted to us the following story.

“One night, she said, about the time of my mother’s death, she had retired to rest, but was not asleep, when suddenly she saw the figure of my mother, attired in her usual white dressing-gown, sitting at the foot of her bed and gazing steadfastly at her. My aunt said that she was aware that, owing to the fact of my mother being delicate, and no letter having arrived very lately from Germany, she was anxious about her, and

that hence, on seeing the figure, she decided that it was the result of some mental disorder, and resolutely closed her eyes so as to avoid any further delusion. After keeping them shut for some time, she re-opened them, and found that the figure had disappeared. She said that having a horror of encouraging superstitious fancies, she took no note of the day or hour, and having resolved not to tell the sister who then lived with her, so as not to excite or frighten her, had never broken her resolution. She admitted, however, that when she heard of my mother's death a short time after, it struck her that the coincidence was remarkable.

“Many years after this conversation, when my aunt had passed away, and we two girls were living with her sister, the conversation turned upon ‘ghosts.’ The company consisted of my Aunt S., her adopted daughter (a cousin of ours), and myself. After remarking that she did not believe in ghosts, my Aunt S. told us she would recount to us a very remarkable experience she had once had. She said that one night, about the time of my mother's death, she had retired to rest, but was not asleep, when suddenly she saw my mother, in her usual white dressing-gown, sitting at the foot of her bed; that she said to the figure, ‘Oh, M., how are you?’ (or words to that effect) and that the figure replied, ‘Quite well, but I shall come back for Jane.’¹ The figure then disappeared. My Aunt S. said that she resolved not to tell her sister, for fear of exciting her, and that she had taken no note of the day or hour, not wishing to encourage a superstitious feeling; but that on hearing of my mother's death, she had been struck by the strangeness of the coincidence. Even then, she said, the words regarding my sister Jane appeared unmeaning, but were startlingly explained when the child soon followed her mother.

“My Aunt S. never recounted this experience to her sister, who thus passed away in ignorance of the phenomenon of a double apparition. Years passed without any allusion to these singular recitals between my sister, my cousin, and myself; we were thoroughly incredulous of the possibility of ‘ghosts’ in general when we heard them, and Spiritualism was to us, for long afterwards, a subject merely for mirth; neither does either my sister or my cousin profess a belief in Spiritualism now; yet they are both ready to attest the truth of my version of a story, the principal witnesses to the veracity of which have passed beyond the reach of inquiry.

“SARAH HECKFORD.

“A. GOFF [her sister, of 22, Palace Road, Upper Norwood].

“S. C. ELAND [her cousin].”

Mrs. Goff tells us that the occurrence took place at Christmas, 1845. Her impression had been that the words heard were in answer to a direct question of her aunt about the children.

§ 3. In the following far larger group the percipients were together.

(654) From Professor J. E. Carpenter, Leathes House, Fitzjohn's Avenue, N.W., an Associate of the S.P.R.

“April 6th, 1884.

“I do not know that my story is likely to be very satisfactory to you

¹ As to the interchange of remarks, see p. 460, second note.

because I am unable to give precise dates, and have no means of access to any memorandum made at the time. It is possible that an account which I wrote soon after the occurrence may be preserved [see below], and if you should desire further particulars I may be able to procure them for you.

“The manifestation took place in the early summer of 1868 or 1869, but I cannot now recall which. I lived then in lodgings in Clifton. The mistress of the house was a nervous, highly excitable woman, lame, having one leg shorter than the other. One morning, after breakfast, she appeared much excited, and then informed me that the evening before she had seen a ghost. The circumstances, as far as I recollect, were these. Miss Reed (the landlady) was standing about 7.30 in the kitchen (lighted by a window opening into a small area), in front of the kitchen fire. The maidservant was standing at the table with her back to the window, peeling some onions for my fellow-lodger’s supper. Suddenly, Miss Reed said to the girl, ‘Oh, Eliza, what’s that?’ The girl replied, ‘Please’m, I saw a man go round the table and out through the door.’ Just then the street-door bell rang. The kitchen door was closed, and had not been opened. The girl’s statement expressed exactly what Miss Reed herself had seen. When the bell rang the girl exclaimed, ‘Please, miss, I’m so frightened, I daren’t go upstairs.’ The landlady went up, and on coming down again questioned the girl about the figure. They had both seen only the upper part, above the edge of the table, and it was naked. I asked Miss Reed if it resembled anyone she knew. ‘I should have said it was like my uncle,’ she answered, ‘but he is a very stout man, and this was very thin.’ She then detailed to me another curious incident in her own life, of which I have now forgotten the particulars; but I got the impression that she was too excited to give me precise facts about remote events, though her story about the night before was quite coherent and distinct.

“The sequel was curious. Either that day, or very shortly afterwards, she was telegraphed for to go to her uncle, who was dangerously ill and had been repeatedly calling for her. At the time of the manifestation she had no idea that he was in any but his usual health. He lived, I think, at Berkeley, in Gloucestershire. She went immediately, and on her return a few days after told me what a shock she had felt, on going into the sick room, at seeing her uncle reduced to the attenuated form of the man who had presented himself in the kitchen.¹

“I have been sorry since that I did not separately question the servant, but I had reason to think her so little sensible that it did not seem worth while. It was only after Miss Reed’s return from her uncle’s sick bed that the incident seemed to have any importance.

“J. ESTLIN CARPENTER.”

In a subsequent letter, Professor Carpenter says:—

“Unfortunately no letter can be found with any account of the actual incident. All that has been discovered I have transcribed on the opposite page. The details I had quite forgotten. The passage does not say that Miss Reed went to her uncle’s house, but I feel sure that she was sum-

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 554-6.

moned thither; indeed, the particulars here recorded could hardly have been learned by her anywhere else. I fear this is a lame and impotent conclusion.

[COPY.]

“Clifton, March 12th, 1869.

“I send you the sequel of my ghost story—if it is to be considered as a sequel at all. I don't know whether I told you that I asked Miss R. if her ghostly visitor resembled anyone she knew, and she said the only one she could think of whom he was like was her uncle, but he was stout and the appearance was thin. At the end of last week she heard, unexpectedly, that her uncle a few weeks before had been taken seriously ill, that he had been exceedingly reduced, and that he was then lying at death's door. (To-day I hear that he is dead.) Further, some small property that he had he had formerly left to Miss Reed. Some little while ago, however, an aunt of Miss R.'s came to “take care of him,” and induced him to alter his will in her favour, at any rate so far as life interest was concerned. When he fell ill, he became much agitated at the injustice he thought he had done Miss R., and expressed himself with strong self-accusation, though, like many weak people, he put off a second alteration from day to day. Whether one of these fits of distress took place at the time of the so-called appearance, and there was really any connection between them, cannot now be traced, and the story must be left with its possibilities unsolved.’

“P.S.—Miss Reed gave up her house some 10 years ago or more. She was afterwards reduced to considerable distress by sickness, &c. I have certainly heard nothing of her for 8 years, and have quite lost all trace of her.”

(655) From Mrs. Mainwaring, of Knowles, Ardingly, Hayward's Heath, (the narrator of case 370,) who sent us a less detailed account in August, 1884.

“March 14th, 1885.

“My aunt, Margaret Saulez, and my mother, then Mary Saulez, slept together; and the rules of the house were strict. One most forbidden thing was noise in bedrooms, or talking after going to bed. But the two young girls one night went on chattering and laughing after they were in bed, and suddenly the door opened and my grandmother came in. She just came and looked at them sorrowfully, as if she was vexed, and without speaking left the room. I do not remember, at this moment, whether they spoke to her then; however, they felt so grieved at her look and silence that they both jumped out of bed and followed her quickly to her door, but found it locked, and she would not answer—as they thought—when they begged her to forgive them. My grandfather woke, and found her by his side in a deep swoon.¹ They sent for the doctor, and he said that he was only just in time to save her life, as she had evidently been in that state some time; and a few hours after a child was born.

“This is the story familiar to me from my mother's lips since my childhood, and I am as sure of its truth as one can be of anything one does not know oneself. The elder sister, my aunt, died soon after.

“E. L. MAINWARING.”

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 230-1 and 563, note.

[Special circumstances, which Mrs. Mainwaring has explained to us, prevent our applying to her mother for a first-hand account.]

(656) Received through the kindness of the Rev. Prebendary Sadler, Rector of Honiton. The ladies concerned in the case were his great-aunt and her daughter (who died in April, 1885). Writing in 1883, Mr. Sadler says, "I took the story from Miss F——n's own lips, questioning her closely upon it. She is as clear and fresh in mind as myself. She has a very accurate and retentive memory. I cannot say when I *first* heard the account—very many years ago." In April, 1884, he added that the account was taken down in writing "several years since."

"In the year 1819, Mrs. S——r and [her daughter] Miss F——n were going into Leeds, down St. Peter's Hill, when Mrs. S——r suddenly stopped, and pointed out to Miss F——n a man on horseback, riding quickly, a little way before them, up the hill. She exclaimed, 'There is Jonah S. ! How strange he looks ! He looks like a corpse. Ah, to think of his riding out now, when we heard yesterday that he was dying of fever !' The man then passed them on horseback without noticing them, though he was well acquainted with them. They stood still, and looked at him as he passed. His eyes looked fixed, as if, though open, they were not looking at anything. He was riding quickly. They followed him with their eyes, till they lost him at the turn of the hill some little way behind them. He had on a light-coloured drab greatcoat, which he usually wore. Miss F——n thinks that he had no hat on, but is not perfectly sure about that. They did not see him till he was nearly up to them.

"They went into the town to Mr. S——r's warehouse. Mr. S——r met them at the door, and before they could say anything to him, said, 'I have just heard that Jonah S. died at 2 o'clock to-day.' Mrs. S——r looked at her watch, and calculated that it was just at that time they saw him pass."

We requested the parish clerk at Leeds to search for the date of the death ; he wrote back implying that he had done so, but refused to send the result except in combination with other information, offered on terms which, though not unreasonable from his point of view, we could not accept.

[The case is too remote for reliance to be placed on details ; but the fact (if correctly remembered) that the ladies were astonished at seeing this particular person out riding, tells against the hypothesis of mistaken identity, in so far as it implies that they gave him more than a hasty glance.]

(657) From Mr. Leonard E. Thomas, Derrie Downs, St. Mary Cray.

"December 17th, 1883.

"A landlady of mine, Mrs. R., with whom I lived for years, and who was one of the kindest of women—a thoroughly God-fearing woman, who, I firmly believe, would scorn to invent or concoct any tale—related to me, among other very peculiar experiences, the following :—

"She was a little girl of about 11 years, when her grandfather, who lived a few streets away from them, was taken ill (I believe she said with scarlet fever), and she was not allowed to go near the house. One afternoon her grandfather (who was very fond of the child) wished to see her

very much, and she was taken to him. That night she was lying by her mother's side in bed, and the door stood ajar with a light on the landing. She was lying awake, when she heard the pat, pat, peculiar to a naked foot, ascending the stairs. The form of her grandfather entered the room, advanced to the bed, drew the curtain, and looked at them, and was gone. She was trembling violently, and clung to her mother; who had seen it too, and who said, 'Hush, child! it is only your grandfather.' Her mother then got up and struck a light, and dressed, saying, 'I fear something must have happened to your grandfather; I had better go round and see.' But the child begged her not to, as she would be frightened to death. They waited, and about three-quarters of an hour afterwards a messenger came round to bear the news of her grandfather's death, which had taken place at that precise time."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Thomas adds :—

"I found out the present address of Mrs. R., and wrote to her, asking her to be good enough to write me out an account of what she had once related to me, at the same time stating for what purpose I wished it. I extract from her reply that part of it which refers to the subject, and which runs as follows :—

"'I do not care in any way to enter into such matters. What I told you, to the best of my knowledge, is true, but undoubtedly the impression then made has been deepened by hearing mother speak of it; and I always think such things that we cannot account for in any way or understand are best let alone.'"

[Details again cannot be relied on, the narrator having been so young at the time. But the fact of the mother's subsequent references to the incident favours the supposition that she herself shared the experience, and that it was not a mere frightened dream of the child's.]

(658) From Mrs. Spenser (mentioned above, p. 575). The account was copied for us by Mrs. Saxby, of Mount Elton, Clevedon, from a private letter.

"97, Railway Street, Southport.

"September 1st, 1871.

"My sister Elizabeth had a young friend staying with her, who shared the same bed. They had ceased chatting, and were preparing for sleep, when Elizabeth touched Henriette, saying, 'Look at that beautiful light!' Henriette exclaimed, 'Very beautiful, but what is it?' Elizabeth replied, 'Oh, it is little Mary Stanger! How exquisitely beautiful. She is floating away,' and the vision passed.

"Early the next morning, she sent to Mr. Stanger's house, and learnt that the dear child had died at the exact time she had seen the vision, about 11 o'clock the previous night.

"The appearance was of the perfect child, enveloped in a soft cloud of the faintest bluish light;¹ so clear, and emitting or reflecting a light which illuminated the whole exquisitely beautiful little vision; but Elizabeth did not seem to know whether the light originated in the cloud or in the lovely little figure. Henriette saw the light clearly, as well as Elizabeth.

"LUCY SPENSER."

¹ Compare cases 210, 311, 315, and see Vol. i., p. 526, first note.

An inscription on a tombstone at Keswick shows that Mary Stanger died on May 24, 1829, aged 3 years and 8 months.

Mrs. Saxby tells us that the two percipients were the most intimate friends of the child's mother. The child was a cousin of the lady—Mrs. Browne, of Tallantire Hall, near Cockermouth—to whom Mrs. Spenser's letter was written. In conversation with Mrs. Spenser, I learnt that she herself heard of the vision on the morning after its occurrence; also that the child had been playing about the day before, and that its death was due to loss of blood after an incision necessitated by a sudden attack of croup.

[We might suppose Henriette's experience to have been due simply to Elizabeth's suggestion—which may have been the reason why Henriette saw the light and not the figure. But if she really "saw the light clearly," we should thus be crediting verbal suggestion with a larger power of evoking sensory hallucination in non-hypnotised persons than the evidence on the subject seems at all to warrant (see p. 188, and Vol. I., pp. 512-3).]

(659) From the *Theory of Pneumatology*, by Dr. Johann H. Jung Stilling (translated by S. Jackson, 1851), pp. 271-272. Stilling knew the family of the narrator well, and vouches in strong terms for their truthfulness and probity.

"My brother J. H. C. was placed by a certain reigning prince as doctor of medicine in A., and, on account of his peculiar abilities, the title of Aulic Councillor was conferred on him. He resided there about four years, towards the close of which he resolved, at the request of my late father, to return to H. . . . We ardently looked for his arrival. . . . I dreamt one night that I saw my brother on horseback, who said to me that he was on a journey; he would therefore give me several commissions to my parents. I observed that his expression of countenance appeared very strange, and asked him why he looked so blue-black in his face? on which he made answer that it was occasioned by the new cloak he had put on, which was dyed with indigo. On this he reached me his hand, but whilst giving him mine, his horse began to plunge, which terrified me, and I awoke. Not long after awaking, the door of my room opened, someone came to my bedside, and drew aside the curtains, when I perceived the natural figure of my brother in his night-gown. After standing there a few minutes, he went to the table, took up the snuffers, and let them fall, and then shut the room door again.¹ Fear, apprehension, and terror overpowered me to such a degree that I could not stay in bed any longer. I begged my eldest sister, who also witnessed this scene, to accompany me to my parents. On entering the chamber of the latter, my father was astonished, and asked me the reason of my nocturnal coming. I besought him to spare me the answer till the morrow, and only permit me to pass the night in his room, to which he assented.

"As soon as I awoke in the morning, I was called upon by my parents to relate what had happened, which my eldest sister confirmed. The circumstance seemed so remarkable to my father that he noted down the night and the hour. About three weeks afterwards my father received the melancholy intelligence of my brother's decease; when it appeared

¹ There is, of course, no reason to suppose the impression that the door and the snuffers were moved to have been anything but part of the hallucination. Cf. cases 659, 670, 676, 696, 698.

that he had died the same night, and the same hour, of an epidemic disorder, in which he had been suffocated, and his face had become quite black. In the last days of his illness he had spoken continually of his family, and had wished for nothing more ardently than to be able to speak once more with me."

[If the singular blue-black appearance of the face was really a feature of the dream, and was not "read back" into it after the truth was known, the details about the dyed cloak well illustrate the subjective and fallacious embodiment which a percipient may supply to a telepathic impression. Another instance of a waking hallucination following at some interval after a dream is case 701.]

(660) From Mr. Alfred W. Hobson, who sent the account from Cambridge, under date March 22, 1864, to the Editor of the *Spiritual Magazine*. Dr. Parkinson, of St. John's College, Cambridge, told us that he remembered Mr. Hobson, a graduate of that College, as a sensible man. The incident was related, in Mr. Hobson's presence, to the late Dr. Elliotson, by Mr. Joseph C. Robertson, Editor of the *Mechanics' Magazine*, who died, we find, in 1852. We have not been able to trace his family.

"The two brothers [*i.e.*, Mr. Robertson and a brother], both very young at the time—I forget their exact ages—were in bed together at their father's house, when they both saw the apparition of a lady to whom their father (a widower) was engaged to be married. She died suddenly that same night. The father was away from home, and not with the boys. In this case it seems as if the dying lady had been desirous of appearing to the father, and had come to his usual dwelling in the expectation of seeing him; but was disappointed, finding only his sons instead.¹

"It so happened that Mr. Robertson himself died a few months after the above dialogue, and the brother referred to in it was with me in the same mourning coach at the funeral, and confirmed the story as told by his deceased brother. The elder brother was, I believe, more alarmed at the apparition than the younger."

(661) From a relative of our energetic friend and helper, Miss Frances M. Peard, of Torquay, who procured us the account. She says that the narrator (whose name we are not at liberty to publish) "is a remarkably shrewd, sensible person."

"1883.

"In the decade of 184—, one of Her Majesty's Regiments was lying in a small town, well up in Upper Canada then, now Ontario. An officer in that regiment, a captain, had from the first shown a great regard for me, and had always been very devoted in his attentions; but though I liked him much, I could not say that I would accept him. In the spring of 184—, April, there were steeplechases got up by the garrison. Captain —, who was a splendid horseman in every way, entered his horse. I must mention that three or four years before, he had met with an accident whilst riding a race, and winning. A man rode across the course. Captain — with his horse ran against him, was thrown, his horse injured, and his own leg broken, which caused him to have a *limp* or halt in his walk; but it did not prevent him being a beautiful waltzer, and a perfect rider. He and I rode together continually, and he made me the good horsewoman I was.

¹ See p. 268.

“The day before the steeplechases above mentioned, Captain —— again spoke to me about my coldness, and told me he put his fate on this race. If he won, would I say ‘yes’; and if I decided thus, would I give him a rose I had been nursing for this occasion? I had not answered then; but if I wore my rose, and afterwards gave it to him whether he won the race or not, it would be a reply to him. Well, I wore my rose. The day was lovely. He won his race and rose and my acceptance; for I was one of a large family of daughters and my father not young, and I really liked no one better. Of course he was delighted. My mother gave a dance that evening to all our world. Captain —— engaged me for the first three waltzes, in fact for several dances, and he was to be there early. The dance began, and the dances, but my partner did not appear. I began to feel annoyed; and several of his brother officers looked at each other smiling and began making jokes, &c. I said to mamma, ‘How odd it is; he has never done such a thing before,’ when I *saw him walk into the drawing-room*, which was the ball-room, in his shell-jacket. The other officers were in full dress as usual for balls, but he appeared in his usual shell-jacket, mess-dress, with my rose in his buttonhole. He walked across the room. I looking at him, he gave me a serious, earnest, yet devoted and constant regard. He walked across the room in front of me, went towards the window, and turned and went back out of the door, always the limp, and the earnest steady regard. A waltz then began. I waited for him; he never came. Mamma said, ‘How strange.’ I went to the other rooms. No partner there; he was not to be seen anywhere. One or two others saw, Colonel W., Colonel T.,¹ and one or two of his brother officers. It spoiled my evening. Somehow I cared not to dance, and felt low and depressed and hurt.

“Next morning, whilst we were at breakfast, papa came rushing in, looking anxious and alarmed. He turned to me and said, ‘S., did you not say Captain —— was here last night? You saw him.’ Mamma and I both said, ‘Yes, certainly. He came into the drawing-room, walked across to the window, his usual limp, and gave me such a serious look.’ We sprang up and said, ‘Why do you ask?’ I knew something had happened. Papa said, ‘He has not been in barracks all night. He rode out towards B—— bridge to a farm about 5 p.m. His horse came back about 12 p.m., saddle soaked, and horse terrified.’ Of course the whole garrison turned out, and a general search was made. He was not found until the second day, in the river. The flap of an overcoat showed where the body was. He had put on his shell-jacket before starting, intending to return late for mess. My rose was still in his buttonhole, and it was buried with him. He came home, or intended doing so, by a deep ford, but the river had risen suddenly, as it sometimes did. He was very late, and he tried no doubt to swim the river, but did not succeed. It was supposed the horse became frightened and knocked him on the forehead, as there was a mark. His watch had stopped at about 10.15 p.m. Our parties began always at 9 p.m., and closed at 1.30 a.m. He came, I seriously believe, to keep his engagement to me, and to have his last long look of one he so loved; for he did so far more than I deserved.

¹ These gentlemen are now dead. Their names were communicated to us, and we have traced them in the Army List. The former was Deputy-Adjutant General in Canada from 1843 onwards.

“This is, I am glad to say, the only ghostly adventure I have ever had. I am most matter-of-fact, and by no means subject to hallucinations of any kind. On the contrary, I do not easily believe anything. That was the only time in all my life that I ever had such a vision; and nothing on earth will ever make me believe that his spirit¹ did not come to see me that evening and to keep his engagement with me—the peculiar limp, the sad expression he rather had at all times, and the little crimson monthly rose.

“My sister A. remembers it. My mother always said how odd and unaccountable it was. Colonel T., who is dead, never got over it. It gave him a shudder even to speak of it. ‘Bedad! I don’t like ghosts!’ he often said.”

We have obtained from the Chief Librarian of the Toronto Public Library a certified extract from the *Toronto Examiner* of May 26, 1841, giving an account of Lieut. (not Capt.)² W.’s death which differs from the above in stating that his horse and dog returned to a farm-house near the river “about 20 minutes after” 5 o’clock, when he had been last seen, and “were brought into the town next day.” He must therefore have been drowned soon after 5. The detail about his watch stopping at 10.15 is thus probably incorrect, and the closeness of the coincidence has been exaggerated.

(662) From an informant who desires that her name may be suppressed, on account of the painful nature of the main incident. She is a very reasonable and respectable woman, who expresses a strong contempt for superstition, and is very sensible of the exaggeration and delusion which enter into the vulgar beliefs in “supernatural” occurrences.

“1883.

“When I was a young girl, I resided with my father, mother, sister (named Ellen), and brother, at Clapham. My sister was in love with a man, but my father and mother disapproved of the attachment, and sent her to a friend in Brighton, to be out of the way. One evening during her absence, between 6 and 7 o’clock, my mother and brother were talking in the garden, at the back of the house. There was a wall at the bottom of the garden, and a gate, leading into a large enclosed space used for drilling, &c.; this enclosure was locked in the evening, and was certainly locked at the time in question. It was dusk, but not dark. My brother John (a very active boy, but who happened to have just sprained his ankle) looked over the wall, and suddenly exclaimed, ‘Mother, there’s Ellen!’ My mother looked, saw, and recognised the figure of my sister, and said, ‘John, go quick, and tell her to come in. Don’t say anything to your father.’ John replied, ‘I can’t because of my foot; call Mary.’ Mother then called me, and whispered, ‘There’s Ellen; go and tell her to come in; her father shall not know anything about her coming back.’ My mother’s idea was to get her quietly into the house, and send her away again next day. I at once went through the garden-gate, and gave her the message. I particularly noticed her dress, a dark blue pelisse, buttoned, and the ribbon on her bonnet. A path led through the enclosure to the outside gate, and she kept receding from me along this path, while

¹ See p. 48, note.

² The Chief Librarian writes (Aug. 26, 1886), “*Captain* is so common an appellation in the country parts that the officer would most likely be addressed and known as such among the ordinary people.”

I followed more and more quickly, my mother and John watching us. There was a deep dip in the path, and here I overtook her and tried to catch hold of her, but seemed to catch nothing. She still receded, and at last stood by the watch-box, close to the gate; and here I repeated the message to her, but as she made no answer, I went back.¹ My mother said, 'Why, where's Ellen?' I said, 'I left her by the gate.' My mother replied, 'But you caught hold of her.' 'Yes,' I said, 'but I did not seem to feel anything in my hand.'

"My mother turned very pale, and went into the house and told my father, and both of them felt a conviction that some calamity had happened. The next day the news came that my sister had thrown herself into the sea and been drowned a little before 7 o'clock on the preceding evening. This is the only occasion on which I have ever seen an apparition."

[This is a case where it is specially important to distinguish the central fact of a coincidence, which may be regarded as probably telepathic, from the details which may have been subsequently imagined or exaggerated. Even if the report is substantially correct, we have no proof that the hallucination was spontaneously collective; in the uncertain light, it may possibly have been produced in the second and third percipients by the suggestion of the first.]

(663) From Mr. C. Colchester, Bushey Heath, Herts.

"1882.

"Forty-two or three years ago, my father was with a detachment of his regiment, the Royal Artillery, stationed at Montreal, Canada. He had left his mother some months before in England, in an indifferent state of health. One evening he was sitting at his desk, writing to her, when my mother, looking up from her work, was startled to see *his* mother looking over his shoulder, seemingly intent on the letter. My mother gave a cry of alarm, and on my father turning round the apparition vanished.² On the same evening I and my brother (aged about 6 and 5 years) were in bed, watching the bright moonlight, when suddenly we saw a figure, a lady with her hands folded on her breast—neither looking to right nor left, but with her eyes cast down in meditation, the head slightly bent forward—walking slowly between the bed and the window, backwards and forwards. She wore a cap with a frill tied under her chin, and a dressing-gown of the appearance of white flannel, her white hair being neatly arranged. She continued to walk, it seemed to me, fully 5 minutes, and then was gone. We did not cry out, and were not even alarmed, but after her disappearance we said to each other, 'What a nice kind lady!' and then went to sleep."

The children mentioned what they had seen to their mother next morning, but were told not to talk about it. The news of their grandmother's death on that same evening arrived a few weeks afterwards.

"I may add," Mr. Colchester concludes, "that neither I nor my

¹ This long pursuit of the phantasmal figure has occasional parallels in cases of purely subjective hallucination. See, *e.g.*, Vol. i., p. 499, note; and compare the case on p. 630.

² See p. 91, second note. Mr. Colchester believes, however, that his father saw the apparition.

brother had ever seen our grandmother until that evening, nor knew of what my mother had seen till years after. The apparition I saw is as palpably before me now as it was 40 years since."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death occurred on March 31, 1840.

[Mr. Colchester tells us, in answer to the question whether he believes his own remembrance to have been unbroken, that "the occurrence was not wholly or even partially revived by my mother"; and that the vision is unique in his experience. But his extreme youth at the time makes his first-hand recollection extremely doubtful. This objection does not apply to his evidence as to his parents' share in the affair. If the facts are correctly reported, this case belongs to the former group, of cases where the percipients were apart, as much as to the present one.]

(664) From Mr. E. Butler, 7, Park Square, Leeds.

"October, 1884.

"During my clerkship I resided in lodgings, with a kind-hearted Christian woman of great simplicity of character and reliable veracity. I heard from her this story.

"Her brother was engaged in the wine trade, and spent a great part of his time in Portugal and Spain. His two children were left in Leeds. I am not sure whether their mother was living, but they were frequently, if not altogether, at their aunt's. One day the two children were in the back sitting-room along with their aunt, and one or two besides (I believe their cousins). It is the room I very shortly afterwards lived in. The children simultaneously cried out, 'Oh! there's papa! gone upstairs.' They were laughed at, and chidden, but persisted, and the search had to be made. Nothing was discovered. It was afterwards found by the testimony of the papa himself, that exactly at that time when the children saw him he had fallen into the Douro, and was in that stage of singular experience before death by drowning when 'all the life seems mapped out before the spirit,' and the soul is just on the point of parting from the body. I do not recollect whether he said that he had specially thought of his children in that supreme moment. Insensibility followed; but he was rescued, not too late for restoration.

"EDWARD BUTLER."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Butler says:—

"With regard to your inquiry, I fear I should have some difficulty now in getting any corroboration of my communication respecting my old landlady, though my own remembrance of her communication is too vivid to admit of the possibility of mistake. It was told me in the room, my own room, where it occurred, with finger pointing to the passage and staircase. Her name was Mrs. Booth; the house, No. 7, Grove Terrace, Leeds: the absentee in Spain, her own brother, William Wild; of the children, his daughters, every one I believe is dead. The daughters left Leeds many years ago, and I believe I am right that they are neither of them living."

(665) From Mr. Beresford Christmas, Carrara, Italy.

"November 30th, 1885.

"My father, George Beresford Christmas, was a cavalry officer in the Danish service; his elder and only brother, John Christmas, an admiral

in the same service. The latter's only son, Walter Christmas, was, and is still for aught I know to the contrary, one of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber to the King of Denmark. The circumstance I am about to relate took place before my father's marriage, when he was yet a young man and living with my grandfather in Copenhagen—it must have been somewhere about 1825. Admiral C. had sailed for St. Thomas, and my father accompanied him, leaving my grandfather in his usual health in Denmark. The two brothers occupied the same cabin, across which, for the sake of coolness on entering the tropics, a couple of cots had been slung parallel to each other. They were within a few days' sail of the island; the sea calm, the sky clear, and, on the night in question, a bright moonlight pouring in through the widely-opened cabin windows, lighting up all within with almost the distinctness of daylight. Both brothers must have been awaked suddenly and simultaneously—by what, they never knew—by some irresistible and unknown power—waked to see standing between their cots the figure of their father. Both gazed in mute amazement: there it stood, motionless for a moment, which seemed a century; then it raised one hand and pointed to its own eyes. They were closed. My father started up in bed, and as he did so the form vanished. So much was my uncle impressed with the fact that he *at once* entered it, with date and moment of appearance, in the log-book; while naturally the circumstance became the all-absorbing topic of conversation and speculation to all on board.

“When later letters reached them in the West Indies, the hour and minute, allowing of course for difference of time, were found to coincide exactly with those in which my grandfather had died.

“In due time the circumstance was known to all Copenhagen. Neither my uncle nor father ever liked to speak about it. I have had the fact from the lips of both. Both firmly believed in the reality of the vision, and neither of them was the man to give heed or credence to an idle delusion. I remember both, in answer to a question of mine, declaring to having felt no fear, or even awe: sudden wonder and an unaccountable chill, as of an icy atmosphere,¹ was the predominating impression. It was only when the figure pointed to its own closed eyes, that a dumb dread of impending bereavement awoke. My father, as also my uncle, used to affirm that neither on the evening in question nor upon any of the previous days had their father been particularly the subject of either their conversation or thoughts. There was no preparation, so to say, on their part for the apparition; at the same instant both were suddenly awake from sleep by some mysterious and irresistible will, when both beheld the identical form standing within arm's length of them.

“I have no doubt, if you have among your correspondents or members anyone in Copenhagen willing to take the trouble, you might be able to get at the entry made in the log-book.² My uncle was on active service till his death almost, which took place only a few years ago, and there could be no difficulty in tracing back the vessels he commanded.

“BERESFORD CHRISTMAS.”

¹ See p. 37, note.

² Unfortunately we have no Danish members. I have mentioned (in Vol. i., p. 161) the great tendency of *log-books* to creep unauthorised into second-hand narratives of this sort; but the essential trustworthiness of the account does not, of course, depend on that detail.

The next case, if telepathically originated, is an interesting instance of the appearance of a phantasm to certain percipients on local, not personal, grounds (p. 268).

(666) From Miss Edith Farquharson, sent to us by her relative, Mrs. Murray Aynsley, of Great Brampton, near Hereford.

“June, 1885.

“In the year 1868, No. 9, Drummond Place, Edinburgh, was in the occupation of Mr. Farquharson, formerly a Judge of the High Court in Jamaica. On the night of Good Friday in that year, two of his daughters, Miss Edith Farquharson, her sister Marianne [now Mrs. Henry Murray], and a little cousin, Agnes Spalding, aged 6 years, were sleeping in a room at the top of the house. About 11.45 p.m., the two sisters were awakened by hearing loud screams from the child, who was sleeping on a mattress placed on the floor beside their bed. The mattress was against the door leading into a dressing-room; this door was locked and sealed with white tapes and black wax; it had been thus closed by a member of the family to whom the house belonged before Mr. Farquharson entered upon his tenancy. The death of the head of the family, and the delicacy of health of one of the daughters, had caused them to wish to leave Edinburgh, and spend the winter in Torquay.

“On hearing the child’s screams of terror, Miss M. F. touched her sister and said, ‘Do you hear the child screaming?’ Miss E. F. replied that she did, and turned her head round to listen better. When the child was asked what she was screaming about, she said, ‘I am wide awake, and I have seen a figure which was leaning over me,’ and when further questioned where the figure went to, said, ‘Round the side of your bed.’

“Miss E. F., when she turned round, saw a figure slide from near the child’s bed and pass along the foot of the bed whereon she and her sister were. (At the first moment she thought it was a thief.) The latter, on hearing her say in French ‘*Il y a quelqu’un,*’ was so terrified that she hid her head under the bedclothes.

“Miss E. F. describes the figure as being dressed in a rough brown shawl held tightly round the bust, a wide brimmed hat, and a veil. When the child was questioned afterwards she gave the same account of the costume.

“Miss E. F. says that after passing along the foot of the bed with a noiseless gliding motion, the figure disappeared into the darkness.

“Except the door which was locked and sealed, the only door of exit to the room was one which was quite close to the bed; at right angles with the door and with the head of the bed was a large hanging cupboard.

“Both the ladies got up instantly. They found the door of their room closed, as they had left it. Their brother’s room was next to theirs; they knocked at his door to rouse him, at the same time keeping a sharp look-out on the door of their own room to see that no one escaped. The whole party then made a thorough search in the room and cupboard, found nothing disturbed, and once more retired to rest. The next morning the page-boy said that he had been unable to sleep all night on account of the sounds he heard of someone scratching at his window. He declared that he had shied all his boots and everything he could lay hold of in the direction whence the noise came, but without effect. He could stand it

no longer, and went to the room where some of the women-servants slept, begging to be let in. They had heard nothing, however, though they, like himself, slept in the basement of the house.

"The whole family were hardly assembled on the Saturday morning, when the son-in-law of the late owner of the house arrived, and asked to see Mr. Farquharson. He wished particularly to know exactly what day this gentleman and his family intended leaving the house, (their term would expire the following week,) for he had just received a telegram informing him that his sister-in-law had died that night, and they were anxious to bring her body there immediately for burial."

(With respect to this last paragraph, the narrator's father writes :—

"The above is a correct statement of the occurrence.

"C. M. FARQUHARSON.")

Miss Farquharson continues :—

"The possible solution of what we presume to have been an apparition of this lady is, that the bedroom occupied by the Misses Farquharson being the one she habitually used, in her dying moments she desired to visit it once more, or else that there was something in the dressing-room which she particularly wished for.

"EDITH A. FARQUHARSON."

The following independent account is from Mrs. Murray :—

"Cobo, Guernsey.

"June 24th, 1885.

"Our home was in Perthshire ; but in the winter of 1868 my father took a house for four months in Drummond Place, No. 8, [19] in Edinburgh, in order to give us a change. The house belonged to General Stewart, who had a delicate daughter, and he let it, to take the daughter to Torquay for the winter. We did not know the Stewarts, so our imagination could not have assisted in any way to account for the curious apparition that was seen. I myself did not *see* it,¹ but I was in the room with my sister and little cousin, who both did. My belief is that Providence prevented my seeing it, as I am of a very nervous temperament, and it might have had a very bad effect on me if I had. Well, the apparition took place on Good Friday night, at about 12 o'clock. This little cousin, who was only about 6 years old, had come into town from the country, and as our house was very full she had a shake-down beside our bed on my side. I was the first to be awakened by hearing her calling out in a frightened way. So I said, 'What is the matter, Addie?' 'Oh,' she said, 'Cousin Marianne, I am so frightened. A figure has been leaning over me, and whenever I put out my hands to push it off it leant back on your bed!' At this I was alarmed and awoke my sister, who lifted her head from her pillow and looked up, when she saw a figure gliding across the foot of our bed wrapped in a shawl, with a hat and veil on. She whispered to me in French '*Il y a quelqu'un,*' thinking it was a thief, whereat we both jumped out of bed together and went to the next room to get our brother, Captain Farquharson. His bedroom door had a shaky lock which made a noise, so he had barricaded it with a portmanteau. While he was coming to our help, we kept our eyes fixed on our door in case anyone should have escaped, but we saw nothing, and after our all

¹ Compare case 684, and see p. 105, second note.

searching every corner of the bedroom we came to the conclusion that no one had been there, for everything was intact. We then questioned little Addie as to what she had seen and what the figure was like. She described it as that of a lady with a shawl on and a hat, and a veil over her face, and said that as I spoke she had gone across the foot of the bed in the same direction that my sister had seen her go. This child, I must tell you, had been most carefully brought up by her mother, and was not allowed to read even fairy tales for fear of having foolish ideas in her head, which makes the thing more remarkable, for she had certainly never heard of a ghost. I don't know even now whether she knows anything about it, for we had to pretend that it must have been my eldest sister who had come in to play us a trick, for fear of frightening her.

"Then the next morning we were relating our adventures, when a ring came to the door, and the servant said a gentleman wanted to speak to my father. This gentleman was a Mr. Findlay, who had married a Miss Stewart. He came to ask when we were to leave, for he knew it was about the time, as he had received a telegram that morning to say that Miss Stewart had died in Torquay during the night, and they wanted to bring her body to Edinburgh. We heard afterwards from friends of the Stewarts that the bedroom we had had been hers. I forgot to mention that the child's bed lay across the door of a small room which had been locked up by the Stewarts, and they had put tapes across and sealed them with black wax.

"We have none of us ever had any hallucinations either before or after this strange affair.

"MARIANNE MURRAY."

We find from the *Scotsman* and the *Edinburgh Courant* that Miss Stewart died on April 11, 1868, the day following Good Friday. If the death took place in the course of a few hours after midnight, "during the night" would of course be the natural expression.

Mrs. Brietzke, of 72, Sterndale Road, W., after reading this account in the *Journal* of the S.P.R., wrote to us as follows, on Sept. 29, 1885:—

"I was very intimate with two Misses Myers; and within a day or two of their cousins', the Misses Farquharson, having the experience related, they (the Misses Myers) told me the affair, just as related in the *Journal*; and they also, I understood, had seen Boyd (2, York Place, Edinburgh), the house-agent, and heard that the description of the lady in the large hat and veil was exactly like the lady to whom the house belonged. The Misses Myers were much impressed. The elder is dead; the other married a Mr. Dunlop, and went to India; I have lost sight of her.

"H. K. BRIETZKE."

Mrs. Murray confirms the fact that her cousins, the Misses Myers, were informed of the vision very soon after its occurrence, and adds:—"I do not think any of us mentioned it to Mr. Boyd; he may have heard it from someone else, for it caused quite a sensation in Edinburgh. I have no reason to believe that the dress of the figure was in any way characteristic of Miss Stewart."¹

¹ A narrative somewhat resembling this was given in *Tinsley's Magazine* for December, 1873, in connection with a family named Fitzgerald, alleged to have resided at Ballyreina, in Ireland. We have not been able to trace the writer of this paper, or to discover any place called Ballyreina. There is a village in Ireland called Ballyraine; but we cannot find that any family of the name of Fitzgerald has been connected with it.

