

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA



3 0144 00348650 3

S
133.07
So 13p





PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

VOLUME X.

(CONTAINING PART XXVI.)

1894.

LONDON :

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

1894.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

CONTENTS.

1234
 Under-branch of the Soc. for psychical research

	PAGE
General Meetings	1
I. Address by the PRESIDENT, the Right Hon. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR, M.P., F.R.S.	2
II. On the Difficulty of Making Crucial Experiments as to the Sources of the Extra or Unusual Intelligence Manifested in Trance-Speech, Automatic Writing, and other States of Apparent Mental Inactivity. By PROFESSOR OLIVER J. LODGE, F.R.S.	14
III. Report on the Census of Hallucinations. By PROFESSOR SIDGWICK'S COMMITTEE	25

		PAGE
Chapter	I.—Introductory	25
„	II.—Method of Conducting the Enquiry and General Results	33
„	III.—Discussion of the Trustworthiness of our Results	54
„	IV.—Hallucinations and Pseudo-Hallucinations	70
„	V.—The Relation of Illusions to Hallucinations	94
„	VI.—Form and Development of Hallucinations	113
„	VII.—Physiology of Hallucinations	134
„	VIII.—Age, Sex, Heredity, Nationality, and Health. Recurrent Hallucinations	149
„	IX.—Mental and Nervous Conditions in connexion with Hallucinations	166
„	X.—Expectancy and Suggestion	174
„	XI.—Organic Effects accompanying Hallucinations	198
„	XII.—Death-Coincidences... .. .	207
„	XIII.—Chance Coincidence... .. .	245
„	XIV.—Veridical Hallucinations continued: Further Coincidental Cases	252
„	XV.—Collective Hallucinations	303
„	XVI.—Premonitions and Local Apparitions	331
„	XVII.—Phantasms of the Dead	364
Conclusion	392
Appendix	402

SUPPLEMENT.

Review:—Mr. Andrew Lang's "Cock Lane and Common Sense." By WALTER LEAF, LITT.D.	423
Supplementary Catalogue of the Edmund Gurney Library	427
List of Members and Associates	431
List of Members and Associates of the American Branch	454

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF GENERAL MEETINGS.

The 63rd General Meeting of the Society was held at the Westminster Town Hall on Friday, January 26th, at 3 p.m.; the President, MR. A. J. BALFOUR, in the chair.

THE PRESIDENT gave an address, printed below, on the relation of the work of the Society to the general course of modern scientific investigation.

MR. W. LEAF read a paper by MR. ANDREW LANG, entitled "Cock Lane and Common Sense."

The 64th General Meeting was held in the same place on Friday, March 9th, at 8.30 p.m.; MR. PEARSALL SMITH in the chair.

MR. F. PODMORE read a paper on "Recent Experiments in Thought-Transference at a distance."

MR. F. W. H. MYERS addressed the meeting on the subject of the Automatic Writings of Mr. Stainton Moses. The substance of his speech will be included in a paper to be published in a future number of the *Proceedings*.

The 65th General Meeting was held in the same place on Friday, April 27th, at 4 p.m.; PROFESSOR SIDGWICK in the chair.

MR. MYERS announced the foundation of a new Anglo-French Psychological Society, which he invited Members and Associates of the Society for Psychical Research to join.

MR. MYERS then gave an address on "Retrocognition," which will appear in a future number of the *Proceedings*.

The 66th General Meeting was held at the same place on Friday, June 8th, at 8.30 p.m.; PROFESSOR SIDGWICK in the chair.

PROFESSOR SIDGWICK announced that a legacy of £3,000 had been left by the late Dr. Myers to the President of the S.P.R. for the time being, in trust for the purposes of the Society.

"MISS X." read a paper on "The Apparent Sources of Supernormal Experiences," which will be published in a future number of the *Proceedings*.

MR. MYERS discussed "The Evidence for Continued Identity contained in Mr. Stainton Moses' Automatic Script," being a further part of his paper on the subject, to appear in a future number of the *Proceedings*.

I.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT,
THE RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—In accordance with precedent, I have to begin my observations to you by calling to your recollection the melancholy fact that since last there was a meeting of this Society we have lost two of our most important and most valued members. Less than a fortnight ago, Dr. Arthur Myers, a member of the Council, and not only a member of the Council, but one who ever since the inception of this Society has done admirable, and, indeed, invaluable work in connection with its labours, passed away. The loss which his friends have sustained by his death it would not be proper for me on such an occasion to dwell upon,—however much, as one of the oldest of those friends, whose friendship dated from Cambridge days, now twenty years ago, I might be tempted to do so. But it is strictly within the scope of my duties to remind you of the admirable aid which he has given to our investigations, of the untiring zeal which he has thrown into all the matters that came before him, of his self-sacrificing energy, and the liberality with which he spent in our service both time and money.

We have lost another distinguished member of our body—not in this case one who was associated very closely with our work, but one, nevertheless, who by the lustre of his name added dignity to our proceedings and who might, had his life been spared, have largely helped us, I believe, in experimental investigations—I allude to Professor Hertz, a corresponding member of our body. As those of you will know who have had the opportunity of following recent developments of physical science, he was the fortunate individual who demonstrated experimentally the identity of light and of certain electro-magnetic phenomena. This identity had been divined, and elaborated on the side of theory, by one of the greatest of English, I ought perhaps to say of Scotch, men of science, Clerk Maxwell, but it had never been conclusively proved until Professor Hertz, about five years ago, startled Europe by the experimental identification of these physical forces. The extraordinary interest and the far-reaching importance of a discovery like this will not perhaps be appreciated by every one of my audience, but all of those who take an interest in such subjects will see that by this stroke of experimental genius a very large stride

has been made towards establishing the unity of the great physical powers of nature.

The mention of a great physical discovery like this, made by one of our own body, naturally suggests reflections as to our actual scientific position. What, we feel tempted to ask, is at the present time the relation of such results as we have arrived at to the general view which hitherto science has taken of that material universe in which we live? I must confess that, when I call to mind the history of these relations in the past, the record is not one on which we can dwell with any great satisfaction. Consider, for example, the attitude maintained by the great body of scientific opinion, whether medical or physical, towards the phenomena which used to be known as mesmeric, but which have now been re-baptised, with Braid's term, as hypnotic. As most of you are aware, it is very little more than a century since the public attention of Europe, and especially of certain parts of the continent, was called to these extraordinary phenomena by the discoveries—if I may call them discoveries, for, after all, they were known long before his time—of Mesmer. Mesmer produced hypnotic phenomena, which are now familiar to everybody, and, not content with that, he invented a theory to account for them. The theory is an extremely bad one, and I imagine, has fallen into the disrepute which it deserves; for Mesmer committed the error, which has been repeated now and then since, of trying to find an explanation for strange and unaccountable facts by simply describing them as the effect of some equally strange and unaccountable cause. He declared that there was a kind of magnetic fluid to the operations of which the results that he obtained were due; and he undoubtedly did his reputation much disservice in the minds of the scientific experts of the time by associating his discoveries with speculations which, after all, did not at the time stand, and have not since stood, the test of critical investigation. Nevertheless, the facts that Mesmer brought forward could be proved in the last century, as they can be proved now, by experimental evidence of the most conclusive character. It can be shewn that they are neither the result of deliberate fraud nor unconscious deception, and, accordingly, there was here a problem presented for solution which it was plainly the duty of men of science in general, and, probably, of the medical profession in particular, to examine and probe to the bottom; to explain if they could, but not to explain away if they could not. Their actual course was a very different one. There were, indeed, a good many doctors and other men of science who could not refuse the evidence of their senses, and who loudly testified to the truth, the interest, and the importance of the phenomena which they witnessed. But if you take the body of opinion of men of science generally, you will be

driven to the conclusion that they either denied facts which they ought to have seen were true, or that they thrust them aside without condescending to consider them worthy of serious investigation. There were, I believe, no less than two or three Commissions of enquiry—three, I think—instituted in France alone, one in Mesmer's lifetime, and the other two, unless my memory deceives me, after his death. The amount of evidence collected, at all events by one of those Commissions, composed of some of the most eminent scientific men in France, should have been enough to call the attention of all Europe to the new problems thus raised. The report which embodied this evidence was, nevertheless, allowed to lie unnoticed upon the shelf; and it has only been by a gradual process of re-discovery, a constant and up-hill fight on the part of the less prejudiced members of the community, that the truths of hypnotism, as far as they are yet attained, have reached something like general recognition; even now, perhaps, their full importance—whether from a therapeutic or a psychological point of view—has not been sufficiently acknowledged.

What I have just very briefly and rudely sketched out to you is the history of an investigation into one small section of these alleged phenomena which fall outside the ordinary field of scientific investigation. If we took it by itself we should say that scientific men have shown in connection with it a bigoted intolerance, an indifference to strictly scientific evidence, which is, on the face of it, discreditable. I, however, do not feel inclined to pass any verdict of so harsh a character upon the action of the great body of scientific men. I believe that, although the course they pursued was not one which it is very easy rationally to justify, nevertheless there was a great deal more of practical wisdom in it than might appear at first sight. I have always been impressed by the lesson taught us by the general course of history, that you cannot expect, either of any single nation or of any single age, that it will do more than the special work which happens, so to speak, to be set before it at the moment. You cannot expect men, being what they are, to labour effectively in more than one relatively restricted field at the same time; and if they insist on diffusing their energies over too wide a surface, the necessary result, as I believe, will be that their labours will prove unfruitful. Now just consider what it is that men of science have done in the century which has elapsed since the first French Commission investigated Mesmer's discoveries. I do not believe it would be going too far to say that the whole body of the sciences, with the exception of mechanics, especially mechanics as applied to celestial motions—that the whole body of the sciences outside that limited sphere has been reconstructed from top to bottom. Our leading ideas in chemistry, our leading ideas in

physics, the theory of light, the theory of sound, the whole of geology, the great generalisation known as the conservation of energy, and all the speculations and extensions which have succeeded that great generalisation, the whole theory of natural selection and of biological evolution, are all the birth of the hundred years which have elapsed since first Mesmer made hypnotic phenomena notorious through Europe. I think if scientific men, looking back upon the past, choose to set up for themselves this defence, that after all only one thing can be done at a time, that they were occupied in co-ordinating within certain lines the experimental data then available, and that, in harmony with a given conception of the material world, they were laying deep the foundations of that vast and imposing fabric of modern science, I for one should accept the plea as a bar to further proceedings. For the men who did that work could not have done it, I believe, unless they had rigidly confined themselves to one particular conception of the world with which they had to deal. If they had insisted on including in their survey not merely the well-travelled regions of everyday experience, but the dark and doubtful territories within which our labours lie, their work would have been worse, not better; less, not more complete. They may have been narrow; but their narrowness has been our gain. They may have been prejudiced; but their prejudices have been fruitful, and we have reaped the harvest. I have often thought that when, on looking back over the history of human speculation, we find some individual who has anticipated the discoveries of a later age, but has neither himself been able to develop those discoveries nor yet to interest his contemporaries in them, we are very apt to bestow on him an undue meed of honour. "Here," we say, "was a man before his time. Here was a man of whom his age was not worthy." Yet such men do very little indeed for the progress of the world of which at first sight they would appear to be among the most distinguished citizens. There is no use in being before your age after such a fashion as this. If neither you nor those to whom you speak can make use of the message that you thus prematurely deliver, so far as the development of the world is concerned you might as well have not lived at all. When, therefore, we are asked to put our hands in our pockets and subscribe towards the erection of memorials to half forgotten worthies like these, by all means let us do it. It is natural and even praiseworthy. But do not let us suppose that those whom we thus honour really stand out among the benefactors of our species. They are interesting; but hardly useful.

This, however, is merely a parenthetical reflection, to which I do not ask your agreement, and which, after all, has nothing to do with the general drift of the argument that I desire to lay before you. The question I now wish you to consider is: Granting to men of science that

they had, if not a theoretical and speculative excuse, still a practical justification, for the course they have adopted in regard to these obscure psychical phenomena during the last hundred years, is that justification still valid? For myself, I think it is not. I think the time has now come when it is desirable in their own interests, and in our interests, that the leaders of scientific thought in this country and elsewhere should recognise that there are well-attested facts which, though they do not easily fit into the framework of the sciences, or of organised experience as they conceive it, yet require investigation and explanation, and which it is the bounden duty of science, if not itself to investigate, at all events to assist us in investigating.

I am, of course, aware that there are necessarily connected with our work difficulties and obstructions in the way of experiment with which scientific men are not familiar, and which not unnaturally rouse in their minds both dislike and suspicion. To begin with, there is the difficulty of fraud. The ordinary scientific man no doubt finds the path of experimental investigation strewn with difficulties, but at least he does not usually find among them the difficulty presented by human fraud. He knows that, if he is misled in any particular, it is the fault of the observer, and not the fault of the observed. He knows that, if his cross-examination of nature fails to elicit anything, it is because he has not known how to cross-examine, not because nature when put in the witness box tells untruths. But unfortunately in the matters with which we have to deal this is not the case. We have come across, and it is inevitable that we should come across, cases where either deliberate fraud or unconscious deception makes observation doubly and trebly difficult, and throws obstacles in the way of the investigator which his happier brother in the region of material and physical science has not to contend with.

And there is yet another difficulty in our work from which those who cultivate physical science are happily free. They have, as the ultimate sources of their knowledge, the "five senses" with which we are all endowed, and which are the only generally recognised inlets through which the truth of external nature can penetrate into consciousness. But we of this Society have perforce to deal with cases in which not merely the normal five or six senses, but some abnormal and half-completed sense, so to speak, comes into play; in which we have to work, not with the organisations of an ordinary and normal type, but with certain exceptional organisations who can neither explain, account for, nor control the abnormal powers they appear to possess.

This is not only a special difficulty with which we have to contend; it is the basis of a serious objection, in the eyes of many scientific men, to the admission of the subject matter of our researches into the sphere of legitimate investigation. These critics

seem to think that because we cannot repeat and verify our experiments as we will and when we will—because we cannot, as it were, put our phenomena in a retort and boil them over a spirit lamp and always get the same results—that therefore the phenomena themselves are not worth examining. But this is, I venture to say, a very unphilosophic view of the question. Is there, after all, any inherent *a priori* improbability in there being these half-formed and imperfectly developed senses, or inlets of external information, occasionally and sporadically developed in certain members of the human race? Surely not. I should myself be disposed to say that if the theory of development be really sound, phenomena like these, however strange, are exactly what we should have expected. For what says the theory of natural selection? Why this, among other things: that there has gradually been elaborated by the slaughter of the unfit and the survival of the fit, an organism possessed of senses adapted to further its success in the struggle for existence. To suppose that the senses elaborated in obedience to this law should be in correspondence with the whole of external nature, appears to me to be not only improbable but, on any rational doctrine of probability, absolutely impossible. There must be countless forms of being, countless real existences which, had the line of an evolution gone in a different direction, or had the necessities of our primitive ancestors been of a different kind, would have made themselves known to us through senses the very character of which we are at present unable to imagine. And, if this be so, is it not in itself likely that here and there we should come across rudimentary beginnings of such senses; beginnings never developed and probably never to be developed by the operation of selection; mere by-products of the great evolutionary machine, never destined to be turned to any useful account? And it may be—I am only hazarding an unverifiable guess—it may be, I say, that in these cases of the individuals thus abnormally endowed, we really have come across faculties which, had it been worth Nature's while, had they been of any value or purpose in the struggle for existence, might have been normally developed, and thus become the common possession of the whole human race. Had this occurred, we should have been enabled to experiment upon phenomena, which we now regard as occult and mysterious, with the same confidence in the sources of our information that we now enjoy in any of our ordinary enquiries into the laws of the material world. Well, if there be, as I think, no great antecedent improbability against there being these occasional and sporadic modifications of the organism, I do not think that men of science ought to show any distrustful impatience of the apparent irregularity of these abnormal phenomena which is no doubt one of their most provoking characteristics.