[The resemblance of the figure seen to the lady who died is entirely problematic. It might almost have been foretold as certain that the resemblance would form a prominent item in any third-hand version of the occurrence.]

(667) From the *Methodist Magazine* for March, 1819, p. 208,—a letter to the Editor.

“Rochester, February 4th, 1818.

“SIR,—At the Sheffield Conference of 1817, when examining the young men in the public congregation, I was greatly surprised by the extraordinary declaration of one of the preachers. The effect his narrative produced upon the audience induced me to request him to commit to paper what he had so distinctly detailed. As it contains a well-authenticated account of what infidelity has affected to deny, and many well-informed Christians receive with suspicion and doubt, your insertion of his letter to me will at least afford some further evidence on a question which is of such high interest and importance to the world.

“I. GAULTER.”

“Sheffield.

“8th August, 1817.

“MR. PRESIDENT,—HON. SIR,—According to your desire I take up my pen, to give you the particulars of a *solemn fact*, which was the first grand means of leading my mind seriously to think of those solemn realities—death, judgment, and eternity.

¶ “A sister being married to a gentleman in the army, we received intelligence that the regiment to which he belonged had orders for one of the Spanish Isles (Minorca). One night (16 years back) about 10 o'clock, as his wife, his child, an elder sister, and myself (a boy of nine years) were sitting in a back room, the shutters were closed, bolted, and barred, the yard-door locked, when suddenly a light shone through the window, the shutters, the bars, illumined the room we sat in.¹ We looked—started—and beheld the *spirit*² of a *murdered brother*; his eye was fixed on his wife and child alternately; he waved his hand, smiled, continued about half a minute, then vanished from our sight. The moment before the spirit disappeared, my sister cried, ‘*He’s dead; he’s dead*’; and fainted away. Her little boy ran to his father’s spirit, and wept because it would not stay. A short time after this, we received a letter from the colonel of the regiment sealed with black (the dark emblem of mortality), bearing the doleful but expected news, that on such a night (the same on which we saw his spirit) my brother-in-law was found weltering in his blood (in returning from the mess-room); the spark of life was not quite out. The last wish he was heard to breathe was to see his wife and child; it was granted him in a certain sense, for the very hour he died in the Island of Minorca, that same hour (according to the very little difference of clocks) his spirit appeared to his wife, his child, an elder sister, and myself, in Doncaster. . . .

“I am, Sir, yours obediently,

“THOS. SAVAGE.”

¹ This case should be added to the list given in Vol. i., p. 551, second note, of examples where the phantasm has included a marked appearance of luminosity.

² See p. 48, note.

“P.S.—My sister, from the night she saw the spirit of her husband, *mourned* him as dead, nor could my father prevent it by any argument. He endeavoured to persuade us we were all deceived, yet he acknowledged the testimony which the child gave *staggered him*; but when the letter arrived from the colonel of the regiment, with the awful tidings, he was *struck dumb*. My two sisters are yet living and can testify to the truth of this account, and at least one hundred persons beside our own family can prove our mentioning *the hour the spirit appeared*, several weeks before we received the melancholy letter, and that the letter mentioned the hour and night he died as the same in which we beheld his spirit. “T. S.”

Mr. Savage wrote a precisely concordant account¹ (of which we have a copy) for the Rev. R. Pilter, whose daughter writes as follows on the subject to our friend, the Rev. J. A. Macdonald:—

“Doncaster.

“December 17th, 1885.

“DEAR MR. MACDONALD,—My father, the Rev. R. Pilter, heard Mr. Savage relate a curious fact at the Conference when he was received into ‘full connexion.’ Mr. Savage said that as a youth he had been sceptically inclined,² but that the circumstance related had led to his conversion. My father was so much interested that he requested Mr. Savage to write down the narrative for him. He did so. The paper which you have accurately copied was the result; it was carefully preserved, and fell into my hands at my father’s death.

“The Rev. H. Hastling, who lived in Doncaster 50 years ago, remembers the tale very well. His recollection agrees exactly with the narrative you have copied. The sister’s husband was supposed to have been murdered in mistake for somebody else, or else by someone who had a grudge against him. Mr. Hastling says the scene was a house in St. George’s Gate, pulled down a few years ago.

“Yours very truly,

“J. M. PILTER.”

§ 4. In the following group of cases, it is more doubtful whether the experience recorded should be ascribed to the agency of the person whom the phantasm represented. If not, they are simply examples of transferred hallucinations of subjective origin, and as such their position in this book has been sufficiently explained (pp. 183, 189-92). The first three examples are (except in the fact of being collective) parallel to the “arrival cases” of Chap. XIV., § 7.

(668) From *The Journal of Mental Science*, for April, 1880, p. 151.

The editor writes, on Feb. 12, 1880:—

“We have received the following letter from a physician, narrating two psychological experiences, in one of which another element enters,

¹ This account adds the detail that the name of the colonel of the regiment was Hebborn. We cannot verify this detail without a more extensive search than the War Office authorities will permit. The English withdrew from Minorca in 1802, having been in occupation there for a few years. This agrees with Mr. Savage’s statement.

² As Mr. Savage was only 9 at the time of the occurrence, he probably did not use exactly this phrase.

namely, an external event coincident with the subjective impression. Had our correspondent been expected by his family at the time, the explanation of 'expectant attention' in an abnormal condition of the nervous system might have sufficed, if it be admitted that two persons can, through this cause, have optical illusions at the same moment. Whether in such cases mere coincidence is a sufficient solution, or whether the two circumstances stand in any causal relation, must be decided by such an accumulation of evidence as would render the first hypothesis untenable."

"February 12th, 1880.

"MY DEAR DR. TUKE,—Although the following circumstance is not exactly similar in kind to that related by Dr. Jessopp, you may like to make use of it. At any rate, it is at your service, and you may rely upon its being quite accurate. One day, some years ago, two of my female relations were looking out of a window in Greenwich just opposite the hospital, and both saw, or thought they saw, me pass and look in. One of them ran immediately to the door, but to her astonishment could see no one either up or down the street. At this time I was not expected, being, as all my family supposed, in Paris. But within a quarter of an hour I arrived at Greenwich. When I did enter, I was called to account for the practical joke I was supposed to have played upon my relations, by peeping in at the window and then concealing myself, and it was with some difficulty I convinced them that I had come straight to the house.

"Some years after this, my wife and daughter (not the relations referred to previously) were sitting in the dining-room, when they both saw an old lady enter at the gate, and walk up the steps leading to the front door of the house. My wife said to her daughter, 'What can bring old Mrs. C. out in such a flood of rain? Run and open the door, that she may not have to wait for the servant to answer the bell.' On opening the door, there was no one there, nor in the garden. Some other curious things of the same character have occurred; but as the illusion affected only a single person, I refrain from mentioning them, as they might arise from the physical condition of the parties concerned, which could hardly, I think, be the case with the others.—Very sincerely yours,

"M. D."

In answer to inquiries, Dr. Hack Tuke writes to us:—

"Lyndon Lodge, Hanwell, W.

"January 29th, 1885.

"'M. D.' died some while ago. His name was Dr. Boase, long respected as a physician at Falmouth. He retired to Plymouth, where he took an active part in the Irvingite Church to which he belonged.

"He was altogether reliable, and I have no reason to doubt the correctness of the facts narrated.

"D. H. TUKE."

[These incidents, if correctly recorded, do not look like mistakes of identity. If (as may be guessed from "M.D.'s" final sentence) either of the percipients in the second case had on other occasions experienced purely subjective hallucinations, the fact would be of interest as favouring the view that the vision of Mrs. C. originated subjectively in one of the two minds.]

(669) From Mrs. Sturge, 2, Midland Road, Gloucester.

“Nov. 26, 1884.

“When residing in Montserrat, West Indies, in or about the year 1858, I was on a visit to some friends in the principal town of Antigua. One evening Mr. George Habershon, a gentleman who boarded with the family, but lodged in another part of the town, remained rather late; Mrs. Burns, the lady of the house, retired, leaving her daughters, to one of whom Mr. Habershon was engaged, and a young lady named Minnie Anderson, and myself downstairs. The evening was a beautiful moonlight one. As soon as Mr. Habershon left, a servant passed through the room in which we were sitting and fastened the outer door, leading from the verandah into the street, passing into the house after he had done so. Soon after Minnie uttered an exclamation. I looked up and saw Mr. H., or what appeared to be him, entering the room from the verandah, and I said, ‘Mr. Habershon!’ Minnie said, ‘Yes.’ None of the others in the room saw him. The apparition disappeared almost immediately. We were somewhat startled at his unexpected reappearance, and searched about and looked down the road (it was bright moonlight, as mentioned before), but could see no one, nor could we understand how he could have got in, as the outer door was locked.

“When our hostess heard of the matter in the morning she was much annoyed, and on Mr. Habershon’s arrival to breakfast, she spoke to him about having come back, frightening the girls. He declared he had not done so, but said that on his way home he had thought of returning to ask for a piece of meat for the dogs, a thing which he had done more than once before, and that he stood in the road considering whether or no he should do so, deciding in the negative because he thought we should laugh at him, as he often did come back. I suppose he appeared to Minnie and myself at the time he was considering whether or no he should return.

“I regret to say most of those who were present in that room, as well as Mr. Habershon, are now no more, but I believe I have correctly narrated the facts. The only survivor is now the wife of Justice Semper, a judge in the Supreme Court of the Leeward Isles. I may add that Mr. Habershon was a much esteemed young Englishman, whose veracity could be entirely depended upon.

“ANNIE STURGE.”

Mrs. Semper sends us the following independent account, from which it appears that she was not herself present at the time.

“St. Kitts.

“20th April, 1886.

“The incident to which you refer took place in the house of my father, Mr. Burns. I was not present, but the strange tale was told to me, and I am very pleased to tell you all I know about it, in accordance with your request. The facts, as well as I can call them to mind, are these. Mr. George Habershon spent the evening with my family. On his leaving, all the members of it retired to rest with the exception of my sister (since dead) and her friend Mrs. Sturge; the two girls remained in the drawing-room, which was still brightly lighted. To their surprise they became aware that Mr. Habershon had come back, and was standing at one of the entrance doors, gazing at them. They pretended not to see him; but on his keeping his statue-like position, they got so curious to know why

he had returned that one of them asked what he wanted. They received no reply, and on advancing to where he stood, he disappeared. Imagining he was playing them a trick, they searched about the verandah; they then watched the street up which he had to go to get to his lodgings—and it being a bright, moonlight night, every object would be seen distinctly. He, however, was not there.

“Next day, on their asking Mr. Habershon how he managed to elude them, he professed perfect ignorance of what they were talking about. Later on, my mother, who thought he had mystified the girls enough, privately asked him to set the matter at rest by explaining it. Mr. Habershon assured her that he had not come back. He said he had had a strong and almost irresistible *wish* to do so, that he had turned and walked a few steps, and then, thinking by that time the door would be shut, he retraced his steps and went home. Mr Habershon’s denial could not be doubted by any one who knew him.

“I may as well mention that Mr. Habershon was engaged to be married to my sister, and the reason he wished to return to the house was that he had not quite understood something she wished done.

“MINNIE SEMPER [*née* BURNS].”

[It will be seen that Mrs. Semper represents her sister, and not Minnie Anderson, as the second percipient. After a conversation with Mrs. Sturge, I feel no doubt that *her* version is the correct one. The discrepancies between the two accounts can scarcely be held to affect the central fact described.]

(670) From Dr. Wyld, 41, Courtfield Road, S.W.

“December, 1882.

“Miss L. and her mother were for 15 years my most intimate friends; they were ladies of the highest intelligence, and perfectly truthful, and their story was confirmed by one of the servants; the other servant I could not trace.

“Miss L., some years before I made her acquaintance, occupied much of her time in visiting the poor. One day, as she walked homewards, she felt cold and tired, and longed to be at home, warming herself at the kitchen fire. At or about the minute corresponding to this wish, the two servants being in the kitchen, the door-handle was seen to turn, the door opened,¹ and in walked Miss L., and going up to the fire she held out her hands and warmed herself, and the servants saw she had a pair of *green* kid gloves on her hands. She suddenly disappeared before their eyes, and the two servants in great alarm went upstairs and told the mother what they had seen, including the *green* kid gloves. The mother feared something was wrong, but she attempted to quiet the servants by reminding them that Miss L. always wore black and never green gloves, and that therefore the ‘ghost’ could not have been that of her daughter.

“In about half-an-hour the veritable Miss L. entered the house, and going into the kitchen warmed herself by the fire; and she had on a pair of *green* kid gloves which she had bought on her way home, not being able to get a suitable black pair.

“G. WYLD, M.D.”

The Rev. W. Stainton Moses writes :—

¹ See p. 612, note.

“ 21, Birchington Road, N.W., January 31st, 1883.

“ I have heard the story of Miss L. from her mother. It is, as far as my memory serves, recounted here with perfect accuracy. Both the ladies mentioned were intimately known to me, and entirely to be trusted.
“ W. STANTON MOSES.”

[This case, it will be seen, does not depend on the testimony of the servants, but on that of Mrs. L., whose character for truthfulness is vouched for by two gentlemen who knew her intimately. The point as to the longing to be “ warming herself at the kitchen fire ” is, however, one very likely to have been imagined or exaggerated ; even supposing that it was genuinely remembered, the “ minute corresponding ” to it is not likely to have been afterwards ascertainable, though very likely indeed to be *inferred* as that of the apparition ; and it is impossible to be sure that the green gloves were mentioned before the reality of their existence was known ; so that Miss L.’s agency cannot be confidently assumed.]

The next two cases resemble Nos. 328 and 329, the state of the person whose phantasm appeared presenting nothing which could be supposed to be a distinctive condition of telepathic agency.

(671) From Dr. Buchanan (late H.E.I.C.S. Bengal Establishment), 12, Rutland Square, Edinburgh. All the percipients are dead, except one, who is inaccessible. Among them were Dr. Buchanan’s late wife, and her parents.

“The following circumstance took place at a villa about one and a-half miles from Glasgow, and was told me by my wife. Of its truth I am as certain as if I had been a witness. The house had a lawn in front, of about three or four acres in extent, with a lodge at the gate very distinctly seen from the house, which was about 80 yards distant. Two of the family were going to visit a friend seven miles distant, and on the previous day it had been arranged to take a lady, Miss W., with them, who was to be in waiting at a place about a mile distant. Three of the family and a lady visitor were standing at one of the dining-room windows waiting for the carriage, when they, including my wife, saw Miss W. open the gate at the lodge. The wind had disarranged the front of a pelisse which she wore, which they distinctly saw her adjust. She wore a light grey-coloured beaver hat, and had a handkerchief at her mouth ; it was supposed that she was suffering from toothache, to which she was subject. She entered the lodge, to the surprise of her friends, and as she did not leave it, a servant was sent to ask her to join the family ; but she was informed that Miss W. had not been there, and it was afterwards ascertained that no one, except the woman’s husband, had been in the lodge that morning.

“The carriage arrived at the house about 10 a.m., and Miss W. was found at the place agreed upon in the dress in which she appeared at the lodge, and suffering from toothache. As she was a nervous person, nothing was said to her of her appearance at the gate. She died nine years afterwards.
“ W.M. M. BUCHANAN, M.D.”

Dr. Buchanan wrote, on 30th Oct., 1883, to say that he had just been staying with relatives of his late wife, who had often heard the story from her, and confirmed it in every detail, except that it was a *white*

beaver hat. He adds that "those who witnessed the fact are quite matter-of-fact people, not in the slightest degree excitable, and most certainly not nervous."

[The fact of the figure's seeming to enter the lodge, as to which Dr. Buchanan is quite positive, favours the hypothesis of hallucination, as against that of mistaken identity.]

(672) From Mrs. Bevan, Plumpton House, Bury St. Edmunds.

"1884.

"In the month of July, 1855, I was spending a week with my brother, the Rector of Chedburgh, and his sweet young wife, when one evening, after the children had gone to bed, and we were all three sitting together, my brother said, 'Cecilia and I have often wanted to ask you whether you were thinking of us in any special way on the 15th of last November?'

"After a few minutes' consideration, I could only say that I remembered nothing of the sort, as there was no special cause for it at that time, and begged to know why they asked.

"My brother then said that on the morning of that day, which of course they specially noted, he awoke while the night-light was still burning, between 6 and 7 o'clock, and opening his eyes, he distinctly saw me standing at the foot of the bed, on his wife's side of it. After watching me for a short time with some wonder, but with no sensation of fear, he reached out his hand and touched his wife, saying, 'Cecilia, are you awake?' 'Yes, I have been awake some minutes.' 'Do you see anything?' 'Yes, I see Sarah standing at the foot of the bed.' 'How very strange!' and while they spoke to each other, the furniture of the room was seen through my figure, which soon entirely disappeared.¹

"We were at the time living only 14 miles off, and I was in a delicate state of health. They came down to breakfast quite expecting that the post would bring some bad news of me, and all day looked for a messenger from Sudbury, and made an early reason for driving over, to find all as usual. Thinking that such a strange circumstance might make me nervous, they kept it to themselves until time had proved that, whatever it was, no harm had come to me. They asked each other whether it could possibly have been our mother who was then living near Norwich, and who died there in February, 1855, but they were quite agreed that it was no one but me. I certainly knew nothing about it, either at the time or afterwards; nor did it make me feel the least nervous.

"My dear brother and his wife also are passed to the other world; she in 1862, he in 1864.

"SARAH BEVAN."

[I have pointed out, on p. 83, that a person whose phantasm has appeared to others, and who has been informed of the fact, is in rather a different position from an ordinary second-hand witness.]

In the next two cases the originating agency of an absent *living* person seems out of the question; and for the first of them, at any rate, there would, in my view, be no difficulty in supposing a purely subjective origin in one mind, (perhaps that of the dying woman,) and a transference thence to the other.

¹ See p. 38, note, and p. 97, first note.

(673) From Miss J. E. Walker, 48, Pembroke Road, Clifton, Bristol. She heard the account from a cousin, of whom she writes, on Feb. 6, 1883:—

“Cousin Emmeline was old Squire Bingley’s youngest daughter; she was sincere and fearlessly *true*, but she had no poetic and scarcely any imaginative faculty. I should have cited her as a good specimen anywhere of the matter-of-fact and common-place woman, which perhaps gives a somewhat additional weight to her narrative which she confided to me many years ago. She died about 6 years since.” Later Miss Walker adds:—“The event narrated took place when she was about 20, and must have happened in (I think) 1844 or 1845. She told me her story very simply and *vivâ voce*. She also told it *separately* to my elder sister in precisely the same terms. It was *I* who threw it, for brevity’s sake, into the narrative form” [and into the first person].

“My father and mother had many children; most of us died in infancy; Susanna survived, and Charlotte and myself. Father’s was an entailed estate, and the deaths of two sons, William, who died in boyhood, and John, who died in infancy, had been the great disappointment of his life. Susanna remembered both the boys, but William was born and died long before my time, and John died at about two years old, when I was the baby. Of William there was no likeness, but *you* know John’s picture well, a well-painted full-length oil picture representing a toddling babe in white frock and blue shoes, one of my father’s prize greyhounds crouching beside him, and an orange rolling at his feet.

“I was grown up, about 20, Susanna was 40, and Charlotte about 30 years old. Father was declining, and we lived together, contented and united, in a pleasant house on the borders of Harrogate Common. On the day about which I am writing, Charlotte was unwell; she had complained of a chill, and the doctor recommended her to keep in bed. She was sleeping quietly that afternoon, and Susanna sat on one side of her bed and I sat on the other; the afternoon sun was waning, and it began to grow dusky, but not dark. I do not know how long we had been sitting there, but by chance I raised my head and I saw a golden light above Charlotte’s bed, and within the light were enfolded two cherubs’ faces gazing intently upon her. I was fascinated and did not stir, neither did the vision fade for a little while. At last I put my hand across the bed to Susanna, and I *only* said this word, ‘Susanna, look up!’ She did so, and at once her countenance changed, ‘Oh, Emmeline,’ she said, ‘they are William and John.’ Then both of us watched on till all faded away like a washed-out picture; and in a few hours Charlotte died of sudden inflammation.”

In conversation, Miss Walker told me that she is certain that her cousin drew the other sister’s attention to the vision without mentioning what she herself saw; also that she was singularly precise in statement and incapable of exaggeration.

We find from the Register of Deaths that Miss Charlotte Bingley died at Harrogate, on June 8, 1843.

The next account is one of the puzzling carriage-cases mentioned on p. 195. Here there was a local tradition of a phantasm carriage,

due to sounds, frequently heard, which were probably not hallucinations but illusions; and this may possibly have acted as a favourable condition to a visual hallucination of the sort described; but it will not in the least account for the correspondence and coincidence of the two hallucinations, which yet can hardly have been accidental. I do not give the case an evidential number, because the written account does not make it appear as impossible as to the witnesses on the spot it certainly *did* appear, that the carriage should have been a real one. The narrator is Mr. Paul Bird, Strand, Calcutta.

“July 25th, 1884.

“One evening, just at dusk, I was returning home from office in my buggy, with lamps lighted. It was dusk, but under the shadow of the trees which overhang the avenue it was pretty dark. I was driving pretty fast, when I heard what appeared to be a runaway gharrie coming from the house towards me. I immediately checked my horse and peered ahead to see how to avoid the coming danger, but as the noise did not appear to get any nearer, I cautiously proceeded, and when about 100 yards from the house, distinctly saw the reflection of my lamps on the panels of a carriage in front of me, proceeding the same way, viz., to Hastings House [in the suburb of Alipore]. I kept my eyes on the panels, so as not to run into them. The gharrie turned to the left to go under the portico, followed by me,¹ but when I arrived there, there was no gharrie; it had disappeared. I was very much puzzled at this, but should probably have thought nothing more about it, had not my wife, who was watching for my arrival from an upper window, asked me at once, ‘What gharrie was that just ahead of you?’ This, you will admit, was curious, and I offer no theory about it.

“PAUL BIRD.”

Mrs. Bird writes, on July 26, 1884:—

“I cannot add anything further to my husband’s description about the gharrie at Hastings House, except that I also saw the outline of the gharrie as it came up the avenue in front of my husband’s buggy, with his lamps shining on it so as to define the outline; and I was at a window upstairs watching for my husband’s return, so that we saw the apparition from totally different points of view, and without, of course, holding any communication. I suddenly lost sight of the fictitious gharrie, and did not trace it right up to the portico. It turned off, I thought, from the direct road; certainly, it disappeared. I may further state that I heard no sound of a second vehicle, but only that made by my husband’s horse and buggy; but I was aware of his checking his horse, as if he saw something ahead, and this action of his may have been the cause of conjuring up in my vision the supposed gharrie. We have always spoken very sceptically of this circumstance, although feeling in our inner consciousness that there was something not utterly to be disregarded in the occurrence.

“GERTRUDE BIRD.”

¹ See p. 616, first note.

§ 5. The remaining cases are auditory. In the following group the impression was of a recognised voice.

(674) From Mr. C. F. H. Froehnert, (Bandmaster of the Royal Marines,) 3, Victoria Place, Stonehouse, Plymouth, who wrote as follows to the *Daily Telegraph*, on October 15, 1881.

“SIR,—Returning from India in 1854, I resided for a few months at Düsseldorf, and there made the acquaintance of two well-known families—Haskal and Focke. Mr. Haskal, a gentleman well known as the author of several works on Oriental botany, held a high appointment under the Dutch Government in Batavia; and his family, consisting of Mrs. Haskal, several daughters, and Miss Focke as companion, had engaged passage out in a large Dutch vessel, and sailed from Amsterdam. One evening, soon afterwards, when Mrs. Focke, with the rest of her family, were at tea, they all heard a loud cry of ‘Mother!’ outside the window. They all recognised at once the voice of the eldest daughter, Anna, who had sailed with the Haskals. They rushed to the window, but saw nothing. Scarcely had they taken their seats again, when a most agonising shriek was heard, and twice ‘Mother, mother,’ in the same voice. A few days later a report came that a large Dutch vessel had been wrecked. I had left for England, and was written to and asked to make inquiries at Lloyd’s if there was truth in this report. The answer I received was that on that particular evening this vessel was lost with every soul on board.—Yours truly,
“C. F. H. FROEHNERT.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Froehnert wrote to us, on June 11, 1883 :—

“The Fockes were old and well-known residents of Düsseldorf; but no doubt Mr. and Mrs. Focke are dead by this time; but there was another daughter—sister of the one lost—but I dare say she has been married long since, and would go under another name. Düsseldorf being near Holland, the news of a large Dutch vessel having been lost soon reached that town, especially as it was reported that among the effects washed on shore many things were recognised as having belonged to the family, Haskal, such as some valuable pictures, &c., &c.

“Mrs. Ifjen, a friend of mine and the Haskals, wrote to me,¹ telling me of the hearing of the voice on that particular evening, and of the rumour of the stranding of the vessel, requesting me to ascertain at Lloyd’s if a vessel had been lost; the answer was as I stated, the ship had been lost that very night.

“Mrs. Haskal and her children had also resided at Düsseldorf until they departed.

“At the time when this happened I was Bandmaster of the 2nd Life Guards at London.”

Mr. Froehnert adds, on April 1, 1885 :—

“In reply to your letter regarding the Focke case at Düsseldorf, I am sorry I cannot recollect the house they were living in at the time; it is so long ago. But I quite remember that it was in a quiet locality; and the voice came from the back of the house, which in most German houses is called ‘Der Hof,’ and which is usually not frequented in the evening by

¹ Unfortunately this letter has not been preserved.

the occupants of the houses; the voice came distinctly through the window, which was open."

In the next case, the two persons affected were widely separated, and their impressions differed.

(675) From Mr. Thomas Young, Elsinore House, Robert Road, Handsworth, Birmingham.

"31st December, 1884.

"One evening—ten years ago about—I was sitting at tea with my wife and children, when my wife suddenly said, 'What a noise there is upstairs,' asking me if I heard it. I said 'No.' She, however, insisted that there was, and insisted upon going upstairs to investigate. She could hear the windows rattled as if by the wind. I accompanied her upstairs, and as she went she suddenly felt a wind rush by her. I felt no rush of wind, nor were the windows rattling. The night was calm. After investigating the room from whence the wind was supposed to proceed, and finding nothing out of the common, we returned to the parlour, my wife much agitated, and I was also agitated. When next she heard from home, it was a letter conveying the sad intelligence of her father's death by drowning, which took place about the time she felt the physical influence. But what is still more strange, her brother, who was captain of a small vessel, and at sea on the same evening of his poor father's death, heard his name called. He was in the cabin at the time. He immediately went on deck, asking who called. 'No one,' was the reply. He went into his cabin, and again he heard his name, and again he went on deck, thinking a trick was being played. Once more all denied having called him. He thereupon re-entered his cabin, only to hear his name called again, and on demanding sternly who called, and receiving the same answer, 'No one,' he said he felt very queer.¹

"THOMAS YOUNG."

[Mrs. Young's experience could not be presented as telepathic evidence on its own account, the impression having been so vague. But she is not a nervous or fanciful person, and is certain that she has never had any similar experience—while the fact that her husband did not hear or feel what she heard and felt decidedly supports the view that the experience was hallucination; and if so, it is a remarkable fact that it fell on the night which was marked not only by her father's death, but by her brother's far more distinct hallucination of the recognised voice.]

Captain Adams writes:—

"62, Commercial Road, Newport, Monmouthshire.

"November 13th, 1885.

"In answer to your letter in reference to my father's death, I will endeavour in a few lines to give you the information you want.

"As the ship was lying in the port of St. Malo, in France, on the 15th December, 1871, I was lying in my berth at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I heard a voice. I knew the voice at once to be my father's, calling 'Jim, Jim, Jim.' It was not a dream, for I was awake and getting up. I asked the men on board whether they heard anyone calling.

¹ Here again we have an account of *three* separate calls—the favourite legendary number (p. 229, note). In the first-hand version which follows, it will be seen that there is no mention of any repetition of the call, though it is represented as having consisted of three utterances of the name.

They said, 'No.' I said to them, 'My father is dead.' When I arrived at Jersey (Island), my wife said to me, 'There is bad news for you.' I said, 'Yes, I know; my father is dead.' This was about nine days after my father was lost in Burnham (Essex). When I read the news of his death, [I found that] it was at the same hour I heard his voice.

"JAMES ADAMS."

In answer to an inquiry as to whether this was his sole experience of a hallucination, Captain Adams adds:—

"You wish to know whether it is the only time I have heard anything of the kind. Yes, it is the only time."

Mrs. Adams writes for her husband, on January 19th, 1886:—

"In reply to your letter of November 17th, in which you ask a few more questions:

"*First.*—You ask my husband whether he made a note of it. He did not; but he always remembered the date, for he has a very good memory.

"*Secondly.*—It is impossible to find any of the men who were with him at the time. Some are dead. The others, I do not know where they are.

"S. E. ADAMS."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the father of Mrs. Young and Captain Adams was drowned in the River Crouch on Dec. 15, 1871.

In the next case, the agency is doubtful, as, though a near relative of one of the percipients died at the time, the voice heard was taken to be that of his brother. It is not unlikely that the two men's voices resembled one another's: compare the cases of mis-recognition, Nos. 170 and 171. The account is first-hand; but we do not know how long a period had elapsed after the occurrence, before it was recorded in writing.

(676) From the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1752, Vol. XXII., pp. 173-4. The editor states the writer (who signs himself "A. B.") to be "a man of great veracity," and the communication to be "a piece of his own private history."

"On the 23rd August, 1736, at noon, standing at the shop door with my mistress and maid-servant and Mr. Bloxham, then rider to Mr. Oakes and Co. (who now lives and follows the haberdashery trade in Cateaton Street), we were choosing figured ribbons and other millinery goods, when I heard my father's voice call 'Charles,' very audibly. As accustomed, I answered, 'Coming, sir.' Being intent on viewing the patterns, I stayed about four minutes, when I heard a voice a second time call 'Charles.' The maid heard it then as well as myself, and answered, 'He is coming, Mr. W—m—n.' But the pattern book not being gone through with, I was impatient to see the end, and being also unwilling to detain the gentleman, I still tarried. Then I saw the door open,¹ heard my father call a third time, in a strong, emphatic, angry tone, and shutting the door I heard

¹ Compare cases 659 and 670. I have mentioned that this form of hallucination is one that occurs also in purely subjective cases.

its sound. Both my mistress and the maid heard this last call, on which she pushed me out of the shop with, 'Sirrah, get you gone, your father is quite angry at your stay.' I ran over, lifted up the latch, but found the gate locked. Then going in at the back gate saw my mother-in-law in the yard. . . . I immediately went in, when I found no father nor any appearance of dinner. Returning, I inquired of her for my father; she said he was not come home, nor would dine at home that day. . . . I then went back to the company, whose consternation was as great as my own. . . . Whether all this was the force of imagination I cannot say, I believe it may. I will not argue to the contrary, though two senses of two persons besides myself could not, probably, be so liable to deception. My mind and disposition from that hour received a new turn. I became another creature

"It is very remarkable that I had an only uncle (who was gunner of the 'Biddeford,' then stationed at Leith), that died there that same day and about the same hour."

We learn from the Admiralty that H.M.S. "Biddeford" was at Leith Road on August 23, 1736.

The following case is an exact parallel to No. 336, and should be read in connection with the remarks on pp. 190-2.

(677) From Mr. Emmerson, Cullercoats, near Newcastle-on-Tyne.

"January 9th, 1885.

"In the summer of 1849, I was sitting in my studio painting, about noon, three days after my mother was buried. (In this locality people were dying by hundreds of cholera—of which she died.) I distinctly heard her call my name, 'Harry,' in a very loud voice, which made me start to my feet. My father, who was in another room, rushed into my studio, terrified, and asked me if I had heard my mother *calling me*. My mother, who was deaf, had a very shrill voice, that there was no mistaking it.

"This is the only experience of the kind that I have ever met with, but which made a lasting impression on my mind.

"H. H. EMMERSON."

Mr. Emmerson's father is dead. Mrs. Emmerson writes to us on January 21st, 1886:—

"I wish to write a few lines to inform you that I frequently heard my husband and his father talking about both of them hearing the mother calling him by name. They were both *most* positive about it; and it left quite an impression upon their minds. I can vouch for the truth of this statement.

"MARY EMMERSON."

In conversation, I learnt from Mr. Emmerson that he and his father were the only persons in the house at the time that the voice was heard; he had no sisters living at home, and the household had been disorganised owing to the cholera. Mr. Emmerson is very far from inclined to believe in marvels, and the above has simply remained in his mind as a unique and inexplicable fact, which at the time was evidently of the most startling kind. The conditions were of course favourable to subjective hallucination; but, equally of course, this will not explain the double experience.

§ 6. In the next and final group, no articulate sounds were heard; and in most of the cases the impression was of a mere noise.

The following two cases are too remote for details to be relied on; and the nature of the sounds may very likely have become more precise in recollection after the coincident facts were known. Still it may be surmised that the experiences described were, at any rate, collective hallucinations.

(678) From Mr. M. P. Stephenson, the narrator of case 613.

“8, Southfield Road, Cotham, Bristol.

“January 31st, 1884.

“The case I am going to relate happened more than 50 years ago. Myself and wife had been to her brother’s to see their little daughter, aged about two years, who was thought to be dying. It was evident when we saw her that she could not last long. We left about 10 o’clock at night, and retired to bed, and settled quietly to go to sleep. But before we could do so we heard a startling scream—a sort of death-scream¹—on the pillow between us. We each thought the other was taken ill, and turned in alarm, and found that the noise was not aroused by either of us. I turned the matter off as best I could, not to alarm my wife. In the morning she said to me, ‘That was a curious noise we heard last night; what could it have been?’ I said, ‘Little Mary died last night at that time, and that was the noise she made before she died,’ which proved to be the fact. I imitated the noise the same evening, and the child’s mother exclaimed, ‘How strange! that was the exact scream made by my child before she died.’

“These things, when they occur, take a deep hold on us, and although it happened more than 52 years ago, we both of us remember it as freshly as if it were but a year ago.”

In answer to inquiry, Mr. Stephenson adds:—

“The death-cry of the child was heard by us at the precise time of her death, and the mother (who has been dead more than 30 years) recognised the cry I imitated as the last cry of her dear child.”

To a request for his wife’s written corroboration, Mr. Stephenson replies:—

“I am sorry that I cannot comply with your request. My dear wife is a confirmed invalid and cannot be persuaded to do what you wish. You are not to suppose that there is any doubt as to the truth of what I related to you.”

(679) From the mother of a Fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge, who desires that her name may not be published.

“1884.

“On the 15th of May, 1829, my mother, myself, and a servant were in the hall, when we heard a loud groan. We were somewhat startled, and a short time after we heard the groan repeated, but louder. We then looked about the garden and in the street, but could see nothing. We had just returned to the house, when a third time² the groan was repeated, but still louder. We were much startled, and again looked about to find the

¹ It is very doubtful, of course, whether this particular description would have been given but for the fact of the death, which was afterwards ascertained.

² See p. 229, note.

cause, but to no purpose. Shortly after, my brother came in, in breathless haste, to tell his mother that his grandfather was thrown from his horse, and nearly killed. The dear old man died the same night."

We find from a copy of a tombstone in Loughton churchyard, that the death occurred on May 16th (not 15th), 1829. The parish-clerk tells us that the accident took place about 100 yards from his house.

(680) From Mr. Charles H. Kallensee, Croan House, Sladesbridge, Cornwall.

"December 30th, 1882.

"In the year 1841, an elder brother of mine died, at Princess Street, Devonport. When I returned from school on the day of his death, I was told to go to his room, as he had inquired for me. On entering the room, I found a great change in him since the morning, and I, who had never seen death, yet knew that he was dying. In the room were my father and mother; my father standing at the side of my brother's bed, while my dear mother sat weeping near the foot. I took a seat near my mother's side.

"It might have been an hour or more that we remained thus, listening to the breathing of my brother, expecting each breath to be the last. I remember it was a beautiful afternoon, and the sun shone into the room and across my brother's bed. Suddenly there were three violent blows or concussions, so violent that I felt the room shake. My mother sprang to her feet, and with excitement exclaimed, 'There it is again'; at the same time I saw my father stooping down and turning back the carpet that went round the bed. My own feeling was one of wonder and curiosity, and on looking at my brother, I saw he was dead. My father's stooping down and examining the carpet was explained by him, after he had felt the third blow strike him at the bottom of his foot; while my mother's exclamation, 'There it is again,' was because she had heard similar manifestations at the death of other members of her family. I know nothing of Spiritualism *per se*; I never attended any meeting or séances on the subject, therefore cannot say whether the knocking I heard was of that character; but of this I am quite certain, that no known power produced the noise.

"CHARLES H. KALLENSEE."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death occurred on October 21, 1841.

In answer to an inquiry whether he had ever experienced hallucinations of the senses on other occasions, Mr. Kallensee replied:—

"I have not met with any similar manifestations. I can scarcely call it a 'knocking,' as it seemed to fill, and even shake, the room. The sound was as of a stick being broken, but much louder, and powerful. My father felt the last blow at the bottom of his foot, and almost the first thing I remember, after my wonder had passed, was seeing him stooping down and examining the carpet under his feet. My mother told us children afterwards, on several occasions, that she had heard similar noises at the death of her father and brother. My mother was an educated woman, and far from superstitious; and yet she could not but believe in this."

(681) From Mr. H. C. Hurry, C.E., 60, Lawford Road, Kentish Town, N.W.

“January 4th, 1884.

“Many years ago I lodged with an old lady, her son and daughter, of the name of Spencer, in Manchester. In conversation they frequently told me that on the occasion of the death of any member of their family, one or more of them invariably had some monition of it. This I treated with a considerable amount of scepticism. One morning they received a letter from Ormskirk, near Liverpool, informing them that the young people’s aunt was very ill. The son at once went off to see her. That night I had gone upstairs to bed, my room being up one flight, and immediately opposite to the front door; whilst I was undressing I heard a very loud knock, as though given with the hand, not the knocker. Miss Spencer immediately came out of the sitting-room, and called, saying, ‘Mr. Hurry, did you knock down?’ I answered, ‘No, it was at the hall-door.’ She went and opened it, and at once said, on finding no one there, ‘Good God! my aunt’s dead.’ Without saying anything to them, I wrote down the exact time, about 11 p.m., so far as I can remember. By the first post possible, they received a letter from young Spencer, informing them the aunt had died exactly at the time I had noted, allowing for the difference of mean-time, by which watches were then regulated. I should add that I was in no way related to the Spencers.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hurry says:—

“I do not know of any of the Spencer family; the old lady, her son and daughter, I mentioned, having long been dead. The circumstance I named occurred in the year 1841, but as I was a party to it I consider my evidence first-hand. You next ask me whether I have had ‘any auditory hallucinations.’ I cannot remember any but the one I give you.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that a Mrs. Spencer, who is probably the person mentioned in this case, died at Ormskirk in 1841.

[This case could, of course, have no claim at all to attention, but for its analogy to others, as there is no sufficient proof that the sound was not a real knock. If it was a hallucination, Mr. Hurry’s share in the experience cannot be accounted for as the subjective effect of strain and anxiety.]

(682) From Mr. W. Hillstead, a teacher of music, who, at the time when he gave us the account, in 1884, was acting as care-taker in a large house at Cambridge.

“In October, 1848, I was sitting with my mother in 8, Suffolk Place, Pall Mall East. The house was empty except for ourselves. The room was mainly lighted by a large skylight. The house was quite quiet. It was rather dark on an October day. Suddenly we were both startled by a terrifying noise, as if a cartload of gravel had been shot down from a height on to the skylight. I jumped up in startled alarm, thinking that the skylight was, of course, smashed to pieces by the stones which I had actually heard falling on it. There was not the slightest trace of anything unusual. My mother, who had had many warnings of different kinds, was less alarmed. She took for granted that someone was dead, but we could neither of us think who it could be, as we knew of no one who was ill.

“Some days afterwards, a cousin of mine called, and told us that his

brother Richard was dead. We asked when he died, and found that it was at dusk on the very afternoon on which we heard the crash. My mother had been very fond of the young man, and so was I. Of late he had gone wrong, and we had seen less of him. "WILLIAM HILLSTEAD."

[Unfortunately the information necessary to enable us to verify the death was not asked for at the time; nor was an address obtained to which we might subsequently write. The narrative was certainly given in good faith; but its only force, again, depends on its analogy to other cases.]

As regards the curious form of the impression in the following case, see the remarks on case 625, pp. 572-3.

(683) From Mrs. Windridge, Sutton Villa, 99, Albert Road, Dalston, E.

"November 9th, 1882.

"In or about the year 1861, I, being weary and worn, first through the long illness and then the depression and inertness of my husband, complained to a lady friend, Mrs. H., whose husband had frequently remonstrated with mine for what appeared to be his laziness. My friend, having a strong sympathy for me, urged her husband to obtain a situation for him. He said, 'I will kill him for her'; and procured my husband work which he believed would place his life in danger.

"Three years after, Mr. H. lay dangerously ill; at his request I had gone over to see him, and found him in a most excited state; he entreated me to use all my influence to induce my husband to leave the situation he had procured, as he feared it would ultimately cause his death.

"Some weeks afterwards my husband and I were awoke by the noise, apparently, of someone endeavouring to open our bedroom door. The noise was quite loud, as if the intruder could not open it readily, and did not care who heard him. My husband listened for a while, and then opened the door with a light in his hand. There was nothing there, but immediately there was the sound of a large dog entering, and scratching on the floor at his feet. My husband searched the house, but we could find nothing. It was just 2 a.m. A day or two afterwards I heard of his death that night. The widow, whom I went to see, told me that, in her own words, he 'died twice.' When, as they thought, already dead,—they began to lay him out,—he opened his eyes, and muttered something about 'Windridge.' 'What time was this?' I asked. 'Just 2 a.m.,' she said.

"E. WINDRIDGE."

Mr. Windridge corroborates as follows:—

"One night, having retired in the ordinary way, we were aroused by a shaking and scratching at the bedroom door, so distinct and impressive that we began to be alarmed, and I arose, and striking a light, went to the door, and opened it. With an exclamation I started back. Something touched my feet. Something seemed, as it were, to be grovelling at my feet, but I could see nothing. I then searched the house and found all undisturbed, as we left it. I looked at the time; it was 2 o'clock. I could not sleep any more that night.

"The next day I heard that a man, who had expressed to my wife that he would do a great wrong to me, had died. I informed my wife, and she said she would visit the widow. She went, and Mrs. H., in relating the

incidents most remarkable in her husband's death, informed her that he had died, as it were, twice; for after he was pronounced dead, and the nurse was laying him out, he seemed to return to life, and murmured the name 'Windridge.' Life was not extinct for a quarter of an hour after this. Mrs. H. informed my wife that her husband died at 2 o'clock, the time I looked at my watch.

" B. WINDRIDGE."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on September 14, 1863.

In conversation, Mr. Windridge informed Mr. Podmore that he had never experienced any other hallucination. Mrs. Windridge has experienced one other, which was of a singular kind, and is described in the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., Vol. III., p. 89.

Mr. Windridge could not clearly remember having been *touched*, as he puts it in his letter; he can only be sure that he had the impression of something grovelling at his feet. That impression may, however, have been conveyed by sound only. Mrs. Windridge states that he told her at the time that he had been touched.

The following is a further specimen of the musical class,¹ parallel to No. 388. With respect to its place in the present collection, I must again refer to pp. 190-2.

(684) A gentleman who is a master at Eton College wrote to us, on Feb. 3, 1884:—

" I enclose a copy of a memorandum made a few days after the event referred to. My memorandum has been copied for me by Miss H., whose name occurs in it. She is my matron; a sensible, middle-aged, active, and experienced woman. None of the people concerned were young, flighty, or fanciful. I have the doctor's letter; his name is G., and he still resides here. Miss H. only wishes to add that it must have occurred from 20 minutes to perhaps 30 after dissolution, and she says that she has never heard anything like the extreme sweetness of the sound.

" H. E. L."

The memorandum is as follows:—

" Eton College.

" August 6th, 1881.

" I wish to write down, before there is time for confusion, the following fact, occurring on Thursday morning, July 28, 1881, when my dear mother died, whom God rest! After all was over, Miss E. I., Eliza W., Dr. G., and myself being in the room, Miss I. heard a sound of 'very

¹ In a case which E. M. Arndt (*Schriften für und an seine Lieben Deutschen*, 1845, Vol. iii., pp. 525-6) records, with names and details, on the first-hand authority of a family whom he highly esteemed, the music of a guitar was heard, first by two daughters of the house, and then by their father and a large group of persons, at the time of the death in battle of an officer who had been staying with the family a little time before, and had delighted them by his performances on that instrument. But there is no sufficient statement of the grounds on which the hearers were convinced (as they undoubtedly were) that the sounds were not due to any objective cause in the vicinity. The house was searched; but there is no mention of inquiries in the environs.

low, soft music, exceedingly sweet, as if of three girls' voices, passing by the house.' She described further the sound as if girls were going home singing, only strangely low and sweet; it seemed to come from the street, past the house towards the College buildings (the road ends there in a *cul-de-sac*), and so passed away. She looked to call my attention, and thought I perceived it. She noticed that the doctor heard it, and that he went to the window to look out. The window faces S.E. Eliza W. being in the room at the same time heard a sound of very low, sweet singing. She recognised the tune and words of the hymn. 'The strife is o'er, the battle done.' Miss I. recognised no tune, but felt 'that the music sounded, as it were, familiar.' As a very accomplished musician, especially remarkable for her quick memory of music, had words or air been those of a well-known hymn, she would almost certainly have remembered it. These two spoke to each other when alone about what they had heard. Miss I. gives the time at about 10 minutes after my dear mother expired. They were then unaware of this additional circumstance. Miss H. had left the room, and had summoned Charlotte C., with whom she had procured something required for laying out the body. As the two returned upstairs they heard a sound of music, and both stopped. Charlotte said to Miss H., 'What is this?' After a pause she said, 'It must be Miss I. singing to comfort master.' They afterwards entered the room, of which the door had been shut all along. Charlotte further described the sound as very sweet and low, seeming to pass by them. She felt as if, had she only been able to listen, she could have distinguished the words. It did not occur to her that her description was most incongruous; she could not listen attentively, but felt 'as if rapture were all around her.' It was not until afterwards, when she mentioned to Eliza having heard Miss I. singing, and how strangely it sounded, that they found that each had heard the sound. Miss H. described the sound as very peculiar and sweet, seeming to pass by them and pass away, as they both stopped on the stairs. All the staircase windows give north-west. I heard nothing,¹ and I should have given no weight to a sound heard or described by these women in the room after communicating with each other, or by these women out of the room respectively; but the coincidence of each party hearing it separately and independently without previous communication, as well as the matter-of-fact explanation suggested for it by one of them seeming to imply that their thoughts were not dwelling on the supernatural, added so much weight to this account that I wrote to the doctor, who answers:—'I quite remember hearing the singing you mention; it was so peculiar that I went to the window and looked out, but although quite light I could see no one, and cannot therefore account for it.' The time must have been about 2 a.m. on July 28th, 1881."

Miss I. writes :—

" 13, Park Street, Windsor.

" February 22nd, 1884.

" I will copy the memorandum which I made in my diary just after the death of my dear friend and connection, Mrs. L.

¹ Compare case 666, and see p. 105, second note.

“July 28th, 1881.

“Just after dear Mrs. L.’s death between 2 and 3 a.m., I heard a most sweet and singular strain of singing outside the windows; it died away after passing the house. All in the room heard it, and the medical attendant, who was still with us, went to the window as I did, and looked out, but there was nobody. It was a bright and beautiful night. It was as if several voices were singing in perfect unison a most sweet melody, which died away in the distance. Two persons had gone from the room to fetch something, and were coming upstairs at the *back* of the house, and heard the singing and stopped, saying, ‘What is that singing?’ They could not *naturally* have heard any sound outside the windows in the front of the house from where they were. I cannot think that any explanation can be given to this—as I think—supernatural singing; but it would be very interesting to me to know what is said by those who have made such matters a subject of study.

“E. I.”

Dr. G. writes in 1884:—

“Eton, Windsor.

“I remember the circumstance perfectly. Poor Mrs. L. died on July 28th, 1881. I was sent for at about midnight, and remained until her death at about 2.30 a.m. As there was no qualified nurse present, I remained and assisted the friends to ‘lay out’ the body. Four or five of us assisted, and at my request the matron of Mr. L.’s house and a servant went to the kitchen department to find a shutter or flat board upon which to place the body. Soon after their departure, and whilst we were waiting for their return, we distinctly heard a few bars of lovely music—not unlike that from an *Æolian* harp—which seemed to fill the air for a few seconds. I went to the window and looked out, thinking there must be someone outside, but could see no one, although it was quite light and clear. Strangely enough, those who went to the kitchen heard the same sounds as they were coming upstairs, quite at the other side of the door. These are the facts, and I think it right to tell you that I have not the slightest belief in the supernatural, Spiritualism, &c., &c.

“J. W. G.”

[The fact that Mr. L. did not share the experience is strong evidence that the sounds were not objectively caused by persons singing outside the house; and this is further confirmed by the slight difference which there appears to have been between the impressions received.]

END OF THE SUPPLEMENT.

ADDITIONAL CHAPTER

OF CASES RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR INSERTION IN THEIR PROPER PLACES.

§ 1. THE printing and revision of these volumes have occupied a considerable time; and meanwhile several items of evidence have been received too late for insertion in the chapters to which they properly belong. They fall under the three classes, already distinguished, of *experimental*, *transitional*, and *spontaneous* cases. I will begin with some cases of the first class, which sufficiently show that the experiments described at the opening of the treatise admit of being repeated and varied with success.

The following results were sent to us at the close of last year, by Herr Max Dessoir, of 27, Köthener-Strasse, Berlin. He has devoted a good deal of time to experimenting with a few friends, he himself almost always acting as percipient. He began with trials of the "willing-game" type, and soon convinced himself that slight muscular hints were the full and sufficient explanation of all the ordinary "thought-reading" exhibitions. He then introduced forms of experiment which offered no opportunity for unconscious guidance on the agent's part—such as the guessing of numbers, words, and cards, without any contact between agent and percipient. These trials, though the amount of success was above what could with probability be ascribed to chance, were not numerous enough to justify any definite conclusion. But a series of trials in the reproduction of diagrams affords an interesting parallel to those described in Vol. I., pp. 37-51. The agent was in some cases Herr E. Weiss, of 28, Wilhelm-Strasse, Berlin (a fellow-student with Herr Dessoir at the Berlin University); in others Herr H. Biltz, of 14, Schelling-Strasse, Berlin; and in one case (No. 7) Herr W. Sachse, of 2, Kirchbach-Strasse, Berlin. (Herr Weiss and Herr Biltz are known to us, through correspondence, independently of these experiments.) All three gentlemen have sent us certificates of the accuracy of the record of the experiments in which they were respectively concerned.

Herr Dessoir thus describes the conditions of the trials :—

“ While the agent drew the original, I was almost always out of the room, to avoid being influenced by the sound of the drawing. When the agent called out ‘ Ready,’ I came in, with eyes closely bandaged—the bandage being made to cover the ears, so as to shut out casual sounds. I set myself at the table, and in many instances placed my hands on the table, and the agent placed his hands on mine : the hands lay *quite still* on one another.¹ When an image presented itself in my mind, the hands were removed, the original drawing [on which the agent had been fixing his eyes] was turned over, or covered with a book, and I took off the bandage and drew my figure. Many of the experiments were made without contact, even though *no note* to that effect was made.”

As regards the cases where there were *two or three* attempts at reproduction, Herr Dessoir says, that after he had had a clear image in his mind, and had removed the bandage, the image would sometimes lose its clearness, and that he was sensible that the figures which he produced did not correspond with it, and so tried again. Still, as no doubt the agent would have told him if the earlier attempt had been successful, and he would not then have made another, every incorrect attempt must count as simply a failure.

The following woodcuts, which have been very carefully copied from the original sheets, include all the trials in which Herr Dessoir was himself the percipient, with the exception of two, (one, to the eye, a success, and the other a failure,) omitted on account of some uncertainty as to the conditions. Nos. iii., vi., and x., in which Herr H. Biltz was the percipient, must be set against three complete failures on his part. The series given contains a considerable proportion of failure ; but if the reader will draw 19 figures of about an equal degree of complexity, and get a friend to do the same, and will then compare each figure of one series with the corresponding one of the other, he will realise the improbability of obtaining by mere chance, in so short a set, 9 resemblances as close as those in Nos. i., iv., vi., vii., xi., xiii., xv., xvii. and xviii., below.

¹ It is important to observe the fundamental difference between contact which *continues while the writing or drawing is going on* (as in the writing of the figures of bank-notes, which is a favourite trick in the public “ thought-reading ” exhibitions), where what the performer receives from the innocent “ willer ” is delicate muscular guidance from moment to moment ; and contact which *ceases before the attempt at reproduction commences*, and which could only betray the required figure if the hand of the agent (which seems both to himself and to the percipient to be perfectly still) were moved on that of the percipient in such a way as to *draw* the required shape. I have reason to believe that certain figures may be thus indicated without the agent’s consciousness ; but it seems to me unlikely that they could be *unconsciously perceived*—at any rate by an observer who, like Herr Dessoir, has devoted special pains to analysing his impressions and discovering their source.

I.

ORIGINAL.



Agent : H. B.

REPRODUCTION.



II.

ORIG.



Agent : H. B.

REP. 1.




REP. 2.



III.

ORIG.



Agent's name omitted.

REP.




It appears here that the agent's image included an impression of the left part of the frame. M. D.

IV.

ORIG



REP.



Agent: H. B.

ORIG.



Agent: H. B.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



REP. 4.




VI.

ORIG.




Agent : M. D.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



VII.

ORIG



REP. 1.



REP. 2.



While the second reproduction was proceeding, an interruption occurred which prevented its completion.

Agent : W. S.

VIII.

ORIG.



Agent: H. B.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



REP. 4.



IX.

ORIG.



Agent: H. B.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



The percipient said, "It looks like a window."

X.

ORIG.



Agent: M. D


REP. 1.



REP. 2.




REP. 3.




XI.

ORIG.




Agent: H. B.


REP. 1.



REP. 2.




REP. 3.




XII.

ORIG.




Agent : H. B.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



XIII.

ORIG.



Agent : E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



The percipient said, "It looks like a window."

XIV.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



XV.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 2.




REP. 3.



The first attempt at reproduction appears to have been a failure.

XVI.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



XVII.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



XVIII.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



The percipient said, "I see two bright triangles, but I cannot tell exactly how the second is situated."

XIX.

ORIG.



Agent: E. W.

REP. 1.



REP. 2.



REP. 3.



The following shorter record is taken from the monthly journal *Sphinx* (Leipzig), for June, 1886, and we have not seen the original diagrams. The experiments were made at the house of Baron Dr. von Ravensburg, whose wife was the percipient. Herr Max Dessoir drew the originals on the spur of the moment, out of the Baroness von Ravensburg's sight, and taking care that his pencil should move noiselessly. He and the Baron then concentrated their attention on the figure, which the Baroness, sitting at another table, endeavoured to reproduce, after a time varying from 20 to 45 seconds. (The Baron did not take part in the first experiment, which, it will be seen, was a failure.)

I.

ORIG.



REP. 1.




REP. 2.



II.

ORIG.



REP. 1.




REP. 2.



III.

ORIG.



REP.




The correction was made by the percipient before the original was shown to her.

ORIG.



IV.

REP.




ORIG.



V.

REP.



The percipient said, "It is a circle outside, and there is something else inside it;" then, after a pause, "A triangle." She then drew the reproduction, and added that the circle was an imperfect one.

With respect to these experiments, the Baron and Baroness von Ravensburg have sent a note of corroboration, of which the following is a translation :—

"18, Zietenstrasse, Berlin, W.

"July 9, 1886.

"We certify that the report of our sitting for a trial of thought-transference, which appeared in the sixth number of *Sphinx*, is throughout in correspondence with the facts, and has been drawn up with complete accuracy.

"FREIHERR GOELER VON RAVENSBURG.

"ELIZABETH, FREIFRAU GOELER VON RAVENSBURG."

The following is a set of 400 trials, made in batches of 40 or 50 at a time, in June, 1886, by the Misses Wingfield, whose former experiments have been described in Vol. I., p. 34. The ninety numbers which contain two digits were inscribed on ninety slips of paper, and placed in a bowl. Miss M. Wingfield, sitting six feet behind the percipient, drew a slip at random, and fixed her attention on the number which it bore; Miss K. Wingfield made a guess at the number, and the real number and the guess made were at once recorded in the Table. The slip of paper was then replaced, the contents of the bowl shuffled, and another draw made at hap-hazard. The most probable number of right guesses for accident to bring about in the 400

trials was 4. The actual number of completely right guesses was 27; in 21 other cases the two right digits were given in reverse order: and in 162 others, one of the digits was given rightly in its right place. The probability which this result affords for a cause other than chance is represented by 47 nines and a 5 following a decimal point; *i.e.*, the odds are nearly two hundred thousand million trillions of trillions to 1. It would be a very inadequate statement of the case to say that, if the waking hours of the whole population of the world were for the future continuously devoted to making similar trials, life on this planet would come to an end without such an amount of success, or anything like it, having been accidentally obtained.

K.	82	90	61	41	84	23	52	72	81	48	36	27	48	64	17	49	94	18	71	52
M.	39	41	60	21	65	33	28	27	56	23	14	37	71	64	25	39	86	17	29	56
K.	45	30	55	54	21	77	97	74	60	48	17	29	34	87	65	90	36	77	42	25
M.	45	67	88	14	91	83	27	74	51	28	85	67	77	21	90	33	65	82	97	
K.	97	49	63	52	14	39	21	12	42	39	28	11	24	47	64	70	71	32	50	74
M.	55	82	76	25	40	59	81	16	27	49	82	88	24	17	85	76	98	12	67	44
K.	89	33	24	42	80	73	19	35	19	56	65	48	34	91	44	32	79	40	83	36
M.	99	75	23	55	67	80	17	35	17	83	65	78	22	15	66	38	19	64	23	31
K.	69	45	36	50	27	42	13	51	65	65	36	68	51	45	34	65	30	17	32	43
M.	55	76	63	56	87	41	64	71	18	56	21	28	83	79	51	68	20	45	27	63
K.	45	48	13	36	13	90	40	48	72	59	72	30	75	21	80	79	30	53	60	79
M.	69	88	47	33	15	21	60	46	53	29	32	69	85	44	80	39	12	41	36	29
K.	57	28	36	42	19	84	37	71	63	98	46	51	41	39	14	39	19	24	32	87
M.	42	18	76	27	15	48	23	72	64	89	14	51	20	66	80	29	91	46	30	86
K.	71	98	46	33	60	48	15	49	64	90	72	14	24	93	65	11	89	70	49	84
M.	23	98	41	33	70	97	50	32	46	91	38	12	27	83	65	47	52	68	59	33
K.	81	70	80	97	99	17	41	45	77	14	24	38	91	18	75	80	77	60	46	38
M.	86	79	42	93	91	87	41	85	37	89	23	55	49	18	65	93	14	62	76	59
K.	30	27	79	13	62	73	40	31	70	43	64	90	81	61	90	21	13	40	17	36
M.	80	67	84	13	26	88	91	51	80	37	14	29	18	61	79	42	58	98	15	66
K.	99	35	75	42	24	35	74	14	85	99	71	49	81	86	44	36	68	24	49	62
M.	97	65	21	40	62	19	35	26	58	90	86	42	18	79	62	37	16	85	23	67
K.	36	44	36	49	78	17	24	18	51	36	81	40	80	92	49	24	71	56	40	71
M.	28	44	56	91	72	65	29	31	52	78	83	60	49	32	50	29	78	56	20	18
K.	45	80	13	13	26	88	84	92	49	60	70	32	44	19	35	40	27	30	99	48
M.	12	86	92	43	23	18	66	29	41	38	70	62	24	85	15	68	97	50	32	68
K.	30	98	65	34	33	16	48	38	59	86	17	64	86	37	18	80	71	23	23	83
M.	71	89	26	14	33	87	42	65	11	83	19	51	68	39	53	80	97	44	15	63
K.	81	97	18	36	72	35	93	42	84	25	71	37	72	19	42	84	36	71	25	67
M.	82	97	85	60	71	55	78	91	14	32	17	49	14	71	43	85	93	44	23	67
K.	41	71	42	77	43	18	60	70	36	77	98	40	86	31	27	91	48	64	64	28
M.	36	38	26	71	94	13	48	40	25	43	86	13	86	40	50	35	47	26	59	48
K.	33	37	41	68	46	46	28	16	56	39	66	48	19	71	25	71	60	76	92	
M.	32	32	14	67	17	39	48	24	57	42	67	70	85	70	19	40	66	67	49	82
K.	13	48	94	32	28	44	67	41	30	24	36	37	98	73	41	37	19	44	81	80
M.	33	41	70	43	69	32	76	41	80	17	41	63	99	37	41	56	69	70	32	88
K.	40	74	36	90	50	46	80	48	38	63	23	37	49	45	18	73	82	13	61	48
M.	68	71	32	71	53	40	20	57	14	55	28	37	58	21	15	80	67	23	70	49
K.	28	18	90	37	75	34	72	86	72	19	53	70	16	58	96	43	70	54	62	14
M.	29	19	42	67	70	34	35	41	70	68	43	50	19	57	38	96	70	60	73	18

The next account is from the Rev. Canon Lefroy, Incumbent of St Andrew's, Liverpool. The percipient, Miss —, is known to Mr. Myers and the present writer. Her *bona fides* is above suspicion; but her state of health has unfortunately prevented further experimentation.

“1885.

“Early in September, 1884, in Zermatt, I was, through the kindness of Miss —, permitted to have an opportunity of testing, by personal observation, experience, and evidence, the reality or otherwise of what is, I believe, called telepathy. I am bound to say that when I was informed, and most kindly informed, of what was proposed to be done, the innate scepticism of my nature rose to its highest.

“I was informed that the eyes of Miss — would be tightly bandaged, and I saw them bandaged; that in this darkened state, mental or ocular perception—probably the latter¹—would, nevertheless, enable her to read any word written by me on a slip of paper. There might be mistake; there might be literal transposition [? transposition of letters]; there might be delay; but, speaking broadly, I was assured that the word could be discerned. We sat at opposite sides of the table. I was desired to hold the lady's hand. I did so, and while so doing I exerted my will to the utmost, and to the intent that, if possible, the conflict of wills should result in favour of my scepticism. I must, with shame and humiliation, confess that my incredulity and volitional resistance did not hesitate to select a word which my gifted antagonist probably never heard of; and accordingly I defiantly, confidently, and I will add, mercilessly, wrote the name of Terence's old play—*Heautontimorumenos*. The completion of my word was followed by a prolonged pause. I felt as if breathing was an intrusion, and not a sound was heard. At last the blinded, and I thought the wearied, or at least strained, interpreter said, ‘What a long word!’ Then a pause. Then as follows: ‘Why—two, four, six, eight—there are eighteen letters in that word!’

“Unconsciously my resisting power became less than it was, and it decreased from the moment Miss — said, ‘What a long word!’ Nevertheless, the long pause seemed to give me a chance, and again I gathered up my mind to resolve that detection should be arrested. But very soon this purpose was foiled; the lady calmly said, ‘That word has two m's to it; it begins with an h; and I never saw that word before.’ I felt very guilty as I observed what I thought were signs of fatigue, and then declared the word was unusual—ill-known, and asked that the bandage might be removed.

“In a few moments I was allowed to try with simpler words. Again the bandage was applied, the word was written, and our hands were clasped. I wrote the word *ink*. In about one minute the word was read, thus, ‘k, n, i; your word is *ink*.’

“Again I was most kindly allowed to try another word. I wrote *toy*. In a minute the word was read thus, ‘y, o, t; your word is *toy*.’²

¹ See p. 48, note.

² The following note, by Mr. Myers, of a trial made in 1884, with the same percipient, exhibits the same curious reversal of letters; which might be compared with the production of anagrams, and of independent and phonetic spelling, in automatic writing (Vol. i., pp. 76-8, and below, p. 665). “I asked Miss — to try some experiments in thought-trans-

The experience then closed, so far as this species of discovery was concerned.

“WILLIAM LEFROY, M.A.”

In answer to inquiries, Canon Lefroy writes, on June 17, 1886 :—

“Abercromby Square, Liverpool.

“I believe I wrote the letters under the cover of my left hand. Miss ——— could not possibly descry them. My own inflexible scepticism respecting her power provided, I can assure you, a ready safeguard against anything she might have been disposed to do under the peculiar circumstances of the experiment. I am, to this hour, a most unwilling believer in her possession of some force which revealed what she could not see, and which disclosed what I resolved should be impenetrable.”

Miss Hamilton, of 47, Albert Mansions, Kensington Gore, W., a Member of the S.P.R., sends (in June, 1886,) the following record of an impromptu trial, of the sort which we wish we could persuade more people to make. In such a case as this, contact, though better avoided, can scarcely be held to afford the opportunity for unconscious physical hints. One reservation unfortunately must be made: the record was not drawn up in writing at the time. But Miss Hamilton tells us that the details were then and there carefully gone over, with a view to the present report; and we have several memories to rely on.

“Experiment between Miss Leila Melvill [now Mrs. Lewis Hamilton] and Mr. Lewis Hamilton, September, 1885.

“Miss L. M., eyes lightly bandaged with a silk handkerchief, was ‘willed’ by Mr. Hamilton. He placed his hands on her forehead, and willed intently that she should read the [printed] words, *A Sermon*, at which he gazed steadily all the time he willed. She said, slowly, A; then spelled the first few letters of ‘Sermon,’ and then said the whole word.

“The same evening she read in the same manner these words, *County Families*. Later on, in November, the same experiment was tried, and she read the unusual words, *Chatto and Windus*. Each experiment took about three minutes. Amongst the witnesses present were :—

“MARY C. D. HAMILTON.

“A. MELVILL [sister of the percipient].

“LILLIAS HAMILTON.”

The agent and percipient also sign the account.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hamilton writes, on June 25, 1886 :—

“Lansdowne, Farquhar Road, Upper Norwood.

(1) “Had the subject’s eyes been unbandaged, she could have undoubtedly seen the words; but not only were they *tightly* bandaged, but my fingers were placed on her closed eyelids, so that she could not even

ference with her sister. She soon told me that the experiments had succeeded, but with this strange peculiarity, that, when the sister fixed her eyes on some word, Miss K. saw its letters appear in her field of mental vision *in reverse order*. Miss K. was, unfortunately, very liable to headache, which these experiments quickly induced, and I was only allowed one short series of trials. I placed the word NET behind her, and looked fixedly at the letters. She said that she saw successively the letters T, E, N. I next chose SEA, and she saw A, E, S. I chose a third word, but she saw no mental image, and headache stopped the experiments.”

have opened them, had there been no bandage. On one occasion the words she read were held above the subject's head, so that she could not in any case have seen. [Miss Hamilton independently confirms this.] I may say, however, that in no single case was there any possibility of her having seen the words. The words, and book, or pamphlet, from which they were read, were chosen *after* her eyes were bandaged, and out of her sight, and they were not whispered from one witness to the other, but shown round.

(2) "In no instance did she *fail with me*, but when Mr. Hope tried her one evening, she failed, and on another occasion (one) she said almost at once she could not do it that evening. The experiment was tried a good many times, and except for the above, always succeeded.

(3) "For about six months we did not try again, and on the two occasions we have tried lately, she has said she could not do it. We, however, do intend to try again. "LEWIS HAMILTON."

The following records of experiments have been sent to us by our friend Dr. Liébeault, of Nancy, a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R.

"Compte-rendu des expériences de transmission de pensées, faites le 10 Décembre, 1885, de 3 heures à 4 heures et demie du soir, chez M. le Dr. Liébeault, en présence de M. le Dr. Liébeault, de Madame S., et de M. le Dr. Brullard. Opérateur, M. le Professeur Liégeois ; sujet, Mlle. M., 20 ans.

"1. Mlle. M., très intelligente et impressionable, est habituée à être endormie et entre très vite en état de somnambulisme, pendant lequel elle est en rapport avec tous les assistants.

"M. le Professeur Liégeois la met en état de somnambulisme hypnotique, et lui suggère de n'être en rapport qu'avec lui seul ; il lui donne du papier et un crayon, et lui commande de faire la même chose que lui. Alors il se rend à une table voisine et dessine un triangle sur un registre, dont la couverture relevée forme un écran entre lui et le sujet, et intercepte toute communication visuelle. Aussitôt Mlle. M. écrit de son côté, 'Les grands hommes.' Le résultat est donc nul.

"2. En second lieu M. Liégeois dit au sujet, toujours en somnambulisme, 'Je dessine un objet,' et dans les mêmes conditions que précédemment, il dessine une carafe. Le sujet dit aussitôt, 'C'est un vase,' et elle dessine un vase de forme carrée. 'Ce n'est pas cela,' dit M. Liégeois. Alors Mlle. M. dessine un objet de même forme que la carafe, mais difforme, vu qu'ayant les yeux fermés elle plaçait ses traits au juger. Le résultat est donc *exact*.¹

"3. En troisième lieu, 'Je dessine quelque chose,' dit M. Liégeois, et il figure un bonhomme. Le sujet, dans le même état passif, dit successivement, 'C'est un dessin d'ornement,' et elle commence à tracer quelques traits ; puis sur une réponse négative, 'On croirait une boussole—un arbre—une maison.' Résultat nul. A ce moment M. Liégeois réveille Mlle. M. avec la suggestion de très bien voir à son réveil

¹ The drawings have been sent to us, and entirely accord with Dr. Liébeault's description.

le dernier objet dessiné, et dès ce moment elle est en communication avec les assistants. 'Je ne sais pas,' dit Mlle. M., et après quelques minutes, 'C'est une tête,' que sur demande elle figure de profil. Alors on lui dit que c'était un bonhomme. 'Eh bien!' répond-elle, 'ma première impression a été de faire un bonhomme, mais j'ai craint que l'on ne se moquât de moi.'

"4. Mlle. M. restant réveillée, M. Liégeois retourne à sa table et dessine une table carrée vue en perspective, avec un tiroir et son bouton; puis, après avoir montré silencieusement son dessin à chaque assistant en particulier, il place ses deux mains sur la tête du sujet et lui dit, 'Maintenant vous allez deviner ce que je viens de faire.' Après moins de deux minutes de réflexion, 'C'est une table,' dit-elle; 'elle est ronde—pas tout-à-fait.' Sur demande de la dessiner, elle dessine peu-à-peu une table exactement semblable et dans la même position, avec le tiroir et son bouton. Résultat exact.

"5. Mlle. M., qui, comme aucun assistant, n'a vu le dessin, est en rapport avec M. Liégeois seul. M. Liégeois dessine un cube. Mlle. M. dit spontanément, 'C'est une lampe.' M. Liégeois lui met les mains sur la tête. 'C'est une chaise,' dit-elle. M. Liégeois lui fixe les yeux sur les siens et lui tient la main. 'Je ne sais pas.' Alors le dessin est montré aux assistants. 'C'est un chapeau,' dit-elle. Mlle. M. est mise de nouveau en somnambulisme. 'Je veux que vous voyiez le dessin,' dit M. Liégeois. 'C'est un petit bureau.' 'Non.' 'Oh, il y a des carrés—oui,' et elle dessine deux carrés, l'un audessous de l'autre. 'Ce n'est pas cela,' et comme elle ne trouve pas, après quelques minutes, 'Quel est l'objet où il y a des carrés?' 'Je ne sais pas.' 'C'est un cube.' 'Ah, c'est vrai; je voulais le faire.' Pendant l'expérience, M. le Dr. Liébeault avait ajouté des points figurant un dé. Donc résultat médiocre.

"6. Mlle. M., étant toujours en état de sommeil hypnotique, M. Liégeois dessine une croix. 'Il y a un carré,' dit Mlle. M. ('C'était vrai; la croix était dessinée dans un carré.) 'Mais qu'y a-t-il dedans?' demande M. Liégeois. 'C'est un verre—non—une étoile—non—un triangle. Cependant il y a trois traits.' Enfin elle figure successivement un angle, puis une croix de S. André, quand on lui eût dit de laisser aller son crayon sans s'en occuper. Résultat à peu près nul.

"7. M. Liégeois écrit le mot *mariage*. Mlle. M. écrit de suite, 'Monsieur.' Puis elle dit, 'Carafe—non—tableau—non.' 'Quelle est la lettre?' 'C'est un *l*—non, c'est un *m*.' Puis, après quelques minutes de réflexion, 'Il y a dans le mot un—*i*—un *a* après l'*m*—un *g*—un autre *a*—un *e*—il y a six lettres—non—sept.' Quand elle eût trouvé toutes les lettres et leur places, *mariage*, elle ne put découvrir la lettre *r*. Ce n'est qu'après plusieurs minutes qu'on lui dit d'essayer les combinaisons avec les différens consonnes, et enfin elle écrit *mariage*. Résultat médiocre."

"Procès-verbal relatant trois faits étonnants de suggestion mentale, obtenus par MM. Liébeault et De Guaita, au domicile du Dr. Liébeault (4, rue Bellevue, Nancy), le 9 janvier, 1886.

"Nous soussignés Liébeault (Ambroise), docteur en médecine, et De Guaita (Stanislas), homme de lettres, tous deux demeurant actuellement à Nancy, attestons et certifions avoir obtenus les résultats suivants.

"1. Mlle. Louise L., endormie du sommeil magnétique, fut informée

qu'elle allait avoir à répondre à une question qui lui serait faite *mentalement* sans l'intervention d'aucune parole ni d'aucun signe. Le Dr. Liébeault, la main appuyée au front du sujet, se recueillit un instant, concentrant sa propre attention sur la demande, *Quand serez-vous guérie ?* qu'il avait la volonté de faire. Les lèvres de la somnambule remuèrent soudain : '*Bientôt,*' murmura-t-elle distinctement. On l'invita alors à répéter devant toutes les personnes présentes, la question qu'elle avait intuitivement perçue. Elle la redit dans les termes mêmes, où elle avait été formulée dans l'esprit de l'expérimentateur. Cette première expérience, entreprise par le Dr. Liébeault, à l'instigation de M. de Guaita, réussit donc pleinement. Une seconde épreuve donna des résultats moins rigoureux mais plus curieux peut-être encore, ainsi qu'on va voir.

"2. M. de Guaita, s'étant mis en rapport avec la magnétisée, lui posa *mentalement* une autre question, *Reviendrez-vous la semaine prochaine ?*¹ '*Peut-être,*' fut la réponse du sujet ; mais invité à communiquer aux personnes présentes la question mentale, elle répondit, 'Vous m'avez demandé si *vous* reviendrez la semaine prochaine.' Cette confusion, portant sur un mot de la phrase, est très significative. On dirait que la jeune fille a 'bronché' en lisant dans le cerveau du magnétiseur.

"3. Le Dr. Liébeault, afin qu'aucune phrase indicative ne fût prononcée, même à voix basse, écrivit sur un billet, 'Mademoiselle, en se réveillant, verra son chapeau noir transformé en chapeau rouge.' Le billet fut passé d'avance à tous les témoins, puis MM. Liébeault et de Guaita posèrent, en silence, leur main sur le front du sujet, en formulant mentalement la phrase convenue. Alors la jeune fille, instruite qu'elle verrait dans la pièce quelque chose d'insolite, fut réveillée. Sans une hésitation elle fixa aussitôt son chapeau, et, avec un grand éclat de rire, se récria, 'Ce n'était pas son chapeau ; elle n'en voulait pas. Il avait bien la même forme ; mais cette plaisanterie avait assez duré ; il fallait lui rendre son bien.' 'Mais enfin, qu'y voyez-vous de changé ?' 'Vous savez de reste. Vous avez des yeux comme moi.' 'Mais encore ?' On dut insister très longtemps pour qu'elle consentît à dire en quoi son chapeau était changé ; on voulait se moquer d'elle. Pressée de questions elle dit enfin, '*Vous voyez bien qu'il est tout rouge.*' Comme elle refusait de la reprendre, force fut de mettre fin à son hallucination, en lui affirmant qu'il allait revenir à sa couleur première. Le docteur souffla sur le chapeau, et, redevenu le sien à ses yeux, elle consentit à le reprendre.²

"Tels sont les résultats que nous certifions avoir obtenus de concert. En foi de quoi, nous avons rédigé le présent procès-verbal.

"Nancy, ce 9 Janvier, 1886, *fait en double.*

"A. A. LIÉBEAULT.

"STANISLAS DE GUAITA."

"Nous avons été, une fois, très heureux avec une jeune fille de 15 ans, Mlle. Camille Simon, et cela en présence de M. Brullard et de quelques autres personnes.³ Je lui ai suggéré mentalement qu'à son réveil elle verrait son chapeau, qui est *brun*, transformé en chapeau *jaune* ; puis je

¹ The questions were not committed to paper till after the conclusion of the sitting, which is unfortunate, as everything depends on their exact wording.

² Et la somnambule, immédiatement après, ne se souvient plus de son hallucination.

³ Moi seul ai touché la somnambule.—A. A. L.

l'ai mise en rapport avec tout le monde, et j'ai fait circuler, sous les yeux de chacun, un billet indiquant ma suggestion, avec recommandation de penser comme moi. Mais, par une distraction dont je suis coutumier, je n'ai plus songé à la fin à la couleur que j'avais désignée antérieurement par écrit ; j'ai eu l'idée bien arrêtée qu'elle verrait son chapeau teint en *rouge*. Et, en la réveillant, je lui ai affirmé qu'elle verrait quelque chose représentant notre pensée commune. Cette jeune fille, éveillée, n'a plus reconnu la couleur de son chapeau. 'Il était brun,' a-t-elle dit. Après l'avoir longtemps considéré, elle a assuré que réellement il n'avait plus le même aspect, qu'elle n'en pouvait pas trop en définir la couleur, mais que toutefois il lui paraissait d'un *jaune-rougeâtre*. Alors je me suis souvenu de ma distraction. Au cas présent les temoins avaient pensé *jaune* et moi *rouge* ; par suite, l'objet a paru *jaune* et *rouge* à la somnambule réveillée ; ce qui est la preuve qu'une suggestion mentale peut être l'écho de plusieurs cerveaux pensants."¹

The following experiment, made with the same "subject," and sent to us by Dr. Liébeault on June 3, 1886, is an interesting example of temporary *latency* of the telepathic impression.