But there is another and a real difficulty, from the point of view of science, attaching to the result of our investigations, which is not disposed of by the theory which I have suggested of imperfectly developed senses. Such senses, if they exist at all, may evidently be of two kinds, or may give us two kinds of experience. They may give us a kind of experience which shall be in perfect harmony with our existing conception of the physical universe, or they may give us one which harmonises with that conception imperfectly or not at all. As an example of the first I might revert to the discovery, previously referred to, of Professor Hertz. He, as I have already told you, has experimentally proved that electro-magnetic phenomena are identical, as physical phenomena, with ordinary light. Light consists, as you all know, of undulations of what is known as the luminiferous ether; well, electro-magnetic waves are also undulations of the same ether, differing from the undulations which we call light only in their length. Now it is easy to conceive that we might have had a sense which would have enabled us to perceive the long undulations in the same way as we now perceive the short ones. That would be a new sense, but, though new, its deliverances would have fitted in with the existing notions which scientific men have framed of the universe. But unfortunately in our special investigations we seem to come across experiences which are not so amenable. We apparently get hints of the existence of facts, which, if they be well established, as they appear to be, cannot, so far as I can judge, by any amount of squeezing or manipulation be made to fit into the interstices of our accepted view of the physical world; and, if that be so, then we are engaged in a work of prodigious difficulty indeed, but of an importance of which the difficulty is only a measure and an indicator. For we should then be actually on the threshold, so to speak, of a region ordered according to laws of which we have at present no cognisance, and which do not appear to harmonise—I do not say they are in contradiction to, but at least they do not appear to harmonise—with those which govern the regions already within our ken.

Let me dwell on this point a little more, as it is one of central interest to all who are engaged in our special investigations. What I am asserting is that the facts which we come across are very *odd* facts, and by that I do not mean merely queer and unexpected: I mean “odd” in the sense that they are out of harmony with the accepted theories of the material world. They are not merely dramatically strange, they are not merely extraordinary and striking, but they are “odd” in the sense that they will not easily fit in with the views which physicists and men of science generally give us of the universe in which we live.

In order to illustrate this distinction I will take a very simple instance. I suppose everybody would say that it would be an extraordinary circumstance if at no distant date this earth on which we dwell were to come into collision with some unknown body travelling through space, and, as the result of that collision, be resolved into the original gases of which it is composed. Yet, though it would be an extraordinary, and even an amazing, event, it is, after all, one of which no astronomer, I venture to say, would assert the impossibility. He would say, I suppose, that it was most unlikely, but that if it occurred it would not violate, or even modify, his general theories as to the laws which govern the movements of the celestial bodies. Our globe is a member of the solar system which is travelling I do not know how many miles a second in the direction of the constellation Hercules. There is no *a priori* ground for saying that in the course of that mysterious journey, of the cause of which we are perfectly ignorant, we shall not come across some body in interstellar space which will produce the uncomfortable results which I have ventured to indicate. And, as a matter of fact, in the course of the last two hundred years, astronomers have themselves been witness to stellar tragedies of incomparably greater magnitude than that which would be produced by the destruction of so insignificant a planet as the world in which we happen to be personally interested. We have seen stars which shine from an unknown distance, and are of unknown magnitude, burst into sudden conflagration, blaze brightly for a time, and then slowly die out again. What that phenomenon precisely indicates, of course, we cannot say, but it certainly indicates an accident of a far more startling and tremendous kind than the shattering of our particular world, which to us would, doubtless, seem extraordinary enough.

This, then, is a specimen of what I mean by a dramatically extraordinary event. Now I will give you a case of what I mean by a scientifically extraordinary event, which as you will at once perceive may be one which at first sight, and to many observers, may appear almost common-place and familiar. I have constantly met people who will tell you, with no apparent consciousness that they are saying anything more out of the way than an observation about the weather, that by the exercise of their will they can make anybody at a little distance turn round and look at them. Now such a fact (if fact it be) is far more scientifically extraordinary than would be the destruction of this globe by some such celestial catastrophe as I have imagined. How profoundly mistaken, then, are they who think that this exercise of will power, as they call it, is the most natural and most normal thing in the world, something that everybody would have expected, something which hardly deserves scientific notice or requires scientific explanation. In reality it is a profound mystery if it be true,

or if anything like it be true; and no event, however startling, which easily finds its appropriate niche in the structure of the physical sciences ought to excite half so much intellectual curiosity as this dull and at first sight common-place phenomenon.

Now do not suppose that I want you to believe that every gentleman or lady who chooses to suppose him or herself exceptionally endowed with this so-called will-power is other than the dupe of an ill-regulated fancy. There is, however, quite apart from the testimony of such persons a vast mass of evidence in favour of what we now call telepathy; and to telepathy the observations I have been making do in my opinion most strictly apply. For, consider! In every case of telepathy you have an example of action at a distance. Examples of real or apparent action at a distance are of course very common. Gravitation is such an example. We are not aware at the present time of any mechanism, if I may use the phrase, which can transmit gravitational influence from one gravitating body to another. Nevertheless, scientific men do not rest content with that view. I recollect it used be maintained by the late Mr. John Mill that there was no ground for regarding with any special wonder the phenomenon of action at a distance. I do not dogmatise upon the point, but I do say emphatically that I do not think you will find a first-rate physicist who is prepared to admit that gravity is not a phenomenon which still wants an explanation. He is not ready, in other words, to accept action at a distance as an ultimate fact, though he has not even got the first clue to the real nature of the links by which the attracting bodies mutually act upon one another.

But though gravitation and telepathy are alike in this, that we are quite ignorant of the means by which in either case distant bodies influence one another, it would be a great mistake to suppose that the two modes of operation are equally mysterious. In the case of telepathy there is not merely the difficulty of conjecturing the nature of the mechanism which operates between the agent and the patient, between the man who influences and the man who is influenced; but the whole character of the phenomena refuses to fit in with any of our accepted ideas as to the mode in which force may be exercised from one portion of space to another. Is this telepathic action an ordinary case of action from a centre of disturbance? Is it equally diffused in all directions? Is it like the light of a candle or the light of the sun which radiates equally into space in every direction at the same time? If it is, it must obey the law—at least, we should expect it to obey the law—of all other forces which so act through a non-absorbing medium, and its effects must diminish inversely as the square of the distance. It must, so to speak, get beaten out thinner and thinner the further it gets removed from its original source. But is this so? Is it even

credible that the mere thoughts, or, if you please, the neural changes corresponding to these thoughts, of any individual could have in them the energy to produce sensible effects equally in all directions, for distances which do not, as far as our investigations go, appear to have any necessary limit? It is, I think, incredible; and in any case there is no evidence whatever that this equal diffusion actually takes place. The will power, whenever will is used, or the thoughts, in cases where will is not used, have an effect, as a rule, only upon one or two individuals at most. There is no appearance of general diffusion. There is no indication of any disturbance equal at equal distances from its origin, and radiating from it alike in every direction.

But if we are to reject this idea, which is the first which ordinary analogies would suggest, what are we to put in its place? Are we to suppose that there is some means by which telepathic energy can be directed through space from the agent to the patient, from the man who influences to the man who is influenced? If we are to believe this, as apparently we must, we are face to face not only with a fact extraordinary in itself, but with a kind of fact which does not fit in with anything we know at present in the region either of physics or of physiology. It is true, no doubt, that we do know plenty of cases where energy is directed along a given line, like water in a pipe, or like electrical energy along the course of a wire. But then in such cases there is always some material guide existing between the two termini, between the place from which the energy comes and the place to which the energy goes. Is there any such material guide in the case of telepathy? It seems absolutely impossible. There is no sign of it. We cannot even form to ourselves any notion of its character, and yet, if we are to take what appears to be the obvious lesson of the observed facts, we are forced to the conclusion that in some shape or other it exists. For to suppose that the telepathic agent shoots out his influence towards a particular object, as you shoot a bullet out of a gun, or water out of a hose, which appears to be the only other alternative, involves us seemingly in greater difficulties still.

Here then we are face to face with what I call a scientifically extraordinary phenomenon, as distinguished from a dramatically extraordinary one. Anyone who has endeavoured to wade through the mass of evidence collected by our Society on the subject will be prepared to admit that it is not exciting or interesting in itself, that it does not arouse a foolish wonder, or appeal unduly to any craving for the marvellous. But dull as these experiments may seem, dull indeed as they often are, their dullness is really one of their great advantages. It effectually excludes some perturbing influences that might otherwise affect, or, which is nearly as bad, be supposed to affect, the cool

analysis of the experimental data ; and in consequence, it makes these investigations, in my judgment, the best starting point from which to reconsider, should it be necessary, our general view, I will not say of the material universe, but of the universe of phenomena in space and time.

I am, of course, aware that probably a very large number, perhaps the majority, of the members of this Society are accustomed to consider the subjects with which we deal from a somewhat different point of view from that which I have adopted this afternoon, and it is well that this should be so. All arbitrary limitations of our sphere of work are to be avoided. It is our business to record, to investigate, to classify, and, if possible, to explain, facts of a far more startling and impressive character than these modest cases of telepathy. Let us not neglect that business. And if beyond the mere desire to increase knowledge many are animated by a wish to get evidence, not through any process of laborious deduction, but by direct observation, of the reality of intelligences not endowed with a physical organisation like our own, I see nothing in their action to criticise, much less to condemn. But while there is sufficient evidence, in my judgment, to justify all the labours of our Society in this field of research, it is not the field of research which lies closest to the ordinary subjects of scientific study, and, therefore, this afternoon, when I was led to deal rather with the scientific aspects of our work, I have deliberately kept myself within the range of the somewhat unpicturesque phenomena of telepathy. My object has been a very simple one, as I am desirous above all things of enlisting in our service the best experimental and scientific ability which we can command. I have thought it best to endeavour to arrest the attention, and, if possible, to engage the interest of men of science by pointing to the definite and very simple experiments which, simple as they are, yet hint at conclusions not easily to be accommodated with our habitual theories of things. If we can repeat these experiments sufficiently often and under tests sufficiently crucial to exclude the possibility of error, it will be impossible any longer to ignore them, and, willingly or unwillingly, all interested in science will be driven to help, as far as they can, to unravel the refractory class of problems which this Society is endeavouring to solve. What success such efforts will be crowned with, I know not. I have already indicated to you, at the beginning of my remarks, the special class of difficulties which beset our path. We have not at our command the appropriate physical senses, we have not the appropriate materials for experiment, we are hampered and embarrassed in every direction by credulity, by fraud, by prejudice. Nevertheless, if I rightly interpret the results which these many years of labour have forced upon the members of this Society and upon others not among

our number who are associated by a similar spirit, it does seem to me that there is at least strong ground for supposing that outside the world, as we have, from the point of science, been in the habit of conceiving it, there does lie a region, not open indeed to experimental observation in the same way as the more familiar regions of the material world are open to it, but still with regard to which some experimental information may be laboriously gleaned; and even if we cannot entertain any confident hope of discovering what laws these half-seen phenomena obey, at all events it will be some gain to have shown, not as a matter of speculation or conjecture, but as a matter of ascertained fact, that there are things in heaven and earth not hitherto dreamed of in our scientific philosophy. (Cheers.)

II.

ON THE DIFFICULTY OF MAKING CRUCIAL EXPERIMENTS AS TO THE SOURCE OF THE EXTRA OR UNUSUAL INTELLIGENCE MANIFESTED IN TRANCE-SPEECH, AUTOMATIC WRITING, AND OTHER STATES OF APPARENT MENTAL INACTIVITY.

BY OLIVER LODGE, F.R.S.

It has long been known that in order to achieve remarkable results in any department of intellectual activity, the mind must be to some extent unaware of passing occurrences. To be keenly awake and "on the spot" is a highly valued accomplishment, and for the ordinary purposes of mundane affairs is a far more useful state of mind than the rather hazy and absorbed condition which is associated with the quality of mind called genius; but it is not as effective for brilliant achievement.

When a poet or musician or mathematician feels himself inspired, his senses are, I suppose, dulled or half asleep; and though probably some part of his brain is in a great state of activity, I am not aware of any experiments directed to test which that part is, nor whether, when in that state, any of the more ordinarily used portions are really dormant or no. It would be interesting, but difficult, to ascertain the precise physiological accompaniments of that which on a small scale is called a brown study, and on a larger scale a period of inspiration.

It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the state is somewhat allied to the initial condition of anæsthesia—the somnambule condition when, though the automatic processes of the body go on with greater perfection than usual, the conscious or noticing aspect of the mind is latent, so that the things which influence the person are apparently no longer the ordinary events which affect his peripheral organs, but either something internal or else something not belonging to the ordinarily known physical universe at all.

The mind is always in a receptive state perhaps, but whereas the business-like, wide-awake person receives impressions from every trivial detail of his physical surroundings, the half-asleep person seems to receive impressions from a different stratum altogether; higher in some instances, lower in some instances, but different always from those received by ordinary men in their every-day state.

In a man of genius the state comes on of itself and the results are astounding. There exist occasionally feeble persons, usually young, who seek to attain to the appearance of genius by the easy process

of assuming or encouraging an attitude of vacancy and uselessness. There may be all grades of result attained while in this state, and the state itself is of less than no value unless it is justified by the results.

By experiment and observation it has now been established that a state very similar to this can be induced by artificial means, *e.g.*, by drugs, by hypnosis, by crystal gazing, by purposed inattention; and also that the state can occur occasionally without provocation during sleep and during trance.

All these states seem to some extent allied, and, as is well known, Mr. Myers has elaborated their relationship in his series of articles on the subliminal consciousness.

Well now, the question arises, What is the source of the intelligence manifested during epochs of clairvoyant lucidity, as sometimes experienced in the hypnotic or the somnambulant state or during trance, or displayed automatically?

The most striking cases of which I am now immediately or mediately cognisant, are the trance state of Mrs. Piper and the automatism of such writers as the wife of the late Rev. P. H. Newnham.¹ Without any apparent lulling of attention at all I am experimentally assured of the possibility of conveying information between one mind and another without the aid of ordinary sense organs; but the cases mentioned are especially striking and will serve to narrow the field to what, after all, may be considered at present the main points.