"J'avais, à cette jeune fille, fait suggérer par plusieurs personnes, et mentalement, qu'après la sortie de son sommeil elle verrait *un coq noir* se promenant sur le plancher de l'appartement. Au réveil et longtemps après (à peu près une demie heure) elle ne voit absolument rien, quoique je lui eusse annoncé qu'elle devait apercevoir quelque chose. C'est alors (au bout d'une demie heure) que cette jeune fille étant allé au jardin, et ayant considéré ma petite basse cour, par hasard, elle revint tout courant nous dire : 'Ah ! je sais ce que je devais voir ; c'est *un coq noir*. Cette idée m'est venue en regardant votre coq.' Mon coq est moitié d'un noir verdâtre sur les ailes, la queue, et le ventre, et partout ailleurs il est d'un blanc jaunâtre. Ainsi voilà une association d'une idée se transmettant de la vue d'un être réel, à une idée fictive transmise suggestivement et mentalement par les personnes présentes."

The following record of experiments was kindly sent to us, on April 27, 1886, by Dr. Jules Ochorowicz, ex-Professor Agrégé of the University of Lemberg, now residing at 24, Boulevard St. Germain, Paris. It is to be wished that the original notes had included a very much more detailed description of the conditions ;² but as corroborative of the parallel but more striking results recorded in Vol. I., Chap. II., the present set deserves attention.

¹ The reader may recall Prof. Lodge's experiment as to the combination of telepathically transferred impressions from two different agents (Vol. i., p. 50 ; see also p. 80). Mr. Myers and I were witnesses of a similar confluence of suggestions *verbally* given at Dr. Liébeault's house, on Aug. 31, 1885. Mr. Myers hypnotised a "subject," and told her that on awaking she would see a baby on his knees. I told her that she would see a *cat* there. When she awoke she gazed at a hat which was on Mr. Myers' knee, and exclaimed, "C'est ni chat ni enfant !" and the mixed hallucination inspired a terror and disgust which lasted for three or four minutes.

² Possibly Dr. Ochorowicz will to some extent repair this omission in his forthcoming book, *Le Problème de la Suggestion Mentale*, in which this record will be embodied.

The first experiments, with cards, were of the type described in Vol. I., pp. 31-3; but though the success obtained told slightly in favour of a cause other than chance, the series was too short to have any independent value. The complete record of the next set of trials is as follows. The percipient was throughout in a normal waking state. (Complete successes are marked *, partial successes †, first guesses only being counted.)

Madame D., âgée 70 ans, forte, robuste, très intelligente. Rheumatisme articulaire chronique. Expérience hypnotique; lourdeur, paralysie, analgésie, dans le doigt. Deux personnes imaginent un objet, Madame D. le devine. Elle ne peut pas nous voir.

PREMIÈRE SÉRIE, LE 2 AVRIL, 1885.

(a) UNE CARTE DE JEU.

OBJET PENSÉ.	OBJET DEVINÉ.
1. Six de pique	"Six noir."†
2. Dix de pique	"Rouge; un roi; un dix."
3. Valet de cœur	"Rouge; † un roi; une dame?"

(b) UNE COULEUR.

4. Bleue	"Bleue."*
5. Jaune	"Jaune."*
6. Noire	"Noire."*

(c) UN OBJET QUELCONQUE.

7. Une lampe	"Un livre; un cigare; un papier."
8. Un chapeau de soie, noir ...	"Quelque chose de bleu; chaise."
9. Un fauteuil	"Une sucrière; une armoire; un meuble."
10. Le sel	"Un gout de sel."*

(d) UNE LETTRE.

11. z	"i, r, s."
--------------	------------

UNE PERSONNE CONNUE.

12. Valentine... ..	"Valentine."*
13. M ^r . O.	"M ^r . D. ? M ^r . Z. ?"

UN PORTRAIT DE LA SALLE.¹

14. D'un évêque	"C'est l'évêque."*
------------------------	--------------------

UN CHIFFRE.

15. 8	"7, 5, 2, 8."
--------------	---------------

¹ It ought to be made a rule that the object chosen is not anything visible in the room; as it is impossible to prove that it was not indicated to the guesser by the attitude or glance of some one present. It ought to have been stated in many cases whether the object or colour was *looked at*, or merely *imagined*, by the agents.

UNE IMPRESSION.

OBJET PENSÉ.

OBJET DEVINÉ.

16. Gaie "Triste."

UNE FIGURE QUELCONQUE.

17. Une croix noire "Un arbre—branches croisées."
 18. Un vieillard à longue barbe ... "Un homme, barbu ; barbe
 blanche."*

UNE PHOTOGRAPHIE SUR SEPT.

19. D'un garçon "Une jeune fille ; des enfants."

UN NOM QUELCONQUE.

20. Marie "Marie."*
 21. Adam "Jean, Gustave, Charles."

UN NOMBRE QUELCONQUE.

22. Dix "Six, douze, neuf, dix."

UN OBJET QUELCONQUE.

23. Un livre bleu, satin... .. "Couleur violette—rose."
 24. Un crayon d'or posé sur un
 fond bleu... .. "Quelque chose de noir sur du bleu."†
 25. As de pique sur un fond noir ... "Quelque chose de noir—bleu ; une
 carte ; l'as de trèfle."

UN INSTRUMENT.

26. Un clairon "Un violon."

UN CHIFFRE.

27. 3 "2, 5."

UN OBJET DE LA SALLE.

28. Une assiette avec un image ... "L'assiette avec l'image."*

UN GOÛT.

29. Du sel "Aigre—amer."
 30. Sucre "Doux."†
 31. Des fraises "D'une pomme—du raisin ; des
 fraises."

DEUXIÈME SÉRIE, LE 2 MAI, 1885.

UN OBJET QUELCONQUE.

32. Un buste de M. N. "Un portrait—d'un homme ;† un
 buste."
 33. Un éventail "Quelque chose de rond."
 34. Une clef "Quelque chose en plomb—en
 bronze—en fer."
 35. Une main portant une bague... "Quelque chose qui brille—un
 diamant—une bague."

UN GOÛT.

OBJET PENSÉ.

OBJET DEVINÉ.

36. Acide "Doux."

UNE FORME.

37. Un carré... .. "Quelque chose d'irrégulier."

38. Un cercle... .. "Un triangle—un cercle."

UNE LETTRE.

39. M "M."*

40. D "D."*

41. J "J."*

42. B "A, X, R, B."

43. O "W, A—non, c'est un O."

44. Jan "J" (Continuez), "Jan."*

TROISIÈME SÉRIE, LE 6 MAI, 1885.

Le sujet, nous tournant le dos, tient un crayon et écrit ce qui lui vient dans la pensée. Nous lui touchons le dos légèrement d'un doigt, en regardant les lettres écrites par nous. Vingt-deux expériences¹ ont été faites sans être notées exactement; c'étaient pour la plupart des échecs. Suit une série de succès étonnants.

66. Brabant "Bra—" (je m'efforce mentalement à aider le sujet, sans rien dire) "bant."*

67. Paris... .. "P . . . aris."*

68. Téléphone... .. "T . . . Téléphone."*

QUATRIÈME SÉRIE, LE 8 MAI, 1885. (MÊMES CONDITIONS.)

UNE LETTRE.

69. Z "L, P, K, T."

70. B "B."*

71. F "S, T, F."

72. n "M, N."

73. P "P, Z, A."

74. Y "V, Y."

75. e "e."*

76. Gustave "F, T, Gabriel."

77. Duch "C, O."

78. ba "B, A."†

79. N O "F, K, O."

UN NOMBRE.

80. 44 "6, 8, 12."

81. 2 "7, 5, 9."

(J'engage mon aide à se représenter la forme écrite et non les sons des nombres.)

82. 3 "8, 3."

83. 7 "7."*

84. 8 "8—non, 0, 6, 9."†

¹ Dr. Ochorowicz speaks of 22 experiments between 44 and 66, but only allows for 21.

Suivent 13 expériences sur les formes dessinées, phantastiques, parmi lesquelles cinq seulement présentaient une certaine analogie.

UNE PERSONNE CONNUE.

OBJET PENSÉ.

OBJET DEVINÉ.

98. Le sujet lui-même " M. O.—non, c'est moi."
 99. M. D. " M. D."*

UN IMAGE QUELCONQUE.

100. Nous nous représentons la lune " Je vois les nuages, qui filent. Une
 croissant—M^e P. (mon aide) lumière. C'est la lune."*
 sur un fond de nuages, moi
 dans un ciel bleu foncé.

The following is a tabular view of the results of this series :—

	Total.	Complete Successes.	Partial Successes.	Failures
I. Visual—Diagrams, with contact	13	0	0	13
II. Imagined objects, various, with contact ...	3	2	0	1
without contact	27	8	4	15
III. Imagined numbers, letters, and names, without contact	12	5	0	7
IV. Visual numbers and names and letters, with contact	41	6	2	33
V. Abstract ideas	1			1
VI. Tastes	4	0	1	3
	101	21	7	73

It will be seen that the majority both of complete and partial successes occur in the first 44 trials, in which there was no contact.

A third set of trials, made with a hypnotised "subject," gave 8 complete and 7 partial successes, and 11 failures. But here, though contact was avoided, the form of experiment—involving movement of the limbs, and sometimes actual movement about the room,—is open to grave objection; as it can never be proved to the satisfaction of persons not present that guidance of some sort was not afforded by unconscious physical signs.

The following case of the transference of a name is recorded by M. Ch. Richet. It is one of the sporadic instances which occurred before the time was ripe for placing telepathy on a firm evidential basis. In future, we may hope that similar casual instances will, as a matter of course, be recorded at the moment, (especially by medical

and scientific observers,) and forwarded to our London headquarters, or to those of the *Société de Psychologie Physiologique* in Paris.

“Octobre 30, 1885.

“Je n'ai obtenu qu'une seule fois dans de nombreuses recherches sur la lucidité des personnes mesmerisées, un résultat satisfaisant. C'est précisément dans une de mes premières expériences, et elle est remarquable, car je ne l'ai jamais pu répéter, même avec une approximation moindre. Une jeune fille, convalescente, fut mise dans le sommeil magnétique, en Novembre, 1872, par moi, à l'Hôtel-Dieu. Un jour, vers 4 heure de l'après-midi, j'amenai avec moi un jeune étudiant Américain de mes amis, M. Hearn. M. Hearn n'avait jamais vu cette jeune fille. Lorsque elle fut endormie, je dis à mon sujet magnétique: 'Connaissez-vous le nom de mon ami?' (J'étais sûr de ne pas avoir prononcé son nom.) Elle se mit à sourire. 'Non,' me dit-elle. Puis, comme j'insistais, elle ajouta: 'Je ne le vois pas.' J'insiste encore, et elle me dit: 'Il y a cinq lettres.' 'Eh bien!' dis-je alors, 'quelle est la première lettre?' Alors elle, à voix très basse, me dit, 'H.' 'Quelle est la seconde lettre?' dis-je. 'E.' 'Et la troisième?' 'Je ne la vois pas.' Comme elle cherchait inutilement, je dis, 'Passons à la quatrième.' 'R.' 'Puis la cinquième.' 'N.'

“J'ai essayé le lendemain d'autres expériences analogues avec le même sujet, mais sans succès. De même plus tard, sans succès, avec d'autres personnes.

“C'est pour cela que je ne l'avais pas publiée; mais maintenant que le fait de cette *thought-transference* semble bien prouvé, je me crois autorisé à le donner; car il rentre dans un ensemble de faits qui paraissent démontrés, et j'en ai été tellement frappé que je me souviens avec une précision absolue de toutes les circonstances qui l'ont accompagné.”

The next case is from Dr. A. M. Chiltoff, of Kharkoff, and is parallel to those described in Vol. I., pp. 82-3.

“University of Kharkoff.

“May, 1886.

“On Jan. 31, 1886, in Petersburg, in the lodging of M. Greshner, I, in 3 minutes, and at a distance of 4 feet, plunged into sleep M. Drobiazguin, an officer of the Russian navy. The experiment was made in the presence of M. Toumas, M.D. (now Professor at the University of Warsaw), and of many other witnesses. When the 'subject' fell asleep, one of the witnesses wrote on a sheet of paper the (Russian) word 'Bog' (God). Then I took this sheet of paper and put it on the forehead of my 'subject.' To my question whether he can read the word written on the paper, M. Drobiazguin gave an affirmative answer, and then proceeded to pronounce in a dead voice the letters. The first two were read correctly, but in lieu of 'g' he said 'tch.' When I remarked to him that the last letter is guessed incorrectly, he immediately said the true letter. In my opinion this experiment cannot be explained by 'mental suggestion,' for those present expected that the 'subject' would pronounce the right letter, 'g,' and he nevertheless pronounced 'tch.'”

[There is no Russian word “botch.” As regards peculiarities of spelling, see Vol. I., pp. 76-8. The independent action of the percipient's

mind which such peculiarities indicate affords, according to the reasoning in this book, no ground at all for doubting that the idea was telepathically transferred from one mind to the other.]

We owe the following accounts of some experiments in hypnotic *rapport* to Mr. C. Kegan Paul, who states that he has known the phenomenon of "community of taste in the mesmeric sleep" to have occurred several times in the case of this "subject." Mr. Paul writes:—

"May 27th, 1884.

"I lived at Great Tew, in Oxfordshire, from March, 1851, to May, 1852. When there, the following circumstance occurred, but I am not able to fix the month, further than to say that I think it was in the late summer of 1851. (No. I am now convinced that it was in April, 1852.)

"I had been in the habit of mesmerising frequently Mr. Walter Francis Short, then an undergraduate scholar of New College, who was, without any single exception, the most 'sensitive' person of either sex I have ever known. He usually became what is called clairvoyant, but this always tired him, and I seldom made protracted experiments in this direction. On several occasions I found that a community of taste was established between us, but only once made any experiment with more than one substance, such as a biscuit, or glass of water.

"At Great Tew, with his consent, my two sisters alone being present besides ourselves, I carried the matter further. We had dined in my only sitting-room, *and the dessert was still on the table.* (I think I am right, though my sister F. doubts.) I put Short to sleep in an arm-chair, which I turned with its back to the table, and Short's face to the wall. There was no mirror in the room. I asked Short, taking his hand, if he thought he could taste what I took in my mouth, and he said he thought that he could. I, still holding his hand, shut my own eyes, and my sisters put into my mouth various things which were on the table. I remember only raisins, but there were four or five various substances tasted. These were all quite correctly described, except that I think there was an uncertainty about the kind of wine. Short, however, had of course been aware of what was on the table, but he could not know, nor did I know, the order in which I was to be fed with these things.

"To carry the experiment further, one of my sisters left the room, bringing back various things wholly unknown to me, which she administered to me having my eyes shut. I remember spices, black pepper, salt, raw rice, and finally soap, all of which Short recognised, and the last of which he rejected with a splutter of great disgust. The experiment only ended when we could think of nothing more to taste.

"I had at that time already left Oxford; Short did so soon after, and our various occupations seldom allowed our meeting. His conviction of my power over him was such that he begged that I would never attempt to place him under mesmeric influence when I was at a distance from him, on the ground that, as he was rowing in the Oxford boat, I might do so when he was on the river. I had once affected him at a distance, under rather singular circumstances, and of course willingly gave the promise.

"C. KEGAN PAUL.

“My sister F. is right in remarking that our four selves were the only persons in the house. My only servant was a woman in the village, who lived close by, and came and went at fixed hours, like an Oxford scout.”

This account was sent by Mr. Paul to his sister, Miss Paul, with the following letter :—

“In talking with my friend Henry Sidgwick over my experiments in mesmerism many years ago, I mentioned one with Short at Tew, when you and M. were present. He has asked me to write it down, and get if possible your recollections on it.

“The particular experiment was one in which Short, being in the mesmeric sleep, was able to taste what was put into my mouth. If you recollect the circumstance at all, I want you, before reading what I have said, enclosed in another envelope, to write down a statement of what you remember as much in detail as possible—time, place, persons present, things tasted, &c. ; *then* to read my narrative, and to write *also* how far your recollection, thus refreshed, tallies with mine, and preserve both accounts, even if you find them contradictory ; then to send my account and your account and remarks enclosed to M., together with this note, asking her to follow exactly the same plan, and return my statement, yours, and her own to me, *together with this note*.

“I should like you also to say that you have observed my order of proceeding as indicated above.

“C. KEGAN PAUL.”

Miss Paul replied as follows, on May 27 :—

“On Thursday, April 29th, 1852, my sister and I went to stay with my brother at Great Tew, in Oxfordshire, and Mr. Short joined us at Oxford, and went with us to Tew. As he returned to Oxford on Saturday, May 1st, the mesmeric experiments, which I well remember, must have been on Friday, April 30th, and they were after dinner in the evening. My brother mesmerised Mr. Short, and when he was quite asleep he tried some experiments.

“My brother drank some wine (I think it was port), and we saw Mr. Short’s lips and throat moving as if he was swallowing it, and on my brother asking him what he was drinking, he at once said what it was. The wine had been taken from a cupboard and poured out, where, even had he been awake, Mr. Short could not have seen what it was before tasting it.”

“[I think my own account is the more correct.—C. K. P.]”

“My sister then got some black pepper from the kitchen and put it in my brother’s hand, and on his putting some in his own mouth, Mr. Short at once tasted it, and on my brother asking him what he had in his mouth, he said it was very hot and unpleasant, but was not quite sure what it was. My brother held Mr. Short’s hand all the time.

“The only other thing I remember is that on my brother removing his hand after, and substituting my sister’s, Mr. Short looked as if in pain, and said the change was unpleasant.

“No one else was in the little cottage at the time.

“F. K. PAUL.

“P.S.—Since writing my account I have read my brother’s, and think it very accurate, as, now I am reminded of the soap, &c., I can faintly recollect it, but not clearly, as I do the things I have written down.

“Also I think the dessert had been put away, and the wine taken out again on purpose.

“I remember the date, as I have always written down very shortly the events of each day.”

Mr. Paul’s other sister, Mrs. P., writes, on May 29, 1884 :—

“In the year 1852 or 1853, I believe at Bloxham [certainly Tew.—C. K. P.], I remember my brother trying experiments on a friend, Mr. Short, whom he was in the habit of mesmerising. One evening, I saw him mesmerise Mr. Short, and while he was in that state my brother asked for a glass of water or wine, and drank it. Mr. Short appeared as if he was drinking, and swallowed, and made a reply when asked what it was ; but the experiment I remember best was, after my getting some pepper, and giving it to my brother, he put some into his mouth, and Mr. Short looked as if in pain, and said, ‘Hot.’ Then I took his hand, and his face changed, and I think he said, ‘Nasty.’ I know he seemed to dislike the change from my brother’s touch ; but although I know there were other experiments, it is so long ago that I cannot quite recall them.

“M. E. P.

“P.S.—Since writing the above I have read my brother’s narrative, which is, I think, substantially correct.”

The Rev. W. F. Short writes to Mr. Podmore :—

“The Rectory, Donhead St. Mary, Salisbury.

“June 12th, 1884.

“DEAR SIR,—Stock tells me you would like my account of some mesmeric experiences of mine at Great Tew in the year ’52. You are very welcome, but 32 years may have impaired my memory for the details, and I should like Kegan Paul to see the account before any use is made of it.

“I had come up to New College by accident a week before the time, and finding college empty accepted an invitation to pay Paul, then curate of Great Tew, a visit. One night, I think the Thursday following, he mesmerised me, and made, I believe, some successful experiments in the ‘transference of taste’ ; but of these, as I was in a deep sleep, I can say nothing. When I was in due time awakened, he said, ‘We tried to get you to visit New College, but you said it was all a guess, and would tell us nothing.’ I answered, ‘I seem to have dreamt of New College Junior Common-room, and to have seen B. and G. sitting at a small round table drawn near the fire, with the lamp on the large table near them, playing at cards.’ It was agreed that I should test the truth of this on my return to Oxford on Friday (one day before men in general came up). On entering college I met B., and said, ‘You up? Are there any other men come?’ ‘Oh, yes ; half-a-dozen. G. and so-and-so,’ &c. ‘Were you in the Common-room last night at 10 (?)?’ ‘Yes.’ ‘Who else was there?’ ‘Oh, the whole lot of us. No, by 10 everyone was gone but I and G.’ ‘Where were you sitting?’ ‘At a small table close to the fire, it was so cold.’

‘With the lamp on the big table near you?’ ‘Yes, drawn close to us.’ ‘Then I will tell you what you were doing. You were playing cards.’ ‘How odd! We weren’t playing cards, but G. was showing me tricks on the cards.’

“I have always thought this a thoroughly good case, too exact to be a mere coincidence, and I think tolerably accurate even in the words used, but those who do not, like myself, believe in clairvoyance¹ will probably set it down to a happy guess.

“I have not for many years had any experience of mesmerism, but after this, for some years, I saw a great deal of it, and have no more doubt of its reality, even in its higher phases of inducing clairvoyance, &c., than I have of my own existence.

“I doubt whether B. would remember this (I don’t think G. ever heard of it), but I would write to him if you like it, only I am rather overworked just now.—Believe me, yours very truly,

“W. F. SHORT.”

Mr. Short writes, on Feb. 18, 1886 :—

“My friend B. remembered nothing of the circumstances (naturally enough), though I feel perfectly sure it took place.”

Mr. C. Kegan Paul writes, on June 16, 1884 :—

“I am sorry to say I do not remember much about the clairvoyance part of the experiment with Walter Short, though I remember the community of taste vividly, and have described it to Mr. Sidgwick.

“Short became clairvoyant on several occasions under my mesmerism, but I do not recall the details with certainty. On the evening in question I only remember that on trying some experiments Short said he was tired, and wished to be wakened. I do not remember his mentioning his ‘dream’ or that I heard afterwards how nearly correct it had been. It is probable that he did mention the dream, but that I paid little attention to it, being full of the first experiment, and that as I only saw him occasionally, and we did not exchange letters, I never heard the verification.”

In the following cases, though they are in a sense experimental, the experiment was not directed to the particular result obtained. They are parallel to those recorded in Vol. I., pp. 78 and 84; they illustrate thought-transference of the “underground” sort, both agent and percipient being unconscious of the idea which nevertheless is pretty clearly shown to have passed from one mind to the other otherwise than through the recognised sensory channels. We have reason to think that this form of transference is not extremely uncommon; and these specimens may serve to elicit further records.

Mrs. Wingfield (mother of the ladies mentioned above, p. 653) writes as follows :—

¹ This may very probably have been a case of telepathic clairvoyance (Vol. i., pp. 368-9), conditioned by the hypnotic trance, but also by the pre-existing relation between Mr. Short and the friends whom he saw (p. 162).

“34, Ennismore Gardens, S.W.

“April 2nd, 1886.

“On the evening of Jan. 13, 1886, Mr. Tatham [of 2, Cambridge Gate, W.] was writing automatically, but not very legibly. He wrote a word twice, which some of us tried to read, but could not. He said he thought it was Phoebe, or something like it. Some minutes afterwards Miss Wingfield, who was sitting at the other side of the room, wrote automatically, ‘Who is G. Norby?’ We none of us knew this name, and asked why the question was written. We were told ‘because he wanted to tell something about an accident,’ or words to that effect. The subject then dropped, and the writing was at an end.

“Some half-hour or more afterwards, Mr. M. W. took up Mr. Tatham’s paper and looked at it, and said, ‘Why! *this* is G. Norby.’ And when we examined the letters carefully we found it was so. Therefore Mr. Tatham and Miss W. were both influenced to write the same name independently of each other,¹ as at the time Miss W. wrote, ‘Who is G. Norby?’ she had not seen what Mr. Tatham wrote, and we none of us had any idea of such a name. There were six persons present beside Mr. T. and Miss W., *none* of whom had ever heard the name.

“E. A. WINGFIELD,
“PERCY TATHAM.”

The next record is from Miss Birrell and Mrs. Medley, near relatives of the present writer, who entertains little doubt that the facts, though somewhat remote, are recorded with substantial accuracy.

“37, Addison Gardens, North Kensington, W.

“October, 1885.

“I was playing at table-turning in the Christmas holidays of 1863, with a party of six or seven. At last the table rapped a name we none of us knew. We thought there was a mistake. A lady in the room, but not at the table, turned round and identified it as the name of some relation—I think her sister’s son. We asked the table to rap three times if it wished her to come, which it did. She came and put her hands on the table but no distinct message followed. The name was new to me. I said, ‘Was there really such a person?’ The lady, who was a good deal distressed, answered, ‘Oh yes!’ and mentioned one or two facts about him, turning round to another lady of her own age, in the room *but not at the table*, for further confirmation. She did this as we were too young to remember the dead person.

“OLIVE BIRRELL.”

“Walden House, All Saints Street, Nottingham.

“October 30th, 1886.

“I was seated with a party of six or eight round a table with our hands placed upon it, and it rapped in reply to the letters of the alphabet. Several names were spelt out and various broken sentences. The table at length spelt the name ‘William Smallshaw.’ We replied, ‘There

¹ If this were certainly the case, the incident could not have been included in the present work. But it is quite conceivable that Miss Wingfield’s production of the name was due to its latent existence in Mr. Tatham’s mind.

never was such a person,' and one gentleman laughed and said, 'You have made a mistake, try again.' The table continued to rap and then a lady in another part of the room, away from our party altogether, said very nervously, '*I had a brother, William Smallshaw.*' The table continued to rap and we asked if Miss Smallshaw should join us. It replied, '*Yes,*' and she came. No sentence of any value or sense was made out after this.

"EMILY G. MEDLEY."

Miss Birrell is tolerably confident that the surname was not Smallshaw, but Lyon, which was Miss Smallshaw's married sister's name.

Mr. Augustine Birrell, who was present, says that the expression of Miss Smallshaw's face, as she came across the room, is fixed in his memory; but he cannot recall what followed, when she put her hands on the table, or the reason of her being summoned to the table.

[The state of Miss Smallshaw's health has prevented us from applying for her recollections.]

§ 2. The following is a transitional case, akin to those recorded in Vol. I., pp. 103-9; but it differs from that group in the fact that the agent remembers his own direct share in the occurrence, and appears to have been reciprocally affected. We owe the case to Mr. H. P. Sparks (of Overbeck Villa, Woodstone, near Southampton,) and Mr. A. H. W. Cleave (of 28, Vardens Road, New Wandsworth, S.W.,) who at the time were fellow-students of naval engineering at Portsmouth. Personal acquaintance has completely confirmed the impression made on me by the letters of these gentlemen, that they had observed the phenomena, which were a complete surprise to them, with intelligence and care. They were unaware of the remarkable interest of their results; and Mr. Sparks addressed me in the first instance, not so much to supply information which, for aught he knew, might be of a common enough type, as to ask for advice about hypnotic experimentation in general. He did not know to what address to write; but acting on a dim recollection of a newspaper notice of our objects, he boldly launched a letter into space, which by good luck reached me after a certain amount of peregrination. His account, received in January, 1886, is as follows:—

"H.M.S. 'Marlborough', Portsmouth.

(685) "For the last year, or for about the last 15 months, I have been in the habit of mesmerising a fellow-student of mine. The way I did it was by simply looking into his eyes as he lay in an easy position on a bed. This produced sleep. After a few times I found that this sleep was deepened by making long passes after the patient was off.¹ Then comes

¹ In conversation, I learnt (as I expected) that during the trance Mr. Cleave was to a considerable degree insensitive to pain, and that, on waking, he had no memory of any actions that he had been made to perform, or of what had passed around him.

the remarkable part of this sort of mesmerism. [Mr. Sparks then describes his 'subject's' ability to see, in the trance, places in which he was interested, if he resolved to see them before he was hypnotised; but there is nothing to show that these visions were anything but purely subjective.] However, it has been during the last week or so I have been so surprised and startled by an extraordinary affair. Last Friday evening (January 15th, 1886) he expressed his wish to see a young lady living in Wandsworth, and he also said he would try to make himself seen by her. I accordingly mesmerised him, and continued the long passes for about 20 minutes, concentrating my will on his idea. When he came round (I brought him round by just touching his hand and willing him, after 1 hour and 20 minutes' trance) he said he had seen her in the dining-room, and that after a time she grew restless, and then suddenly looked straight at him and then covered her eyes with her hands. Just after this he came round. Last Monday evening (January 18th, 1886) we did the same thing, and this time he said he thought he had frightened her, as after she had looked at him for a few minutes she fell back in her chair in a sort of faint. Her little brother was in the room at the time. Of course, after this we expected a letter if the vision was real; and on Wednesday morning he received a letter from this young lady asking whether anything had happened to him, as on Friday evening she was startled by seeing him standing at the door of the room. After a minute he disappeared, and she thought that it might have been fancy; but on the Monday evening she was still more startled by seeing him again, and this time much clearer, and it so frightened her that she nearly fainted.

"This account I send you is perfectly true, I will vouch, for I have two independent witnesses who were in the dormitory at the time when he was mesmerised, and when he came round. My patient's name is Arthur H. W. Cleave, and his age is 18 years. My own is 19 years. A. C. Darley and A. S. Thurgood, fellow-students, are the two witnesses I mentioned.

"H. PERCY SPARKS."

Mr. Cleave writes, on March 15, 1886 :—

"H.M.S. 'Marlborough,' Portsmouth.

"Sparks and myself have, for the past 18 months, been in the habit of holding mesmeric séances in our dormitories. For the first month or two we got no very satisfactory results, but after that we succeeded in sending one another to sleep. I could never get Sparks further than the sleeping state, but he could make me do anything he liked whilst I was under the influence; so I gave up trying to send him off, and all our efforts were made towards my being mesmerised. After a short time we got on so well that Sparks had three or four other fellows in the dormitory to witness what I did. I was quite insensible to all pain, as the fellows have repeatedly pinched my hands and legs without my feeling it. About 6 months ago I tried my power of will in order, while under the influence, to see persons to whom I was strongly attached. For some time I was entirely unsuccessful, although I once thought that I saw my brother (who is in Australia), but had no opportunity of verifying the vision.

"A short time ago, I tried to see a young lady whom I know very well, and was perfectly surprised at my success. I could see her as

plainly as I can see now, but I could not make myself seen by her, although I had often tried to. After I had done this several times, I determined to try and make myself seen by her, and told Sparks of my idea, which he approved. Well, we tried this for five nights running without any more success. We then suspended our endeavours for a night or two, as I was rather over-exerted by the continued efforts and got severe headaches. We then tried again (on, I think it was, a Friday, but am not certain), and were, I thought, successful; but as the young lady did not write to me about it, I thought I must have been mistaken, so I told Sparks that we had better give up trying. But he begged me to try once more, which we did on the following Monday, when we were successful to such an extent that I felt rather alarmed. (I must tell you that I am in the habit of writing to the young lady every Sunday, but I did not write that week, in order to make her think about me.) This took place between 9.30 p.m. and 10 p.m. Monday night, and on the following Wednesday morning I got the letter which I have enclosed. I, of course, then knew I had been successful. I went home about a fortnight after this, when I saw the young lady, who seemed very frightened in spite of my explanations, and begged me never to try it again, and I promised her that I would not.

"I must now tell you our method of mesmerism. I lay on my bed, with my head raised on two pillows, and Sparks sat facing me about three feet off on a chair. The lights were made low, and then I watched his eyes intently, thinking in the meantime of the young lady whom I wanted to see. After a short time (about 7 minutes) my sense of hearing left me, and I could see nothing but two eyes, which after a short time disappeared, and I then became senseless. (When we first experimented I could never get farther than this state, and it was only after repeatedly trying that I did so.) I then seemed to see (indistinctly at first) her face, which gradually became plainer and plainer until I seemed to be in another room altogether, and could detail minutely all the surroundings. I told Sparks, when I came round, what I saw, who was with the young lady, and what she was doing, all of which were verified in her letter.

"A. H. W. CLEAVE."

The two witnesses of the experiment last described write as follows:—

"I have seen Mr. Cleave's account of his mesmeric experiment, and can fully vouch for the truth thereof.

"A. C. DARLEY."

"I have read Mr. Cleave's statement, and can vouch for the truth of it, as I was present when he was mesmerised and heard his statement after he revived.

"A. E. S. THURGOOD."

The following is a copy, made by the present writer, of the letter in which the young lady, Miss A. —, described her side of the affair.

The envelope bore the postmarks, "Wandsworth, Jan. 19, 1886," "Portsmouth, Jan. 20, 1886," and the address, "Mr. A. H. W. Cleave, H.M.S. 'Marlborough,' Portsmouth."

“Wandsworth.

“Tuesday morning.

“DEAR ARTHUR,—Has anything happened to you? Please write and let me know at once, for I have been so frightened.

“Last Tuesday evening, I was sitting in the dining [room] reading, when I happened to look up, and could have declared I saw you standing at the door looking at me. I put my handkerchief to my eyes, and when I looked again, you were gone. I thought it must have been only my fancy, but last night (Monday), while I was at supper, I saw you again, just as before, and was so frightened that I nearly fainted. Luckily only my brother was there, or it would have attracted attention. Now do write at once and tell me how you are. I really cannot write any more now.”

[Signature of Christian name.]

It will be seen that Miss —— mentions *Tuesday* as the day of her first hallucination; whereas both Mr. Sparks and Mr. Cleave mention *Friday* as the day on which he first seemed to obtain a vision of the room where she was; and though, in a letter written on March 21st, Mr. Cleave expresses uncertainty on this point, and inclines to the view that his first vision of the room occurred on the Tuesday, “as I waited for a day or two to see if I should get a letter before I tried again” on the following Monday, it is impossible to set aside the earlier statement. But in conversation, both he and Mr. Sparks expressed their decided opinion—which accords with what would be naturally inferred from their letters—that Tuesday must at any rate have fallen within the *five days running* on which trials were made, before the break; and the first incident therefore gives valuable confirmation to the second. Mr. Cleave’s omission to write as usual to Miss —— on the Sunday was perhaps an error of judgment; as it leaves it open to the objector to say that the non-receipt of a letter on Monday morning so wrought on her mind as to conjure up a spectral illusion, to which she had become predisposed by her experience of the previous week.

Mr. Cleave explains that though he might naturally enough have imagined Miss —— to be in the dining-room at that hour, it would have seemed to him more probable, had he made a guess at the scene, that other elder members of the family should also be present, than that she should have been alone with her little brother—which is so far an argument for supposing his vision to have been of the telepathically clairvoyant sort, and not a mere subjective picture. But the nature of his percipience is, of course,

a separate question ;¹ the prime fact in the case is the hallucination produced by his agency. Miss —, it will be seen, was so seriously disturbed by what occurred that she has requested him not to repeat the experiment. Her feeling is natural enough—it is just one of the natural conditions that “psychical research” has to reckon with. Every department in the exploration of Nature has difficulties of its own ; and it would be strange if a study that deals with living human material were an exception. That the particular form of obstacle here again encountered (see Vol I., p. 109) may make the accumulation of evidence for the rarer psychical phenomena a slow process is probable enough ; but that the prolongation of our search should have already brought us a single fresh instance of this rarest type is really a fact of the most hopeful significance, and one which would alone amply vindicate the plan of wide and public inquiry that we have adopted.

The next account is perhaps even more remarkable, as the agent was in a normal state. We owe it to Mrs. Russell, of Belgaum, India, wife of Mr. H. R. Russell, Educational Inspector in the Bombay Presidency.

“June 8th, 1886.

(686) “As desired, I write down the following facts, as well as I can recall them. I was living in Scotland, my mother and sisters in Germany. I lived with a very dear friend of mine, and went to Germany every year to see my people. It had so happened that I could not go home as usual for two years, when on a sudden I made up my mind to go and see my family. They knew nothing of my intention ; I had never gone in early spring before ; and I had no time to let them know by letter that I was going to set off. I did not like to send a telegram, for fear of frightening my mother. The thought came to me to will with all my might to appear to one of my sisters, never mind which of them, in order to give them a warning of my coming. I only thought most intensely for a few minutes of them, wishing with all my might to be seen by one of them—half present myself, in vision, at home.² I did not take more than ten minutes, I think. I started by Leith steamer on a Saturday night, end of April, 1859. I wished to appear at home about 6 o'clock p.m. that same Saturday. I arrived at home about 6 o'clock on the Tuesday morning following. I entered the house without anyone seeing me, the hall being cleaned and the front door open. I walked into the room. One of my sisters stood with her back to the door ; she turned round when she heard the door opening, and, on seeing me, stared at me, turning deadly pale and letting what she had in her hand fall. I had been silent. Then I spoke, and said, ‘It is I. Why do you look so frightened?’ when she answered, ‘I thought I saw you again as Stinchen’ (another sister) ‘saw you on Saturday.’

¹ If the case was truly reciprocal, it seems clearly to exemplify the connection of the power to act telepathically with an abnormal extension of the agent's own susceptibility. See pp. 161-2 and 309-10.

² Note by Mr. Russell :—“*I.e.*, she was at home, and saw her people, in thought.”

"When I inquired, she told me that on the Saturday evening, about 6 o'clock, my sister saw me quite clearly entering the room in which she was by one door, passing through it, opening the door of another room where my mother was, and shutting the door behind me. She rushed after what she thought was I, calling out my name, and was quite stupefied when she did not see me with my mother. My mother could not understand my sister's excitement. They looked everywhere for me, but of course did not find me. My mother was very miserable; she thought I might be dying.

"My sister who had seen me (*i.e.*, my apparition) was out that morning when I arrived. I sat down on the stairs, to watch, when she came in, the effect of my real appearance on her. When she looked up and saw me, sitting motionless, she called out my name, and nearly fainted. My sister has never seen anything unearthly either before that or afterwards; and I have never made any such experiments again—nor will I, as the sister that saw me first when I really came home had a very severe illness afterwards, caused by the shock to her nerves. "J. M. RUSSELL."

Mrs. Russell wrote to ask her sister (Fräulein Holst, of 7, Wohler's Allée, Altona, Holstein) if she recollected the occurrence, and has copied an extract from her sister's reply, of which the following is a translation:—

"Of course I remember the matter as well as if it had happened to-day. Pray don't come appearing to me again!" Fräulein Holst declines, however, to give an independent account, on the ground of dislike to the subject.

I proceed to some more hypnotic cases. The following is an apparently genuine, though isolated, case of the telepathic influence of will on a hypnotic "subject," who however was at the time in a normal state. (*Cf.* Vol. I., pp. 89-94.) The further experiment with the same "subject" recalls the cases in Vol. I., p. 96, and above, pp. 334-6. We received the account in May, 1886, from Mr. E. M. Clissold, of 3, Oxford Square, W.

"United University Club,

"Pall Mall East, S.W.

(687) "In the year 1878 (I believe), there was a carpenter (Gannaway) employed by me to mend a gate in my kitchen garden, when a friend of mine (Moens) called upon me, and the conversation turning on mesmerism, he asked me if I knew anything about it myself. On my replying in the affirmative, he said, 'Can you mesmerise anyone at a distance?' I said that I had never tried to do so, but that there was a man now in the garden upon whom I could easily operate, and that I would try the experiment with this man, if he (Moens) would tell me what to do. He then said, 'Form an impression of the man whom you intend mesmerising in your mind, and then wish him strongly to come to you.' I very much doubted the success of the enterprise, but I followed out the suggestion of my friend, and I was extremely astonished to hear the steps of the man, whom I wished to appear, running after me; he came right up to me and asked me what I wanted with him. I must explain that my friend was walking with me previously in the garden, and that we had seen and talked to the

man whom I subsequently mesmerised, but that when I wished him to come to me I was out of his sight, behind the garden wall, some 100 yards distant, and that I had neither by conversation nor otherwise led him to believe that I proposed to mesmerise him.

"My friend (Moens) is dead; the man Gannaway I have not heard of for more than seven years; but I have this day written to him, and asked him, if he remembers the incident alluded to, to write to me, and in his own language describe the scene. I may tell you that I have not supplied him with any of the above details, but have left him (if he can) to tell his own story.

"E. M. CLISSOLD."

Mr. Gannaway writes back, in a letter which Mr. Clissold has forwarded to us, that he remembers being often mesmerised by Mr. Clissold, and he recalls some incidents of his experiences; but he does not recollect this particular occasion. One sentence of his letter is as follows:—"I remember, in the dining-room, when you made me think the same as you were thinking about, and I told you what you were thinking of." Mr. Clissold explains that this was an occasion when the Hon. Auberon Herbert was present, and he thus describes it:—

"June 1, 1886.

"Gannaway was mesmerised, and stood in one corner of my dining-room. Herbert sat at the table, and wrote on a paper a subject on which he wished me to think. Gannaway instantly told me, when I asked him, what the thought was about. Herbert wrote:—

- "1. I see a house in flames.
- "2. I see a woman looking out of a window.
- "3. She has a child in her arms.
- "4. She throws it out of the window.
- "5. Is it hurt?' &c., &c.

"Gannaway became much excited, as he appeared to witness these scenes acted before him. I am conscious that if there had been *mala fides* on my part, there was nothing in the experiment; but it was quite honestly conducted, and we were all of us very much surprised at the wonderful accuracy with which Gannaway interpreted my thoughts."

I wrote to Mr. Auberon Herbert, asking him if he remembered participating in an experiment in thought-transference, made with Mr. Clissold's "subject," Gannaway, in which the ideas transferred related to a conflagration. He replied:—

"Ashley Arnewood Farm, Lymington.

"June 22nd, 1886.

"My recollection is as follows; some of the details have escaped me. I thought of a house on fire. Gannaway (a carpenter, I think), on my asking him what I saw, answered quite rightly. I then asked him again what I saw, and he answered quite rightly, 'Fire-engine coming up.' Then the conversation went on (I have shortened it). I. 'Ah! something has happened! what is it?' G. 'A horse, belonging to the fire-engine, has fallen down.' (Quite right.) My memory is quite distinct up to this point as to the questions and answers, though I cannot exactly remember the part Gannaway and Mr. Clissold took respectively. I

remember very distinctly I thought of and asked these questions, and I believe it was Gannaway himself who answered them directly to me. The next point was that, in answer to what I saw, he said they were throwing feather-beds out of a top-storey window—this also was perfectly right—but on this point my memory is not so clear as on the first three points. I have as clear and positive a memory as a man could have about the three first points, (1) fire, (2) fire-engine, (3) horse falling down. They were all quite fairly asked, and quite fairly answered; and I believe I might add to them the fourth point, ‘the feather bed,’ but I cannot speak positively on this. Then comes a curious point. I imagined an entirely different scene—I cannot recall it, but it was to do with a wood—and his power seemed to fail entirely. He made quite wrong answers. I have no doubt about the truthfulness of the whole proceedings. One night I had mesmerised him, and told him he was in a boat, and attacked by a shark. If I had allowed it, he would have almost battered himself to pieces in striking with both arms upon the floor, where he thought the shark was.¹ He was an extraordinary man. It was enough, when you knew him, to look in his eyes to have influence over him. Kindly tell Mr. Clissold I most fully corroborate his statement as far as I know it.

“AUBERON HERBERT.”

Another gentleman who was present on this occasion was Mr. A. T. T. Peterson, of Arnewood Towers, Lymington, who believes that it was he who drew up the programme of the experiment. His account is as follows:—

“June 24th, 1886.

“I drew out a programme in writing of what I wished the operator to think without speaking, in order to try the mere power of the operator over the patient. On this occasion Herbert was the operator, Gannaway the patient. Programme.—A fire-engine with two horses galloping on a public road. One of the horses falls down; gets up again, and on they go. A house on a rising ground on the left on fire. A woman in her night-dress, with a baby in her arms, imploring for help from the first floor. People are throwing beds out of some of the windows of the rooms, which are taken to opposite where the lady was. The child is thrown out and caught all right. The woman jumps out, and is caught and saved.

“This paper I handed to Herbert, requesting him not to say a word, which request he obeyed. He put Gannaway into trance, and Gannaway acted the part [of spectator, presumably,] to the very letter.

“A. T. T. PETERSON.”

[Mr. Peterson goes on to describe another equally successful experiment where the picture transferred was a fishing-scene. Possibly this preceded the failure which Mr. Herbert mentions.]

It is in connection with hypnotism that the most striking telepathic results have been obtained, in the recent rapid development of “psychical research” among French men of science. The

¹ It is of course important to distinguish this phenomenon (which is of a very ordinary type, and is merely of interest here as indicating the reality of the hypnotic state,) from the telepathic result before described.

cases here given were reported to the Société de Psychologie Physiologique towards the close of last year, and were published in the *Revue Philosophique* for February and for April, 1886. The observations themselves, and the circumstances of their publication, mark a distinct step in the scientific recognition of telepathic phenomena on the Continent. The first report—*Note sur quelques Phénomènes de Somnambulisme*—is from Professor Pierre Janet, of Havre, a Corresponding Member of the S.P.R.

(688) “Grâce à l’obligeance d’un médecin bien connu de la ville du Havre, M. le docteur Gibert, j’ai pu pendant une quinzaine de jours observer certains phénomènes curieux de somnambulisme. . . .

“Le sujet sur lequel ces expériences ont été faites est une brave femme de la campagne, que nous désignerons sous le nom de Mme. B. Elle a toujours eu, autant du moins que l’on peut le savoir, une très bonne santé, et en particulier elle ne présente à l’état normal aucun des signes de l’hystérie. Elle est seulement sujette depuis son enfance à des accès de somnambulisme naturel, pendant lesquels elle peut parler et décrire les singulières hallucinations qu’elle paraît éprouver. Son caractère pendant sa vie ordinaire est très honnête, très simple et surtout très timide; quoique son intelligence paraisse fort juste, Mme. B. n’a reçu aucune instruction, elle ne sait pas écrire et épelle à peine quelques lettres. Plusieurs médecins ont déjà, paraît-il, voulu faire sur elle quelques expériences, mais elle a toujours refusé leurs propositions. Ce n’est que sur la demande de M. Gibert qu’elle a consenti à venir passer quelques jours au Havre, du 24 septembre au 14 octobre 1885, et c’est pendant ce court séjour que nous avons eu l’occasion de l’observer.

“Il est assez facile de mettre Mme. B. en état de somnambulisme artificiel; il suffit pour cela de lui tenir la main en la serrant légèrement pendant quelques instants.”

The usual symptoms of deep hypnotic trance presented themselves, including complete insensibility to light, sound, and pain.

“Néanmoins il est un genre d’excitation auquel Mme. B. reste sensible pendant ce sommeil. Celui qui l’a endormie, et celui-là seul, a le pouvoir de provoquer à volonté une contracture partielle ou générale. Il suffit, par exemple, qu’il place un doigt dans l’extension forcée pour qu’il reste raide comme un morceau de bois, et une personne étrangère ne parvient pas à le fléchir. Si à ce moment le magnétiseur touche même légèrement le doigt contracturé, il s’assouplit instantanément. Pour provoquer la contracture générale, il suffit que le magnétiseur place sa main étendue à une petite distance au-devant du corps.”

Other persons could not produce these effects in the slightest degree; and in several other ways the person who had hypnotised the subject retained, during her trance, a quite peculiar influence over her.

After about 10 minutes of deep sleep, Mme. B. would wake into a somnambulant state, in which she was completely sensible to impressions, and could answer questions.

“Mais le caractère, ainsi qu'on l'a fréquemment remarqué, n'est plus du tout le même qu'à l'état de veille. Au lieu d'être simple et timide, Mme. B. est devenue subitement très hardie, très vive, pleine de caprices et toute disposée à se moquer de tout le monde, quelquefois avec esprit.”

From this stage she could be wakened to the normal state by the person who had hypnotised her, but *by no one else* (see Vol. I., p. 88, note); if not wakened she soon relapsed again into the state of deep sleep.

The first phenomena suggestive of “psychical” influence presented themselves in the process of hypnotisation.

“M. Gibert tenait un jour la main de Mme. B. pour l'endormir; mais il était visiblement préoccupé et songeait à autre chose qu'à ce qu'il faisait: le sommeil ne se produisit pas du tout. Cette expérience répétée par moi de diverses manières nous a prouvé que pour endormir Mme. B. il fallait concentrer fortement sa pensée sur l'ordre du sommeil qu'on lui donnait, et que plus la pensée de l'opérateur était distraite, plus le sommeil était difficile à provoquer. Cette influence de la pensée de l'opérateur, quelque extraordinaire que cela paraisse, est ici tout à fait prépondérante, à un tel point qu'elle peut remplacer toutes les autres. Si on presse la main de Mme. B. sans songer à l'endormir, on n'arrive pas à provoquer le sommeil; au contraire, si l'on songe à l'endormir sans lui presser la main, on y réussit parfaitement.”

Experiments of this sort were often repeated; but it is impossible, as M. Janet fully recognises, absolutely to exclude the hypothesis that the hypnotisation was due to some suggestion of the purpose in view, unconsciously conveyed by gesture, or attitude, or mere silence and appearance of expectation. This objection would not apply to other cases in which M. Gibert, without warning, and at a moment then and there fixed on by M. Janet or another friend, produced a distinct effect on the subject from another part of the town—the fact being immediately verified by M. Janet; who on one occasion found that the “subject,” on feeling the impulse to sleep, had only prevented herself from yielding to it by putting her hands in cold water; and on two others, found her in a deep trance from which only M. Gibert could wake her. On the last of these occasions, M. Gibert, at a distance, further willed three times, at intervals of 5 minutes, the performance of certain actions during the trance, which the entranced “subject” began to execute, though obviously rebelling against the impulse, and ending with a laugh, “Vous ne pouvez pas . . . si peu, si peu que vous soyez distrait, je me ratrape.”

“Mais les suggestions mentales, car ce mot me paraît ici bien à sa place, peuvent être faites sur Mme. B. d'une autre manière et avoir un tout autre succès. On réussit peu, comme nous l'avons dit, quand on lui commande d'exécuter l'ordre immédiatement pendant le sommeil; on réussit beaucoup mieux quand on lui commande mentalement une action à exécuter plus tard quelque temps après le réveil. Le 8 octobre M. Gibert fit une suggestion de ce genre: *sans prononcer aucun mot* il approcha son front de celui de Mme. B. pendant le sommeil léthargique, et pendant quelques instants concentra sa pensée sur l'ordre qu'il lui donnait. Mme. B. parut ressentir une impression pénible et poussa un gémissement; d'ailleurs le sommeil ne parut pas du tout être dérangé. M. Gibert ne dit

à personne l'ordre qu'il avait donné et se contenta de l'écrire sur un papier qu'il mit sous enveloppe. Le lendemain je revins auprès de Mme. B. pour voir l'effet de cette suggestion qui devait s'exécuter entre 11 heures et midi. A 11 heures 1/2 cette femme manifesta la plus grande agitation, quitta la cuisine où elle était, et va dans une chambre prendre un verre qu'elle emporte ; puis, surmontant sa timidité, se décide à entrer dans le salon où je me trouvais, et toute émue demande si on ne l'a pas appelée ; sur ma réponse négative elle sort et continue plusieurs fois à monter de la cuisine au salon sans rien apporter d'ailleurs. Elle ne fit rien de plus ce jour-là, car bientôt elle tomba endormie à distance par M. Gibert. Voici ce qu'elle raconta pendant son sommeil : 'Je tremblais quand je suis venue vous demander si on m'avait appelée—il fallait que je vienne—c'était pas commode de venir avec ce plateau—pourquoi veut-on me faire porter des verres—qu'est-ce que j'allais dire, n'est-ce pas—je ne veux pas que vous fassiez cela—il fallait bien que je dise quelque chose en venant.' En ouvrant l'enveloppe, je vis que M. Gibert avait commandé hier à Mme. B. 'd'offrir un verre d'eau à chacun de ces messieurs.' Ici encore il faut reconnaître que l'expérience n'avait pas entièrement réussi, la suggestion n'avait pas été exécutée ; peut-on nier du moins qu'elle n'ait été comprise ?

"Voici maintenant une expérience plus significative. Le 10 octobre, nous convenons, M. Gibert et moi, de faire la suggestion suivante : 'Demain à midi fermer à clef les portes de la maison.' J'inscrivis la suggestion sur un papier que je gardais sur moi et que je ne voulus communiquer à personne. M. Gibert fit la suggestion comme précédemment en approchant son front de celui de Mme. B. Le lendemain quand j'arrivai à midi moins un quart je trouvai la maison barricadée et la porte fermée à clef. Renseignements pris, c'était Mme. B. qui venait de la fermer ; quand je lui demandai pourquoi elle avait fait cet acte singulier, elle me répondit : 'Je me sentais très fatiguée, et je ne voulais pas que vous puissiez entrer pour m'endormir.' M. Bernheim et M. Richet ont déjà parlé de ces personnes qui inventent des raisons pour s'expliquer à elles-mêmes un acte qu'elles font nécessairement sous l'influence d'une suggestion. Mme. B. était à ce moment très agitée ; elle continua à errer dans le jardin, et je la vis cueillir une rose et aller visiter la boîte aux lettres placée près de la porte d'entrée. Ces actes sont sans importance, mais il est curieux de remarquer que c'était précisément les actes que nous avions un moment songé à lui commander la veille. Nous nous étions décidés à en ordonner un autre, celui de fermer les portes, mais la pensée des premiers avait sans doute occupé l'esprit de M. Gibert pendant qu'il commandait, et elle avait eu aussi son influence.

"Voici une troisième expérience qui ne mériterait pas d'être racontée, car elle réussit moins bien que la précédente, mais elle est intéressante cependant, car elle montre combien le sujet peut résister à ces suggestions mentales. Le 13 octobre, M. Gibert lui ordonne toujours par la pensée d'ouvrir un parapluie le lendemain à midi et de faire deux fois le tour du jardin. Le lendemain elle fut très agitée à midi, fit deux fois le tour du jardin, mais n'ouvrit pas de parapluie. Je l'endormis peu de temps après pour calmer une agitation qui devenait de plus en plus grande. Ses premiers mots furent ceux-ci : 'Pourquoi m'avez-vous fait marcher tout

autour du jardin—j'avais l'air bête—encore s'il avait fait le temps d'hier par exemple—mais aujourd'hui j'aurais été tout à fait ridicule.' Ce jour-là il faisait fort beau et la veille il pleuvait beaucoup : elle n'avait pas voulu ouvrir un parapluie par un beau temps de peur de paraître ridicule. La suggestion avait au moins été comprise si elle n'avait pas été exécutée entièrement."

In April, 1886, Mr. Myers and Dr. A. T. Myers had the opportunity of witnessing some further experiments made with this "subject."¹ The times at which the trials were made were always chosen without premeditation. It is true that Mme. B. had come to Havre for a few weeks for the purpose of hypnotic experiments, and may therefore have had a general idea that attempts to influence her from a distance were likely to be made ; but the closeness of the coincidences, coupled with the fact that she is not liable to go into spontaneous trances at other times, makes it in the highest degree improbable that the results were due to accident.

(1) "In the evening of April 22, 1886," says Mr. Myers, "we dined at M. Gibert's, and in the evening M. Gibert made an attempt to put Mme. B. to sleep at a distance (from his house in the Rue Séry to the Pavillon, Rue de la Ferme), and to bring her to his own house by force of will. At 8.55 he retired to his study ; and MM. Ochorowicz, Marillier, Janet, and A. T. Myers went to the Pavillon, where Mme. B. was staying, and waited outside in the street. At 9.22 Dr. Myers observed Mme. B. coming half-way out of the garden-gate, and again retreating. Those who saw her more closely observed that she was plainly in the somnambule state, and was wandering about and muttering. At 9.25 she came out (with eyes persistently closed, so far as could be seen), walked quickly past MM. Janet and Marillier, without noticing them, and made for M. Gibert's house, though not by the usual or shortest route. (It appeared afterwards that the *bonne* had seen her go into the *salon* at 8.45, and issue thence asleep at 9.15 : had not looked in between those times.) She avoided lamp-posts, vehicles, &c., but crossed and re-crossed the street repeatedly. No one went in front of her or spoke to her. After eight or ten minutes she grew much more uncertain in gait, and paused as though she would fall. Dr. Myers noted the moment in the Rue Faure ; it was 9.35. At about 9.40 she grew bolder, at 9.45 reached the street in front of M. Gibert's house. There she met him, but did not notice him, and walked into his house, where she rushed hurriedly from room to room on the ground-floor. M. Gibert had to take her hand before she recognised him. She then grew calm.

"M. Gibert, before hearing Dr. Myers' statement, said that from 8.55 to 9.20 he thought intently about her ; from 9.20 to 9.35 he thought more feebly ; at 9.35 he gave the experiment up, and began to play billiards ; but in a few minutes began to will her again. It thus appeared that his visit to the billiard-room had coincided with her hesitation and stumbling

¹ A fuller account of these experiments will be found in Part X. of the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R.

in the street. She may, however, have hesitated merely because she was not sure of the way.

(2) "On April 23, M. Janet lunched in our company, and retired to his own house at 4.30 (a time chosen by lot) to try to put her to sleep from thence. At 5.5 we all entered the *salon* of the Pavillon, and found her asleep with shut eyes, but sewing vigorously (being in that stage in which movements once suggested are automatically continued). Passing into the talkative state, she said to M. Janet, 'C'est vous qui m'avez fait dormir à quatre heures et demi.' The impression as to the hour may have been a suggestion received from M. Janet's mind. We tried to make her believe that it was M. Gibert who had sent her to sleep, but she maintained that she had felt that it was M. Janet.

(3) "On April 24 the whole party chanced to meet at M. Janet's house at 3 p.m., and he then, at my suggestion, entered his study to will that Mme. B. should sleep. We waited in his garden, and at 3.20 proceeded together to the Pavillon, which I entered first at 3.30, and found Mme. B. profoundly asleep over her sewing, having ceased to sew. Becoming talkative, she said to M. Janet, 'C'est vous qui m'avez commandée.' She said that she fell asleep at 3.5 p.m."

Writing from Havre on June 18, 1886, M. Janet gives the following brief summary of the results obtained in the particular experiment of inducing "sommeil à distance," during this visit of Mme. B. to Havre:—

"Ne parlons pas des suggestions de sommeil faites par la pensée en se tenant devant le sujet, ou même dans une autre pièce de la maison; on n'est jamais assez certain que le sujet ne soit pas du tout prévenu. Il ne s'agit ici que des expériences tentées de loin, de chez M. Gibert ou de chez moi, c'est-à-dire, à 500 mètres au moins du pavillon où se trouvait Mme. B. Les expériences faites dans ces conditions, soit par M. Gibert, soit par moi, sont au nombre de 21 pendant ce second séjour de Mme. B. au Havre. Je ne compte pas un essai fait au milieu de la nuit dans des conditions déplorable. Considérons comme échecs toutes les expériences dans lesquelles le sujet n'a pas été trouvé endormi quand on entrait dans le pavillon, ou même celles dans lesquelles le sujet a mis plus d'un quart d'heure à s'endormir après l'instant de la suggestion mentale. Le nombre de ces insuccès a été de 6, et chacun d'eux peut avoir une explication précise. Il reste à retenir 15 succès précis et complets, ou 15 coïncidences extraordinaires, suivant que l'on voudra les comprendre d'une manière ou d'une autre."

The next record is from M. J. Héricourt, of 50, Rue de Miroménil, Paris.

(689) "L'observation que je rapporte ici date de l'année 1878, époque à laquelle je l'ai communiquée à mon ami M. Charles Richet, qui l'a gardée fidèlement et prudemment dans ses cartons, pour des raisons faciles à comprendre.

"Il s'agit d'une jeune femme de vingt-quatre ans, d'origine espagnole, veuve et mère d'une petite fille de cinq ans. . . . L'examen le plus minutieux n'a pu faire découvrir chez elle aucune tare hystérique, personnelle ou héréditaire."

M. Héricourt easily succeeded in hypnotising Mme. D. on the first trial.

“J’endormais Mme. D. avec une facilité chaque jour plus grande. En effet, après quinze jours environ de cet entraînement spécial, je n’avais plus besoin pour obtenir ce résultat ni du contact ni du regard : il me suffisait de *vouloir*, tout en m’abstenant de toute espèce de geste qui pût trahir mon intention. Était-elle en conversation animée au milieu de plusieurs personnes, tandis que je me tenais dans quelque coin dans l’attitude de la plus complète indifférence, que je la voyais bientôt, à mon gré, lutter contre le sommeil qui l’envahissait, et le subir définitivement, ou reprendre le cours de ses idées, selon que moi-même je continuais ou cessais d’appliquer ma pensée au résultat à obtenir.

“Et même je pouvais regarder fixement mon sujet, lui serrer les pouces ou les poignets, et faire toutes les passes imaginables des magnétiseurs de profession ; si ma volonté n’était pas de l’endormir, il restait parfaitement éveillé, et convaincu de mon impuissance.

“Mais bientôt, ce ne fut plus seulement d’une extrémité à l’autre d’une chambre que je songeai à exercer mon action ; d’une pièce à une autre, d’une maison à une autre maison, située dans une rue plus ou moins éloignée, le même résultat fut encore obtenu.

“Les circonstances dans lesquelles j’exerçai ainsi pour la première fois cette action à longue distance méritent d’être rapportées avec quelques détails. Étant un jour dans mon cabinet (j’habitais alors Perpignan), l’idée me vint d’essayer d’endormir Mme. D., que j’avais tout lieu de croire chez elle, et qui habitait dans une rue distante environ de 300 mètres de la mienne. J’étais d’ailleurs bien éloigné de croire au succès d’une pareille expérience. Il était trois heures de l’après-midi, je me mis à me promener de long en large, en pensant très vivement au résultat que je voulais obtenir ; et j’étais absorbé par cet exercice, quand on vint me chercher pour voir des malades. Les cas étant pressants, j’oubliai momentanément Mme. D. que je devais d’ailleurs rencontrer vers quatre heures et demie sur une promenade publique. M’y étant rendu à cette heure, je fus très étonné de ne l’y point voir, mais je pensai qu’après tout, mon expérience avait bien pu réussir ; aussi, vers cinq heures, pour ne rien compromettre et rétablir les choses en leur état normal, dans le cas où cet état eût été effectivement troublé, par acquit de conscience, je songeai à réveiller mon sujet, aussi vigoureusement que tout à l’heure j’avais songé à l’endormir.

“Or, ayant eu l’occasion de voir Mme. D. dans la soirée, voici ce qu’elle me raconta, d’une manière absolument *spontanée*, et sans que j’eusse fait la moindre allusion à son absence de la promenade. Vers trois heures, comme elle était dans sa chambre à coucher, elle avait été prise subitement d’une envie invincible de dormir ; ses paupières se faisaient de plomb, et ses jambes se dérobaient—jamais elle ne dormait dans la journée—au point qu’elle avait eu à peine la force de passer dans son salon, pour s’y laisser tomber sur un canapé. Sa domestique étant alors entrée pour lui parler, l’avait trouvée, comme elle le lui raconta plus tard, pâle, la peau froide, sans mouvement, *comme morte*, selon ses expressions. Justement effrayée, elle s’était mise à la secouer vigoureusement, mais sans parvenir cependant à autre chose qu’à lui faire ouvrir les yeux. A ce moment, Mme. D. me dit qu’elle n’avait eu conscience que d’éprouver un violent mal de tête qui, paraît-il, avait disparu subitement vers cinq heures. C’était précisément le moment où j’avais pensé à la réveiller.

“Ce récit ayant été spontané, je le répète, il n’y avait plus de doute à conserver : ma tentative avait certainement réussi. Afin de pouvoir la renouveler dans des conditions aussi probantes que possible, je ne mis pas Mme. D. au courant de ce que j’avais fait, et j’entrepris toute une série d’expériences dont je rendis témoins nombre de personnes, qui voulurent bien en fixer les conditions et contrôler les résultats. Parmi ces personnes, je citerai le médecin-major et un capitaine du bataillon de chasseurs dont j’étais alors l’aide-major. Toutes ces expériences se ramènent en somme au type suivant.

“Étant dans un salon avec Mme. D., je lui disais que j’allais essayer de l’endormir d’une pièce voisine, les portes étant fermées. Je passais alors dans cette pièce, où je restais quelques minutes avec la pensée bien nette de la laisser éveillée. Quand je revenais, je trouvais en effet Mme. D. dans son état normal, et se moquant de mon insuccès. Un instant plus tard, ou un autre jour, je passais dans la même pièce voisine sous un prétexte quelconque, mais cette fois avec l’intention bien arrêtée de produire le sommeil, et après une minute à peine, le résultat le plus complet était obtenu. On n’invoquera ici aucune suggestion autre que la suggestion mentale, puisque l’*attention expectante*, mise en jeu dans toute sa force, lors de l’expérience précédente, avait été absolument sans action. Les conditions de ces expériences, qui se contrôlent réciproquement, sont d’une simplicité et d’une valeur sur lesquelles j’attire l’attention, parce qu’elles constituent une sorte de schéma à suivre pour la démonstration.

“Mme. D. prétendait que, toutes les fois que je pensais à elle, elle ressentait une vive douleur dans la région précordiale ; c’était d’ailleurs cette même douleur qu’elle éprouvait encore quand les séances de somnambulisme se prolongeaient, et qui me déterminait à y mettre fin. De fait, après convention préalable, si je voulais que Mme. D. descendît de chez elle, je n’avais qu’à m’arrêter dans une rue voisine de la sienne, et à lui en donner l’ordre mentalement. Je ne tardais pas à la voir arriver, et toujours elle me disait que sa *douleur au cœur* lui avait indiqué ma présence.”

The next account, from Dr. E. Gley, of 37, Rue Claude Bernard, Paris, records some observations of his friend, Dr. Dusart, (published in the *Tribune Médicale* in May, 1875), on a girl of 14, whom he found suffering from obstinate hysterical attacks, and for whom he easily procured sleep by a simple hypnotic process.

(690) “J’avais observé que, quand, en faisant des passes, je me laissais distraire par la conversation des parents, je ne parvenais jamais à produire un sommeil suffisant, même après un long espace de temps. Il fallait donc faire une large part à l’intervention de ma volonté. Mais celle-ci suffirait-elle sans le secours d’aucune manifestation extérieure ? Voilà ce que je voulais savoir.

“A cet effet j’arrive un jour avant l’heure fixée la veille pour le réveil, et, sans regarder la malade, sans faire un geste, je lui donne *mentalement* l’ordre de s’éveiller : je suis aussitôt obéi. A ma volonté, le délire et les cris commencent. Je m’assieds alors devant le feu, le dos au lit de la malade, laquelle avait la face tournée vers la porte de la chambre,

je cause avec les personnes présentes, sans paraître m'occuper des cris de Mlle. J., puis, à un moment donné, sans que personne se fût aperçu de ce qui se passait en moi, je donne l'ordre mental du sommeil, et celui-ci se produit. Plus de *cent fois* l'expérience fut faite et variée de diverses façons : l'ordre mental était donné sur un signe que me faisait le Dr. X., et toujours l'effet se produisait. Un jour, j'arrive lorsque la malade était éveillée et en plein délire ; elle continue, malgré ma présence, à crier et s'agiter, je m'assieds et j'attends que le Dr. X. me donne le signal. Aussitôt celui-ci donné et l'ordre mental formulé, la malade se tait et s'endort. 'Vous saviez que j'étais là depuis quelque temps?' 'Non, monsieur ; je ne me suis aperçue de votre présence qu'en sentant le sommeil me gagner ; j'ai eu alors conscience que vous étiez assis devant le feu.'

"Je donnais chaque jour, avant de partir, l'ordre de dormir jusqu'au lendemain à une heure déterminée. Un jour, je pars, oubliant cette précaution ; j'étais à 700 mètres quand je m'en aperçus. Ne pouvant retourner sur mes pas, je me dis que peut-être mon ordre serait entendu, malgré la distance, puisque à 1 ou à 2 mètres un ordre mental était exécuté. En conséquence, je formule l'ordre de dormir jusqu'au lendemain 8 heures, et je poursuis mon chemin. Le lendemain, j'arrive à 7 heures et demie ; la malade dormait. 'Comment se fait-il que vous dormiez encore?' 'Mais, monsieur, je vous obéis.' 'Vous vous trompez ; je suis parti sans vous donner aucun ordre.' 'C'est vrai ; mais cinq minutes après, je vous ai parfaitement entendu me dire de dormir jusqu'à 8 heures. Or il n'est pas encore 8 heures.' Cette dernière heure étant celle que j'indiquais ordinairement, il était possible que l'habitude fût la cause d'une illusion et qu'il n'y eût ici qu'une simple coïncidence. Pour en avoir le cœur net et ne laisser prise à aucun doute, je commandai à la malade de dormir jusqu'à ce qu'elle reçût l'ordre de s'éveiller.

"Dans la journée, ayant trouvé un intervalle libre, je résolus de compléter l'expérience. Je pars de chez moi (7 kilomètres de distance), en donnant l'ordre du réveil. Je constate qu'il est 2 heures. J'arrive et trouve la malade éveillée : les parents, sur ma recommandation, avaient noté l'heure exacte du réveil. C'était rigoureusement celle à laquelle j'avais donné l'ordre. Cette expérience, plusieurs fois renouvelée, à des heures différentes, eut toujours le même résultat.

"Mais voici qui paraîtra plus concluant encore.

"Le 1^{er} janvier, je suspendis mes visites et cessai toute relation avec la famille. Je n'en avais plus entendu parler, lorsque le 12, faisant des courses dans une direction opposée et me trouvant à 10 kilomètres de la malade, je me demandai si, malgré la distance, la cessation de tous rapports et l'intervention d'une tierce personne (le père magnétisant désormais sa fille), il me serait encore possible de me faire obéir. Je défends à la malade de se laisser endormir ; puis, une demi-heure après, réfléchissant que si, par extraordinaire, j'étais obéi, cela pourrait causer préjudice à cette malheureuse jeune fille, je lève la défense et cesse d'y penser.

"Je fus fort surpris, lorsque le lendemain, à 6 heures du matin, je vis arriver chez moi un exprès portant une lettre du père de Mlle. J. Celui-ci me disait que la veille, 12, à 10 heures du matin, il n'était

arrivé à endormir sa fille qu'après une lutte prolongée et très douloureuse. La malade, une fois endormie, avait déclaré que, si elle avait résisté, c'était sur mon ordre, et qu'elle ne s'était endormie que quand je l'avais permis.

"Ces déclarations avaient été faites vis-à-vis de témoins auxquels le père avait fait signer les notes qui les contenaient. J'ai conservé cette lettre, dont M. — me confirma plus tard le contenu, en ajoutant quelques détails circonstanciés."

§ 3. I come now to the spontaneous cases. The following seems to be an instance of casual spontaneous transference of an idea; and strikingly exemplifies the *latency* of the impression, and its emergence after several hours, which has been so frequently noted in the course of this work. Mrs. Lethbridge, of Tregear, Launceston, Cornwall, writes:—

"Bella Vista, Corsier, Vevey, Switzerland.

"April 10th, 1886.

(691) "In December, 1881, my husband was slowly recovering from a severe illness; and one afternoon, about 5 o'clock, I went into his study, where he had gone for 2 or 3 hours, to see if he wanted anything. Finding him asleep in his armchair, I left him, and having some village lending-library books to sort, I went into the small room where they were kept, called the 'box-room' (in a distant part of the house), to do so. There, to my surprise, I saw our gamekeeper's dog, Vic, curled up. On seeing me she rose, wagged her tail, turned half round and lay down again. This dog had never been inside the house before, which was the reason of my surprise at seeing her where she was. However, I turned her out of doors, and there I thought the matter ended. I am *quite sure* I did not mention the matter to my husband.

"He went to bed very early that evening, and had a most restless night, talking a great deal in his sleep. While fast asleep he related the whole occurrence of 'Hawke's dog, Vic,' actually being found in the box-room, even describing the animal's behaviour, rising, turning half round and lying down again. Next morning I asked my husband if he had dreamt? 'No, not that he knew of.' If he had not dreamt of Vic? 'No, why of Vic?' Then I asked him if by any chance he had heard where Vic had been found the previous evening? 'No. Where?' And when I told him, he was extremely astonished, just because the dog had never been known inside the house before, and the box-room was on an upper landing. Subsequently I related to him what he had said in his sleep, but he evidently had not the slightest recollection of it.

"MILLICENT G. LETHBRIDGE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Lethbridge adds:—

"I am glad my account interested you, and regret extremely that it cannot be corroborated, for I *fully understand* the necessity in investigations such as yours to obtain perfectly trustworthy evidence, and free from intentional or unintentional exaggerations or inaccuracies. My dear husband died about 16 months ago. On receiving your letter I tried to find out whether he mentioned the occurrence in his diary, but unfortunately the diary of that year (1881) was left behind in England.

“From *mine*, which I succeeded in finding, written at the time, I copy out the following brief notice, dated Dec. 14th, 1881. ‘Baron talked a great deal in his sleep last night, and curiously enough he described how the terrier was found curled up on the mat in the box-room, which actually happened yesterday, probably for the first time in the terrier’s life, for I was so amazed at finding the dog in so unusual a place that I called the children to see it. But the strange part is this, Baron was asleep in the study at the time, and no one had told him of the occurrence. Of this I am *quite sure*.’

“I mentioned the occurrence to several people at the time, but as it happened 5 years ago, I doubt if any of them would recall it quite accurately.”

[Mr. Lethbridge’s complete forgetfulness is clearly a strong indication that the news of the occurrence had not reached him in any normal way—*e.g.*, by overhearing the children speaking of it.]

The following experiences belong to a class whose force, in the cumulative proof of telepathy, is comparatively small—the class of mere impressions, without any sensory affection; but they are in themselves well-evidenced cases, the records of the impressions having been carefully written down before the news of the corresponding event arrived. The narrator is Mr. J. C. Grant, of 98, Cornwall Gardens, S.W.; from whose very full journal they were copied by the present writer. Mr. Grant desires that the names of the persons mentioned shall not be printed; but says that “the fullest information is open to private inquiry.” The instance which was second in date is given before the earlier one, as being more complete, and is the only one to which I have attached an evidential number.

(692) Entry in diary for April 11, 1882.

“A very strange thing happened to me last night. It has happened once before. After being asleep some little time, I was wakened up, quite quietly and with no dread or horror, but with the absolute and certain knowledge that there was a ‘presence’ in my room. I looked everywhere into the darkness, implored it to appear, but to no effect; for though I have the gift of ‘feeling,’ I have not that of ‘sight.’ I felt certain, in fact was told by it, that it was to do with Bruce [Christian name]. I thought it was his father—I was sure it was: I thought he must be dead.¹ All this took place in about a couple of minutes or so; and as I saw I could *see* nothing, I got up, struck a match, lighted the candle at my bedside, and looked at my watch. It was just 14 minutes past 12 o’clock. I then put out the candle; but all feeling of the presence had gone. It had spoken as only a spirit² can speak, and then had passed away. I did not get to sleep for a long time, and was very unhappy for poor Bruce. . . . I

¹ Mr. Grant explains this sentence as follows:—“I knew his father to be very seriously ill, which no doubt was the reason why my thoughts took this direction.”

² See p. 48, note.

have been quite out of sorts all day for poor old Bruce, to whom I wrote this morning. Told M. and R. of my feeling and experiences of the night."

[The entry for April 12 mentions a conversation with Mr. and Mrs. M., in which Mr. Grant remembers that he described the occurrence.]

Entry for April 13.

"In afternoon went over to my aunt M.'s, had a long talk with her, told her and J. and others all about my presentiment. I have not heard from poor Bruce yet."

Entry for April 14.

"Up early, at half-past seven—expecting a letter. The letter has come, as I expected—deep black edge; but it is not his father, but his brother, that has died, poor old E., date and all, on Tuesday. . . . I wrote to him this morning. I will not tell him of my strange meeting of Tuesday morning or Monday night. . . . Witnesses to this strange pre-knowledge of mine: Mrs. R., my housekeeper; Mrs. C., my aunt; J., my cousin (Captain C.); other cousins, Mrs. M. and Mr. M., Mr. H. R., and Mme. G. So you see¹ I am not without my authorities, besides my written journal."

Entry for April 15.

"Wrote a long letter to my father, giving him what news there was, and telling him about my queer experience."

The following is a copy, made by the present writer, of a letter written to Mr. Grant by Mr. M., on June 3, 1886:—

"We distinctly remember your telling us about the strange circumstance that took place before² the death of one of your friends. The details have escaped our memory, but we remember that it was a case of premonition, which was afterwards verified. "C. W. M."

The date of death appears in the *Times* obituary as April 10, 1882. This was Monday, not Tuesday; and probably Mr. Grant assumed that the day on which his friend heard of the death was the day of the death itself. The death, which took place in China, can only have fallen within 12 hours of his experience if it occurred in the few hours preceding midnight.

Mr. E. T. R., who died, was an intimate friend of Mr. Grant's, but not so intimate as his brother Bruce.

Entry in diary for Wednesday, Dec. 10, 1879. (Mr. Grant was at the time in Southern India.)

"Yesterday I had a peculiar sensation. When I say yesterday, I mean last night. . . . I have as it were an inner eye opened. I had a sort of unconscious feeling that, if I were to wish it, I could see some strange visitant in the chamber with me—someone disembodied. [Here

¹ The journal, though a private one, is in many parts written as if addressed to an imaginary reader.

² The wording of this letter, and Mr. Grant's expressions above, illustrate what I have more than once remarked on—the common tendency to describe what are really telepathic impressions, coinciding with or closely following real events, as prophetic and premonitory. See p. 535, note, and p. 569.

follow some words of description which, though general and not distinctive, apply perfectly to the particular person who, as it turned out, died at the time, and would have applied equally naturally to only a small group of persons. Mr. Grant has what appear to me valid reasons for withholding the clause from publication.] I forced the idea from me, and fell into a troubled sleep."

Entry for Dec. 11.

"Went in afternoon to the library; thence to C.'s. Hear by telegram, while there, of the death of my uncle, Mr. C., on Tuesday. Wonder if that had anything to do with my feelings the night before last."

We find in the obituary of a leading newspaper that the death took place on Dec. 9, 1879.

Mr. Grant states that he had had no idea that anything was the matter with his uncle.

I have studied in Mr. Grant's diary the full record of a third case, which was even more remarkable than the first, as it included the peculiarity that, for some time after his first impression, he felt forcibly impelled to *draw* the figure of the person who died. The case was made the more striking to me by the fact that Mr. Grant was so certain that the death (the time of which he had only very vaguely learnt) must have coincided in date with his impression, that he had actually not taken the trouble to verify the coincidence. He left it to me to find in the *Times* obituary—as he confidently foretold that I would—that the death (which was quite unexpected) occurred, thousands of miles from the place where he was, on the day preceding that on which the entry in his diary, relating his impression of the previous night, was written. The impression of that night did not, however, bear distinct reference to the particular person who died, but was a more general sense of calamity in the family. Certain reasons which at present make it desirable not to publish the details of this case may in time cease to exist.

Mr. Grant writes, on May 31, 1886 :—

"Except on these three occasions, I have never, to the best of my recollection, had any feeling in the least resembling those described."

To pass now to examples where the senses were concerned—the following is an auditory death-case of the ordinary type. The narrator is Mrs. Evens, mentioned above (pp. 176 and 344).