Mrs. Piper in the trance state is undoubtedly (I use the word in the strongest sense; I have absolutely no more doubt on the subject than I have of any friend's ordinary knowledge of me and other men),—Mrs. Piper's trance personality is undoubtedly aware of much to which she has no kind of ordinarily recognised clue, and of which in her ordinary state she knows nothing. But how does she get this knowledge? She herself when in the trance state asserts that she gets it by conversing with the deceased friends and relatives of people present. And that this is a genuine opinion of hers, *i.e.*, that the process feels like that to her unconscious or subconscious mind, the part of her which calls itself Phinuit, I am fully prepared to believe. But that does not carry us very far towards a knowledge of what the process actually is.

Conversation implies speaking with the mouth, and when receiving or asking information she is momentarily in a deeper slumber, and certainly not occupied in speech. At times, indeed, slight mutterings of one-sided questions and replies are heard, very like the mutterings of a person in sleep undergoing a vivid dream.

Dream is certainly the ordinary person's nearest approach to the

¹ *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I. p. 63.

Phinuit condition, and the fading of recollection as the conscious memory returns is also paralleled by the waking of Mrs. Piper out of the trance. But, instead of a nearly passive dream, it is more nearly allied to the somnambulic state, though the activity, far from being chiefly locomotory, is mainly mental and only partially muscular.

She is in a state of somnambulism in which the mind is more active than the body; and the activity is so different from her ordinary activity, she is so distinctly a different sort of person, that she quite appropriately calls herself by another name.

It is natural to ask, Is she still herself? but it is a question difficult to answer, unless "herself" be defined. It is her mouth that is speaking, and I suppose her brain and nerves are working the oral muscles, but they are not worked in the customary way, nor does the mind manifested thereby at all resemble her mind. Until, however, the meaning of identity can be accurately specified, I find it difficult to discuss the question whether she or another person is really speaking.

On this point the waking experience of Mrs. Newnham and of other automatic writers is of assistance.

In their case the mouth does not speak, but the hand writes; and it writes matter not in the writer's mind and which he does not feel that he is writing. His hand is writing and he is in some cases taking the attention of his own conscious mind away from his hand and letting it be guided by his subconscious or by some other mind.

The instructive feature about this phenomenon is that the minds apparently influencing the hand are not so much those of dead as of living people. The great advantage of this is that they can be catechised afterwards about their share in the transaction; and it then appears that although the communication purporting to be from them really does convey what they were doing or thinking, in fact what they *might* have written, yet actually they know nothing about the writing, neither the muscular fact nor the intelligent substance. It does not do to jump to the conclusion that this will always be the case; that the connection is never consciously reciprocal, as when two persons are talking; but it shows that at any rate it need not be so. Since the living communicant is not aware of the fact that he is dictating the handwriting, so the dead person need not be consciously operative; and thus conceivably the hand of the automatist may be influenced by minds other than his own, minds both living and dead (by one apparently as readily as by the other), but not by a conscious portion of the mind of anyone; by the subconscious or dreamy portion, if by any portion at all.

When Phinuit then, or Mrs. Piper in the trance state, reports conversations which she has had with other minds (usually in Phinuit's

case with persons deceased), and even when the voice changes and messages come apparently from those very people themselves, it does not follow that they themselves are necessarily aware of the fact, nor need their conscious mind (if they have any) have anything whatever to do with the process.

The signature of an automatist's hand is equivalent to the assertion that Miss X., for instance, is deliberately writing; Phinuit's statement is equally an assertion that Mr. E. is deliberately speaking; and the one statement may be no more a lie than the other is a forgery, and yet neither need be what is ordinarily called "true."

That this community of mind or possibility of distant interchange or one-sided reception of thoughts exists, is to me perfectly clear and certain. I venture further to say that persons who deny the bare fact, expressed as I here wish to express it without any hypothesis, are simply ignorant. They have not studied the facts of the subject. It may be for lack of opportunity, it may be for lack of inclination; they are by no means bound to investigate it unless they choose; but any dogmatic denials which such persons may now perpetrate will henceforth, or in the very near future, redound to the discredit, not of the phenomena thus ignorantly denied, but of themselves, the overconfident and presumptuous deniers.

We must not too readily assume that the apparent action of one mind on another is really such an action. The impression received *may* come from the ostensible agent, but it *may* come from a third person; or again it *may*, as some think more likely, come from some central mind or *Zeitgeist*, to which all ordinary minds are related and by which they are influenced. If it could be shown that the action is a syntonic or sympathetic connection between a pair of minds, then it might be surmised that the action is a physical one, properly to be expressed as occurring directly between brain and brain, or body and body. On the other hand, the action may conceivably be purely psychological, and the distant brain may be stimulated not by the intervention of anything physical or material but in some more immediate manner, from its psychological instead of from its physiological side.

The question is quite a definite one if properly expressed; Does the action take place through a physical medium or does it not?

Guesses at *a priori* likelihood are absolutely worthless; if the question is to be answered it must be attacked experimentally.

Now the *ordinary* way in which A communicates with B is through a certain physical mechanism, and the thought of A may be said to exist for a finite time as an ethereal or aerial quiver before it reproduces a similar thought in the mind of B. We have got so accustomed to the existence of this intermediate physical process that

instead of striking us as roundabout and puzzling it appeals to us as natural and simple ; and any more direct action of A on B, without a physical mechanism, is scouted as absurd or at least violently improbable. Well, it is merely a question of fact, and perhaps it is within the range of a crucial experiment.

But it may be at once admitted that such an experiment is difficult of execution. If the effect is a physical one it should vary according to some law of distance, or it should depend on the nature of the intervening medium ; but in order to test whether in any given case such variation occurs it is necessary to have both agent and percipient in an unusually dependable condition, and they should if possible be unaware of the variation which is under test.

This last condition is desirable because of the sensitiveness of the sub-consciousness to suggestion : self-suggestion and other. If the percipient got an idea that distance or interposed screens were detrimental, most likely they would be detrimental ; and although a suggestion might be artificially instilled that distance was advantageous, this would hardly leave the test quite fair, for the lessened physical stimulus might perhaps be over-utilised by the more keenly excited organism. Still that is an experiment to be tried among others ; and it would be an instructive experience if the agent some day was, say, in India when the percipient thought he was in London, or *vice versâ*.

It is extremely desirable to probe this question of a physical or non-physical mode of communication in cases of telepathy, and if the fact can be established beyond doubt that sympathetic communication occurs between places as distant as India or America and England, or, say, the terrestrial antipodes, being unfelt between, or in the neighbourhood of the source, then I should feel that this was so unlike what we are accustomed to in Physics that I should be strongly urged to look to some other and more direct kind of mental relationship as the clue.

This, then, is the first question on which crucial experiments are desirable though difficult.

(1) Is the mechanism of telepathy physical or not ?

The second question of which I am thinking is one less easy to state and far less easy (as I think) to resolve. It may be stated thus, in two parts, or as two separate questions :—

(2) Is the power of operating on the minds of terrestrial persons confined to living terrestrial people ?

(3) Is the power of operating on or interfering with the rest of the physical universe confined to living material bodies ?

I should conjecture that an affirmative answer to Question 1 would render likely an affirmative answer to Questions 2 and 3 ; but that a negative answer to Question 1 would leave 2 and 3 entirely open,

because, so far as we at present know, terrestrial people and people with material bodies may be the only people who exist.

It is this possibility, or, as many would hold, probability or almost certainty, that renders the strict scientific statement of Questions 2 and 3 so difficult. Yet they are questions which must be faced, and they ought to be susceptible in time of receiving definite answers.

That there are living terrestrial people we know, we also know that there is an immense variety of other terrestrial life ; though, if we were not so familiar with the fact, the luxuriant prevalence and variety of life would be surprising. The existence of a bat, for instance, or a lobster would be quite incredible. Whether there is life on other planets we do not know, and whether there is conscious existence between the planets we do not know ; but I see no *a priori* reason for making scientific assertions on the subject one way or the other. It is only at present a matter of probability. Just because we know that the earth is peopled with an immense variety of living beings, I myself should rather expect to find other regions many-peopled, and with a still more extraordinary variety. So also since mental action is conspicuous on the earth I should expect to find it existent elsewhere. If life is necessarily associated with a material carcass then no doubt the surface of one of the many lumps of matter must be the scene of its activity ; but if any kind of mental action is independent of material or physical environment then it may conceivably be that the psychical population is not limited to the material lumps, but may luxuriate either in the interstellar spaces or in some undimensional form of existence of which we have no conception.

Were it not for the fact of telepathy the entire question would be an idle one, a speculation based on nothing and apparently incapable of examination, still less of verification or disproof.

But granted the fact of telepathy the question ceases to be an idle one, because it is just possible that these other intelligences, if they in any sense exist, may be able to communicate with us by the same sort of process as that by which we are now learning to be able to communicate with each other.

Whether it be true or not, it has been constantly and vehemently asserted as a fact that such communications, mainly from deceased relatives, but often also from strangers, are occasionally received by living persons.

The utterances of Phinuit, the handwriting of Miss A., Mr. Stainton Moses, and others, abound with communications purporting to come from minds not now associated with terrestrial matter.

Very well then ; is a crucial or test experiment possible to settle whether this claim is well founded or not ?

Mere sentimental messages, conveying personal traits of the

deceased, though frequently convincing to surviving friends, cannot be allowed much scientific weight. Something more definite or generally intelligible must be sought.

Of such facts the handwriting of the deceased person, if reproduced accurately by an automatist who has never seen that handwriting, seems an exceptionally good test if it can be obtained. But the negative proof of ignorance on the part of the writer may be difficult.

At first sight facts known to the deceased but not known to the automatist, if reported in a correct and detailed manner so as to surpass mere coincidence, would seem a satisfactory test, but here telepathy, which has stood us in good stead so far, begins to operate the other way; for if the facts are known to nobody on earth they cannot perhaps be verified, and if they are known to somebody still alive—however distant he may be—it is necessary to assume it *possible* that they were unconsciously telepathed from his mind.

But a certain class of facts may be verified without the assistance or knowledge of any living person, as when a miser having died with the sole clue to a deposit of "valuables," an automatist's hand, over the miser's signature, subsequently describes the place; or when a sealed document, carefully deposited, is posthumously deciphered; the test in either of these cases is a better one. But still, living telepathy of a deferred kind is not excluded (though to my thinking it is rendered extremely improbable), for, as Mr. Podmore has often urged, the person writing the document or burying the treasure may have been *ipso facto* an unconscious agent on the minds of contemporaries.

Postponement of the apparently posthumous action for more than a century, so that all contemporaries are necessarily dead, strains this sort of telepathic explanation still more—in fact to breaking point; but such an event is hardly within the reach of purposed experiment: the other is; and responsible people ought to write and deposit specific documents, for the purpose of posthumously communicating them to someone if they can, taking all reasonable precautions against fraud and collusion; and also, which is perhaps a considerable demand, taking care that they do not forget the contents themselves.

But after all, even if this were successfully achieved, the proof to us of mental action on the part of the deceased "agent" is still incomplete, for it may be that telepathy is not the right kind of explanation of these things at all; it may be that they are done by clairvoyance; that the document, though still sealed or enclosed in metal, is read in some unknown or fourth-dimensional manner by the subliminal self.

The existence of such a power as this, however, can be separately tested, because, if straightforward clairvoyance is possible, things un-

known to any person living or dead may be read or inspected. And in trying this experiment a negative conclusion must not be jumped at too readily. A positive answer might be definite enough ; a negative answer can only be a probability. Moreover, it would be wise not to tell an automatist who is endeavouring to decipher the unknown figures that in that collocation they have never been inspected by man, lest the knowledge should act as a gratuitously hostile or debilitating suggestion.

As to the third question I must defer its consideration, as this paper is too long. I pass to a fourth :—

(4) Is it possible to become aware of events before they have occurred ?

The anticipation of future events is a power not at all necessarily to be expected on a Spiritistic or any other hypothesis ; it is a separate question and will have important bearings of its own. An answer to this Question 4 in the affirmative would vitally affect our metaphysical notions of "Time," but they will not of necessity have an immediate bearing on the existence in the universe of intelligences other than our own. A cosmic picture gallery (as Mr. Myers calls it), or photographic or phonographic record of all that has occurred or will occur in the universe, may conceivably in some sense exist, and may be partly open and dimly decipherable to the lucid part of the automatist's or entranced person's mind.

But the question for us now is whether we can obtain clear and unmistakable proof of the existence of this foreseeing power in any form. It is not an easy thing to establish beyond any kind of doubt. Casual and irresponsible critics (like Mr. Taylor Innes in the *Nineteenth Century*) frequently urge that documentary evidence, such as a postmark on a letter which detailed an event either not yet happened or certainly not known by ordinary methods at the date of the postmark (like a recent shipwreck in mid-ocean for instance), would be proof positive to them of something occult. Mr. Innes goes so far as to say that a document thus officially verified by a Post Office clerk would be worth thousands of pounds to the British Museum. If so it would be singularly easy to get rich. I believe that a postmark on an envelope would satisfy some of these critics, but a postmark on the document itself would be entirely convincing.

I wonder some enterprising Pigott has not endeavoured to gull a leading journal by an elaborate account, say, of the *Victoria* disaster, or the Santander explosion, written on foolscap paper transmitted blank through the post, at small cost, in preparation for any such striking event ; or perhaps on paper subsequently covered with previous postmarks by a genial Post Office friend, and decorated with red tape by a live Government clerk !

The feeling that everything done by a Post Office official is conclusive is of the same order as the opinion that barristers or criminal judges or medical practitioners are the only people fit to investigate unusual mental phenomena, because their practice makes them familiar with the warpings of the human mind.

But to consider the case of a medical practitioner ; as I understand a doctor's business, it is to cure an abnormality if he can, not to prolong and investigate it. True, a doctor may be a scientific man in addition, but *qua* physician he is out of his element as a general investigator, and as a leading practitioner he has very little spare time. Were it not so, the record against the profession—the attitude the main body of doctors has taken to everything new—would be not only pitiful, as it is, but essentially disgraceful.

To this day I feel sure that many promising subjects, some for investigation and some for psychical cure, are being lost both to science and to themselves within the walls of our asylums.

But about this question of postmarks. Let it not be thought that I claim that their evidence is worthless. As evidence subsidiary to testimony they may be very valuable, and every effort should be made to get them ; my contention only is that they do not dispense with testimony.

This I hold is the function of all circumstantial evidence, or of any automatic record ; it lessens the chance of self-delusion or over-exuberant imagination, it can never can be held to guard against fraud.

If a couple of friends by interchanging letters, with their dates verified in some cold blooded official manner, are able to establish foreknowledge of events such as could hardly be guessed or inferred, then their testimony is strengthened by the date marks to this extent :— Either the things happened as they say, or they are in some sort of collusion to bear false witness and deceive. One could only grant them the loophole of self-deception on the alternative of something very like insanity.

That is how these automatic records, photographs and the like, may be so valuable—as supplementary to human testimony—never as substitutes for it.

A word before concluding as to Question 3, whether direct mental action can ever physically affect matter.

Conspicuously it can affect and move some matter, viz., the matter forming part of a living organism ; but is it possible to move dead or inorganic matter without contact, direct or indirect, between our bodies and it ; that is, in short, without any recognised medium of connection or known method of action ?

Can an entranced or any other person raise a chair or table without pressing it up and without conjuring ?

Assertions that such events publicly occur are innumerable, and the recognised possible explanation, after fraud and imposture are eliminated (not by any means an easy matter), is collective hallucination or collective hypnotism by the operator. This is supposed to be guarded against by photography. If a person with a camera could photograph the table while in the air with nobody touching it, or with only a few persons standing free and holding their fingers downwards to it, a sceptic would be satisfied. But ought he to be satisfied?

A crucial experiment is seldom so easy as that: True, one is not likely to be able to hypnotise a photographic plate, but if a company can be hallucinated so as to see the table rise where it does not rise, they can likewise be hypnotised not to see the operator place convenient plate-glass supports under the table legs just before the photographic gentleman is ready to begin.

[Photographs of a table in the open air and off the ground without visible means of support were here shown.]

So also with Indian jugglery. If the audience cannot be trusted to perceive what they see (and I by no means say that they can), neither can the bald record of the camera be trusted, with all antecedent circumstances omitted or at best given in patches.

Of all the many defects of observation, that of lapsed attention is one to which the camera is pre-eminently subject. A camera simply cannot look continuously, at the best it can only take a series of tableaux vivants, and for all the intervening acts we are dependent on testimony.

A crucial experiment in this case also is difficult, and for myself I would prefer to trust my own observation rather than any amount of second-hand testimony, fortified by the assurance of any number of Kodaks.

I do not say, therefore, that photographic records are useless: as supplementary evidence they may be highly valuable and they should always be obtained when possible. All these experiments should be tried, and their concurrent evidence may do much, though their individual cogency is incomplete.

So also it may be desirable to get a phonographic record of the speech of a ghost, if it can be done. But (even eliminating fraud) there would be nothing crucial about it, unless one can be sure that the ghost-seer has not in a somnambulic state spoken the necessary words into the instrument itself.

Meanwhile, it seems to me probable that in this department of science, as in every other, the wholesome and valuable part of scepticism will ultimately be broken down, if at all, not by any one conclusive experiment, but by converging lines of testimony coming in from

many and unexpected quarters ; and the breach will be assisted by the gradual perception that such psychical actions as are proved to occur are not portents or ruptures in the order of nature but are natural and simple outgrowths from what science already knows ; they are first-fruits from a promised land which has been seen from the hills but has not yet been explored.

It is a most unpardonable blunder for a scientific man to suppose that everything that can be known is already more or less within his cognisance ; and his least justifiable attitude is that which holds that there are certain departments of truth in the universe which it is not lawful to investigate.

The same Lord Kelvin who, in a moment of aberration (I hope), wrote this very year that “one-half of hypnotism and clairvoyance is imposture and the rest bad observation,”¹ uttered also the worthier sentiment that “Science is bound by the everlasting law of honour to face fearlessly every problem which can fairly be presented to it.”²

¹ Stead's *Borderland*. No. 1.

² Presidential Address to the British Association, Edinburgh. B. A. Report 1871, or “Popular Lectures and Addresses,” (Macmillan), Vol. II., p. 200.

III.

REPORT ON THE CENSUS OF HALLUCINATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The statistical inquiry into the spontaneous hallucinations of the sane, of which the results are here given, was undertaken in 1889 by the Committee which now presents its final report. It will be convenient, for brevity, to refer to this inquiry as "The Census." The undertaking received the approval of the International Congress of Experimental Psychology, held in Paris in 1889 under the presidency of Professor Ribot; and, in its present form, the inquiry may be said to date from this Congress, which formally entrusted it to Professor Sidgwick's direction.

For though, as we shall presently explain, the investigation was originally started with a special view to the aims of the Society for Psychical Research, the interest taken in it at this general Congress of Experimental Psychologists led the Committee somewhat to enlarge its scope. Accordingly, in tabulating our returns and stating the general conclusions that may be drawn from them, we have taken pains to note, and treated more fully than we should otherwise have done, such points as seemed likely to interest psychologists generally who might be studying the phenomenon of hallucination,—apart from the special question of the "veridicality" of some hallucinations, on which the Census was primarily designed to throw light.

We were confirmed in our choice of this more comprehensive treatment of our results by our experience of the labour involved in the investigation; which renders it, in our opinion, very doubtful whether any equally extensive statistical inquiry into the characteristics and conditions of this class of phenomena will ever again be undertaken, unless with some such special interest as that which prompted our researches.

The plan of our Report, thus enlarged in its scope, divides itself naturally into three parts. First, in Chapters II. and III., we explain the method of inquiry, present the chief statistical results in a tabular form, and then give a full discussion of possible sources of error and endeavour to estimate the extent of their operation. Then—in Chapters IV.-XI. inclusive—we deal mainly with topics interesting to psychologists generally, and only connected in a subordinate way with

the primary aim of our inquiry. We discuss the characteristics by which sensory hallucinations are to be distinguished from cognate phenomena, especially from mere illusions of the senses: the chief forms of hallucinations—especially of the visual type—and the stages in which they are sometimes developed: the physiological processes involved in them and their physical effects on percipients so far as reported: and the influence, favourable or the reverse, of certain general physical conditions,—such as age, sex, health and heredity—and certain special mental conditions such as grief, anxiety, nervous overstrain, abstraction, and expectancy. Then, finally, in Chapter XII., we enter upon the special subject which supplied the original motive for undertaking the work of the Census, and justifies its publication in these *Proceedings*,—the examination of the evidence for telepathy furnished by the results of the present inquiry; and from this point to the end of the Report our attention is concentrated on that portion of our phenomena which there is—or may appear to be—any reason to refer to a supernatural cause.

In order to explain clearly the principal question on which we endeavour to throw light in this concluding portion of the Report, it will be convenient briefly to review the whole evidence for telepathy hitherto collected by our Society, so as to show the relation of this particular question to the general course of our investigations.

The word Telepathy was brought into use by us to express the (scientifically speaking) novel conclusion—which several different lines of inquiry have tended to establish—that thoughts and feelings in one mind are sometimes caused by the influence of another mind, conveyed somehow otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense. The word by its derivation suggests that the influence in question operates across a considerable distance of space: and this is ordinarily the case in the instances of telepathic phenomena with which the present Report is concerned; but it has been found convenient to use the term, for scientific purposes, as merely connoting the exclusion of recognised channels of sensation, and not necessarily implying any definite interval of space between the persons whose states of mind are telepathically connected.

Now, there can be no doubt that the general acceptance of Telepathy, in this sense, as a fact of nature, must importantly modify the current scientific view of the relation of mind to matter. But it may conceivably modify this view in either of two different ways, respectively important in very different degrees.

(a) It may lead to the ultimate discovery of some physical process hitherto unknown, by which the psychical state of one human being (A) influences the psychical state of another human being (B) through the corresponding physical states of the two human organisms concerned.

Or (*b*), it may lead ultimately to the conclusion that the causal relation between the two psychical facts telepathically connected is independent of any such physical process.

It is obvious that the modification of received views involved in the acceptance of the second alternative would be far greater and more fundamental than that involved in the acceptance of the first. We may therefore assume that, if the *fact* of telepathy were once accepted by the scientific world as completely established, the efforts of scientific men to explain the fact would—at any rate at first—take the direction suggested by the first alternative : *i.e.*, they would try to discover the physical process involved in telepathy,—unless, indeed, other strange facts should be simultaneously established clearly cognate to telepathy, and clearly not admitting of any such physical explanation.

But we now refer to this only to say that no attempt of this kind—to discover the physical basis of telepathy—has been made in the present Report: since no indication of any such basis, or of the direction in which (if at all) it is to be sought, appears to us to be afforded by any of the lines of investigation so far pursued,—including such examination as the present inquiry has enabled us to make of the empirical causes and concomitants of hallucinations. In dealing therefore with the hallucinations *primâ facie* telepathic, reported to us in the course of the Census, we have been mainly concerned to examine carefully their value as evidence of the general fact that the psychical state of one human being may influence the psychical state of another, under conditions which satisfactorily exclude all *known* physical processes by which such influence might be conveyed.

Now, when we consider, from this evidential point of view, the whole work of investigation carried on by our Society, we find that it has divided itself into two main parts: (1) Experiments on persons *primâ facie* susceptible of telepathic influence, whether in the hypnotic or in a normal condition; and (2) the collection and examination of accounts of phenomena *primâ facie* telepathic, which have been produced not experimentally, but spontaneously. It will easily be understood that the problems presented by these two lines of investigation are to a great extent dissimilar. For the most part—though, as will presently appear, not entirely—it has been only found possible to perform telepathic experiments successfully when the persons between whom the telepathic influence operates are separated by a comparatively small interval of space; and in such cases it has usually been a matter of some difficulty to render the exclusion of known processes of sense quite certain. And this has often been the only difficulty: since, in the experiments which we regard as successful, it is often quite obviously undeniable that there is *some* causal connexion between the similar ideas in the two minds concerned; the

only possible question is whether that causal connexion is telepathic. The opposite is more often the case with the non-experimental evidence; the distance between the two persons concerned is often so great that if *any* causal connexion can be established between a particular experience of one mind and the corresponding experience of another—say, between the death of A. in England, and the apparition of A. to B. in Australia—there will be no dispute that the causation lies outside the ordinary channels of sense. Thus, while practically the main point in experimenting is to exclude known modes of causation, the main point in dealing with the non-experimental evidence is to ascertain whether there is any causal connexion at all.

It should be added that in the former case the psychical effect telepathically produced is in most cases not a hallucination: whereas in the latter case hallucinations constitute the larger part of the phenomena *primâ facie* referable to telepathy, and the part that is, generally speaking, evidentially most important.

The difference between these two portions of our evidence is so marked that some critics, not altogether unfriendly to our investigations, have been disposed to regard as forced and artificial the connexion that we have tried to establish between them. "Granted," they say, "that you have managed to transfer diagrams and numbers in some unknown way to the mind of a person sitting a few feet off: granted, again, that your well-attested appearances of dying persons to friends in remote places can hardly be explained as merely subjective hallucinations: still, the phenomena are too dissimilar in their nature and circumstances to justify even a hypothetical reference of them to the same cause."

To this objection there are two answers. Firstly, apparitions or other sensory hallucinations are not the only kind of spontaneous experiences in which the influence of one mind on another is found operating at a distance far beyond the limits within which our successful experiments in telepathy are ordinarily confined. A number of instances may be found in *Phantasms of the Living* (Chaps. V.—VII.) of sensations, emotional states, ideas and mental images, and impulses to action, produced in a manner which can hardly be regarded as other than telepathic, if telepathy be once admitted as a real cause. It is true that these phenomena are, for the most part, evidentially less important than those with which we are concerned in the present Report; but they cannot be disregarded in considering the whole evidence for telepathy, and they form a natural link between the spontaneous hallucinations and the experimental cases of thought-transference.

A more important link, however, is furnished by a portion of our experimental evidence—comparatively small in bulk but good in

quality—which has a special affinity to the subject of the present inquiry. We refer to cases in which the percipient sees an apparition of some one who is trying to transfer an idea of himself—or of some other human being—to the percipient's mind, without any previous knowledge on the part of the latter that such an attempt was being made. There are 15 successful experiments of this kind already recorded by our Society, in which ten different experimenters have taken a part: the records are all at first-hand, and in every case the evidence of the percipient has been obtained, as well as that of the experimenter. Thirteen of these experiments were made during the years 1878-1890, and were recorded less than 2 years after the event; and in 6 of them a record was made, either by the experimenter before learning the result of the experiment, or by the percipient while ignorant that an experiment had been made. It is also noteworthy that seven out of the ten experimenters appear to have succeeded on the first trial.¹

The experiments may be divided into three classes. (1) In the great majority of cases the experimenter was trying to make himself visible to the percipient, at or near the time at which the effect was produced on the latter. But (2) there are two cases in which the percipient saw an apparition of the experimenter when the latter was merely trying to make the percipient think of him: and these are noteworthy as having a closer resemblance than the first class to the ordinary non-experimental apparitions of living persons. (3) Finally, we have an old, but well attested, record of a unique case, in which the experimenter transferred to two percipients an apparition of a third person. An account of this case was given in our *Proceedings*, Part XVI., Vol. VI., p. 287: it is interesting as presenting more than one point of analogy to certain classes of spontaneous apparitions, which at first sight appear not easily susceptible of a telepathic explanation, though it is difficult to regard them as purely subjective.

An examination of these experimentally produced hallucinations will, we think, render it easier to enter into the point of view from which we regard the non-experimental evidence for telepathy with

¹ Ten of these cases are recorded in *Phantasms of the Living* (see Vol. I.; p. lxxxi. and pp. 103-109, and Vol. II., pp. 671, 675); and five in the *Journal* of the S.P.R. (see Vol. III., p. 307, Vol. IV., p. 218, and pp. 321-326, and Vol. V., pp. 23-4). The two cases last mentioned are included in the Census, and will be found in Chap. XIV. It is noteworthy that, in the majority of these cases, the experimenter was either asleep or hypnotised when his apparition was seen, having fallen asleep (or into the hypnotic state) with his mind fixed on the determination to appear.

It may be added that, while this Chapter was passing through the press, we received information of another successful attempt of the same kind.

which the present Report is concerned. This evidence consists—as has been indicated—largely, though not solely, of accounts of apparitions of human beings, who are afterwards ascertained to have been dying—or passing through some crisis other than death—elsewhere, at or about the time at which the apparition is seen; the seer of the apparition not having at the time any knowledge of this fact, other than what is conveyed by the apparition itself. We speak of these phenomena as “coincidental” or “veridical” hallucinations. The latter of the two terms has been sometimes criticised, on the ground that the meaning of the adjective is inconsistent with the received sense of the substantive; but it seems to us that the combination exactly expresses the mingling of truth and error in the apparent perception of objective fact which the phenomenon involves. We regard the phenomenon as a “hallucination,” because it is an apparent perception of a body occupying a portion of space, under conditions which render it unreasonable to suppose that this portion of space really was so occupied: at the same time, we call it a “veridical hallucination,” because, so far as it suggests that the person in question is dying or passing through some other crisis at the time, it represents a real fact otherwise unknown to the percipient.

We need hardly remind our readers that the labours of our Society during the last twelve years have brought before the world a considerable number of such experiences, recorded at first hand and with corroboration by intelligent witnesses whose good faith is unimpeached. And they will now, I trust, be willing to regard it as at least an obvious and natural explanation of these phenomena, when considered in the light of the experiments before described, to suppose that the apparition is an effect somehow telepathically caused by the contemporaneous crisis in the life of the person that it represents; in the same manner as the experimentally induced hallucination is somehow telepathically caused by the attempt of the experimenter to influence the percipient. Certainly, if all hallucinations that occur otherwise than experimentally were as clearly *veridical* or *coincidental* as many that have been narrated in our publications, this explanation—or some other equally alien to the view of ordinary science—would be seen to be inevitable: since in that case it would be evident, at first sight, that the coincidence of these numerous hallucinations, occurring quite independently of one another, with critical events in the lives of the persons represented could not possibly be due to chance. But this is not the case: common experience makes us familiar with the fact that similar apparitions of living persons occur when nothing particular is happening to the persons that they represent. Let us call these “non-coincidental”: it is easily seen that if they are sufficiently numerous in proportion to the veridical or coincidental ones, the

coincidences in the latter class of cases may be reasonably regarded as purely accidental, and could furnish no evidence for telepathy. Before, therefore, we can come to a final conclusion as to the telepathic character of these phenomena, we must form some estimate of the proportion of non-coincidental to coincidental cases.