(693) In 1885, Mrs. Evens filled up a census-form (p. 7) with the information that about September, 1858, in the early hours of the night, she experienced an auditory hallucination representing the voice of a "most intimate and deeply attached friend. She died suddenly that night. The lady was French. We had been very intimate, and she had frequently mesmerised me for neuralgia. We had been parted for more than a year—she in France and I in England. I had been to sleep, but woke *as if I were called*. I sat up, saw nothing, but heard distinctly, in the well-known and beloved voice, 'Adieu, ma chérie' (her name for me).

It was not till a week after that I heard of her sudden and quite unexpected death (she not having been ill) on that night. At the time, I had no feeling of surprise or fear. I may mention that only during the last year I heard, in an indirect manner, that, under the pressure of great horror, she was supposed to have committed suicide."

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Evens writes :—

“Oldbank, Enniskillen.

“December, 1885.

“I was staying in a country house, but not with (at that time) very intimate friends, and I cannot feel sure that I mentioned the circumstance. I shall be writing to one of them soon, and will ask if she remembers my speaking of it at all. The recollection, except as to precise date, is as vivid in my mind as ever—the tone of the voice, as of one *not stationary*, but leaving the room by the door,¹ which was on the left side and near the head of my bed; and likewise the words, distinctly spoken. I left France in 1857, and my friend died in 1858. It was the year before my marriage, and I was then a girl of 20. I had no terror, or even surprise; but equally little when I heard of her sudden death, which I seemed to have foreknown. As to the hour, I gathered that it must have been tolerably simultaneous with the death. We did not go to our rooms till 11 ever in that house. I had the sensation of being awoke out of my first sleep. My friend was found dead and *cold* (in her house in Alsace) between 4 and 5 in the morning. Having led a wandering life since my marriage, I have kept no letters of so long ago. The circumstances of the loss of my beloved friend, and *my firm belief in her desire to take leave of me*, are both indelibly impressed on my memory. I wish, for the sake of science, my details were more satisfactory.

“I was a parlour boarder from '55 to '57 (inclusive) at the Château Giron, then a large and well-known school. Mme. H. was one of the principals; the friendship between us was of a very close and unusual kind. She was just the sort of woman whose ‘*will*’ once more to see a dear friend would triumph over almost any difficulties, as I always believe it did.

“AGNES EVENS.”

In reply to further inquiries, Mrs. Evens adds :—

“In my own mind I always associate the hearing of the voice with a Sunday night. You will say this is unreliable, and so it is, but I find that in the recollection of my domestic events, births, deaths, &c., my recollection of the *day of the week*, with its associations, is more reliable than that of the *date*.

“As to any other [auditory] hallucinations, the only one I can remember is the sound of music [unusual in character, &c., but it took place when I was worn out with nursing and grief, and I have always assigned it to an abnormal condition of the nervous system, associated with a time of such sorrow that I can hardly bear to go back upon it.

“I seemed not so much to be awoke *by* the voice as to wake to hear it. I had no doubt as to whose it was; it produced the effect of a passing, not stationary, voice; the words, distinctly uttered, were ‘*adieu, ma chérie.*’ I heard yesterday from the friend with whom I was staying at

¹ I have mentioned (Vol. i., p. 573) how frequently *visual* hallucinations, alike of t subjective and the telepathic class, present this feature of movement.

the time. She says, 'We both' (herself and sister) 'well remember about your friend Mme H., and what a terrible attack of neuralgia you had just at the time when she died.' I had forgotten this latter circumstance. It would account in some measure for the want of distinctness in my recollections."

We have procured from the Registrar at Rappoltswiler an official certificate of the death, which states that it occurred at 2 p.m., on Sept. 5th, 1858. This was a Sunday—which confirms Mrs. Evens' recollection. The death must have preceded her experience by at least 10 hours.

The next case, also auditory, is apparently one of direct reproduction of the agent's sensation. (See cases 267-270.) It is from Mr. J. G. F. Russell, of Aden, Aberdeenshire (the narrator of case 196). The agent was a near relative who had been making a long stay with Mr. and Mrs. Russell.

"32, Upper Brook Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

"December 18th, 1885.

(694) "On Wednesday, December 2nd, 1885, I was woke up at night, between 12 p.m. and 2 a.m. (as far as I can recollect), by hearing myself distinctly called from a small passage outside my bedroom door; the voice seemed to come from just outside the door itself. I got up, fearing Mrs. Waller, in the adjoining room, was ill, but, as the calling of my name was no longer repeated, I did not then disturb her. (There is no door of communication between the rooms, the wall is solid, and a gigantic wardrobe is against it.) Next morning I asked her if she had called me during the night; but she declared she had slept 'like a top,' and had never thought of me or anyone else. I did *not* mention the incident to her sister (who had just left us after a long visit), but she (Mrs. Waller) did, on returning to the country. I enclose what Miss Young wrote to me, solely from her sister mentioning to her my having questioned her. The dates correspond exactly; it was the first night of Mrs. Waller's visit.

"J. G. F. RUSSELL."

The following is the extract from Miss Young's letter to Mr. Russell:—

"I will tell you something that has struck me rather. The two nights my sister was with you in London were very disturbed nights to me; you were continually in my dreams, and one of those nights I found myself sitting up in bed, having woke myself up by calling you loudly by name. When she came back she told me you had asked her one morning whether she had called you in the night, as you had distinctly heard your name. I wish I could remember which night it was. I have an impression it was the first.

"BLANCHE YOUNG."

Mr. Russell (who gave me the account *vivâ voce* on December 16th, a fortnight after the occurrence,) has explained that the wall between his room and the next is so thick that even a very loud cry in one would be almost inaudible in the other. He has never had such a hallucination on any other occasion.

The following cases are visual. The first is from Mr. Teale, of 50, Hawley Road, Kentish Town, N.W.

“June, 1886.

(695) “In 1884, my son Walter was serving in the 3rd King’s Royal Rifles Regiment, in the Soudan. The last we had heard from him was a letter informing us that he was about to return to England, which he expected would be about Christmas time. Things were in this position on the 24th October, 1884, when on returning home in the evening, I said, (noticing my wife looking very white,) ‘Whatever is the matter with you?’ and she said she had seen Walter, and he had stooped down to kiss her, but owing to her starting he—like—was gone, so she did not receive the kiss.

“After that we had a letter from the lady nurse at Ramleh Hospital to say that the poor boy had a third relapse of enteric fever; they thought he would have pulled through, but he had been taken, and when we had that letter, it was a week after he died. But the date when the letter was written corresponded with the date of the day when Walter appeared, which was on the 24th October, 1884.

[When Mr. Teale used these words, he had not referred to the letter, and was under the impression that it had been written on the very day of the death, which (as will be seen below) was October 24.]

“My son Frederick, Selina, and Nelly were in the room, but none of them saw Walter; only Fred heard his mother scream, ‘Oh!’ and Fred asked her what was the matter. I thought, having heard many tales of this kind, I would set it down; so I put the date on a slip of paper. He was in his regimentals, and she thought he had come on furlough to take her by surprise—knowing the back way; but when she saw he was gone, and the door not open, she got dreadfully frightened.

“FRED. J. TEALE.”

Mrs. Teale herself died in April, 1886, after an illness due in great measure to the shock of the bereavement.

Mr. Teale has shown me the letters which were received during August, September and October, 1884, respecting his son’s condition. A letter, dated August 20, which the son dictated and signed, states that he is in hospital, down with enteric fever. The next letter, dated September 7, which was similarly dictated and signed, states that he has had a very serious illness, but is much better, and hopes soon to be home. The next letter, dated October 12, from Sister Thomas, states that he had had a bad relapse a fortnight previously, but “is getting on very nicely now.” This was the last letter received before October 24. In a letter dated October 52, Lieutenant W. H. Kennedy states that the death had taken place on the preceding day; and in a letter dated October 28, Sister Thomas states that the death occurred about 2 o’clock p.m., on Friday, October 24. This date has been confirmed to us by an official communication from the Depot at Winchester.

In conversation, Mr. Teale explained to me that his wife’s experience took place between 7 and 8 in the evening—which would be between 7 and 8 hours after the death. She was at the time sitting at the table, talking. The son who was present is at a distance; but Miss Teale

showed me how the persons in the room were placed, and described to me how she saw her mother start, and heard her exclamation. Mr. Teale is certain that his wife never experienced any other visual hallucination ; and he says that she was of anything but a brooding temperament, and was not at the time anxious about her son. His note of the date of the vision was on the back of an envelope, which he carried in his pocket-book. He thought that this envelope was lost ; but was kind enough, at my request, to make a search, which brought it to light. The envelope, which lies before me, bears his address, and the post-mark London, N., Feb. 22, 84 ; the pencil note on the back of it is 24-10-84.

The next case is from the Rev. R. Markham Hill, of St. Catherine's, Lincoln.

“June 17, 1886.

(696) “On the evening of Easter Sunday, about 8 or 9 years ago, I think, I was just beginning my supper, feeling very tired after the day's work, when I saw the door opening behind me.¹ I was sitting with my back to the door, but could just see it over my shoulder. I may also have heard the opening, but cannot speak with certainty upon this point. I turned half round, and just had time to see the figure of a tall man rushing hastily into the room, as if to attack me. I sprang up at once, turned round, and threw the glass, which I held in my hand, at the spot where I had seen the figure, which had disappeared in the act of my rising. The disappearance had, however, been too sudden to arrest the act of throwing. I then realised that I had seen an apparition, and I immediately connected it with one of my uncles, whom I knew to be seriously ill. Moreover, the figure which I saw resembled my uncle in stature. Mr. Adcock came in, and found me quite unnerved by the occurrence ; and to him I related the circumstances. I don't remember telling him that I connected the vision with my uncle. The next day a telegram came announcing my uncle's death on the Sunday. My father was summoned to my uncle's death-bed unexpectedly, on the Sunday evening as he was sitting at supper, and the death must have coincided in time with what I saw.

“R. MARKHAM HILL.”

The Rev. H. Adcock, of Lincoln, writes :— “June 16, 1886.

“I called on my friend, the Rev. Markham Hill, one evening, and found him apparently in an exhausted condition in an arm-chair ; he told me, before I could ask for any explanation, that he had just seen the figure of his uncle standing opposite to him against the wall, behind a piano ; that he lifted up a glass from the table, and was about to throw it at him, when the figure vanished. He said he felt convinced that he should very shortly hear of his uncle's death. It was only the following day, or the day after, that he showed me a letter received that morning informing him that his uncle had died on the day when the appearance took place.”

In conversation, Mr. Podmore learnt from Mr. Hill that he was alone at the time. He has had no other visual hallucination in his life, unless it were an experience which impressed him in somewhat the same way as this one, but which may well have been merely a case of mistaken identity.

¹ See p. 612, note.

Mr. Adcock explained that the above incident must have occurred about 12 years ago. He cannot remember whether it was a Sunday evening.

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Hill's uncle died on April 5, 1874, which was Easter Sunday.

[It would be difficult to account for the hallucination here as due to anxiety respecting the uncle's condition. If a person's mind, from brooding over the condition of a sick relative, is led to evolve a phantasm of that relative, we should certainly expect the appearance to be *recognised*; and we should not expect its character to be at once unfamiliar and formidable.

It will be seen that the two accounts differ as to whether the glass was actually thrown.]

The next example belongs to the "borderland" class. It is one of the cases where the agent's bond of connection has apparently been with someone who was in the percipient's company at the time of the experience, rather than with the actual percipient. (*Cf.* Nos. 242 and 355.) The narrator desires that his name may not appear, as the family of the agent, whom he has already assisted liberally, might base on the incident described a sentimental claim to further favours.

"June 12, 1886.

(697) "There can be no doubt whatever that there is some transmission for which no explanation has yet been given by the savants.

"I am a practical business man, and look upon all theories of Spiritualism, &c., as so much humbug that only deludes weak-minded people. But at the same time, I recently had an experience of a most extraordinary character, which I should scarcely have believed if related to me of anyone else, and the plain facts of which I will give as they actually occurred.

"I had in my employ a clerk who contracted an illness which incapacitated him from regular attendance at his duties. He was absent about six months in 1884, and, on leaving the hospital, as I found that he was unable to resume his regular work, I agreed with him that he should come to the office whenever he felt able to do so, and that I would pay him for the work so done. This arrangement continued for some months; then, at the beginning of April, 1885, he had to stay away altogether for two or three weeks. He seemed in fair general health, but he was troubled with a diseased ankle-joint, which prevented him from getting about. I was in no anxiety on his account, however, and had no apprehension of any serious illness. My wife, who knew Mr. Z. from seeing him occasionally at my private house, did not even know that he was absent from the office at this time.

"On the night of the 27th-28th April, I was wakened by my wife calling out convulsively, 'There is someone looking at you.' Though by no means timid as a rule—a practical woman, not subject to nervous fancies of any kind—she was much disturbed and terrified. She jumped out of bed, and turned up the gas. Finding no intruder in the room, and all the doors locked, she got back into bed; but she was shivering all over,

and it was some time before I succeeded in quieting her. The clock in the hall struck 1 during this disturbance.

"In the morning we referred to the incident, and I told my wife she must have been suffering from nightmare.

"Later on that day, news was brought to my office that poor Z. had passed away in the night. When I got home in the evening, my wife met me as usual at the door, and I said to her, 'I have some sad news to tell you.' Before I could say more she replied, 'I know what it is; poor Z. is dead. It was his face which I saw looking at you last night.'

"I afterwards learnt, from a man who lodged in Mrs. Z.'s house, that he had died just at 1 o'clock in the morning of the 28th, and that in the delirium which preceded his death, he called upon me to look after his wife and children when he was gone."

Mrs. B., the percipient, writes:—

"I have read this paper through, and the contents correctly describe what transpired. I was *awake*, when I saw the face. I have never experienced any similar occurrence."

[The last sentence is in answer to the question whether she had experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.]

We have verified in the *Times* obituary the fact that Z. died on April 28, 1885.

Mr. Podmore has examined the clerk whom Mr. B. despatched to make inquiries of the widow on hearing of the death,—*i.e.*, on the afternoon of April 28—and who has since heard Mrs. B. narrate her experience. So far as he could recollect, Mrs. Z. told him that Z. died about 1.30 a.m., certainly at an early hour in the morning. He did not remember to have heard anything about the dying words, &c.

The following is a "borderland" case of the ordinary type. The percipient, Emma Burger, has been for 6 years in the service of our friend and colleague, M. Ch. Richet, and has his most complete confidence. Mr. Richet writes:—

"Mars, 1886.

(698) "Emma Burger, âgée de 24 ans, née à Malsch, près de Radstadt, avait été fiancée à Paris avec M. Charles Br. Le mariage était convenu. Emma B. partit le 1 août à Usrel (Corrèze), chez Madame d'U., où elle était alors en service. La santé de M. Charles Br. était bonne, où du moins il avait toutes les apparences de la santé. En tout cas le mariage était décidé, et Emma B. n'avait aucune inquiétude sur l'état de la santé de son fiancé.

"Quelques jours après son arrivée à Usrel, le 7 ou 8 août, Emma B. reçut une lettre de Charles, lui apprenant que pour affaires de famille il quittait Paris, et allait passer quelques jours dans les Ardennes.

"Le 15 août, jour de la fête de Sainte Vierge, Emma B., quoique n'étant pas dévote, se sentit prise d'une grande tristesse et pleura abondamment au pèlerinage qui avait lieu alors à Usrel.

"Le soir de ce même jour, 15 août, E. couchait comme d'habitude dans un cabinet de toilette contigu à la chambre de Madame d'U. A côté de son lit était la petite porte d'un escalier de service, porte masquée par le rideau du lit, de sorte qu'une personne qui était dans de lit devait se

lever et écarter le rideau du bas du lit pour voir qui entraît par l'escalier. Voici le récit que m'a fait E.

“ Vers onze heures et demie du soir je venais de me mettre au lit ; les domestiques n'étaient pas encore couchés tous, parcequ'on entendait encore du bruit dans la maison. Madame d'U. était couchée dans la chambre voisine, dont la porte de communication était ouverte. J'ai alors entendu un léger bruit, comme si la porte du petit escalier s'ouvrait. Je me suis mise à genoux sur mon lit pour soulever le rideau et prévenir la personne qui entraît que Madame d'U. étant couchée, il ne fallait pas faire de bruit, ni passer par sa chambre. C'est alors que j'ai aperçu distinctement la personne de Charles Br. Il était debout, son chapeau et sa canne à la main droite, de la main gauche tenant la porte entr'ouverte, et restant dans l'entrebâillement de la porte. Il avait un costume de voyage—son costume habituel. Il y avait une veilleuse dans la chambre, mais j'étais tellement surprise que je ne me suis pas demandé si la clarté de la veilleuse suffisait pour expliquer l'extrême netteté avec laquelle j'ai aperçu tous ses traits, sa physionomie, et le détail de son costume. Il avait une figure souriante, et il m'a regardée sans rien dire, en s'arrêtant dans la porte. Alors je lui ai dit avec sévérité, ne pouvant, quelque invraisemblable que fût son arrivée soudaine à Usrel, pas supposer que ce ne fût pas Charles Br. lui-même, “ Mais que venez-vous faire ici ? Madame d'U. est là. Partez ! partez donc ! ” Puis, comme il ne disait rien, j'ai repris de nouveau, “ Qu'est-ce que vous me voulez ? Partez, partez donc ! ” Alors il m'a répondu, en souriant et avec une grande tranquillité, “ Je viens vous faire mes adieux ; je pars en voyage. Adieu ! ” C'est à ce moment que Madame d'U., qui était dans la chambre voisine, et qui, n'étant pas endormie encore, lisait dans son lit, m'ayant entendu parler tout haut, me dit, “ Mais qu'avez-vous donc, E. ? vous rêvez ! ” Mais moi, au lieu de lui répondre, croyant toujours que Charles Br. était réellement devant moi, je lui dis, et cette fois à voix plus basse, “ Mais partez donc, partez donc. ” Et alors il disparut, non pas subitement mais comme quelqu'un qui ferme une porte et qui s'en va.¹ C'est alors seulement que, sur une nouvelle demande plus pressante de Madame d'U., je lui répondis, “ Mais oui, madame, j'ai eu un cauchemar. ”

“ J'étais parfaitement éveillée, puisque je ne m'étais pas endormie, et que je venais à peine de me coucher. Je pensai alors, restant encore quelque temps éveillée, que Charles Br. était venu me surprendre, et je me mis à regretter de ne pas lui avoir demandé où il allait en voyage. Mais je ne m'en préoccupai pas outre mesure, et au bout d'un certain temps je m'endormis très tranquillement, sans supposer le moins du monde qu'il ne s'agissait pas de la présence formelle, en chair et en os, de Charles Br. à la porte de ma chambre.

“ Le lendemain matin je fus fort étonnée de ne pas entendre parler de Charles Br. Je crus qu'on jouait avec moi une sorte de comédie ; enfin je me décidai à demander si on n'avait pas fait venir quelqu'un dans ma chambre. On m'assura que non ; on me plaisanta de mes rêves, et je finis par croire que j'avais rêvé, ou plutôt, par une sorte d'inconséquence, je

¹ This way of describing the sense of a door closing is of interest, suggesting a vaguer form of what in other cases has appeared as a distinct part of the hallucination. See p. 612, note ; and compare case 696.

n'arrêtai pas ma pensée sur les invraisemblances accumulées de cette visite. Je saurai bien la vérité, me disais-je, quand il écrira.

“ Le lendemain, 18 août, vers neuf heures du matin, je reçus la lettre suivante :—

“ “ MADemoisELLE,—Monsieur C. vient de recevoir par dépêche télégraphique la nouvelle de la mort de M. Charles Br. Il est mort le 16 du courant. Nous nous joignons à vous pour le regretter.

“ “ PERRIN, Concierge.

“ “ 26, Rue Marignan, Paris.

“ “ le 18 août.”¹

[M. Richet has seen and transcribed this letter.]

“ On jugera de ma stupeur quand je reçus cette lettre. Depuis j'ai appris que Charles Br. était mort dans la nuit du 15 au 16 août, d'une maladie du cœur que tout le monde ignorait, et qui ne s'était antérieurement traduite par aucun symptôme.”

We have made repeated and urgent applications to the Maire of the commune where the death occurred, for a copy of the *Acte de Décès*, but have received no reply.

The Vicomtesse d'Ussel wrote to us on April 1, 1886, that Emma Burger was in her service in the summer of 1875, at Corrèze, and slept in a room adjoining her own; but she does not remember hearing of the incident. She remembers noticing, however, towards the end of the stay, that Emma Burger was in distress, and learning afterwards that this was due to the death of some one about whom Emma had never told her.

The percipient has had in her life two hallucinations representing a person whom she knew to be dead. But the first of these did not occur till 9 years after the incident above described; and they can scarcely therefore be regarded as diminishing the force of the coincidence.

The following is a copy made by M. Richet of a letter written to Emma Burger by a friend, Madame Aourousseaux, who heard from her of the vision before the news of the death arrived.

“ Vous me demandez si je me souviens de votre rêve. Je m'en souviens comme si c'était d'aujourd'hui. Je me rappelle parfaitement de notre pèlerinage à la Vierge, et de tout ce que vous m'avez raconté au sujet de votre rêve, et aussi de votre fiancé.”

On May 13, 1886, M. Richet writes :—

“ Pour ce qui concerne le cas de Charles Br. je puis vous donner d'intéressants détails. J'ai pu faire venir chez moi la personne qui a eu la confiance de Emma Burger avant que la mort de Charles Br. soit connue, et voici ce qu'elle m'a raconté. ‘Le 15 août, jour de la fête de la Vierge, Emma n'était pas comme d'ordinaire. Elle était triste et cherchait à s'égarer; elle était à peu près comme folle ce jour-là. Le soir il y a eu un grand dîner, mais, comme Emma était la bonne d'un enfant, elle a dîné dans la chambre de l'enfant avec moi, qui étais alors nourrice. Puis, vers dix heures nous nous sommes couchées, chacune dans notre chambre, mon nourrisson dormant avec moi dans ma chambre, Emma couchant seule dans une petite chambre contigue à la grande chambre de Madame d'U. Le lendemain matin, elle a dit à Jeanne, la femme-de-

¹ Il y a une erreur; c'est le 17 août que la lettre a été écrite.

chambre de la Comtesse d'U., "Vous m'avez donc envoyé quelqu'un cette nuit." Jeanne s'est mise à rire, et alors Emma m'a raconté qu'elle avait fait un rêve très heureux, qu'elle avait vu son fiancé dans sa chambre, puis quand elle s'est réveillée qu'elle s'est sentie très triste, et qu'elle n'a pu dormir le reste de la nuit. Alors je lui ai dit, "Taisez-vous donc, vous êtes folle," et nous nous sommes toutes moquées d'elle. Mais elle dit, "Je suis sûr que c'est lui qui est venu, et on ne m'ôtera pas de l'idée que c'est vrai. Vous pouvez vous moquer de moi, mais je crois bien que c'est vrai."

"JEANNE AUROUSSEAUX, à Tragny, Nièvre."

"P.S.—Je viens de montrer à Emma Burger la lettre que je vous écris, car j'ai interrogé Arousseau hors la présence d'Emma. Elle l'approuve complètement, mais dit seulement qu'au lieu de se croire *heureuse* elle était très ennuyée, sans être inquiète, et que c'était par suite des moqueries dont on l'avait assaillie qu'elle avait répondu, 'Eh bien oui ! j'étais très contente de voir mon fiancé.'"

The following is a collective case. It will be seen that we have no proof that the second witness independently recognised the figure ; at the same time, the way in which the figure disappeared, if correctly remembered, tells strongly against the hypothesis of mistaken identity. The narrator is Mr. Amos Beardsley, M.R.C.S., of Grange-over-Sands, Lancashire. He had sent us a shorter account in 1883.

"June 28th, 1886.

(699) "From 1845 to '50 I lived between the villages of H—— and L——, in Derbyshire. The landlord of the chief hotel in L—— had a farm just opposite my house, from which I used to get my supplies of milk and other dairy produce. I had also been called in on one occasion to attend his wife in illness. One evening, probably in August or September, I had been out with my boy, John Howitt—a connection of the poet, William Howitt—hunting for moths, and was returning home about 9 p.m., as far as I can remember. We had just passed a railway cutting which crossed the road, or rather which was intended to cross the road ; for the cutting—16 or 20 feet deep—had been brought within a few yards of the roadway on either side, but had not yet been carried through it. Just after passing this part I turned round, and saw, as I thought, E., the owner of the farm referred to, crossing the road—having apparently just come in by a footpath on the right—in the direction of a corresponding footpath a little lower down on the left. I had noticed that the cutting had been carried right through the footpath, so that passengers would have to make a *détour*, and thinking that E. was probably not aware of this, and might run some risk of falling down the embankment, I sent the lad after him, to warn him of the danger. The lad ran off at once ; the distance was not more than 100 yards or so ; but when he got to the stile, the man was nowhere to be seen. He could not have got clear away in that short interval ; but we searched the cutting to see if he had by any ill-chance fallen down there. There was nothing to be seen ; and after spending about half an hour in a fruitless search, we returned home.

Next morning, Howitt came to me with a scared face to tell me that E. had fallen down dead the night before, about 9 p.m., just after he had offered to make a blasphemous wager.

“That is all the story. I could not, and did not, for a moment doubt my recognition of E.’s figure. My eyesight is good, and I think it hardly possible that I could have been mistaken. Why the apparition should have come to me I cannot say, unless, perhaps, the dying man’s thoughts turned instinctively towards me as a doctor. I have never had any hallucination of the senses,—unless this apparition was one.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that E. was found dead in his bed, from heart-disease, on July 25, 1847. Dr. Beardsley does not profess to have gathered the circumstances of his death from eye-witnesses; and the imagination of neighbours would be likely to exaggerate the suddenness with which the supposed punishment followed on the transgression.

Mr. Podmore has questioned Mr. John Howitt, now butler at the Ship-Building Yard Board Rooms, Barrow. He has no real independent memory of the incident, though when Mr. Podmore repeated Dr. Beardsley’s account, he said, “Now you seem to bring it all back to me.” He was only 14 at the time.

Dreams, as has been so often pointed out, being a specially weak class of evidence, it was not my intention to give any further specimens in this chapter; but at the last moment some records have been received which claim admittance. The force of cases where a dream exactly reproduces the thoughts of a person in the dreamer’s vicinity is so much increased by their multiplication in the experience of the same two persons, that the following additional instance, from the narrators of case 90, needs no apology. Mrs. Fielding writes:—

“Yarlington Rectory, Bath, 19th May, 1886.

(700) “I sleep badly, and on Monday night it was 2 o’clock when I slept. I had, for half-an-hour before going off, fixed my mind upon every turn and corner of my girlhood’s home (where I have not been for above 20 years) in Scotland. My father, a squire, had a neighbour squire, called *Harvey Brown*. In my whiling away the night, I dwelt upon him, and his house and family, *particularly*. My husband knew him *only* by name, but of course, knew my home, and loves it as much as I do. He and I awoke at 6. Before a *word* of any kind was said, he said to me, ‘I have had such a strange dream about Harvey Brown, and been at the old home, wandering about it.’ What made it seem stranger is that Harvey Brown is a man we never spoke of in our lives, or for 20 years have ever thought of, till Monday night in idleness I went over old meetings with him; and I was wide awake and my husband asleep; he had slept heavily all the night after a 12 mile walk; so there was no possibility of my leading his mind near Scotland, in any conversation even, before he slept.

“JEAN ELEANORA FIELDING.

“J. M. FIELDING.”

The chief interest of the next case depends on the *repetition* of the dream. I have implied (Vol. I., p. 358, note) that distinct repetition on

several successive nights, though by no means unexampled, is very decidedly rare, in dreams of purely subjective origin ; and the repetition in a case of telepathic origin may fairly be taken as an indication of that special intensity which is shown also in other ways—notably often by the exceptional sense of reality surviving into waking hours (see case 482). I do not, however, number the account, as the closeness of the coincidence cannot be completely determined. The narrator is Dr. Gibert, the leading physician at Havre, who was concerned in case 688.

“ Rue Séry, le Hâvre.

“ 19 Mai, 1886.

“ La scène se passait en 1849, au printemps. Un vieillard âgé de 84 ans, du nom de Borel, grand-oncle de ma mère, demeurant près Genève, au petit Sacconex, vint un samedi déjeuner à la maison. Nous demeurions à la Monnaie, campagne aux portes de Genève, à une distance de 4 kilomètres de la demeure du vieillard. Il était parfaitement portant. Deux jours après sa visite, dans la nuit de dimanche au lundi, à deux heures du matin, au milieu de son sommeil, ma mère se réveille en criant, ‘ L’oncle est mort ; je le vois à terre, les bras étendus ! ’ Mon père chercha à la rassurer, mais la nuit fut sans sommeil.

“ Le lundi, mon père nous raconta le rêve de ma mère, et nous en rîmes, lui disant que si l’oncle était mort on serait venir nous prévenir. Dans la nuit de lundi au mardi, à la même heure, nouveau réveil de ma mère, qui crie de même, ‘ L’oncle est mort ! ’ Enfin, dans la nuit de mardi au mercredi, même scène.

“ Le mercredi, mon père, qui était juge de paix, me pria de l’accompagner au petit Sacconex, afin de convaincre ma mère que son rêve, répété trois fois, n’était qu’un rêve. A peine arrivé à la demeure de mon oncle, on nous dit que le vieillard n’avait pas paru depuis trois jours. La petite maison isolée était close de toutes parts. Mon père fit sauter un volet, et nous vîmes dans la cuisine le vieillard étendu. Nous pénétrâmes par l’écurie, et j’allais relever le malheureux, qui était mort, la tête dans le foyer, face contre terre, les bras étendus, quand mon père me fit remarquer que le crâne était fracassé. Il avait été assassiné. L’assassin fut pris, condamné à mort, et exécuté. Il avoua tout après sa condamnation. Il avait tué le vieillard le dimanche, entre midi et une heure. Le rêve de ma mère avait donc eu lieu douze ou treize heures après le crime.

“ DR. GIBERT.”

We have procured from the Département de Justice et Police, at Geneva, a copy of the Procès-verbal made by the official who inspected the scene of the crime immediately after the murder was discovered, and who received on the spot the evidence of M. Gibert *père*. This document completely confirms Dr. Gibert’s account of the murder, and of the discovery of the body lying face downwards on the hearth—the arms however, not “étendus,” but “raccourcis sous l’estomac” ; but it shows that his recollection is not correct as to dates and days. The murder was discovered about 6 p.m. on Thursday, November 9, 1848 ; and M. Gibert *père* stated that he had made the visit to the house, which led to

the discovery, on hearing that his uncle had not been seen by the neighbours since the Tuesday evening. It seems probable therefore that the murder was committed on the Tuesday night.¹ It may fairly be supposed that Dr. Gibert is at least as likely to be right in his statement that the dreams fell on the nights immediately preceding the discovery, as in his statement of the particular days of the week on which they fell—since his recollection of the days of the week is connected with his recollection, proved incorrect, as to the day on which the murder fell; and this hypothesis is somewhat favoured by his recollection that there was an interval of more than a day between the last visit of M. Borel to the Giberts' house and the first dream. It is not improbable, therefore, that one of the dreams very closely coincided with the murder. But after this dream there would be room for only a *single* repetition—on the Wednesday night.

The next two cases illustrate the point so often emphasised—the psychological identity of dreams and waking phantasms—in a rare and interesting way; a telepathic impression taking effect first as a dream, and afterwards as a hallucination. In the first of the two cases there was an interval of a good many hours between the two experiences.² In the second case, the visual hallucination was apparently a prolongation of the dream-image into waking moments (see Vol. I., pp. 390-1); but the waking experience included a further feature—a hallucination of hearing.

The following account was obtained through the kindness of Mrs. Walwyn, of 9, Sion Hill, Clifton, Bristol, who has known the narrator from a boy.

“February 24th, 1886.

(701) “‘I dreamed that Maggie, my sister-in-law, had been taken seriously ill. The next evening, when I went into the dining-room to have my usual smoke previous to going to bed, just after I entered the room, Maggie suddenly appeared, dressed in white, with a most heavenly expression on her face. She fixed her eyes on me, walked round the room, and disappeared through the door which leads into the garden. I felt I could not speak; but followed her. On opening the door and outside shutter nothing was to be seen. I vouch for the truth of this.

“‘H. E. M.’”

Mr. M.'s mother writes to Mrs. Walwyn :—

“H. and his wife were in England in the autumn, and returned on the 9th November. They had been visiting the parents in L.—General and Mrs. R. They left the next younger sister apparently in her usual health. On Friday, the 20th, she was at the theatre with friends. At 1 a.m. she

¹ If, as Dr. Gibert says, the murderer made a full confession, it is probable that some record of the hour of the murder exists. But we cannot obtain any information as to such a confession, either from official sources or from the leading Geneva newspaper; and the Secretary of the Département de Justice tells us that the man always persisted in his denial, and that the hour remained doubtful. He adds, “On a supposé que c'était le soir.”

² Compare case 659; and also case 283, where the hallucination preceded the dream. For cases where a hallucination has been itself repeated after an interval, see p. 237, note.

was seized with violent internal pains; these continued all day, but no danger was apprehended till 4.45 p.m., when she became insensible, and at 5.15 all was over. The cause of death, 'perforation of the stomach.' On the Saturday night H. dreamt that Maggie had been taken dangerously ill; the next evening when he went into the dining-room as usual to have his smoke previous to going to bed, just after he entered the room Maggie suddenly appeared to him. [Mrs. M.'s description of the appearance exactly coincides with her son's account.]

"He told me in the morning what had happened. I tried to persuade him it was only an optical delusion, but he knew better. Why the apparition should have come to H. is most extraordinary, for he was not in the least superstitious, nervous, or fanciful. The only way we can account for it is that the telegram which the General sent off on Sunday never reached us, and it was actually Wednesday, the day of the funeral, before we heard the sad news, and she might have known this and come to tell us that she was gone.

"R. L. M."

We find from an obituary in the *Leamington News* that Miss R. died on 21st November, 1885, and that she "remained perfectly conscious until 5 o'clock, when she suddenly collapsed and died in a quarter of an hour."

The final case is from Mr. M. S. Griffin, of San Remo, Weymouth.

"May, 1886.

(702) "I have been requested to give an account of an odd coincidence which occurred some three years since. (I am no believer in spirits, and believe the following was the result of illness.) I was in the tropics, and, at the time I mention, laid up with fever, when one night I had a dream about an old lady friend of mine. I woke up suddenly, and thought I saw her at the foot of my bed, and the strange part was I thought I heard her speak. She seemed to be dressed in white. I told this to a friend, who only laughed at me and said I was ill, but at the same time, he put down the date and hour. A few mails after, I heard of the old lady's death, at the same date and hour. I have no belief in spirits whatever, but this was a fact."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Griffin supplied the following fuller account.

"June 15, 1886.

"At the time of the occurrence, June, 1882, I had been in Jamaica for about 18 months. I had been ill with country fever, but was convalescent, though still very weak. I was sleeping in a room next that of a friend, with the door open between. I had a dream, in which my mind went back to old times when I had seen much of the lady I mentioned; and then I became aware that she was dead, in a room which seemed to be near me, and that I wanted to get to her; and as this thought flashed across me, I seemed to see her. Then I woke with a sudden start, and distinctly saw her standing at the foot of my bed, dressed in white, and with the hands by her side. The face was extremely distinct, and quite unmistakeable. Had a real person been standing in that place, I certainly could not have distinguished the features, as it was

a dark night.¹ The figure plainly pronounced my name, 'Marcus,' once, and then gradually disappeared as I watched it. It remained visible a sufficient number of seconds for me to be keenly aware that I was awake; I felt quite clearly, the *former* experience was a dream, *then* I woke, and *now* this is a waking reality. After the disappearance, I called out, and my friend came in. I described the whole experience to him, and he was sufficiently impressed with it to notice the time—which was a few minutes past midnight, June 11th—and to note the occurrence *at once* in his diary. The next morning he and others laughed at the matter, but could not but be impressed by its reality to *me*.

"About three weeks afterwards, I received a letter from a daughter of my friend, informing me of her mother's death in England, on June 11th, soon after 5 a.m. My friend and I calculated the difference of longitude, and the hours corresponded to within a few minutes. I had no idea of the lady's being ill, and had neither been anxious about her nor thinking about her. In conversation with the family, two years later, they told me that a few minutes before her death she said, 'Tell Marcus I thought of him.' I may mention that this lady had, three years before, nursed me through a dangerous illness; and I had a warm affection for her.

"I do not recollect on any other occasion in my life experiencing the continuation of a dream-image into waking moments; nor have I ever had a hallucination either of sight or hearing.

"MARCUS SOUTHWELL GRIFFIN."

Mr. Griffin kindly allowed me to copy the following sentence from the letter which announced the death:—

"Alphington.

"June 17, 1882.

"Mother died on St. Barnabas' Day [*i.e.*, June 11], at 5.20, and was buried on the Thursday following, June 15th, 1882."

We have verified the date of death in the Register of Deaths.

The next letter that Mr. Griffin received made it quite clear that the 5.20 was A.M.; and in conversation with the family since, the death was described to him as having taken place *before breakfast*.

[Mr. Griffin has now no *separate* recollection of the date of his vision. He had an idea that the death had been on June 15, not having looked for some time at the letter in which it was announced, where it will be seen that June 15 (the day of the funeral) is the only day of the month mentioned, the day of the death being otherwise described. The "June 11" in the foregoing account was added after he had referred to this letter. But there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that he is justified in his conviction that his vision took place on June 11. He can hardly be wrong in his recollection that he and his friend made a careful computation of the longitude, with a view to ascertaining how close the coincidence was; and that they specially noticed a slight discrepancy. (The difference of longitude being about $73\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, the time of the death would correspond with about 12.30 a.m., not 12.10 a.m.; so that if the two times are quite accurately given, Mr. Griffin's experience preceded the death by about 20 minutes.) Now persons who took this amount of trouble with regard

¹ See Vol. i., pp. 462 (note) and 551; and compare case 698, above.

to the *hours*, may fairly be assumed not to have made a gross blunder as to the identity of *day*; even if Mr. Griffin is mistaken (which there is no reason for supposing) in his recollection that the means for establishing the identity of day were there in black and white before them. It is to be hoped that the diary has been preserved, and that the evidence will in time be completed by our obtaining the entry. The friend who made it is at present in America, and Mr. Griffin has written to him, but doubts whether the last address given will now find him. He is sure, he thinks, to have news of him before very long. I may mention that Mr. Griffin's mother told me that her son gave her a full description of the occurrence on his return to England, not very long after it took place.]

I naturally cannot convey to others the full effect of Mr. Griffin's *vivâ voce* description. Though he had not attributed any scientific importance to the incident, he impressed on me that his own experience, taken alone, and quite apart from the facts which he learnt afterwards, was to him absolutely unique—by far the strangest and most perplexing thing that had ever happened to him. It gave him precisely the same vivid feeling of astonishment that the sanest of my readers would receive if they looked up from this page, and saw a friend standing palpably before them, who gazed at them, addressed them, and then vanished into air. As regards the coincidence, Mr. Griffin will allow me to add that the view expressed in his first account—namely, that his own illness was a sufficient explanation of his experience, and that the coincidence therefore was accidental—is not that which he now holds. I pointed out to him (as so often in the course of these pages) that the theory of accident which would be the reasonable one if the particular experience in question stood alone or nearly alone in our generation, becomes unreasonable when the case is only one of a large class; and I can only hope that others may agree with him in finding this argument as just as it is obvious.

Here I must stop. Cases continue to reach us which may claim a place in a future collection; but time is needed for inquiry into their details; and the limits of space proposed for the present work have already been overpassed. To those whom it may have interested, its last word must be a reminder that to them we look for vigorous aid in the accumulation of further facts, which may confirm or modify our conclusions.

TABLE OF NUMBERED CASES.

IN COLUMN IV.

A = Auditory. D = Dream. E = Emotional. G = Gustatory. I = Ideational.	M = Motor. O = Olfactory. S = Sensation of pain, &c. T = Tactile. V = Visual.
--	---

IN COLUMN V.

H = Husband. F = Father. S = Son. B = Brother. U = Uncle. N = Nephew. C = Cousin (male). G = Grandfather or Grandson. FR = Friends. ¹ AC = Acquaintances. ¹	w = Wife. m = Mother. d = Daughter. s = Sister. a = Aunt. n = Niece. c = Cousin (female). g = Grandmother or Granddaughter. ST = Strangers.
--	---

In column V., the first letter indicates the percipient, the second the agent. Letters indicating females are in small type.

The large majority of the names, of which only the initials are here given, appear in full at the pages indicated.

NO.	PAGE. VOL. I.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
1	88	Blind Man — Dr. E.	Hypnotic sleep	A C
2	89	Miss C. — Rev. J. L. S.	M	a C
3	90	Patient — Mr. B.	M	a C
4	90	Mr. N. D. — Mesmerist	M	A C
5	90	Mrs. T. — Mr. H. S. T.	M	f R
6	91	Miss L. F. C. — Mr. H. S. T.	M	c C
7	93	Miss V. — Mr. S. H. B.	M	f R
8	94	E. C. — Rev. L. L.	I	a C
9	96	Mrs. W. — Mr. G. A. S.	I or V	a C
10	98	Friends — Mr. H. S. T.	S	F F R
11	98	Girl — Son of Rev. L. L.	I	a C
12	99	Friends — Mr. H. S. T.	I	F F R
13	103	Rev. W. S. M. — Friend	V A	F r
14	104	Miss L. S. V. } — Mr. S. H. B. Miss E. C. V. }	V	f R
15	106	Mrs. L. — Mr. S. H. B.	V T	a C
16	108	Miss V. — Mr. S. H. B.	V T	f R
17	188	Mrs. A. S. — Mr. A. S.	S	w H
18	190	Mrs. N. — Rev. P. H. N.	O	w H
19	191	Rev. J. D. — Miss J. W.	I	F r
20	194	Mrs. B. — Mrs. G.	I or V	d m
21	196	Mr. K. — Mrs. K.	I	H w
22	197	Miss M. — Mrs. K.	E	c c
23	199	Mr. F. W. — Mr. R. W. B.	D	B B
24	202	Mrs. W. — Sir J. C.	D	d F

¹ It has not been possible to draw the line between acquaintance and friendship with precision. The percipient and agent have been classed as *friends* in cases where the account indicates some strength of attachment on both sides or on one side. Where there is no clear sign of such attachment, the more general designation of *acquaintances* has been adopted.

NO.	PAGE. VOL. I.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
25	204	Mrs. C. — Mr. J. C.	V	m S
26	207	Mr. G. M. — Mr. R. K.	V	CC
27	209	Mr. R. R. — Mr. X.	I or V	FR
28	210	Mr. N. J. S. — Mr. F. L.	V	FR
29	212	Mr. A. B. — Mrs. F.	V	A c
30	214	F. R. — Mrs. A. (?)	A V	s t
31	216	Capt. J. C. — Mr. J.	V	NU
32	218	Rev. R. B. — Mrs. B.	V	S m
33	221	Miss S. — Capt. J. B.	A	f R
34	222	Mr. A. Z. — Mr. S. B.	A	FR
35	225	Mrs. N. — Rev. P. H. N.	AT. D	f R
36	227	Mr. J. D. } — Mrs. E.	A	F f r
37	234	Col. L. A. — Sir L. G.	I	FR
38	235	Mr. K. — Herr S.	I	FR
39	236	Miss B. — Mrs. B.	I	d m
40	236	Count G. — Mr. R. B.	I	ST
41	237	Miss C. B. M. — Jeweller	E	s T
42	239	Miss C. E. S. — Mr. W. B. S.	I	s B (?)
43	240	R. } — Miss —	{ E	ss
		E. }	{ E	ss
44	242	Mr. L. H. S. } — Miss M. R. or Mr. A. F.	I	F f R r
		Mrs. L. H. S. }		
45	243	Mrs. H. D. — Mr. C.	I	a C
46	244	Miss A. S. J. — Miss M. L. J.	I	ss
47	245	Mr. M. — Miss J. —	I	C c
48	246	Miss A. O. — Mr. D. A.	I	c C
49	247	Mrs. A. — Rev. A. W. A.	I A	w H
50	247	Bishop W. — Son.	I	FS
51	249	Mrs. S. — Mr. T. W. S.	I	w H
52	249	Mme. O. — Mons. O.	I	w H
53	251	Mrs. G. — Mr. G.	I or V	m S
54	253	Miss M. E. P. — Mr. J.	I	f R
55	253	Mr. R. C. — Mr. J. C.	I	BB
56	255	Mr. J. G. K. — Mother-in-law	I or V	Fr
57	256	Miss M. E. P. — Sister... ..	I	ss
58	257	Mr. J. H. — Mrs. H. or Miss H.	I or V	S m or B s
59	258	Miss G. — Mr. H. G.	I or V	s B
60	260	Mrs. J. — Mr. W. R.	I or V	BB
61	261	Mr. J. A. W. — Mr. T. W. or Mr. G. W.	I or V	s B
62	262	Mrs. L. — Mr. A.	I or V	f R
63	263	Mrs. B. — Friend	I or V	f R
64	264	Lady L. — Sir B. L.	I or V	w H
65	265	Miss L. — Mr. —	I or V	f R
66	267	“F.R.C.P.” — Landlord	I or V	AC
67	271	Mr. A. C. — Sister	E	B s
68	271	Hon. Mrs. P. — Sister	E	ss
69	272	Mr. J. D. H. { — Brother }	E	{ BB
		{ — Uncle }		{ NU
		{ — Mother }		{ S m
70	273	Mrs. R. — Mr. S. R.	E	w H
71	274	Dr. E. L. F. — Grandmother	E	G g
72	275	Mrs. B. — Rev. J. J.	E	d F
73	276	Mr. — — Mrs. —	E	H w
74	277	Mrs. S. — Mr. S.	E	w H
75	278	Dr. J. D. — Father	E D	S F
76	280	Rev. J. M. W. — Twin brother	E	BB
77	281	Mr. J. C. — Twin brother	E	BB

No.	PAGE.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
	VOL. I.			
78	283	Mr. A. J. M. — Twin brother	E	B B
79	283	Rev. E. D. M. — Father	M	S F
80	284	Mrs. C. — Mr. C.	M	w H
81	285	Mr. A. S. — Mrs. S.	M	H w
82	286	Mrs. W. — Father	M	d F
83	287	Mr. P. — Father... ..	M	S F
84	288	Mrs. V. — Mr. V.	M	w H
85	288	Major K. — Father	M	S F
86	291	Mr. R. R. — Rev. T. H.	M	F R
87	293	Mdlle. B. — Mdlle. M.	M	f r
88	314	Mr. E. P. T. — Mrs. T.	D	H w or w H
89	315	Rev. J. P. H. — Mrs. H.	D	H w
90	315	Mr. J. M. F. — Mrs. F.	D	H w or w H
91	316	Mr. M. — Mrs. M.	D	H w
92	316	Mr. W. — Mrs. W.	D	H w
93	317	Mrs. C. — Mr. C.	D	w H
94	318	Miss C. S. B. — Miss K. E.	D (?)	f r
95	321	Mr. C. — Mrs. C.	D	H w
96	322	Mr. C. — Mrs. C.	D	H w
97	322	M. H. — Miss M. M.	D	f r
98	324	Mr. D. B. W. S. — Father	D	S F
99	325	Mr. T. J. H. — Mrs. W.	D	F r
100	327	Mr. J. A. — Lieut. O.	D I	F R
101	328	Mrs. M. — Mr. M. ?	D	w H (?)
102	329	Mrs. L. — Mr. J. C.	D	f R
103	330	<i>Coriolanus</i> — Mr. E. C. B.	D	F R
104	331	Miss E. J. M. — Rev. A. B. M.	D	c C
105	333	Mrs. H. — Mr. H. H.	D	m S
106	335	Mrs. S. — Son	D	m S
107	336	Mr. A. A. — Son	D	F S
108	338	Rev. Canon W. — Mr. A. W.	D	B B
109	339	Mrs. F. — Mr. F.	D	w H
110	339	Mrs. C. L. — Mother	D	d m
111	342	Miss B. — Navy	D	f R
112	342	Mr. G. G. — Mrs. S.	D	A c
113	343	Mrs. G. — Son	D	m S
114	345	Rev. W. D. W. R. — W. E.	D	F R
115	346	Mrs. F. — Mr. C. F.	D	m S
116	347	Mrs. S. — Mrs. C. R. S.	D	f r
117	349	Herr von R. — Capt. von P.	D	A C
118	350	Miss L. K. D. — Friend	D	f r
119	350	Miss K. G. — Mr. M.	D	a C
120	352	Mrs. J. — Mr. G. J. H.	D	f r
121	353	Mr. E. J. H. — Father	D	S F
122	355	Mrs. F. — Mr. F.	D	w H
123	355	Mrs. F. — Mr. F. E. F.	D	m S
124	357	Miss C. A. — Mr. L. (?)	D	a C
125	358	Mr. J. W. — Mrs. W.	D	S m
126	359	Mrs. H. B. — Colonel F.	D	a C
127	362	Mrs. M. } — Mrs. A.	{D	f f r
		Miss V. }		
128	363	Brigade Surgeon W. — Mother	D	S m
129	364	Rev. C. C. W. — Mr. W.	D	F R
130	365	Mrs. M. — Mr. W.	D	s B
131	366	Mrs. H. — Mr. J. M.	D	s T
132	366	Mrs. H. — Mr. J. G.	D	a C
133	369	Miss R. H. B.	D	?
134	370	Mrs. S. — Mr. H.	D	s B

NO.	PAGE. VOL. I.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
135	373	Miss P. — Mr. J. T. M. P.	D	s B
136	374	Mrs. M. M. — Major P.	D	f R
137	375	Mrs. M. M. — Friend	D	f r
138	375	Mrs. G. — Miss A.	D	a n
139	377	Miss S. S. P. — W. T.	D	a C
140	378	Miss L. A. W. — Brother	D	s B
141	380	Mrs. H. — Sister-in-law	D	f r
142	381	Dr. Y. — Tenants	D	A C
143	383	Mrs. M. — Dr. H.	D	n U
144	383	Dr. B. } — Mr. —	{ A D	F R
		Mrs. S. }	D	s B
145	386	Mrs. V. S. — Son	D	m S
146	395	Lord B. — G.	V	F R
147	397	Mrs. K. — Mr. E. K.	M	m S
148	399	Dr. R. — Grandmother	M	G g
149	400	Mr. W. D. — Miss D.	D (?)	F d
150	403	Lord L. — Brother	A	B B
151	404	Mrs. P. — Brother	A	s B
152	406	Mrs. R. — Son	A	m S
153	407	Rev. A. J. — Mrs. M. J.	A	F r
154	408	Miss T. — Mr. H. S.	A	f R
155	409	Mr. E. — Mrs. E.	A	S m
156	410	Mr. — — Father	A	S F
157	411	Mr. H. C. F. — Mrs. F.	A	S m
158	413	Mrs. S. — E. M.	A	f r
159	414	Archdeacon F. — Friend	V	F R
160	415	Major M. — Miss S. M.	V	B s
161	416	Miss B. — Captain C. M.	V	c C
162	416	Mr. J. A. S. — Dr. M.	V	A C
163	417	Rev. W. J. B. — Mr. R. D.	V	F R
164	418	Rev. C. C. W. — Mr. B.	V	F R
165	419	Mrs. — — Captain P.	V	f R
166	420	Mrs. W. } — Captain W.	{ D V	w H
		Mrs. N. }	V	s T
167	424	Mr. W. de G. — Mr. H. de G.	V	B B
168	425	Mrs. T. — Mr. N.	V	f R
169	427	Miss T. J. C. } — Mr. —	{ V	s T
		Mr. C. B. }	V	F R
170	428	Mrs. S. — Aunt	V	n a
171	429	Mrs. R. — Mr. F.	V	a N
172	430	Mrs. D. — Miss G.	V	f r
173	431	Mrs. B. — Captain G.	V	f R
174	431	Miss C. P. — Major G.	V	a C
175	433	Mr. T. R. — Mr. J. H. H.	D V	F R
176	434	Mrs. W. — Mr. W.	T V	w H
177	435	Mrs. B. — Brother	V T	s B
178	436	Miss E. A. S. — Mr. S.	V T	d F
179	437	Mr. W. — Mr. G. B.	T V	F R
180	439	Mr. G. J. C. — Mrs. R.	T V	N a
181	440	Mrs. W. — F. W.	T A	m S
182	441	Miss K. J. — Miss B.	A V	f r
183	443	Mrs. R. — General R.	V A	w H
184	444	Mr. J. G. K. — I. K.	A V	F S
185	445	Mrs. S. — Mr. S. P.	T V A	s B
186	447	Miss B. — Grandfather	V A	g G
187	448	Miss H. — R.	V A	f r
188	449	Mrs. P. — M. P.	V A	m S
189	451	Mrs. W. — Mrs. H.	A V	f r

TABLE OF NUMBERED CASES,

711

NO.	PAGE.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
	VOL. I.			
190	453	Mrs. L. — Mrs. R.	A V	f r
191	523	Mr. T. W. G. — Mrs. —	V	F r
192	524	Mr. B. — Mrs. R.	V	A c
193	525	Canon — — Mr. —	V	F R
194	527	Miss R. — Captain W.	V	f R
195	528	Miss R. — Mrs. M.	V	g g
196	530	Mr. J. G. F. R. — Mrs. —	V	N a
197	531	Miss B. — J. N.	V A	f R
198	532	Mrs. S. — B—	A V	f R
199	534	Mr. B. — Friend	A V	F r
200	540	Miss C. — Mr. T. C.	V	s B
201	542	Mrs. B. — R.	V	f R
202	544	Miss S. — Mrs. A.	V	f r
203	548	Mrs. A. — Mrs. C.	V	d m
204	549	Mrs. C. — Mrs. —	V	f r
205	549	Lady C. — Father H.	V	f R
206	551	Colonel J. — Miss J.	V	B s
207	552	Mrs. L. — A. C.	A V	f r
208	553	Mrs. R. — Mr. E. R.	A	w H
210 ¹	556	Captain C. — Lieut. O. C.	V	B B
211	559	Miss L. — Great Uncle	V	n U ²
212	560	Dr. B. — Mr. J. M.	V	B B
213	561	Mr. J. H. — Mrs. P.	V	A c
214	563	Mrs. J. — Mrs. R.	V	a n
215	566	Mr. J. R. — Mrs. W.	V	F r
216	567	Mrs. P. — Brother	V	s B
217	568	Mr. T. C. — Rev. J. C.	V	S F
VOL. II.				
218	30	Mr. H. H. H. — Great Uncle	I or V	N U ²
219	31	Mr. A. — Mrs. A.	V	H w
220	31	Mr. F. G. — Mr. C. T.	V	F R
221	34	Lady C. — Mrs. L.	V	d m
222	35	Mr. R. S. — Mrs. S.	V	H w
223	37	Mrs. T. — Mr. W.	V	n U
224	38	Mdme. B. — Mons. d'E.	V	f R
225	40	Mrs. R. — Miss L. B.	V	a c
226	41	General H. — Miss H.	V	B s
227	42	M. — Friend	V	F r
228	44	Rev. F. B. — Aunt	V	N a
229	45	General F. — Friend	V	F R
230	46	Mr. J. E. — Twin brother	V	B B
231	47	Mr. S. S. — Hon. R. G.	V	F R
232	49	Miss E. H. H. — Mrs. W.	V	f r
233	50	Mrs. G. — Brother	V	s B
234	51	Mrs. S. — Mr. H. S.	V	m S
235	51	Col. S. — Lieut. J. D. S.	V	B B
236	52	Miss B. — Mr. W. B.	V	s B
237	54	E. M. G. — Friend	V	f r
238	55	Mrs. D. — D. D.	V	w H
239	57	J. M. — Mr. W.	V	F R
240	59	Mrs. E. — Mr. J. S.	V	f R
241	59	Mr. S. J. M. — Friend	V	F r

¹ The number 209 has been accidentally omitted.

² Great Uncle.

NO.	PAGE.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
	VOL. II.			
242	61	Nurse — Mr. J. B.	V	s T
243	63	Chevalier S. F. — Mr. C. F.	E V	B B
244	66	Major O. — Mr. J. E. H.	V	C C
245	67	Rev. W. E. D. — Friend	V	F R
246	68	Mr. A. I. — Mr. E. P.	V	F R
247	69	Mrs. — — Son	V	m S
248	70	Mr. A. L. — Professor C.	V	A C
249	71	Mr. T. H. C. — Mr. X.	V	F R
250	72	Mr. R. S. — M. M.	V	A c
251	74	Mrs. W. — F. W.	V	m d
252	75	Rev. J. W. — Pupil	V	F R
253	76	Mr. S. M. S. — Nurse S.	V	F r
254	78	Miss D. } — Mrs. H.	V	c c c
	79			
	80	Caroline — Mrs. H.	V	a c
255	81	Mr. E. H. — Mrs. H.	V	S m
	82	Mrs. W. — Rev. T. L. W.	V	w H
	82	Miss W. — Rev. T. L. W.	V	d F
	82	Parishioner — Rev. T. L. W.	V	f R
256	83	Four Friends — Miss H.	V	a c
			V	F r
257	85	Sister-in-law — Mrs. S.	V	f r
	85	Miss J. S. — Mrs. S.	V	n a
	85	Mrs. S. — Mrs. S.	V	f r
	86	Mrs. C. — Mr. B.	V	f R
258	88	Miss S. — Mr. B.	T V A	f R
	88	Mrs. G. — Mr. B.	V	f R
	89	Dr. P. } — Mr. B.	V	F f R
	90	Mrs. P. }		
259	91	Mrs. G. — Mr. B.	V	f R
260	92	Capt. B. — Mrs. B.	V	H w
	92	Capt. B. — Mrs. B.	V	F r
261	93	E. B. — Mrs. B.	V	a c
			V	f r
262	94	Mrs. B. — Mrs. G.	V	F R
263	96	Col. B. — Col. R.	V	F R
264	96	J. C. — Twin Brother	V	B B
	97	Rev. W. M. }	V	?
		Mr. C. }		
		Mrs. C. }		
265	100	Miss C. }		
265	100	Mr. J. S. — Mr. D. S.	A	B B
266	100	Mrs. R. — Mr. S. R.	A	m S
267	102	Mrs. S. — Mr. S.	A	m S
268	103	Mr. R. F. — Mr. J. T. F.	A	B B
269	104	Dr. — — Brother	A	B B
270	105	Miss G. — — Sister	A	s s
271	105	Servant — Mr. J. P.	A	a C
272	107	Mr. L. T. — Son	A	F S
273	108	Mr. G. A. W. — Brother	A	B B
274	109	Mrs. S. — Mr. S.	A	m S
275	110	Mr. W. T. B. — Mr. B.	A	S F
276	111	Mrs. H. — Mr. H.	A	w H
277	112	Miss B. — Mrs. B.	A	d m
278	113	Mrs. W. — Sister	A	s s
279	114	Mrs. W. — Mother, and (?) other relatives... ..	A	d m
280	115	Mr. G. — Miss —	A	F r

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
281	116	Mrs. W. — Cousin	A	c C
282	116	Mrs. W. — E.	A	fr
283	117	Miss H. — Mrs. H.	A D	d m
284	119	Rev. R. H. K. — “Etta”	I or A	F d
285	120	Count G. — Mr. V.	I or A	S T
286	122	Rev. — — Friend	S I	F R
287	123	Dr. J. S. — J. G. (?)	A	A C
288	124	Mr. B. — Mrs. B.	A	S m
289	127	Mr. — — Friend	E A	fr
290	130	Miss V. — Mrs. D.	A	fr
291	132	Mrs. — — Mr. J — —	S	m S
292	134	Mrs. H. — Captain W — —	T	n U
293	135	J. G. — Mrs. G.	T A	S m
294	136	Rev. P. H. N. — W. B.	T A	F R
295	137	Mrs. R. L. — Mr. R. L.	A T V	fr
296	139	Rev. J. A. H. — Mrs. P.	A V	Fr
297	141	Miss P. — Mr. M. P.	V A	s B
298	143	Mrs. B. — Friend	A V	fr
299	144	D. B. — W. H. P. (?)	V A	F R
300	146	E. S. — Father	V A	S F
301	147	Mr. H. O. — Miss K. A. O.	V A	B s
302	149	Mr. H. B. G. } — Rev. T. H. and others	{ V, A A	F R s s s T
303	154	Mr. J. H. W. — Mrs. W.	D. D (?)	G g
304	156	Miss M. — Mr. J. T. M. P.	V. (?) V	fr
305	158	Miss — — Mr. V.	D. D	fr
306	159	Miss B — — Mrs. S.	V T A. D	fr
307	162	Mrs. P. — Mr. L.	V. I	a C
308	164	Mrs. S. } — Mr. E. W. Mrs. R. }	{ A } { A } I or V	{ s B { fr
309	173	Mrs. B. } — Mrs. J. M. W. }	{ E { D	st st
310	174	Rev. C. C. T. F. } — Captain C. Major C. }	{ A { A	F R F R
311	176	Mrs. E. } — Mr. B. Captain B. }	{ V { A	S T S F
312	178	Mrs. P. } — Mrs. G. Servant }	{ V { V	fr a c
313	179	C. M. } — Susan — — Mrs. M. }	{ E { A V T	A c fr
314	181	Mrs. C. } — Mrs. W. Mrs. B. } Mrs. — — }	{ V { V { V	fr a n s s
315	182	Mr. de G. } — Miss de G. Mrs. E. }	{ V { V (?) D	B s s s
316	193	Mrs. W. } Mr. E. M. W. }	{ V { V	? ?
317	196	Miss V. M. } Miss S. M. } C. }	{ V { V { V	? ?
318	198	Lord C. } Lady C. }	{ V { V	? ?
319	199	Rev. — — } Dr. C. }	{ V { V	? ?
320	200	Surgeon-Major S. } Mrs. R. }	{ I V { I V	? ?
321	202	Rev. D. W. G. } Mrs. G. }	{ V { V	? ?

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
322	203	Lady C. } Miss T. } Mr. B. }	{ V A V	? ? ?
323	204	Mrs. B. } Miss B. } Mrs. B. }	{ V V V	? ? ?
324	205	Sister } Capt. N. }	{ S V (?) V	? ?
325	208	Mr. J. A. }	{ V V	? ?
326	209	Mrs. R. } and others } — Rev. — (?)	{ V V V	ddF AC
327	210	Mrs. M. } Friend } — Mr. — (?)	{ V V	ffR
328	210	Mrs. H. } Miss M. H. } — Miss H. (?)	{ V V	md ss
329	211	Mr. M. } Mr. R. } — Rev. Mr. H. (?)	{ V V	FFR
330	213	Mr. J. C. } Son }	{ V V	? ?
331	213	Mr. L. } and others }	{ V V	? ?
332	215	Rev. C. J. } Child }	{ V D (?)	? ?
333	217	Mrs. H. } Mr. H. — } — Mrs. H. (?)	{ V V V	? ? ?
334	218	Miss G. } Miss L. — }	{ A A	? ?
335	219	Mrs. S. } Two servants }	{ A A	? ?
336	220	Rev. W. R. } Miss R. }	{ A A	? ?
337	221	Mr. S. } Mrs. S. }	{ A A	? ?
338	223	and others } Mrs Y. } Mrs. B. }	{ A A A	? ? ?
339	226	Mr. B. } Mrs. B. } — Miss S. and others }	{ A A A	FFFfr
340	227	Mr. L. } Mrs. L. } — W. L.	{ A A	FS mS
341	227	Mrs. A. } The Misses A } — Commander A.	{ A A A	mS sssB
342	228	Mr. W. } Mrs. W. } — D. M. A.	{ A A	FR sB
343	230	Mrs. P. } Miss P. } — A. D.	{ A A	ffR
344	234	Miss L. } Miss J. L. } — Aunt	{ A A	nna
345	235	Child — Mr. — } Mrs. C. — Mr. — }	{ V VA	SF sB
346	236	Mr. T. D. } Mrs. T. D. } — Mrs. D. Friend }	{ V T V V	S m fr Fr
347	237	Mrs. R. } Mrs. A. — Mr. — }	{ V V	nU sB

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
348	239	Mrs. E. } — Mr. —	{ V	f R
		Miss D. }	{ V	s T
349	241	Mr. W. } — P. W.	{ V	F S
		Miss K. W. }	{ V	s B
350	244	M. J. F. } — Mrs. R.	{ V	s t
		and 2 others }	{ V	f fr
351	247	Mrs. B. } — Mr. P. M.	{ V	a a C
		Miss A. B. }	{ V	
352	248	A. F. } — Rev. F.	{ V D	G G
		Mr. S. S. F. }	{ V	S F
353	250	Mrs. — } — Mr. —	{ V	s T
		Mr. — }	{ V	B B
354	253	Miss D. E. W. } — Miss M. C.	{ V	n a
		Miss L. C. }	{ V	a c
355	256	Captain A. } — Mr. H.	{ A V	S T
		Mr. H. }	{ A	S F
356	257	Mr. B. } — Mr. W.	{ V	F F R
		Mr. E. }	{ V	
357	259	Sir J. S. } — Mr. J. W.	{ V	S T
		Colonel W. }	{ V	B B

CASES IN THE SUPPLEMENT.

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
358	325	A. M. — Rev. C. H. T.	T S	a C
359	326	Mrs. S. — Dr. E.	G T O	a C
360	328	Boy — Professor J. S.	G	A C
361	329	A. D. — Mons. M.	S	F R
362	332	Patient — Mons. C. R.	M	a C
363	333	Patient — Professor B.	I	A C
364	334	Patient — Dr. G.	I E	a C
365	334	Patient — Dr. G.	I	a C
366	336	Miss M. N. — Mrs. P.	I G T E	f r
367	344	Mrs. J. E. — Captain B.	I T O G	f R
368	346	Patient — Dr. P.	I	f R
369	347	Miss C. — Serjeant C. and others	I	s B, &c.
370	349	Mrs. M. — Mrs. —	I	f r
371	350	Mr. C. — Coachman	I (?)	F R
372	350	Rev. J. B. — Rev. J. S. B.	I	F S
373	351	Mr. — — Dr. —	I	F R
374	353	Mr. H. — Father	I	S F
375	354	Miss B. — Madame H.	I	F r
376	354	Professor W. — Mr. R. W.	I	B B
377	356	Mrs. C. — G. C. or Brother	I	m S
378	356	Mr. J. W. S. — Mrs. —	E	F r
379	358	Mrs. — — Dr. S.	I	f R
380	360	Rev. Mr. B. — Brother	I or V	B B

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
381	360	Miss C. — Mrs. —	E	s s
382	361	Mr. — — Miss E — and others	I	F d, &c.
383	362	Miss — — Miss E —	I	s s
384	363	Mrs. G. — Mr. G.	I	m S
385	364	Mrs. W. — Insane patient (?)... ..	I	s T
386	364	Mr. J. C. — Mr. —	I	A C
387	368	Mr. J. A. E. — ?	I E	?
388	369	Mr. N. C. — ?	I E	?
389	370	Rev. — — Son	E	F S
390	371	Mr. J. P. — Mr. B.	I	F R
391	371	Mr. — — Mr. C.	E	F R
392	372	Mrs. — — Mr. — and others	E	n U, n U, f R
393	373	Mrs. — — Sons	E	m S, m S
394	374	Mr. F. H. P. — Mrs. P.	E	S m
395	374	Mrs. D — Ada —	E	f r
396	375	Mr. S. N. W. — Mr. —	E	F R
397	376	Mr. F. M. — Mrs. M.	M	S m
398	377	Dr. E. L. F. — Patient	M	A c
399	377	Mr. W. B. — Son	M	F c S
400	378	Herr von S. — Frau von S.	M	S m
401	379	Mr. N. — Miss N.	M	F d
402	380	Mr. A. A. W. — Mrs. W.	D	S m
403	380	Mr. F. — Mrs. F.	D	H w
404	381	Rev. P. T. D. } — Negress	{ D }	A a c
		Miss D. }	{ D }	
405	382	Mr. F. M. } — Mrs. M.	{ D }	S S m
		Brother }	{ D }	
		Mr. S. }	{ D }	
406	382	Mr. W. S. } — Mrs. S.	{ D }	S S S m
		Mr. J. S. }	{ D }	
407	383	Miss J. W. — M. H.	D	f r
408	385	Mrs. H. — Miss H.	D	m d
409	385	Mrs. S. — Mr. S.	D	m S
410	386	Servant — Mr. E. C. T.	D	a C
411	387	Miss A. G. — Mr. G.	D	s B
412	387	Mrs. O'S. — Hon. J. L. O'S.	D	m S
413	388	General B. — Mrs. B.	D	H w
414	388	Mrs. B. — Servant	D	f r
415	389	Miss A. J. M. — Mr. M.	D	s B
416	390	Mrs. B. — Mr. J. B.	D	m S
417	391	Dean C. — Rev. E. T. C.	D	B B
418	392	Mr. A. S. — Mr. S. S.	D	B B
419	393	Mrs. — — Mr. —	D	m S
420	393	Rev. W. B. B. — Mrs. B.	D	F r
421	394	Miss C. D. G. — Mrs. G.	D	g g
422	395	Colonel V. — Mr. A. V.	D	F S
423	396	Mrs. S. — Frau S.	D	f r
424	396	Mrs. W. — Mr. —	D	s B
425	397	Mrs. D. — Mrs. W.	D	f r
426	398	Miss C. — Mr. —	D	f R
427	399	Miss G. — Rev. —	D	a C
428	400	Mrs. H. — Mr. J. J.	D	a C
429	400	Mr. F. M. — Mr. M.	D	S F
430	400	Rev. F. R. H. — Mr. —	D	C C
431	402	Miss D. — Rev. S.	D	s T
432	403	Mrs. B — Professor T.	D	s B
433	404	Mr. F. T. D. — Mr. —	D	N U

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
434	404	Mr. H. W. D. — Mrs. D.	D	S m
435	405	Mr. G. U. — Mr. R. U.	D	BB
436	406	Mrs. T. — ?	D	?
437	406	Mrs. H. — Mr. J. M.	D	n U
438	407	Mrs. D. — Mr. —	D	s B
439	408	Mons. J. C. — Mons. H. C.	D	BB
440	408	Mons. L. — Mons. L.	D	S F
441	408	Mr. A. G. S. — Mr. D. L.	D	FR
442	409	Mrs. S. — Rev. S. H. S.	D	w H
443	411	Mr. J. D. B. — Mrs. —	D	G g
444	412	Mr. H. — Lieut. A. E. H.	D	FS
445	412	Rev. J. M. — Mrs. —	D (?)	Fr
446	413	Mrs. P. — Miss —	D	s s ?
447	414	Fräulein M. L. — Herr L.	D	d F
448	415	Mr. W. B. — Mr. J. B.	D	BB
449	416	Mme. A. — Dr. A. F. S.	D (?)	f R
450	417	Miss A. E. R. — Mr. X.	D	f R
451	418	Rev. G. L. F. — Dr. H. H. F.	D	BB
452	419	Mr. T. — Mrs. T.	D	S m
453	420	Miss — — Mr. —	D	n U
454	421	Mr. — — Major —	D	S F
455	422	Mr. G. H. F. P. — Miss E. B.	D	A c
456	423	Miss M. — K. A. H. (?)	D	s t
457	423	Mrs. — — Mrs. M.	D	f r
458	424	Mrs. W. — Mr. W. G.	D	n U
459	425	Miss E. F. H. — (?)	D	?
460	427	Mrs. B. — Mr. B. C. and others	D	c C, f R, f r, w H
461	428	Mrs. F. — Mr. W. H. or Miss H.	D	f R or f r
462	429	Mr. J. R. — Mr. J. M.	D	FR
463	430	Miss A. G. — Mrs. —	D	f r
464	431	Miss B. — Mr. —	D	f R
465	431	Mr. J. W. B. — Dr. B.	D	S F
466	432	Mrs. F. — Mrs. L.	D	m d
467	432	Mme. S. (hypnotised) — Father	D	d F
468	433	Mr. R. — J. R. T.	D	U N
469	434	E. G. — Woman	D	a c
470	435	Miss M. — Mr. M.	D	d F
471	436	Mrs. S. — W. S.	D	m S
472	437	Mrs. W. — Mr. G. E.	D	s B
473	438	Mrs. — — Mrs. W.	D	f r
474	439	Mdlle. R. — Mme. R.	D	d m
475	440	Mrs. H. — Mme. —	D	d m
476	441	Mrs. D. S. — Mr. T. P.	D	d F
477	442	Miss M. — Capt. F.	D	f R
478	443	Mr. L. H. S. — Mr. H. S. (?)	D	BB (?)
479	443	Mr. R. R. — E. G.	D	A C
480	444	Mr. R. R. — W. T.	D	A C
481	444	Mr. C. — Rev. S. H. I.	D	FR
482	445	Mrs. P. — Mrs. B.	D	n a
483	446	Mr. E. W. P. — Clerk (?)	D	ST (?)
484	447	Miss — — Mrs. G.	D	s t
485	449	Mr. R. H. D. — Miss —	V	Fr
486	450	Mrs. L. — M. T.	V	c c
487	451	Mrs. H. — Mr. A.	V	s B
488	452	Mr. W. G. — Mr. G.	V	BB
489	453	Mrs. N. — Capt. N.	V A	f R
490	454	Lady C. — Mr. J. D.	V A	s T

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
491	455	Mrs. C. — Mr. R.	V	d F
492	456	Mrs. G. G. — Col. S.	V	d F
493	457	Mr. F. — Mr. F. F.	V	F S
494	458	T. P. — Mrs. P.	V	S m
495	459	Mr. G. W. — Mrs. B.	V A	N a ¹
496	459	Mr. G. W. — Miss M. —	A	F r
497	460	Mrs. F. — Mrs. —	A	s s
498	460	Miss E. B. — Mr. H. A. D.	V A	f R
499	461	Rev. W. B. L. — Mr. L.	V	S F
500	462	Mrs. — — Mr. —	V	w H
501	463	Mrs. B. — Miss G. B.	V	f r
502	464	Mrs. W. — Mother and others... ..	V, D, A	d m, s s, s s
503	467	Mrs. D. — Mr. —	V	s B
504	468	Mons. M. — Mons. M., Mme. M.	T A V	S F, S m
505	469	Miss H. W. — Maurice —	V	a N
506	470	Miss L. — Mr. —	A	s T
507	471	Mr. F. A. S. — Mrs. R.	A	C c
508	473	Mrs. H. — Mrs. —	T A	d m
509	473	Mrs. S. — Mrs. G.	A V	d m
510	474	Rev. S. M. — Archbishop of T.	V A	F R
511	475	Herr A. — Frau —	V	N a
512	475	Mrs. J. B. — Mr. R. M.	V T	f R
513	476	E. H. — J. S. and others	A V T, &c.	{ f R, s B, s B, n a, n U
514	477	Mrs. S. — Miss A. H.	V	f r
515	477	Mrs. S. — Mrs. G.	V	s s
516	479	Miss E. C. — Mrs. C.	V	d m
517	480	Lady R. — Hon. J. V.	V	c C
518	481	Mme. C. — Mons. R.	V A	f R
		Mme. V. — Mons. G.	A	d F
519	482	Mrs. F. — Mrs. M.	V A	s s
520	482	Dr. C. — Mrs. C.	V A	S m
521	483	Mrs. C. — Mr. J. C.	V	m S
522	485	Rev. J. C. — Mrs. B.	V A	F r
523	486	Mr. B. — Mr. —	V	A C
524	486	Miss S. — Sir L. S.	V	d F
525	488	Mrs. B. — Miss B. B.	V	m d
526	488	Commander C. — J. F. J.	V A	F R
		Commander C. — T.	V A	F R
527	490	Mrs. H. — D. H.	V A(? D)	m S
528	491	Miss M. N. — Lieut. E. M. N.	A V	s B
529	491	Mrs. N. — J. N.	V	m S
530	492	Mr. W. J. — Mr. J.	V	S F
531	493	Mrs. — — Mr. —	V	a N
532	494	Mr. W. — Mr. W.	V	B B
533	494	Mr. J. M. — Mr. A. M.	V T	F R
534	495	Mr. C. — Miss C.	V	B s
535	495	Mr. — — Father	V	S F
536	495	Servant — Farm Lads	V	a C
537	496	Lieut. C. — Lieut. L.	V	F R
538	497	J. P. — Mrs. P.	A	S m
539	498	Hon. R. H. — Mr. L.	A V	F R
540	499	Mr. — — Mr. B.	A V	F R
541	501	Mrs. — — Son	I or V	m S

¹ Great Aunt.