This is the point of view from which the question was treated in *Phantasms of the Living*, Chap. XIII.. Here, in arguing against the theory of chance coincidence, as applied to apparitions *primâ facie* veridical, Mr. Gurney employed a calculation framed on the basis of a Census similar to ours; and obtained the result that chance could not account for the number of coincidences. He was, however, unable to obtain answers from more than 5,705 persons,—a number too small to enable him to draw inferences as to the proportion of coincidental cases from these answers alone. Accordingly, in order to arrive at a conclusion, while he inferred the frequency of subjective hallucinations within a certain period of time from his Census, he had to infer the frequency of coincidental hallucinations from the best-authenticated cases given in *Phantasms of the Living*, making certain assumptions as to the size of the circle from which all the cases there given were drawn. It was always his wish that a more extensive inquiry should be undertaken, by which a sufficient number of answers might be obtained to enable the investigator to infer the general proportion of coincidental to non-coincidental cases from these answers alone. The number of our informants in the present Census is, we think, sufficiently large to justify us in adopting this simpler and more satisfactory method; which is, accordingly, applied in Chapters XII. and XIII. of the present Report, to that group of coincidental cases in respect of which the probability of chance coincidence is capable of being calculated with numerical exactness. Then, in Chapter XIV., we illustrate and discuss the rest of the evidence for telepathy furnished by our Census. In Chapter XV., we deal with the cases of *shared*—or, as we find it convenient to call it, *collective*—hallucination, the explanation of which presents peculiar difficulties. Finally, in Chapters XVI. and XVII., we consider how far the operation of other causes of a supernormal kind is required to explain any part of the phenomena reported to us.

It only remains to explain how the labour and responsibility of our work has been distributed among different members of the Committee. The Report has been in the main drawn up by Mrs. Sidgwick and Miss Johnson, with special assistance from Professor Sidgwick, who has acted throughout as Chairman of the Committee. But the plan on which it has been drawn up was considered and determined, in a series of meetings, by the Committee jointly, who also discussed together the evidential value of the cases *primâ facie* telepathic: and the other

members of the Committee—Mr. Myers and Mr. Podmore—have read all the chapters in proof and recommended additions, omissions, and modifications, and have taken part in the personal interrogation of important witnesses. The lamented death of one member of the Committee—Dr. A. T. Myers—deprived us of his aid before the final Report was composed; but he had been able to consider the statistical evidence obtained by us as to the influence of ill-health in causing hallucinations, and to give advice as to the manner in which it should be treated.

* * * A complete Table of Contents will be found at the end of the Report, before the Appendix.

CHAPTER II.

METHOD OF CONDUCTING THE ENQUIRY AND GENERAL RESULTS.

As has been already explained, our general aim was to ascertain what proportion of persons have had sensory hallucinations while awake, and not suffering from delirium or insanity or any other morbid condition obviously conducive to hallucination; and, further, to enquire into the nature of these hallucinations and the conditions under which they occur. We determined, however, to limit ourselves to hallucinations of sight, of hearing, and of touch, and, in the case of hearing, to sounds suggesting the human voice; because, while we thus included most of the more interesting and important sensory hallucinations, we not only reduced the labour of the investigation, but avoided certain difficulties in obtaining definite statistical results. For the phantasmal character of supposed hallucinations of the other senses—of taste, of the muscular sense, of smell,—and of those representing non-vocal sounds, is more often uncertain than that of the hallucinations to which we have confined our attention. If any one sees distinctly a human figure near him in a well-lighted room, where it is certain that there is nobody but himself,—if he hears a familiar voice speaking to him when its owner is miles away, there can hardly be a doubt that the experience is hallucinatory, in the sense explained in the preceding chapter. But if he hears in a house a sound of footsteps which all efforts fail to explain, it still remains very doubtful whether the impression was not after all caused by a real sound, of which he has merely failed to discover the origin owing to his incomplete knowledge of the acoustical properties of the building and of the possible source of the sound. Some persons would, we found, in such a case answer our question negatively, and others affirmatively, so that a collection of their answers would be of little statistical value.

Method of Conducting the Enquiry.

The question put to all the persons who are included in our statistics was:—

Have you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a living being or inanimate object, or of hearing a voice; which impression, so far as you could discover, was not due to any external physical cause?

This question we shall speak of as “the Census question.” It was printed at the head of a schedule, marked A, with spaces for twenty-five answers and for the names, occupations, etc., of the persons answering. The A schedules were entrusted to persons who volunteered to collect answers, and the collectors were asked to put the question,

impartially and unselectively, to persons over the age of 21. An explanation of the object of the enquiry, and instructions as to the method to be followed in collecting answers, were printed on the back of the schedule, which is reproduced in *Appendix A*.

The Census question is obviously not free from ambiguities, and, as worded, would be likely to bring in some affirmative answers not referring to phenomena which we wished to include in our statistics;¹ but it was necessary to make it short and to avoid technicalities, and it seemed difficult to make it more precise consistently with these conditions. We believed, too,—and experience has on the whole justified the belief—that the particulars given by our informants would enable us to reduce the returns to uniformity.

For those who answered the question of schedule A in the affirmative, a second schedule, marked B, was provided, containing questions, with spaces for answers. The questions on this schedule are also reprinted in *Appendix A*. They were intended to bring out the most important and essential features of the hallucination, together with such points as the date of its occurrence, the conditions under which it was experienced, whether any notes had been made at the time, and whether the percipient had had any similar experiences. In order that the percipients should not be deterred by the fear of publicity from giving information, both A and B schedules had printed clearly on them the words “No names or addresses will be published without special permission.”

The information given about the hallucinations was, of course, not necessarily limited by the questions on the B schedule. Many informants volunteered further details, some preferred to write their accounts in a narrative form, and in a very large number of cases we elicited further details by correspondence,—either directly with the percipient or more often through the collector,—and obtained corroborative evidence. In a considerable number of cases a member of the Committee has seen the percipient and talked over the particulars of his experience with him.

The Collectors.

The collectors, who aided us in carrying out the enquiry, were 410 in number, 223 women and 187 men. More than a quarter of them were friends or acquaintances of members of the Committee, and some of these again induced friends or acquaintances of their own to become collectors. About a third of all the collectors are members of the S.P.R., while about another sixth are friends of theirs. Further

¹ Strictly interpreted, for instance, it may be held to include impressions occurring during sleep, if the percipient while asleep, believed himself to be awake; and a few of those who answered understood the phrase in this sense.

assistance in the enquiry was obtained by a special appeal to psychologists made by Professor Sidgwick in *Mind*, and through articles by him and other members of the Committee published in various more popular periodicals (*Nineteenth Century*, *New Review*, *Murray's Magazine*, *the Review of Reviews*). Through the kindness of Mr. W. T. Stead, copies of the A and B schedules were circulated with one number of the *Review of Reviews*, and 40 collectors, who obtained between them 936 answers, were thus added. A more complete analysis showing how the services of the collectors have been obtained, with some particulars of the number of answers collected through the different sources, and the status and profession of the collectors, will be found in *Appendix B*. It will be observed that the great majority (about nine-tenths) are educated people,—educated, that is, up to the standard of the professional classes,—and correspondence with nearly all has given us an opportunity of judging of the *bona fides* and intelligence of collectors not personally known to members of the Committee.

The work of all the collectors has been entirely gratuitous, and we take this opportunity of thanking them for the care and energy that they have displayed in carrying out a piece of work which has, we fear, often turned out to be much more troublesome than they had anticipated,—involving, as it has done, a good deal of correspondence with ourselves, as well as persistent questioning of their informants. The amount of work done by some collectors has been very large indeed, as will be seen by reference to the *Appendix*.

Classes of Persons Included in the Statistics.

As far as intellectual status is concerned, the collectors are fairly representative of the persons answering the Census question; as each has, as a rule, collected among his own friends and acquaintances. There is, however, a somewhat larger proportion of uneducated persons among those answering than among the collectors, because a few of the educated collectors—and especially some among the large collectors—have worked a good deal among uneducated people, and a good many collectors have asked the servants of their own or their friends' households. Notwithstanding this, the preponderance of educated persons among our informants remains too great for our statistics to afford a good basis for ascertaining the distribution of the phenomena investigated among different social grades. But so far as they throw light on the question, they point to the conclusion that differences of education and occupation lead to no material difference in tendency to hallucinations.

Number of Informants.

The collection was carried on for a little over three years, having been begun in April, 1889, and ended in May, 1892. When the time

announced for closing it arrived, we had nearly 17,000 answers, and, by including belated schedules as they came in, we made up, for convenience, a round number, stopping when we had reached exactly 17,000.

Proportion of Affirmative Answers.

Of the 17,000 answers, 2,272 were in the affirmative; but it appeared on examination that important deductions had to be made from this number. In some cases the scope of the question asked had not been fully attended to by our informants, and the experiences described (*e.g.*, dreams, or the hearing of mysterious footsteps), clearly did not come within it. Affirmative answers relating to such cases must of course be counted as negative. Their number is 353.

There are certain other experiences as to which it is doubtful whether they come within the scope of the Census question or not. We find, as might be expected, that persons who have had such experiences sometimes answer "yes" and sometimes "no," according to their interpretation of the exact meaning of the question. This may have happened to a much larger extent than we can discover, because when a person answers "no" no further information is generally given. For statistical purposes, therefore, it would have been useless to take count of these experiences, and the best plan seemed to be to exclude them, in order to secure uniformity of result. We have for this reason counted affirmative answers as negative when the experiences on which they were based belonged solely to one or other of the following types:—

(1) Hallucinations occurring either during illnesses of a kind in which delirium is known often to occur (*e.g.*, scarlet or typhoid fever), though there is no proof that there was delirium in the particular case; or while the percipient was suffering from the effects of temporary injury to the brain (*e.g.*, after a blow on the head). (Number of answers, 18.)

(2) Dream-images and nightmares, even when persisting into the waking state. (Number of answers, 7.)

(3) Voices or touches rousing the percipient from sleep, but not continuing when he wakes. (Number of answers, 21.)

(4) Visions of objects seen with closed eyes. (Number of answers, 3.)

(5) Visual experiences of the type called "*illusions hypnagogiques*"—objects seen in going to sleep or awaking, in the dark, and without reference to actual space (*e.g.*, "Faces in the dark"). (Number of answers, 4.)

(6) Apparent illumination of the place where the percipient was, or of real objects in his field of view. (Number of answers, 11.)

(7) Sounds as of the human voice other than speech—*viz.*, laughing, sighing, coughing, singing, crying, groaning, sobbing, whistling,

screams or shrieks ; also whispering when no distinct words can be heard, but not sounds as of speaking aloud, even though the words are not distinguished. (Number of answers, 24.)

(8) Tactile impressions not involving a sense of contact with any definite object, *e.g.*, feelings of pressure through the bedclothes, or of the bedclothes being moved, shaking of the bed in which the percipient was, cold breezes. (Number of answers, 10.)

(9) Lights seen at some little distance out of doors, and thus under conditions in which it is almost necessarily impossible to exclude the hypothesis of their being real lights (9 answers) ; and

(10) Objects seen sideways out of the corner of the eye, and never brought within the field of direct vision, when there is consequently a special probability of illusion (5 answers).

(11) After excluding these well-defined classes of experiences, there remain others about which serious doubt must be felt as to whether they were really waking sensory hallucinations at all. A considerable number¹ of such doubtful experiences are included in our tables, because in view of the numerical comparison to be made of seemingly veridical hallucinations with those which are to be taken as purely subjective (see Chapter XIII.), it is important to be sure of not understating the number of the subjective cases ; but the Committee have felt justified in cutting out certain cases where, after careful consideration, the reasons for regarding the experience as hallucinatory seemed to them altogether inadequate. In each case thus omitted they have endeavoured to give full weight to the percipient's own opinion, but this is often very dubious. Forty-seven affirmative answers have been counted as negative under this head—namely, 15 as not truly externalised, and 32 as either mere illusions,² or cases of mistaken identity.

Experiences of some of the above types are often interesting, and some of them will be discussed further on, although we have excluded them from the numerical tables.

The number of answers transferred from the "yes" to the "no" list under all the above heads is 522,³ or 26 per cent. of the cases in which those who have answered "yes" have given particulars of their experiences.⁴

¹ An outside estimate of this number would, we think, be 10 *per cent*, see p. 100.

² The distinction between illusions and hallucinations is explained in Chap. V.

³ For further analysis of these transferred answers, see *Appendix C*.

⁴ Quite apart from this changing of the answer from "yes" into "no," 21 persons who answered "yes" have been excluded altogether from the Census, because the account given of their experiences was such as to make it almost certain that they should have been counted as answering "no," but was too vague for us to feel quite justified in counting them so.

But 256 persons have given the answer "yes" and withheld all information as to the nature of their experiences. Various causes have led to this—sometimes merely negligence, indolence, or shyness on the part of collector or percipient—sometimes disinclination in the percipient to confide in the collector—sometimes the vagueness or remoteness of the experience, making it difficult for the percipient to describe or remember details, or its triviality, making him think it not worth recording,—sometimes the intimate nature of the experience and the emotions connected with it. All these causes, we know, have operated, and there may have been others. We have as far as possible tried to overcome these difficulties by corresponding ourselves with the percipients who had given no particulars, and have in 39 cases obtained information from them. From the accounts received, together with information given in some other cases by collectors, we have come to the conclusion that the general character of the experiences which are not described, is not, on the whole, different from that of the described experiences. We have accordingly felt justified in assuming that the proportion of affirmative answers which should have been negative is about the same among the undescribed cases as among those which are described, and therefore 26 per cent. of those who have answered "yes" and given no particulars, have been transferred to the "no" column.¹

With these corrections, our answers are found to be divided as shown in Table I. The number of experiences which led to the affirmative answers are shown in Tables II. (with Supplement), IV., V., VI., VII. and VIII., classified under different heads, according to the sense affected, the nature of the percept, the date of the occurrence, and certain conditions of the percipient at the time. Table III. is a kind of Supplement to Table I., relating to the answers of informants who have had more than one experience. Table IX. gives the results of Tables I. and II., divided according to the nationality of the informants; Table X. the results obtained in certain specially selected portions of the collection; and Table XI. the present ages of our informants, and the distribution of the hallucinations according to the age of the percipient at the time of the experience.

The Tables are followed by further explanations.

¹ Of the 522 answers transferred from the "yes" to the "no" list on account of experiences not coming within the scope of the Census question, 198 were from men and 324 from women: Thus, of the whole number of persons who have answered "yes" and given particulars of their experiences, 25½ per cent. of the men and 26 per cent. of the women should have answered "no." Of the 256 persons answering "yes" and giving no particulars of their experiences, 102 were men and 154 women. Of these, therefore, 25½ per cent. (*i.e.*, 26) of the men and 26 per cent. (*i.e.*, 40) of the women are counted as having answered "no."

TABLE I.

Showing the number of negative and affirmative answers and the proportion of affirmative answers to the whole.

	Number answering "No."	Number answering "Yes."				Total number of answers.	Percentage of affirmative answers.
		Particulars given at first-hand.	Particulars given at second-hand.	No particulars given.	Totals.		
MEN.	7,717	496	83	76	655	8,372	7.8
WOMEN.	7,599	753	162	114	1,029	8,628	12.0
Totals	15,316	1,249	245	190	1,684	17,000	9.9

NOTE.—The answers included in the third column of figures in Table I. are given at first hand, but the particulars about the experiences which led to the answer "yes" in these 245 cases are given at second-hand, or in 7 cases at third or fourth-hand. The second-hand accounts are usually written by the collector, who received them orally from the percipient. We have, of course, always obtained the accounts at first-hand when it seemed possible to do so. All the accounts in the succeeding chapters are given at first-hand, except one or two in which the opposite is expressly mentioned.

TABLE

HALLUCINATIONS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE SENSE

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Realistic Human Phantasms						Incom- pletely developed apparitions.	Visions		Angels and religious phantasms		
	of living persons.		of dead persons.		unrecog- nised.							
	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.
Visual... ..	296	36	105	22	272	47	120	12	18	9	10	3
Visual and Auditory (vocal)...	30	1	41	3	10	—	1	—	—	1	1	—
Visual and Auditory (non-vocal)	7	—	4	—	24	2	13	—	3	—	—	—
Visual and Tactile	13	—	7	2	4	—	5	3	—	—	—	—
Visual and Auditory (vocal) and Tactile	5	—	6	1	4	—	2	—	—	—	1	—
Visual and Auditory (non- vocal) and Tactile	1	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
Auditory (vocal)	172	42	57	13	144	58	—	—	—	—	4	3
Auditory (vocal) and Tactile ...	6	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tactile... ..	6	—	8	2	55	12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tactile and Auditory (non- vocal)	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	536	79	232	43	520	119	143	15	21	10	16	6

NOTE.—To obtain the corrected totals given in column (15), the 190 affirmative proportionately to the totals of visual, auditory, and tactile cases given (16) are calculated on the corrected totals.

SUPPLEMENT TO

SHOWING THE NUMBER OF GROUPS OF

			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)						
Visual	{ Many	3	1	7	—	2	—	3	—	—	—		
	{ Several	7	2	5	2	13	2	5	—	—	—		
Auditory	{ Many	18	4	5	2	18	13	—	—	—	—		
	{ Several	38	7	6	1	33	13	—	—	—	1		
Tactile	{ Many	1	—	1	—	9	8	—	—	—	—		
	{ Several	—	—	1	1	13	5	—	—	—	—		
Undescribed	{ Many	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
	{ Several	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Totals	67	14	25	6	95	43	7	—	3	—	—	1

II.

AFFECTED AND ACCORDING TO THE KIND OF PERCEPT.

(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)		(13)		(14)		(15)	(16)
Grotesque horrible, or monstrous apparitions.	Animals.		Definite inanimate objects.		Lights.		In-definite objects or touches.		Insuffi- ciently described for classifica- tion.		TOTALS.		TOTALS.		Cor- rected Totals.	Number of Halluci- nations per cent. of persons answering.	
	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.			1st & 2nd hnd.
23	6	22	11	10	2	14	1	14	—	8	12	912	161	} 1120 175	} 1422	} 8.4	
1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	87	5				
7	—	3	—	3	—	1	—	2	1	—	—	67	3				
2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	31	5				
—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	1				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	377	116				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—				
—	—	2	1	2	—	—	—	35	14	—	—	108	29				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6	—				
33	6	27	12	16	2	17	1	53	15	8	12	1622	320	1622	320	—	—

answers relating to which no particulars have been given (see Table I.) are divided in column (14) and added to these totals. The percentages in column

TABLE II.
UNENUMERATED HALLUCINATIONS.

(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
4	1	2	2	—	—	11	1
2	1	1	5	2	—	18	5
—	—	—	—	—	—	41	19
—	—	—	—	—	—	77	22
—	—	—	—	—	—	11	8
—	1	—	1	—	—	16	6
—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—
—	—	—	—	—	3	1	3
6	2	4	7	3	—	33	7
—	—	—	—	1	—	244	80

TABLE III.

NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO HAVE HAD MORE THAN ONE HALLUCINATION,
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER THEY HAVE HAD AND THE
SENSE AFFECTED.

Sense affected.	Number of Hallucinations.						Totals.
	2	3	4	5	6	Indefinite.	
All Visual	88	18	5	4	1	81	197
Some Visual and some Auditory	26	6	9	2	1	22	66
Some Visual, some Auditory, and some Tactile	—	—	—	—	—	4	4
Some Visual and some Tactile	12	—	—	—	—	6	18
All Auditory	14	4	—	—	—	89	107
Some Auditory and some Tac- tile	5	—	—	—	—	9	14
All Tactile	6	—	—	—	—	15	21
Totals	151	28	14	6	2	226	427
Number of the above Persons who have seen apparitions of recognised living persons. }	40	6	6	1	2	31	86

NOTE.—Table III. includes only the persons who have had more than one hallucination and who give some account at first-hand of their experiences (their total number, 427, being thus comparable with the number of persons included in the second column of Table I.)

In classifying the hallucinations they have had according to the sense affected, the term "all visual" means that all their hallucinations affected the sense of sight; the term "some visual and some auditory" means that some of their hallucinations were visual and some auditory, and so on. Thus the second line in the Table gives the information that, out of the 151 persons who have each had two hallucinations, 26 have each had one visual and one auditory hallucination; out of the 28 persons who have each had three hallucinations, 6 have each had, either two visual and one auditory, or one visual and two auditory; and so on.

TABLE IV.
 VISUAL HALLUCINATIONS, INCLUDING THOSE IN WHICH SOME OTHER SENSE IS AFFECTED AT THE SAME TIME, DIVIDED
 ACCORDING TO DATES.
 (Second-hand Cases are not included.)

	Within the Last 10 Years.										Totals.	More than 10 years ago.	Undated.	Totals.
	Number of Years Ago.													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
Realistic human apparitions of living persons	35	19	15	13	15	13	17	12	8	10	157	166	29	352
" " of dead persons	12	10	7	1	7	6	6	2	8	3	62	85	16	163
" " unrecognised ...	17	16	12	17	17	13	11	10	5	8	126	140	49	315
Incompletely developed apparitions	13	8	7	1	9	5	1	3	3	10	60	74	9	143
Visions	1	—	—	2	3	—	—	—	1	1	8	10	3	21
Angels and religious apparitions or visions ...	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	5	3	12
Apparitions, grotesque, horrible, or monstrous	1	—	1	1	—	—	2	1	—	—	6	24	3	33
" of animals	3	—	2	2	—	2	3	—	—	—	12	7	6	25
" of definite inanimate objects.....	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	5	6	3	14
" of lights	—	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	—	12	4	1	17
" of indefinite objects	—	2	2	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	8	8	1	17
Totals	87	57	47	39	55	44	42	29	28	32	460	529	123	1112

NOTE.—The dates in this and the four following Tables are reckoned according to the interval between the experience and the time when the percipient answered the Census question.

TABLE V.
VISUAL HALLUCINATIONS DIVIDED ACCORDING TO CONDITIONS OF PERCEPTION.

	Immediately after waking.	Percipient awake in bed.*	Percipient up and indoors.	Seen out of doors.	Unstated.	Totals.
Realistic human apparitions of living persons	43	77	149	70	13	352
" " of dead persons	8	46	74	19	16	163
" " unrecognised	36	90	111	67	11	315
Incompletely developed apparitions.....	24	50	47	19	3	143
Visions	2	4	11	4	—	21
Angels and religious apparitions or visions.....	—	5	3	2	2	12
Apparitions, grotesque, horrible, or monstrous	6	13	2	10	2	33
" of animals.....	2	4	13	3	3	25
" of definite inanimate objects	1	2	11	—	—	14
" of lights	6	2	6	3	—	17
" of indefinite objects	1	1	11	4	—	17
Totals.....	129	294	438	201	50	1112
		423	639			

* Excluding the cases in the first column. Under the heading "in bed," in this and the following Tables, we include a few hallucinations occurring when the percipient has awakened after sleeping in his chair or sofa.

TABLE VI.

VISUAL HALLUCINATIONS (combining Tables IV. and V.).

		Within the last 10 years.	More than 10 years ago.	Undated.	TOTALS.	
Realistic Human Apparitions	Of living Persons	Immediately after waking	16	24	3	43
		Awake in bed	31	43	3	77
		Up	78	64	7	149
		Out of doors	31	31	8	70
		Unstated	1	4	8	13
	Totals		157	166	29	352
	Of dead Persons	Immediately after waking	5	3	—	8
		Awake in bed	19	25	2	46
		Up	26	42	6	74
		Out of doors	9	10	—	19
		Unstated	3	5	8	16
	Totals		62	85	16	163
	Unrecognised	Immediately after waking	18	10	8	36
		Awake in bed	31	54	5	90
		Up	47	42	22	111
Out of doors		30	33	4	67	
Unstated		—	1	10	11	
Totals		126	140	49	315	
Incompletely developed apparitions	Immediately after waking	12	12	—	24	
	Awake in bed	19	29	2	50	
	Up	23	20	4	47	
	Out of doors	5	12	2	19	
	Unstated	1	1	1	3	
Totals		60	74	9	143	
All other Visual hallucinations	Immediately after waking	9	5	4	18	
	Awake in bed	3	24	4	31	
	Up	27	22	8	57	
	Out of doors	14	12	—	26	
	Unstated	2	1	4	7	
Totals		55	64	20	139	

TABLE VIII.

TACTILE HALLUCINATIONS, INCLUDING THOSE IN WHICH SOME OTHER SENSE IS AFFECTED AT THE SAME TIME, DIVIDED ACCORDING TO DATE AND ACCORDING TO CONDITIONS OF PERCEPTION.

(Second-hand cases are not included.)

	Touches associated with Human Beings.				Touch of an animal or inanimate object.				Indefinite.				Totals.															
	Living.		Dead.		Unrecognised.		Totals.		Undated.		More than 10 years ago.		Within the last 10 years.		Totals.		Undated.		More than 10 years ago.		Within the last 10 years.							
Percipient touched	9	6	1	16	8	5	2	15	18	7	4	29	2	1	1	4	2	5	11	2	3	4	40	21	12	73		
	12	3	—	15	8	1	2	11	21	9	8	38	1	1	1	3	3	5	16	3	3	8	50	17	16	83		
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	10	1	1	3	1	13	17	—	
Percipient touching	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	21	10	1	32	16	7	4	27	44	17	17	78	2	2	1	5	13	6	18	37	96	42	41	179				

TABLE IX.
DIVIDING THE ANSWERS ACCORDING TO THE NATIONALITIES OF THE PERSONS ANSWERING.
(Second-hand Cases are included.)

	English Speaking.					Russians.					Brazilians.					Other Nations.				
	Number answering		Percentage of affirmative answers.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.	Number answering		Percentage of affirmative answers.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.	Number answering		Percentage of affirmative answers.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.	Number answering		Percentage of affirmative answers.		
	No.	Yes.	Totals.	No.		Yes.	Totals.	No.	Yes.		Totals.	No.	Yes.	Totals.		No.	Yes.	Totals.	No.	Yes.
Men ...	7167	567	7734	7.3	300	34	334	10.2	167	50	217	23.0	83	4	87	4.6	19	10	29	34.5
Women ...	7274	932	8206	11.4	272	74	346	21.4	34	13	47	27.7	19	10	29	34.5	102	14	116	12.1
Totals	14441	1499	15940	9.4	572	108	680	15.9	201	63	264	23.9	102	14	116	12.1	102	14	116	12.1
	Number of Hallucinations.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.		Number of Hallucinations.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.		Number of Hallucinations.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.		Number of Hallucinations.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.		Number of Hallucinations.		Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.	
Visual ...	947	68	1015	7.1	86	17	103	16.1	31	5	36	19.3	9	2	11	12.9	31	5	36	19.3
Visual & Auditory (vocal) ...	68	52	120	7.5	9	3	12	18.6	5	2	7	19.3	2	1	3	12.9	2	1	3	12.9
Visual & Auditory (non-vocal) ...	52	30	82	5.8	3	9	12	18.6	2	2	4	19.3	1	—	1	12.9	1	—	1	12.9
Visual & Tactile ...	30	9	39	3.0	3	9	12	18.6	2	2	4	19.3	1	—	1	12.9	1	—	1	12.9
Visual & Auditory (vocal) & Tactile ...	9	3	12	3.0	9	29	38	4.3	2	37	39	14.8	—	2	2	2.2	—	2	2	2.2
Visual & Auditory (non-vocal) & Tactile ...	3	425	428	3.0	—	29	29	4.3	1	2	3	14.8	—	2	2	2.2	—	2	2	2.2
Auditory (vocal) ...	425	9	434	3.0	29	6	35	1.0	37	4	41	1.5	2	—	2	—	2	—	2	—
Auditory (vocal) & Tactile ...	9	127	136	9.9	—	1	1	1.0	2	4	6	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tactile ...	127	5	132	9.9	6	7	13	1.0	4	4	8	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tactile & Auditory (non-vocal) ...	5	192	197	9.9	1	2	3	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Undescribed ...	192	—	192	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

NOTE.—“Undescribed” means affirmative answers about which no particulars have been given. The proportion of visual hallucinations, &c., to the persons answering is calculated on the total numbers corrected for these undescribed answers, as in Table II.

T A B L E X.

SHOWING THE NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF ANSWERS AND HALLUCINATIONS IN CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE COLLECTION
(Second-hand Cases are included.)

DESCRIPTION OF SECTIONS.	NUMBER OF PERSONS ANSWERING.			Percentage of affirmative answers.	NUMBER OF HALLUCINATIONS.		
	No.	Yes.	Totals.		Kind of Hallucination.	Number	Per cent. of persons answering.
A Complete groups of persons defined in some way independent of the inquiry.	Men	378	42	420	Visual	40	6.6
	Women	166	40	206	Auditory	40	6.6
	Totals	544	82	626	Tactile	11	1.8
B* Collected by the Committee.	Men	311	38	349	Undescribed ...	3	—
	Women	191	47	238	Visual	45	7.9
	Totals	502	85	587	Auditory	43	7.5
C Collected by Psychologists and Medical Men.	Men	613	53	666	Tactile	10	1.8
	Women	534	103	637	Undescribed ...	3	—
	Totals	1147	156	1303	Visual	127	10.4
D Combining B and C.	Men	924	91	1015	Auditory	50	4.1
	Women	725	150	875	Tactile	15	1.2
	Totals	1649	241	1890	Undescribed ...	12	—
					Visual	172	9.6
					Auditory	93	5.2
					Tactile	25	1.4
					Undescribed ...	15	—

NOTE.—“Undescribed” means affirmative answers about which no particulars have been given. The proportion of visual hallucinations, &c., to the number of persons answering is calculated on the total numbers corrected for these undescribed answers, as in Table II.
* Of the total collected by the Committee, 391 are also included in Division A. Since A and B, therefore, coincide to so large an extent, we have excluded A from Division D.