NO.	PAGE.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
	VOL. II.			
542	502	Mrs. A. — Rev. F. A.	V	m S
543	502	Mrs. O. — Mr. O.	V	m S
544	502	S. S. — Mrs. F.	V	st
545	503	Miss H. P. — Hon. J. P.	V	d F
546	504	Mr. B. — Mr. C. F. S.	V	f R
547	505	J. R. — Mons. G.	V A	f R
548	506	Mrs. B. — Dr. —	I or V	f R
549	507	T. — Mr. J. P.	V	A C
550	509	Mr. J. A. C. — J. H.	V	f R
551	510	Farmer — Capt. W.	V	A C
552	511	Mrs. R. — Mr. —	V	f R
553	511	Mrs. H. — Z.	V	f R
554	512	Mrs. H. — Mrs. —	V	m d
555	513	Mrs. P. — Mother	V	d m
556	513	Miss — — Mrs. —	V	d m
557	514	Miss M. C. — Mrs. S.	V	a c
558	515	Rev. W. J. — Daughter (?)	V	F d
559	515	Mr. T. H. — Mrs. H.	V	S m
560	516	Mr. T. H. — Mr. E. H.	V	B B
561	516	Rev. H. A. H. — Mrs. B.	V	f R
	517	Rev. H. A. H. — Mr. R.	V	f R
562	519	W. S. — Capt. S.	V	S F
563	520	J. B. — Father	V	d F
564	520	Mrs. P. — Mrs. —	V	f r
565	520	G. — Father	V	d F
566	521	Mrs. M. — G.	V	c C
567	522	Mrs. A. — Mrs. W.	V	d m
568	522	Mr. V. T. E. — Mrs. E.	V	S m
569	523	A. — Mr. A. J.	A T V	f R
570	524	M. V. — Capt. de L.	V	F R
571	525	Mr. H. W. — Mrs. W.	V	S m
	526	Mr. H. W. — Mrs. W.	E	S m
572	526	Miss H. C. — Mr. —	V	f R
573	527	Mrs. B. — Mr. H.	V	a C
574	528	Mr. J. H. J. — Mr. —	V	f R
575	529	Mrs. W. — Mrs. —	V	d m
576	529	Mrs. C. — Mrs. — (?)	V	a c
577	530	Dr. C. M. — Mr. M.	V	A C
578	531	Lord D. — Mrs. P. C.	V	F d
579	532	Mrs. — — Mrs. —	V	d m
580	533	Lieut. W. C. B. — Mrs. B.	V	S m
581	533	Miss J. C. — H. C.	V	s B
582	534	Col. C. — W. C. or J. C.	V	A C
583	536	Mrs. M. — Capt. P.	V	f R
584	537	General M. — Laundress	V	A c
585	538	Mr. H. — Dr. G.	V	f R
586	538	Mrs. F. — General F.	V	w H
587	539	Mr. J. D. — Mrs. F.	V	B s
588	540	Mrs. R. — Mr. D.	V	f R
589	541	Mr. G. — Miss R.	V	A c
590	542	Mr. — — Mrs. —	V	S m
591	543	Bishop E. — Mr. C.	V	f R
592	543	Rev. G. — Lord K.	V	f R
593	544	Mrs. de S. — Sister	V	s s
594	545	Mr. — — Mrs. —	V	H w
595	545	Child — Frau —	V	S m
596	546	Mrs. W. — G. W.	V	m S

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
597	547	J. ——— J. M.	V	FR
598	547	Major H. — Capt. H.	V	BB
599	548	Miss M. — Sir J. Y.	V	fR
600	549	Officer — Lieut. G.	V	AC
601	550	Mr. M. — H. M....	V	FS
602	550	Mrs. P. — Mr. ———	V	dF
603	551	Mr. A. — J. A.	V	FS
604	552	Mr. J. W. — Mrs. W.	V	Hw
605	553	General K. — Mrs. K.	V	Hw
606	553	Mr. J. S. — Mrs. S.	V	Hw
607	555	Child — Officer	V	dF
608	556	Mate — Brother	V	BB
609	556	Mr. F. L. M. — Mr. S	V	CC
610	557	Maori — Brother... ..	V	BB
611	558	Mrs. G. — Son	V	mS
612	558	Mrs. A. — Mrs. G.	V	ac
613	561	Mr. M. P. S. — Mr. S.	A	FS
614	562	Mrs. R. — G. R.	A	mS
615	563	Herr D. — Mr. G. S.	A	FR
616	564	Miss B. — Dr. H.	A	aC
617	564	Rev. C. C. F. — Mrs. F.	A	SM
618	565	Miss S. — Mrs. ———	A	fr
619	566	Mrs. M. — Sister and mother	A	ss, ss, dm
620	567	Rev. J. W. — Rev. T. C. E.	A	FR
621	568	Mrs. M. — Mr. ———	A	sB
622	570	Mrs. M. — Tom ———	A	fR
623	570	Mrs. M. — W. M.	A	mS
624	572	Miss C. — Mr. J.	A	fR
625	573	Miss H. — Nephew	A	aN
	573	Miss H. — Nephew	A	aN
626	574	Mr. C. — Mr. C.	T	SF
627	574	“Master of Marines” — Father	T	SF
628	575	Mrs. W. — Mrs. De M.	VT	ss
629	576	Miss S. W. — Mr. W.	T	fR
630	576	Mr. F. C. — Mrs. C.	S	Hw
631	578	Colonel M. T. — Miss ———	VA	Fr
632	579	Capt. ——— Mme. ———	VA	Hw
633	580	Miss ——— Lieut. B.	VA	fR
634	581	Child — Mother	VA	dm
635	582	M. ——— Mrs. ———	AV	dm
636	583	Mme. E. — Mons. E.	AV	mS
637	583	Miss S. P. — Mrs. W.	VA	ss
638	584	Colonel T. — Mr. J. T.	AV	BB
639	585	Mrs. W. — Mr. W.	AV	wH
640	586	Mrs. E. — W. E.	VA	wH
641	590	Miss ——— Rev. ———	I or V. I	fR
642	591	Mr. ——— Miss L. A. W.	D. D	St
643	593	Mrs. A. W. — Major F. M. M.	D. D	sT
644	595	Mrs. W. — Mr. W.	D. VT	wH
645	597	Miss ——— } — Mrs. T.	{V}D	sss
		Miss E. ——— }	{V}D	
646	598	Mrs. M. ——— } — Mrs. ———	{A}D	na
		Mrs. ——— }	{A}D	ss
647	600	Lady G. } — Mrs. ———	{E	ddm
		Sister }	{E	
648	600	Miss S. } — Mr. J. P.	{D	cC
		Mrs. P. }	{D	mS

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
649	602	Mrs. P. } — Mrs. —	{ T	d m
		Mrs. C. }	{ T	d m
		Mrs. H. }	{ V	f r
650	603	Nurse } — Mrs. M.	{ V	a c
		Miss E. H. }	{ V	a c
651	604	Mr. S. } — Mr. T. S.	{ V	F S
		W. B. }	{ V	A C
		C. F. }	{ I	S F
652	605	Nurse } — Capt. F.	{ V	a C
		Mrs. R. }	{ V	f R
		Capt. R. }	{ V	F R
653	606	Miss S. — } — Mrs. —	{ V A	s s
		Miss J. — }	{ V	s s
654	607	Miss R. } — Mr. —	{ V	a N
		Servant }	{ V	s T
655	609	Miss S. } — Mrs. S.	{ V	d m
		Miss M. S. }	{ V	d m
656	610	Mrs. S. } — Mr. J. S.	{ V	a C
		Miss F. }	{ V	a C
657	610	Mrs. R. } — Mr. —	{ A V	g G
		Mrs. — }	{ V	d F (?)
658	611	Miss E. — } — M. S.	{ V	f r
		Miss H. — }	{ V	f r
659	612	Herr C. } — Herr J. H. C.	{ D V	B B
		Fräulein C. }	{ V	s B
660	613	Mr. R. } — a lady	{ V	A c
		Mr. J. C. R. }	{ V	A c
		Miss — }	{ V	f R
661	613	Colonel W. } — Capt. —	{ V	F R
		and others }	{ V	F f R
		Mrs. — }	{ V	m d
662	615	Mary — } — Ellen —	{ V	s s
		John — }	{ V	B s
663	616	Mr. C. } — Mrs. C.	{ V	S m
		Mrs. C. }	{ V	f r
		and 2 Children }	{ V	G G g
664	617	Miss W. } — Mr. W.	{ V	d d F
		Miss — W. }	{ V	
665	617	Admiral C. } — Mr. C.	{ V	S S F
		Mr. G. B. C. }	{ V	
666	619	Miss A. S. } — Miss S.	{ V	s t
		Miss E. F. }	{ V	s t
		Page }	{ A	S t
		Mr. T. S. }	{ V	F R
667	622	Mrs. — } — Mr. —	{ V	w H
		Child }	{ V	S F
		Miss S. }	{ V	f R
668	623	Two Ladies ¹ } — Dr. B.	{ V	?
		Mrs. B. }	{ V	
		Miss B. }	{ V	f f
669	625	Miss A. } — Mr. G. H.	{ V	f i R
		Miss B. }	{ V	
670	626	2 servants — Miss L.	{ V	a a c
671	627	Mrs. B. and } — Miss W.	{ V	F f f r
		3 others }	{ V	

¹ Described by the agent as "relations" simply.

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
672	628	Rev. — } — Mrs. B. (?)	{ V V	B s f r
673	629	Miss E. B. } — Miss C. B. (?)	V	s s s
674	631	Mrs. F. } — Miss F.	{ A A	m d s s
675	632	Mrs. Y. } — Mr. A.	{ A T A	d F S F
676	633	"A. B." } — Mr. —	{ A A	N U s s T (?)
677	634	Mr. H. H. E. } — ?	{ A A	? ?
678	635	Mr. M. P. S. } — Child	{ A A	F r a n
679	635	Mrs. S. } — Mr. —	{ A A	d F, g G, a C
680	636	Mr. C. H. K. } — Mr. K.	{ A A	B B F S
681	636	Mrs. K. } — Mrs. S.	{ A A	m S S t
682	636	Mr. H. C. H. } — Mr. R. —	{ A A	a n (?) f R
683	638	Mrs. W. } — Mr. H.	{ A A T (?)	f R A C
684	639	Mr. L. } — Mrs. L. (?)	{ A A	S m F f f f r

CASES IN THE ADDITIONAL CHAPTER.

NO.	PAGE. VOL. II.	PERCIPIENT AND AGENT.	NATURE OF IMPRESSION	RELATIONSHIP OF P. TO A.
685	671	Miss — — Mr. A. H. W. C.	V, V	f R
686	675	Fräulein H. — Mrs. R.	V	s s
687	676	G. — Mr. E. M. C.	M. I	F R
688	679	Mme. B. — Mons. G.	Hypnotic sleep, &c.	a C
689	683	Mme. D. — Mons. J. H.	Hypnotic sleep, &c.	a C
690	685	Mlle. J. — Dr. D.	Hypnotic sleep, &c.	a C
691	687	Mr. L. — Mrs. L.	I	H w
692	688	Mr. G. — Mr. E. T. R.	I	F R
693	690	Mrs. E. — Mme. H.	A	f r
694	692	Mr. J. G. F. R. — Miss Y.	A	F r
695	693	Mrs. T. — Mr. W. T.	V	m S
696	694	Rev. R. M. H. — Uncle	(A ?) V	N U
697	695	Mrs. B. — Mr. Z.	V	a C
698	696	E. B. — C. Br.	V A	f R
699	699	Dr. A. B. } — E.	{ V V	A A C
700	700	Mr. J. M. F. — Mrs. F.	D	H w
701	702	Mr. H. E. M. — Miss R.	D, V	F r
702	703	Mr. M. S. G. — Mrs. —	D V A	F r

An analysis of the above table shows that of 882¹ percipients, 370, or 42 per cent., were males, and 512, or 58 per cent., females. Of 708¹ agents, 448, or 63·3 per cent., were males, and 260, or 36·7 per cent., females. The preponderance of female percipients cannot be assumed to indicate any superior susceptibility in that sex to telepathic impressions (see above, p. 3, last sentence of first note). The preponderance of male agents is probably to be accounted for by the fact that men are more liable than women to accidents and to violent deaths, and that a larger proportion of them die at a distance from their nearest relatives and friends.

Analysing the results of column V, we find that, out of 830 cases, the agent stood to the percipient in the relation of

Parent or child	in 193 cases,	or 23·3 per cent.
Brother or sister	„ 122 „ „	14·7 „
Husband or wife	„ 52 „ „	6·3 „
Cousin, uncle, &c.	75 „ „	9·0 „
Friend	„ 263 „ „	31·7 „
Acquaintance	„ 89 „ „	10·7 „
Stranger	„ 36 „ „	4·3 „

It will be seen that only in 47 per cent. of the cases is any blood-relationship known to have existed between the parties; and since in many cases the relatives of the percipient will have naturally belonged also to the circle of his intimate friends, it seems reasonable to conclude that consanguinity, as such, has little if any predisposing influence in the transmission of telepathic impressions. It may be suggested that the comparative infrequency of such transmissions between husbands and wives is probably due to the fact that it is commoner for married persons than for blood-relations to be together, when one of the two dies.

It is noteworthy that, out of 36 cases in which the agent was a stranger to the percipient, no less than 15 are collective cases in which an intimate friend of the agent was one of the co-percipients, and may be held to have constituted the link between the agent and the stranger percipient. On the other hand, it is possible that the examples that have been given of telepathic affection by strangers show somewhat less than the true proportion; as there may be cases belonging to this category which for evidential purposes must be dismissed, the fact of coincidence, which alone could distinguish them from purely subjective hallucinations, having been unsuspected and unknown.

¹ Where the same person has been concerned on more than one occasion as percipient or agent, each such experience has been reckoned for the purpose of the calculation as a distinct case. Cases 88 and 90 have been omitted in reckoning the percipients, it being doubtful which of the two persons concerned was the percipient, and which the agent; and cases 44, 88, 90, 133, 264, 316-325, 330-338, 387, 388, 436, 459, 461, 668, and 677 have been omitted in reckoning the agents.

INDEX.

N.B. For many topics, the Synopsis at the beginning of each volume forms (with the clue which the titles of the Chapters afford) a ready means of reference ; and these are, for the most part, not included in the present Index.

The page-numbers of the *second* volume are printed in *italics*.

	PAGE
ABERCROMBIE, DR., Case described by, of hallucinations voluntarily originated	lxxxii
After-images	489-91, 502, 505
Agency, telepathic, Various conditions of, in spontaneous cases	229
Anonymous testimony, Worthlessness of	167-9
Anxiety, Effect of, in producing hallucinations	506-9
“Arrival Cases”	<i>251-4, 517-8, 96-100, 362-4, 530-2, 588-9, 623-7</i>
Auditory hallucinations, Different proportion of to visual, in the purely subjective and in the telepathic class	22-3
—— Numerical estimate relating to, in the two classes	12-6
—— of an internal sort	480-2, <i>119-20</i>
—— non-verbal and rudimentary	<i>222-5, 403-5, 502-3, 125-32, 568-74</i>
—— due to anxiety	509-10
—— due to expectancy	514
Automatic actions telepathically produced (See Unconscious percipience)	
Awe, Effect of, in producing hallucinations	510-2
BAILLARGER, DR., on “psycho-sensorial” hallucinations	461-2
—— Defects of his view	465-6
Ball, Prof., on various points connected with hallucinations	467, 470, 479-80
—— Case recorded by	476
Barrett, Prof. W. F., Paper of, read before the British Association in 1876	13
—— Experiments of, in thought-transference	20-9, 59-61
Bernheim, Dr., Experiments of, in hypnotic hallucinations	469-70, 472
Bell-sounds, Hallucinations of	502-3, <i>127-9, 233-5</i>
Binet, A., on certain hypnotic hallucinations	468-70
Binsfeld, <i>Tractatus de Sortilegiis</i>	175, 183
Blood, a prominent feature in the telepathic percept	<i>373, 34, 403, 430, 433, 481</i>
Bodin, <i>Démonomanie</i>	<i>173, 177, 180, 182, 478</i>

	PAGE
Boguet, <i>Discours des Sorciers</i>	178, 180, 183
Boismont, Dr. Briere de, Spurious cases of collective hallucination recorded by	186-7
“Borderland” hallucinations, Various sorts of	389-92
—— Importance of distinguishing from dreams	393-7
Brewster’s view of visual hallucinations	465
Brougham, Lord, Remarks of, on his own experience	396-7
CARDAN, <i>De Varietate Rerum</i>	479, 555
Cards and other objects, Experimental transferences of ideas of	21-9, 31-5, 37, 661-4
Casaubon, Méric, <i>Of Credulity and Incredulity</i>	184
Casual experiments	81-85, 655-7, 665
Census of dreams of death	303-10
—— of sensory hallucinations	6-24
Centrifugal origin of hallucinations, strongly supported by telepathic examples	570-1
Cevennes, Spurious marvels in the	lxxiv-v
Chambers, Dr. T. King, Case of simultaneous hallucinations recorded by	198-9
Chance, how far an explanation of the facts adduced (See Probabilities)	
Charcot, Dr., Form of unilateral hallucination recorded by	471-2
Children, Percipience of, (“collective” cases not included) 245, 246, 235, 248-9, 423, 519, 555, 581	
Chiltoff, Dr. A. M., Experiment of, in thought-transference	665
Clairvoyance	266-7, 555-6, 286-7
—— Difference between telepathic and independent	368-9, 669
—— Telepathic, in reciprocal cases	161-2, 289, 303-10
—— Independent, often assumed without any sufficient warrant 329-30, 335	
—— Relation of to collective cases	269, 289-90
—— alleged of Swedenborg	xlviii
Cloudy or misty appearance of visual phantasms 521, 526, 527, 557, xxvii, 182, 450, 481, 513	
Coincidences, apt to be regarded as either accidental or supernatural 397, 461-2	
—— significant in virtue of <i>frequency</i> , not of <i>oddness</i>	2
—— Tendency to exaggerate the closeness of	lxxv-vii, 144-5, 156-7
Cold, Sensation of, at the time of a telepathic affection	210, 527, 37, 122, 150, 180, 249, 500
Collectivity of percipience, in what sense a proof of objectivity in the percept	168-70, 190-2
Collusion, Hypothesis of, in experiments in thought-transference	18-20
—— Necessity of, if experiments in thought-transference are to be explained as tricks	22-3
Community of sensation, first noticed in connection with the hypnotic state 11	
—— shown in experiments in the transference of tastes and of pains 51-8, 324-31, 339, 344, 666-8	
Compact, previous, between agent and percipient, Possibly effect of	66
—— Instances of	395, 419, 427, 527, 63, 477, 489, 497

	PAGE
Contact, the essential condition for muscular guidance, all possibility of which must be precluded in experiments in thought-transference	17-8
Contact, Alleged effect of, in certain cases of hallucination	. 189, 359
Contemporary evidence, Importance of	. 13, 274
Cotta, <i>The Infallible, True and Assured Witch</i>	. 120, 182
Creery family, Experiments with the	. 20-31
DAGONET, DR., <i>Les Maladies Mentales</i>	. 476, 480, 484
D'Autun, <i>L'Incrédulité Scavante</i>	. 180, 184
Dead, Phantasms of the, how connected with the present inquiry	190-2, 214
————— Evidence for, inconclusive	. 512
Death-cases, Large proportion of	. 303, 25-6
Deferment or latency of telepathic impressions	. 56, 70-1, 201-2, 265, 519
De l'Ancre, <i>Tableau de l'Inconstance des mauvais Anges et Démons</i>	. 117, 173
Del Rio, <i>Disquisitiones Magice</i>	. 179, 180, 181, 182
Dessoir, Max, Experiments of, in thought-transference	. 642-53
Development of hallucinations, Gradual, in the purely subjective class	. 520-2
————— in the telepathic class	. 522-34
Diagrams, Experiments in the reproduction of	. 35-51, 642-53
Disappearance of visual phantasms, Gradual, a feature common to purely subjective and to telepathic specimens	. 573, 97
————— Instances of	. 444, 446, 454, 521, 527, 552, 96, 176, 182, 214, 246, 453, 467, 503, 512, 522, 628, 629
————— Special modes of	. 432, 559, 573, 239, 605
————— on sudden speech or movement, a feature common to purely subjective and to telepathic specimens	. 573, 91
————— Instances of	. 207, 414, 417, 436, 530, 542, 564, 60, 91, 451, 461, 464, 491, 500, 616
Door opening or shutting, Hallucination of	. 214, 454, 532, 459, 492, 497, 543, 612, 626, 633, 694, 697
“Double Consciousness”	. 69-70
Dreams, Relation of, to waking hallucinations	. 296-7, 484-5, 539, 547
————— Evidential weakness of, as a class	. 298-9
————— of death, Census and computation relating to	. 303-10
Dress and appurtenances of visual phantasms	. 540-6, 569-70, 90-6, 294-7
Drowning-cases, Large proportion of	. 26
EDGEWORTH, F. Y., his remarks on the application of the theory of probabilities to certain experimental results	. 26
————— and to certain spontaneous results	. xxi
Emotional impressions, Evidential weakness of, as a class	. 269-70
Error, Possibility and effects of, in observation	. 123-5
————— in inference	. 125-6
————— in narration	. 126-9
————— in memory	. 129-31
Esdaile, Dr., Importance of his testimony	. 12-3, 88
Evidence, experimental, Necessity of accumulating	. 19, 274
————— Difference in the nature of, in experimental and in spontaneous cases	. 114-5

	PAGE
Evidence, for telepathy, contrasted with that for other alleged marvels	115-22
——— for phantasms of the living, contrasted with that for phantasms of the dead	lxiii-iv, 121-2, 512
——— Points of, required in a typical case of spontaneous telepathy	131
——— of the percipient as to facts	133-8
——— as to dates	140-6
——— Description of the, admitted to this book: its cumulative strength	158-66
——— its deficiencies	167-9
Expectancy, Effect of, in producing hallucinations	512-7
Experimental and spontaneous telepathy, Connection between	110-3, 171-2, 271
Experiments (See under various headings—Community of sensation, Cards, Diagrams, &c.)	
Externalisation of hallucinations, Various degrees in the	480-3, 29-38
“FACES IN THE DARK”	473, 479, 492
Falck, <i>De Dæmonologiâ recentiorum Autorum</i>	462, 168
Fechner, Experiment of, in hallucination of colour	462-3
Féré, Dr., Experiments of, in certain cases of hypnotic hallucination	468
<i>Folie à deux</i>	458, 280
Fragmentary appearances	416, 504, xxx, 33-4, 59, 512, 526
GALTON, F., on the sympathy of twins	279
Gifford, G., <i>Dialogue concerning Witches</i>	176
——— <i>Discourse of Subtill Practices</i>	179
Glanvil, <i>Sadducismus Triumphatus</i>	118, 174, 178-81, 184
Godelmann, <i>Tractatus de Magiis</i>	175, 179
Griesinger, <i>Die Pathologie und Therapie der Psychischen Krankheiten</i>	461, 467, 477, 494
Guthrie, M., Experiments organised by	36-58
HALLUCINATIONS OF THE SENSES	
——— Census of	6-24, 133-4
——— Proportion of various types of, in the subjective and the telepathic classes	22-5
——— Psychological identity of with dreams	484-5, 539, 547, 702
——— Resemblances between subjective and telepathic specimens of	496-500 572-3, xxii
——— how far transferable from one person to another	183, 224-5, 279-82
——— Epidemic	187
——— Hypnotic	187-8
——— Traditional	189
——— “Particular,” <i>i.e.</i> , unshared by persons present with the per- cipient, frequent in the telepathic class	573, 105
——— Visual instances of	210, 218, 552, 560, 42, 43, 61, 163, 212, 237, 256, 455, 484, 495, 513, 517, 522, 542, 555, 557
——— Auditory instances of	223, 452, 100, 104, 106, 109, 222, 485, 568, 569, 580, 581, 584
Hartmann, E. von., on <i>Spiritism</i>	184

	PAGE
Hereditary or family susceptibility to telepathic influence	573, 132
Herschell, Sir J. F. W., Experience of, in hallucinations	465, 472, 487
Holland, <i>A Treatise against Witchcraft</i>	175, 179
Holland, Sir H., Cases of hallucination recorded by	479, 481
Hutchinson, F., <i>Historical Essay concerning Witchcraft</i>	174, 175, 176, 177, 180, 184
Hypnotic effects, Telepathic production of	88-91, 332-3, 344, 676-87
Hypnotism, Importance of, in psychical inquiries	xlii-iii
IDEAS, Experimental transference of, involving more than a single image or word	82, 94-5, 340-3, 345-8
Illness, Possible effect of, in heightening telepathic susceptibility	360, 397, 424, 147, 162, 164, 176, 345-53, 358, 390, 464-5, 515, 703
Illusions, Collective, distinguished from hallucinations	184-6
———"Hypnagogic"	390, 400-1, 473-4
———Telepathic, quite conceivable	62-3
Imagery and symbolism of telepathic percepts	341-68, 539-54, 298-9, 412-27, 497, 612-3
Inhibition of utterance or of particular movements in another person, by the power of the will	58-62
JOLLY, PROF. F., Experiments of, in auditory hallucinations	470-1
KAHLBAUM, Types of hallucination observed by	472, 476, 490, 491, 495
Kandinsky, View of, on hallucinations	494
Köppe, on auditory hallucinations	467, 471, 475, 480, 495
Kraepelin, <i>Ueber Trugwahrnehmungen</i>	490, 495
Krafft-Ebing, <i>Die Sinnesdelirien</i>	467, 476, 487, 502
LANG, A., on popular superstitions	122, 550
Lawson, D., <i>Tryals of the New England Witches</i>	477, 508
Lecky, W. E. H., on witchcraft	177-9, 183-5
Liébeault, Dr., Experiments of, in thought-transference	657-60
Light (See Luminosity)	
Limitation, Arbitrary, of the interval of time in spontaneous tele- pathic cases to 12 hours	139-40, 511
Locality, Occasional influence of	268, 301-2
Loudun, Hysterical epidemic at	119
Lowell, J. Russell, Features of subjective hallucination described by	xxii
Luminosity, a frequent feature of visual hallucinations, both in the subjective and in the telepathic class	550-1
———Examples of	417, 436, 437, 444, 550, 557, 561, 31, 46, 72, 76, 176, 181, 182, 204, 215, 416, 455, 459, 460, 475, 477, 478, 509, 512, 522, 611, 622, 629, 703-4
Lyall, Sir A. C., <i>Asiatic Studies</i>	183
MAYO, DR., <i>Truths contained in Popular Superstitions</i>	8
McGraw, Dr., Observations of, on some rare features in the "willing- game"	15

	PAGE
Mackenzie, Sir G., <i>The Laws and Customs of Scotland</i>	177, 183
Magnan, Dr., Record of dramatic hallucinations by	477-8
<i>Malleus Maleficarum</i>	116, 118, 173
Marillier, L., Record of subjective hallucinations by	521, 32, 73, 99
Marshall, Prof. A., on probabilities	xxvii
Mather, <i>Wonders of the Invisible World</i>	181, 184, 477
Maudsley, Dr., on certain alcoholic hallucinations	390
Maury, Record of an <i>illusion hypnagogique</i> by	390
Mazzini, Case of collective hallucination described by	188
Mesmerism, Early connection of thought-transference with	11-3
——— Erroneous ideas of the power of	87, 92-3
(See Hypnotic effects)	
Mickle, Dr. W. J., on the cerebral seat of hallucinations	488-9
Misrecognition on the percipient's part	428, 429, 390, 422-3, 582-3, 633-4
Mistakes of identity, how far an explanation of alleged telepathic phantasms	62-3, 243-4
More, G., <i>A True Discourse against S. Harsnet</i>	119, 181, 182
Motor-form of thought-transference, Experiments in the	62-81, 89-94
Movement, a frequent feature of visual phantasms, both of the purely subjective and of the telepathic class	432, 573
Musical hallucinations	503, 221-3, 639-41
NEWMHAM, REV. P. H., Record of experiments by	63-70
——— Subjective hallucinations described by	475, 481, 492, 72
Nicolai's hallucinations	458-9, 492
Numbers, Experimental transference of ideas of	25, 34, 653-4, 661-4
OCHOROWICZ, DR. J., Experiments of, in thought-transference	660-4
PAIN, Experimental transferences of (See Community of sensation)	
——— Spontaneous transferences of, rare	189-90
Parant, Dr. V., Cases of hallucination recorded by	476, 490
Paterson, Cases of hallucination recorded by	474, 38, 133
Paul, C. Kegan, Experiments of, in community of sensation, &c.	666-9
Percipience, telepathic, Various types of, in spontaneous cases	186-7
Physical basis for telepathic phenomena very hard to conceive	111-13, 314-5
——— discomfort on the percipient's part	197, 273, 280, 371, 374
Pick, Dr. A., Records of hallucinations by	472, 487
Pitcairn, <i>Criminal Trials of Scotland</i>	176, 177
Pollock, W. H., Case of collective illusion recorded by	185
Porta, J. Baptista, <i>Magia Naturalis</i>	175
Prediction, Power of, how far a test of scientific achievement	1-4
Presence, Alleged feeling of, actual or potential hallucination	483-4, 528, 138
Probabilities, Theory of, applied to experiments in thought-transference	26, 31-5, 73-6, 653-4
——— applied to spontaneous telepathic occurrences	303-10, 12-21

	PAGE
Psychical aspect of telepathic phenomena, that to which this work is confined	113
—— Specialised meaning of the term	5
—— Research, its peculiar difficulties and obligations	4-6, 130, 167-9, 6-8, 273
—— Society for	vii-x
—— American Society for	35, 51
<i>Psychologie Physiologique, Société de</i>	332-3, 679
“Psycho-sensórial” hallucinations	461-4
—— Common misunderstanding of the term	479
RAPP, <i>Die Hexenprocesse</i>	176
<i>Rapport</i> , Different sorts of	265-9
Reciprocal telepathic affections	227, 153
—— often assumed on quite inadequate grounds	154
—— Apparent rarity of, how explicable	167, 303
Recognised phantasms, Different proportion of to unrecognised, in the purely subjective and in the telepathic class	24-5
Recognition, Absence of, generally but not always an evidential defect	220, 117, 137, 565
—— of a phantasm sometimes delayed	520-7, 71, 32, 464
Régis, Dr., on unilateral hallucinations	467
Religious investiture of telepathic impressions	552-3, 414
Remarks, Interchange of, with hallucinatory figure	476, 460, 505, 524, 584, 607
Remy, <i>Dæmonolatria</i>	175, 180, 181, 182
Repeated apparition of the same person	77-90
—— occurrence of a telepathic experience to the same person	196 22, 77
Repetition of telepathic dreams after an interval	357-8
—— Instances of	330, 340, 343, 357, 365, 418, 424, 447, 701
—— of telepathic hallucinations after an interval	414-5, 105
—— Visual instances of	414, 415, 445, 59, 467, 482, 500
—— Auditory instances of	409, 100, 113, 120, 123, 228, 229, 473, 631, 633-4, 635
Reuss, <i>La Sorcellerie au 16me et 17me Siècle</i>	176, 183
Richet, Dr. C., his experiments in thought-transference	31-3, 72-81, 664-5
—— <i>L'Homme et l'Intelligence</i>	118, 173, 462
Rink, <i>Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo</i>	550
Rudimentary hallucinations, visual	73-6
—— auditory	125-32, 570-6, 635-9
Rumour, Possible telepathic spread of	365
ST. MÉDARD, <i>The Convulsionnaires</i> of	120
Scot, R., <i>The Discovery of Witchcraft</i>	175
Second-hand evidence, Defects and errors of	lxxvii, 148-57, 496, 539
—— Sort of, admitted to the Supplement	322
“Second sight,” Remarks on	535

	PAGE
Sensation, Community of (see Community)	
——— Telepathic production of by will	97-109, 671-6
Sensory and non-sensory telepathic effects distinguished	186-7
Sidgwick, Prof., on the moral factor in experiments	19-20
Sikes, Wirt, <i>British Goblins</i>	lxxx, 547
Simon, Dr. Max, on a peculiar type of hallucination	481
Solidity, apparent, Presence or absence of, in visual hallucinations	37-8
Spee, <i>Cautio Criminalis</i>	176
Spina, <i>Quæstio de Strigibus</i>	174, 175
Sully, J., on a particular type of hallucination	477
Supernormal and supersensuous, Meaning to be attached to the words	xlvi, 7
Supplement, Position of the, in the evidential case for telepathy	321-3
TACTILE cases, hard to establish	225
——— hallucinations, Rarity of	133-4
Taine, his special use of the word <i>hallucination</i>	459
Tamburini, on the physiology of hallucinations	487
Tartarotti, <i>Del Congresso Nocturno delle Lamie</i>	175-6
Taste, Experimental transferences of (see Community of Sensation)	
Telepathy, Two distinct branches of—the experimental and the spontaneous	8-9
——— Important differences between them, evidentially, and theoretically	110-3, 114-5
——— their true theoretic connection	171-2
——— Spontaneous, two great divisions of—the <i>sensory</i> and the <i>non-sensory</i> class—which are further subdivided	186-7
——— Relation of, to religious and to materialistic conceptions	l-vii
Theosophy, so-called, Exposure of	xlvii
“Thought-reading,” Spurious exhibitions of	14-5, 17
Thought-transference, a preferable term to “thought-reading”	10-1
——— a less wide term than telepathy	11, 63
——— Conditions of satisfactory experiments in, and importance of a cumulative proof	17-9, 85
Three, Prevalence of the number, in accounts of abnormal phenomena	229
Transitional cases, (or experiments to which the percipient is not knowingly a party)	86, 110, 671-87
——— Importance of	171
——— Difficulty of obtaining accounts of	109, 675
Tuke, Dr. Hack, Case of collective illusion recorded by	185
Tunes, Possible telepathic transference of	233-4
Twins, Telepathic transferences between	279-83, 370, 46
Two (or more) phantasmal figures, Proportion of appearances of, about equal in hallucinations of the purely subjective and of the telepathic class	546
——— Instances of	450, 499, 529, 535, 544, 98, 144, 456, 469, 475, 482, 496, 506, 523, 534, 629
Two or three senses, Different proportion of hallucinations affecting, in the purely subjective and in the telepathic class	23-4

	PAGE
UNCONSCIOUS agency in experimental cases	78-9, 84, 670-1
——— percipience —————	62-81, 84, 293, 379, 670-1
——— intelligence	lxii, 69-70, 230-1, 313-4
Unconsciousness of the agent, Frequent, at the time when a spontaneous transference takes place	230-1
——— Instances of, (swoon, coma, &c.)	194, 406, 435, 545, 548, 563, 569, 112, 394, 419, 517, 609
Unrecognised phantasms, Different proportion of to recognised, in the purely subjective and in the telepathic class	24-5
——— figures 218, 427, 452, 530, <i>xxi</i> , 61, 236, 256, 468-9, 493, 502, 517, 619, 694	
——— voices uttering words 227, 409, 553, 100, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 137, 164, 470, 473, 561, 563, 565, 568, 584, 692	
VISUAL hallucinations, Different proportion of to auditory, in the purely subjective and in the telepathic class	22-3
——— Numerical estimate relating to, in the two classes	16-20
——— due to anxiety	506-9
——— due to awe	510-2
——— due to expectancy	512-4
——— Rudimentary	73-6, 192-4
Voisin, Dr., on various types of hallucination	465, 473, 495
WAGSTAFFE, <i>The Question of Witchcraft debated</i>	183, 184
Webster, on "possession"	182
Wier, <i>De Præstigiis Dæmonum</i>	175, 179, 180, 181, 183
Will, Relation of, to telepathic experiments	92-3
——— Experiments in the silent exercise of	58-62, 89-91, 93-4, 676-7
——— Effect of, in the production of the hypnotic state	88, 332-3, 679-87
"Willing-game," Results obtained at the, due to the interpretation of slight physical signs	14-5, 642
——— Occasional hints of some further cause	15
Witchcraft, Lack of evidence for the spurious marvels of	lxxiii, 116-8, 172-7
——— Mr. Lecky's treatment of	177-9
——— Certain genuine phenomena of, how explicable	179-83
Words and names, Experimental transferences of	23-5, 27-9, 64, 66, 69, 74-9, 82-4, 655-7, 665
Wundt, on "psychical energy"	xli-ii
——— on hallucinations	461, 474, 476, 487, 38

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

The price of each volume is half-a-guinea; the Parts can be obtained separately.

VOLUME I.

CONTAINING PARTS I.—IV.

Objects of the Society.

Address by the President at the first General Meeting.

First Report of the Committee on Thought-Reading.

Note on Thought-Reading. By PROFESSOR BALFOUR STEWART.

Note on Thought-Reading. By REV. A. M. CREERY.

Appendix to the Report on Thought-Reading. By PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT.

Address by the President at the second General Meeting.

Second Report of the Committee on Thought-Transference (*with Illustrations*).

Preliminary Report of the "Reichenbach" Committee.

First Report of the Committee on "Haunted Houses."

First Report of the Literary Committee.

On "Clairvoyance," by G. WYLD, M.D. (Abstract).

Third Report of the Committee on Thought-Transference (*with Illustrations*).

First Report of the Committee on Mesmerism.

First Report of the "Reichenbach" Committee.

On Some Phenomena Associated with Abnormal Conditions of Mind. By
PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT.

Address by the President at the fourth General Meeting.

Second Report of the Committee on Mesmerism.

Record of Experiments in Thought-Transference at Liverpool. By MALCOLM
GUTHRIE, J.P., and JAMES BIRCHALL.

Appendix to the Report on Mesmerism.

Note on Muscle-Reading. By the REV. E. H. SUGDEN.

Constitution and Rules of the Society.

VOLUME II.

CONTAINING PARTS V.—VII.

Fourth Report of the Committee on Thought-Transference.

Third Report of the Committee on Mesmerism.

An Account of some Experiments in Thought-Transference (*with Illustrations*).
By MALCOLM GUTHRIE, J.P.

Second Report of the Literary Committee.

Note on the Existence of a "Magnetic Sense." By PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT.

The Stages of Hypnotism. By EDMUND GURNEY.

Report on Wells Sunk at Locking, Somerset, to Test the Alleged Power of the
Divining Rod. By PROFESSOR W. J. SOLLAS, M.A., D.Sc.

The Divining Rod. By EDWARD R. PEASE.

Appendix I. Tabular Abstract of Evidence on the Divining Rod, collected by
Mr. E. VAUGHAN JENKINS.

Appendix II. Selected Cases from the same.

Third Report of the Literary Committee—A Theory of Apparitions. Part I.

Second Report of the Committee on Haunted Houses, &c.

Opening Address at the eighth General Meeting. By the PRESIDENT.

Fourth Report of the Literary Committee—A Theory of Apparitions. Part II.

Opening Address at the ninth General Meeting. By PROFESSOR BALFOUR STEWART, F.R.S.
An Account of some Experiments in Thought-Transference. By PROFESSOR OLIVER J. LODGE, D.Sc.
An Account of some Experiments in Mesmerism. By EDMUND GURNEY.
Diagrams Illustrative of Thought-Transference.

Automatic Writing. I. By FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.
Abstract of the President's Opening Address at the eleventh General Meeting.
Account and Criticism of M. Richet's recent Researches in Thought-Transference. By EDMUND GURNEY. With a Note by PROFESSOR O. J. LODGE and ALFRED LODGE.
The Problems of Hypnotism. By EDMUND GURNEY.

VOLUME III.

CONTAINING PARTS VIII. AND IX.

Automatic Writing. II. By FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.
Opening Address at the thirteenth General Meeting. By PROFESSOR BALFOUR STEWART, F.R.S.
Notes on the Evidence, collected by the Society, for Phantasms of the Dead. By MRS. H. SIDGWICK.
Hallucinations. By EDMUND GURNEY.
The Calculus of Probabilities applied to Psychological Research.—I. By F. Y. EDGEWORTH.

Report on Phenomena connected with Theosophy
(1) Statement and Conclusions of the Committee.
(2) Account of Personal Investigations in India, and Discussion of the Authorship of the "Koot Hoomi" Letters (with Appendices). By RICHARD HODGSON.
(3) Report of MR. F. G. NETHERCLIFT on the Blavatsky-Coulomb Correspondence.
(4) Note on Certain Phenomena not dealt with in Mr. Hodgson's Account. By MRS. H. SIDGWICK.
(5) Details of the Evidence referred to on page 207. Contents of the Above Report.
Some Higher Aspects of Mesmerism. By EDMUND GURNEY and FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.
Further Report on Experiments in Thought-Transference at Liverpool. By MALCOLM GUTHRIE, J.P.
Local Anæsthesia induced in the Normal State by Mesmeric Passes.
Report on an alleged Physical Phenomenon.
Catalogue of the Library (Abridged).

PART X.

Human Personality in the light of Hypnotic Suggestion. By FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.
On some Physical Phenomena commonly called Spiritualistic, witnessed by the Author. By PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT.
Results of a Personal Investigation into the "Physical Phenomena" of Spiritualism, with some critical remarks on the Evidence for the genuineness of such phenomena. By MRS. H. SIDGWICK.
The Possibilities of Mal-observation in relation to Evidence for the phenomena of Spiritualism. By CHARLES C. MASSEY.
Note on Mr. Massey's Paper. By PROFESSOR H. SIDGWICK.
Experiments in Muscle-Reading and Thought-Transference. By MAX DESOIR.
On Telepathic Hypnotism, and its relation to other forms of Hypnotic Suggestion. By FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.
The Calculus of Probabilities applied to Psychological Research.—II. By F. Y. EDGEWORTH.