TABLE XI.

NUMBER OF HALLUCINATIONS EXPERIENCED AT DIFFERENT AGES,
AND AGES OF INFORMANTS.

(Second-hand Cases are Included.)

	AGES.									Totals
	Un- der 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and Over	Un- sta- ted	
Visual ...	72	217	300	143	81	40	22	5	415	1295
Auditory ...	3	42	91	38	21	14	5	—	290	504
Tactile ...	1	11	32	17	14	3	1	—	64	143
All Halluci- nations	76	270	423	198	116	57	28	5	769	1942
Number of Informants of different present ages.			4927	4278	3316	2338	1419	722	—	17000
Hallucinations per 1000 of Informants.	7	26	48	33	31	29	32			

NOTE.—The two last lines of this Table are estimates; the way in which the estimates are obtained is explained on p. 53. The “present ages” of informants means their ages at the time they answered the Census question.

GENERAL EXPLANATION OF THE TABLES.

Explanation of the Headings of Table II.

In Table II. the first three columns and columns (8) and (9) contain the cases which, according to the percipients' accounts, appear to have belonged to the most completely externalised class—those which look just like human beings, animals, or things forming part of the real world. In column (1) we include with living persons those who are not known to the percipients to be dead, and who have not, in fact, been dead for more than twelve hours. In doing so, we have followed the plan adopted in *Phantasms of the Living*, for reasons there explained, and further discussion of the subject will be found in Chapter XVII of the present Report. The number of apparitions thus included of persons who are definitely reported as dead at the time is nine, and the number of apparitions of persons who died at or near the time their apparition was seen—but about whom it cannot be affirmed that they were at the moment either living or dead—is 56. Column (4) contains visual hallucinations of a less realistic kind, being apparently imperfectly developed. They are either shadowy, vague, transparent, or colourless; or they represent part only of the human form, the rest being conspicuously absent (not merely apparently hidden by intervening objects). All appearances of a hand, or hand and arm only, 14 in number, are also

placed in this column, as are veiled and shrouded apparitions even when quite solid looking. Examples of this class are discussed in connection with the development of hallucinations in Chapter VI. By "Visions," which occupy column (5), we mean scenes or pictures or sometimes single figures or faces, which do not seem to belong to the percipient's actual surroundings. For a discussion of this class, see Chapter IV. In columns (6) and (7) are apparitions of persons or things which we should not expect to meet with in the real world ; for examples, see Chapters VI. and VIII. In column (11) we have placed hallucinatory objects which our percipients did not see distinctly enough to identify as anything in particular, or could not give a name to. With these we have included appearances as of smoke and two cases of dark shadows between the percipient and the lamp or candle.

These definitions, of course, apply also to the other Tables relating to visual hallucinations.

Mode of Counting the Hallucinations.

The total numbers of Table II. do not, of course, correspond with those of Table I., because, while Table I. gives the number of *persons* answering "yes," Table II. gives the number of specified *hallucinations*, and a large number of our informants (see Table III.) have had more than one hallucination, the number they have had varying from two to an indefinitely large number. The degree of minuteness with which these are either described or enumerated varies very much, and some difficulty has thus been introduced into the tabulation of hallucinations. The plan we have finally adopted is as follows:—

Every experience individually mentioned, described, or enumerated has been counted in Table II. in its appropriate line and column.¹ When a general description is given of a type of hallucination which has been experienced more than once, but the number of occasions on which it occurred is not stated definitely, the description is taken for the purposes of Table II. as applying to one individual experience. The case is also put down under its own head in the Supplement to Table II., the object of which is to give such data as there are for a correction of Table II. on account of those hallucinations which are mentioned only in a general manner in groups, and not enumerated. We have divided these groups into groups of "several" and of "many." Our informants do not, of course, always use the words "several" or "many" in their account, but we think that the words they use may fairly be classed under these two heads. Thus, expressions like "on other occasions," "a few times," "two or three times," "more than once" (or any indefinite number apparently not exceeding 10), are taken as equivalent to "several times"; and "often," "frequently," or any indefinite number apparently exceeding 10 (*e.g.*, "almost nightly for about three months"), are taken as equivalent to "many times."

Some examples will make the mode of counting clearer.

No. 422.22, whose narrative is printed in Chapter XVII., saw apparitions of a deceased person known to him. He describes four separate occasions,

¹ Hallucinations said to have affected two or more percipients at the same time are counted once for each percipient included in the Census.

but says that there were many others. The collector further informs us that he has had other hallucinations. His experiences appear, therefore, in Table II. as 4 cases of apparitions of a dead person, and in the Supplement to Table II. as (a) one case of "many" apparitions of a dead person, and (b) one case at second-hand¹ of "several" hallucinations insufficiently described for classification.

No. 484.22 frequently saw an apparition of his father (then living) standing by his study door, with his face looking livid and a dark bruise on his left temple. This is counted in Table II. as one case of an apparition of a living person, and in the Supplement to Table II. as one case of "many" such.

No. 698.23 (see Chapter XVI.) saw many times an apparition of an old man with bright blue eyes, dressed in a black coat and white riding breeches, and also saw many times an apparition of a certain deceased person. This case is counted in Table II. as (a) one unrecognised human apparition and (b) one apparition of a dead person, and in the Supplement to Table II. as one case of "many" under each of these two heads.

No. 55.1 often heard his name called—generally in his mother's voice—both before and after her death, sometimes in the voice of other friends. This appears in Table II. as (a) one auditory hallucination of the voice of a living person and (b) one auditory hallucination of the voice of a dead person, and in the Supplement to Table II. as one case of "many" auditory hallucinations under each of these two heads.

The cases of "several" or "many" hallucinations in the Supplement to Table II. do not include hallucinations repeated once or more at such short intervals—one or two days at most—as to suggest that the appearances after the first are merely recrudescences of the first. These cases, of which there are about 20, are included only in Table II., and there counted each as one case, unless there are some special features of difference between the different appearances. Thus No. 340. 19, in which the percipient saw a figure in a grey cloak at the end of a lighted passage, and saw it again in the passage half an hour later, is counted as one case. In a few of the cases, the same figure appears many times at short intervals during the course of one or two days. Instances of this, quoted below, are Mr. Beer's experience, No. 645.11, in Chapter XII., and Miss M.'s experience, No. 740.9, in Chapter XVII.

The mode of counting hallucinations adopted in Table II. is also used in all the tables that follow; but in Tables IV., V., VI., VII., and VIII. second-hand cases are not included, nor the experiences included in column (12) of Table II. as "insufficiently described for classification."

In the Supplement to Table II., and in Tables III., X., and XI., the term "visual hallucinations" includes all the cases where some other sense than sight was affected at the same time; the term "auditory hallucination" includes only cases where the sense of hearing alone, or of hearing and touch

¹ Column (12) in Table II. includes *only* single cases of hallucinations insufficiently described to be classified. When it appears that a percipient has had an indefinite number of experiences thus insufficiently described, they are included *only* in the Supplement to Table II.

together, were affected ; and the term "tactile hallucination" includes only cases where the sense of touch alone was affected. The total numbers given under these heads are, therefore, to be compared with the total numbers in columns (14), (15) and (16) of Table II.

On the other hand, in the Tables relating to hallucinations of each sense by itself, viz., Tables IV., V., VI., VII., and VIII., the term "visual hallucination" is used in the same way as just explained, but the auditory Table also includes cases where some other sense than that of hearing, and the tactile Table cases where some other sense than that of touch, was affected at the same time, so that the "bisensory" and "trisensory" hallucinations are counted for each sense affected in these Tables, which consequently overlap to some extent.

Explanation of the Estimates in Table XI.

The periods we have taken (except the last) are each ten years long ; thus the heading "10 to 19" means 10 years old and upwards, but under 20, and so on. As the Census question was only to be put to persons over 21, the period headed "20 to 29," as far as the ages of informants are concerned, is really a period of nine years, from 21 years of age upwards.

The last line but one of Table XI. is arrived at by assuming that the 6,521 informants (1,447 of those who answered "yes," and 5,074 of those who answered "no") whose age at the time they answered the Census question was stated, either by themselves or by the collector, are fairly representative of the 17,000 persons included in the Census, and therefore that the number of informants of each age multiplied by $\frac{17,000}{6,521}$ gives the number of that age for the whole Census. The numbers so multiplied are what we give in the line in question.

The average present age of the 6,521 informants was 40 years, which we may assume to be the average present age of all the persons included in the Census.

The last line of the Table is arrived at by distributing the 769 hallucinations which occurred at unstated ages proportionately among the different age periods and dividing the totals thus obtained by the estimated number of persons who have had a chance of experiencing a hallucination within that period. The number of possible percipients for any particular period is estimated by taking the arithmetic mean between the number of persons whose age exceeds the highest age included in the period and the number of those who have not yet attained the lowest age included in it.

CHAPTER III.

DISCUSSION OF THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF OUR RESULTS.

We have now to consider how far the proportions of the affirmative answers in Table I. and of the different kinds of hallucinations in the other tables represent fairly the true proportions in the circles from which our information is drawn.

Several possible sources of error need discussion.

Possibility of Deception.

(1) There is first the possibility that some of the affirmative answers received have been intentionally deceptive, and some of the accounts of hallucinations fictitious.

This may have occurred occasionally, but it has not, we feel sure, occurred to any appreciable extent. The method of collecting was calculated to guard against it, both by providing that the question should only be put to persons of mature age, (over 21),—who are certainly less likely to romance, on the whole, than children,—and also that it should be asked through collectors. The answers on Schedule A were attested by the name and generally by the signature of the informant, and always by that of the collector; and the collectors being, as a rule, if not friends, at least acquaintances of the persons asked, would have some means of judging whether they could be relied on, while there would also be less likelihood of informants giving an untrue answer when it would involve deceiving a friend or acquaintance, and not merely a stranger.

If, notwithstanding this, there were deception, the following up of the details of the hallucinations would be pretty sure to reveal it. Apart from the improbability of deception thus secured, and the absence of any motive for it, we think that the general style and character of the accounts received are clearly indicative of genuineness. The cases quoted in the course of our report will give the reader an opportunity of forming an opinion on this point for himself.

(2) We have been so far discussing the question whether “yes” has been untruthfully said for “no,” but it is also possible that “no” has been untruthfully and deliberately said instead of “yes.” We know of eight cases in which the collector, rightly or wrongly, concluded, from information received, that this had happened.¹ If these persons ought to have answered “yes,” they presumably answered “no” because they

¹ Two of these eight answers were cut out by the collector. The other six remain in our tables as negative answers, since we do not know enough of the details to justify us in changing them.

resented being asked, or wished to avoid further questioning,—perhaps owing to the presence of others. Of course we cannot assume that we have heard of all the cases where “no” has been given instead of “yes,” especially as the collector would not always suspect it; but it is unlikely that there are many, since it was obviously open to anyone either to refuse to give an answer, or to answer “yes,” and refuse to give details.

Refusals to Answer the Census Question.

(3) The next possibility is that those who have refused to answer either “yes” or “no” to the Census question may include a materially larger or smaller proportion of those who should have said “yes” than the proportion of affirmative answers in our Tables.

We have received information from a good many collectors as to the refusals they have met with, the results which they thought were produced on their own collections by them, and the motives which they thought influenced the refusals. Two or three persons have been discouraged from collecting altogether on account of refusals to answer, and it is very probable that many other refusals have not been reported to us at all; but we think that those reported are most likely fairly representative. In about 51 cases (reported by 19 collectors) the collector knew, or had reason to think, that the person who refused should have answered “yes”; and in a few of these we know further that the refusal arose from the intimate or painful nature of the experience. In 9 cases (reported by 4 collectors) it was believed that the answer should have been “no.” In about 16 cases (reported by 8 collectors), the collector had no grounds for any opinion as to what the answer should have been.

We have also received some general statements from other collectors with regard to refusals to answer. As regards affirmative answers, one collector finds great difficulty in persuading people who have had experiences to answer “yes,” “as they seem to have a great horror of being questioned on the subject, or of having their names published.” Another says, “Many refused on the ground that they had seen or heard something.” Another “is convinced that those who could answer ‘yes’ frequently refuse to answer at all.” On the other hand, the following opinions of collectors seem to indicate the withholding of negative answers. One says “Many objected for trivial reasons.” Another “found it difficult to induce people to interest themselves in the subject sufficiently to give their signatures.” A third concluded, from remarks he overheard about another collector, that “a great many persons whose answer would be ‘no’ refuse to sign from mere contempt for the whole subject, whereas those who have had any experience of the kind, however slight, are impressed with the seriousness of the enquiry, and

more ready to take the trouble to enter their names." A fourth says "Most of my acquaintance object to even writing 'no.'" A fifth finds "some people strangely reluctant to sign anything." Another writes: "Several people have declined to answer, for they said they could not feel sure whether they had seen something or not." Another found that "there were two classes of people who ridiculed the idea; namely, those who read little or nothing outside newspapers . . . and also Spiritualists, who seemed to take it as a deliberate insult."¹

The Committee have themselves met with 9 persons who refused to answer, out of 594 asked. In two of these cases the collector felt no doubt that the answer should have been "yes," and they have accordingly been counted as undescribed affirmative answers. In four cases the collector was doubtful what the answer should be, and in the remaining three it was nearly certain that it should have been "no." It may be instructive to examine the last seven in more detail. Of one nothing is known, but the collector gathered from the manner of the person asked that he had had some psychical experience, though it may not have been a hallucination. One person asked to take the paper away with him, promising to think it over and send in his answer later; this never came, in spite of reminders, and the collector thought that the evasion probably arose from an unwillingness to give details. Another similarly evaded a direct reply, apparently from a general aversion to the subject. A fourth was not sure whether what she had seen—two vague white figures in a garden at night—was an apparition or real persons. Of the three persons who, the collector thought, should have answered "no," one referred to a childish experience which he is now sure was not hallucinatory, though he thought differently at the time, and the other two thought that all the enquiries of the S.P.R. tended to foster superstition, and therefore would have nothing to do with any of them.

Besides the reasons for refusals to answer already mentioned, the idea that sensory hallucinations are symptoms of insanity and a consequent shrinking from mentioning them have probably operated to some slight extent. This has been mentioned to us as one of the obstacles met with by two persons in collecting. Neither of these, however, sent in any returns.

It will be seen that it is very difficult or impossible to make a numerical estimate of the total error that has been introduced into

¹ This is the only instance reported to us of a collector who has found any difficulty in working among Spiritualists, though several persons expressed to us beforehand their fear that Spiritualists and others who believed their experiences to be veridical would be repelled by the terms used in our schedules—especially the use of the word "hallucination." As a matter of fact, many Spiritualists have been included in the Census, and several—notably Mr. Aksakoff—have assisted us as collectors.

our statistics by refusals to answer. But the small proportion of refusals experienced by the Committee, together with the conflicting reasons for refusals reported by other collectors, lead us to believe that this error is not very important. So far as it goes, it probably tends to reduce unduly, but only to a small extent, the proportion of affirmative answers, and especially those relating to experiences which affect the percipient emotionally, such as phantasms of dead and dying persons closely connected with him, and religious phantasms.

Danger of Selection.

(4) Another cause of error requiring careful consideration lies in the possibility that the collector may have selected the persons to be asked according to what they were likely to say, either through his greater interest in obtaining one form of answer rather than another, or on some other ground. We adopted two precautions with a view to avoiding this particular source of error. First, we printed instructions to collectors on this point (see *Appendix A*). Secondly, we did not receive isolated answers, but asked for 25.¹ To collect 25 answers is a sufficiently difficult task to make collectors unwilling, as a rule, to neglect opportunities of obtaining any of either sort. We believe that most of our collectors have understood the importance of avoiding any kind of selection, and in many cases we have definite evidence, through our correspondence with them, that this is so. Still, we have evidence of some selection. In fact, 13 collectors—out of 410—have used expressions which have made us think that they, or friends collecting for them, had allowed themselves to be biassed by a desire to obtain affirmative answers, as being more interesting. Between them, they collected 898 answers, of which 14 per cent. were affirmative; so that, as the average proportion is 9.9 per cent., they would seem to have had some success in this illegitimate endeavour, though not enough to affect materially the total result.

On the other hand, some affirmative answers which would naturally have come in have been omitted. Thus, four collectors whom we know to have had hallucinatory experiences, or experiences which at one time they believed to be so, have omitted to put down their own answers in their lists, and in one case, a collector, who thought his proportion of affirmative answers was getting too large, abstained from asking some persons who, he thought, would answer "yes."

On the whole, we should conclude from our communications with collectors, and our examination of their returns that, while pursuit of affirmative answers has certainly taken place to some extent, its

¹ A few of our collectors have not sent in the full 25, but have probably at least made an effort to do so.

operation has been too limited to cause any considerable increase in the general proportion of affirmative to negative answers. But to obtain greater certainty on this point, we adopted two methods of checking the general result.

(a) With a view to judging whether selection were exercised, we asked collectors, in our instructions, to mark the names of persons in their lists whose answers they could have foretold. Unfortunately, all our collectors have not attended to this instruction, and the check thus afforded would have been in any case only partial, because previous knowledge of an answer would, of course, be no proof that it was selected; the person giving it might be one whom the collector would naturally ask in any case.¹

(b) A more efficient means of judging of the combined effects of selection and refusals to answer was obtained by means of answers from complete groups of persons, the groups being defined in some way quite unconnected with the investigation. Thus all the members of a household, including servants, would form such a group, or all the members of a committee (not formed for purposes of psychical research), or all the persons present at a dinner party, or all the persons who happened to be together in a room at a given time. Groups of this kind will obviously be entirely unselected in respect of experience of hallucinations, and they also cannot be affected by refusals to answer, since such a refusal from any one person would simply exclude the whole group as incomplete. A comparison of the answers obtained from these groups with the whole number of answers gives, therefore, a means of judging how far the proportion of affirmative to negative answers has been affected on the whole by these two sources of error. The answers of persons included in these groups, classified as in Tables I. and II., but with less detail, are shown in Division A of Table X. above. They are not so numerous as we could have wished, but this mode of collecting is rather troublesome, and not very easy to explain to collectors by correspondence, and the Committee have had to rely on themselves for a large part of this division.

In Table X. we also show (in Division B) all the answers collected by members of the Committee and (in Division C) the answers collected by persons who have had systematic training in medicine or psychology, whose collections have been kept distinct in accordance with a desire strongly expressed at the Paris International Congress of Experimental Psychology. It was in order to make this portion of the collection as large as possible, that Professor Sidgwick made his special appeal for the co-operation of psychologists in *Mind*, of October, 1889. Speaking

¹ Nor would comparison of the number of marked "yeses" and marked "noes" help us, since a collector could hardly ever be sure that any answer would be negative.

broadly, we may presume that these specially trained collectors were specially on their guard against any tendency to selection.

Division B of Table X., collected by the Committee, is perhaps of less interest to others than to ourselves; but we are, of course, in a position to make more positive statements about these answers than about other parts of the collection. We are certain, as regards this set of answers, that they are unselected, either as to the kind of answers, or the kind of hallucinations, included. We believe also that errors due to hasty and insufficiently considered answers, and to neglect of trivial cases, occur less among the answers collected by the Committee than in the average of the whole collection.

In using the results of these special sets of answers to control the results of our general collection, comparison ought to be made with that part of the general collection—nearly 16,000—which was obtained from English-speaking persons (see Table IX.), since it was from these that all the answers in Table X., except 3 per cent. of Division C, were obtained.

On making this comparison, it will be seen that the percentages of affirmative answers in Table X. are throughout above the average. It may therefore be inferred that the operation of selection in increasing affirmative answers in the general collection must have been more than counterbalanced by some other cause. A comparison in more detail between the special sets of answers and the general collection shows that the percentage of *visual* experiences, though on the whole higher in the special sets of answers, cannot be said to differ in any very marked degree from the general average, and in the set collected by the Committee is almost identical with it; so that the trustworthiness as regards the number of *visual* experiences of the collection in general receives decided confirmation from the special sets of answers. On the other hand, the proportion of *auditory* and *tactile* experiences is, in the special sets A and B, double that in the whole collection. This we believe, however, to be mainly due to another source of error which will be considered below: viz., that auditory and tactile experiences are apt to be trivial and unimpressive, and thus easily forgotten or ignored, unless special care is taken in enquiring about them.

Proportion of Collectors who have had Hallucinations.

(5) Before leaving the subject of selection, it may be well to discuss another form of it. It has been suggested that persons who have had experiences of their own, or whose intimate friends have had them, would thereby be led to take an interest in the subject, and consequently to serve as collectors; and that this natural selection of collectors would lead to our collection being made in circles in which there is a

greater tendency to hallucinations than among the average of mankind. This predicted selection of collectors has perhaps operated to a certain extent, for of the 326 collectors¹ whose answers are included in the Census, either in their own lists or in those of other collectors, 68, or about 21 per cent., answered "yes." Moreover, it is probably true that a tendency to hallucinations sometimes runs in families,² and also that a habit of attaching importance to them either fosters a tendency to them, or brings persons who have the tendency together. A collector who himself answered "yes" might therefore possibly be apt to obtain more affirmative answers than one who himself answered "no." But the whole effect thus produced can only have been small, and for evidence tending to show that it is practically unimportant we may refer again to Table X.,—since only one member of the Committee can answer the Census question in the affirmative, and that one only on account of a trivial and uninteresting tactile experience; nor has the interest of its members in the subject been fostered by the experiences of their relatives and friends, so that division B is free from suspicion of the source of error here discussed.

(6) So far we have considered sources of error in our statistics which, though feared or suspected, appear either to have had no material effect, or to have counteracted each other. The case is very different as regards that now to be considered—namely, forgetfulness. This may be of two kinds.

Superficial Forgetfulness.

There is first the temporary forgetfulness which comes from mere carelessness or want of sufficient thought, with which may be classed a neglect to answer affirmatively arising from the view that certain experiences were too trivial to be worth mentioning. It may be instructive to quote some of the opinions expressed by collectors as to the effect of this kind of forgetfulness on the statistics. One says "it is rather common for a person to answer 'no' at once; while if you go on speaking to them a little, they will say 'I once had a queer sort of experience, but it is not worth relating.' Then if you press them, you may find it is just the sort of thing which you are asking about." Another remarked that most people hesitated before they could say "no," only those who were apparently not inclined to very deep thought gave a decided negative. A third says "one difficulty is that many entirely forget anything of the kind and it is only by an effort and often after some time that they can recall them."

¹ The remaining 84 collectors gave no answer, or at least we have failed to trace their answers among the 17,000.

² For evidence on this question afforded by the present collection, see Chapter VIII.

Two others find that people often say "no" at first and then change to "yes" when they go on talking and explaining to them what is wanted. Two others think that trivial experiences, such as hearing voices, are very common and perhaps not always included. Another, who has collected accounts of supernormal occurrences for many years, is persuaded that the answer should often be "yes" when it is put down as "no"—much oftener than the reverse.

The following is a description of his methods and conclusions given by another collector, who has had special opportunities of making the enquiry in an important Government office :—

"I have had 225 answers in all from two different offices, 125 from one, and 100 from the other. In each case I went round the office asking everybody of the required age, without selection, until I had completed the required number. . . . Out of the 125, I have 17 'yeses,' one doubtful.

"In the other office, out of 100, I have only eight 'yeses,' and of these one is a 'non-Census' 'yes,' and two others seem doubtful cases. I am unable to account satisfactorily for the smaller proportion here. The men belong almost entirely to what is called the Second Division of the Civil Service—*i.e.*, they entered by a very simple competitive examination, and are mostly below the standard of University education.

"I am not so well known in the office as in my own—not known even by sight to many of the men—and it is possible that these men may have been less careful to answer the question of a stranger. Again, I think it possible that fear of ridicule may have withheld some from answering 'yes.' Neither cause would be likely to lose us any very striking hallucinations; but both, I think, may have operated to exclude some auditory and tactile cases. I am convinced, from the result of the enquiry, that to answer the question fully requires a pretty careful and prolonged interrogation of memory: a task which my questionees were in most cases probably unwilling to undertake. Some asked to keep the paper, and sent in their reply a day after. But this source of error (which would only exclude unimportant 'yeses') has probably affected my answers less than those of other collectors. The question was in all cases asked personally, and an interval of about five minutes left for reply. (My plan was to come into a room, distribute a Census paper to each of four or five persons, and then go round and talk and answer questions until one or other was ready with his answer.) In very few cases did a man reply 'no' at once.

"Still, I feel almost sure that if I could have discussed the matter for 20 minutes with each individual, I should have had a larger proportion of 'yeses.' For instance,—— wrote 'no' first, and some ten minutes later, in a discussion on the general subject, mentioned his experiences, 'which, of course, were only the result of dyspepsia, and not worth putting down.' I think, therefore, that though the present collection may perhaps be more accurate than that of the average collector—not only from absence of selection, but from the exceptional facilities which I had for securing the attention of my questionees (the subject being regarded as a welcome relief to the monotony of office work, and the men having no other occupation, beyond

the work aforesaid, to distract them)—it is still by no means complete as regards the less impressive experiences.”

It will be noticed that almost all the collectors quoted believe that it is the trivial experiences—auditory and tactile ones generally—which have been ignored. That these should be the ones ignored, one would naturally expect, since trivial experiences,—*e.g.*, hearing one’s name called from a distance when no one is calling,—often make little impression, because, from their nature, they are apt to leave the percipient himself in doubt as to whether they are really hallucinatory, or only misinterpretations of real sounds.

The correctness of the view that trivial auditory and tactile experiences have been a good deal ignored is confirmed, we think, by Table X. The Committee have been careful as far as possible to prevent the ignoring of these experiences in their own collection, and it is probably owing to this that they have obtained so high a percentage compared with the average. If we may judge from Table X., it would appear that, roughly speaking, the inclusion of unimpressive auditory and tactile experiences which have been neglected in the whole collection, would have about doubled the number of auditory and tactile experiences recorded: while the same comparison would show that no material loss of this kind has occurred in visual experiences.

Permanent Forgetfulness.

But there is a more serious and complete oblivion which no care or thought will overcome—the forgetfulness which in course of time effaces some experiences from the mind altogether—at least so far as conscious memory is concerned. This kind of forgetfulness will affect the work of all collectors, and the answers of all groups of informants, alike, and cannot be checked by the special collections shown in Table X. We must, therefore, adopt some other method for estimating the extent of its operation.

In considering this question we will confine our attention, in the first instance, to visual hallucinations; the record of which, as we have just seen, is not materially affected by any of the sources of error so far considered; while, as will hereafter appear, they are of special importance in estimating the evidence for telepathy.

In order to judge of the effect of lapse of time on the number of visual hallucinations reported to us, and to discover, as far as is possible from the reported number, what the true number should be, we have in Table IV. divided the reported number according to the length of years that had in each case elapsed since the occurrence, when the percipient answered the Census question.

As all our informants are over 20 years of age, they have all had more than 10 years in which to experience hallucinations. If there-

fore they were sufficiently numerous for accidental variations to be eliminated, and if hallucinations occurred with equal frequency at all ages, the same number would have occurred to our informants during each of the last 10 years. But an inspection of Table IV. at once shows that this is not the case with those reported. On the contrary, they exhibit a more or less systematic variation; the number for the most recent year being comparatively very large, the annual number decreasing rapidly at first as the years become more remote, and, when we reach 8, 9 and 10 years ago, being less than half what it is at first. This variation is far too systematic to be accounted for by accident, and any error in our assumption that hallucinations are equally numerous at all ages will affect the number occurring annually but little, if at all, being neutralised by the variety in the ages of our informants. It is clear, therefore, that as the years recede into the distance the proportion of the hallucinations that occurred in them to those which are forgotten, or at least ignored, is very large.

If we could assume that the number reported for the most recent year was correct—that memory has been trustworthy for a year—we could infer the total number from it by multiplying it by the mean number of years during which our informants have lived. But when we analyse the experiences reported for the last year, we find the difference between the recent and remote portions of it even more marked than that between the last year and 10 years ago. Out of the 87 visual hallucinations reported for the last year, 42 are stated to have occurred within the most recent quarter, and of these 19 within the most recent month, and 12 within the most recent half-month; numbers which correspond approximately to 168, 228, and 288 per annum instead of 87. This kind of difference extends through all classes of visual hallucinations (though it is less in degree in some than in others), and this confirms the view that it cannot be accidental. At the same time we have now come to subdivisions too small for us to rely on the exact numbers, not only because the numbers are too small for accidental variations to be eliminated, but because any error in them is very largely multiplied in the final result.¹ If, therefore, we are to infer the whole number of hallucinations from the number within a given recent period, it is a matter of some difficulty to determine what the length of the recent

¹ Suppose, for instance, that we wish to infer from the number within the most recent half-month how many occurred altogether. Then, since the average age of our informants is 40 years (see p. 53) we must multiply 12—the number within the half-month—by 24 times 40, which makes 11,520. But if there has been a mistake, and one of those said to have occurred within the half-month occurred 16 days ago, then the whole number would be reduced by $\frac{1}{12}$ or 960.

period should be: since, if it is too long, the numbers are reduced by forgetfulness; while if it is too short, we are liable to largely magnified errors in the result.

In deciding on the period, we have been influenced by another consideration—viz., that oblivion appears to have specially affected doubtful hallucinations, or alleged hallucinations erroneously regarded as such.

We are led to this view by examining the 42 cases in the most recent quarter individually, and observing how many exhibit certain specified and easily defined characteristics suggestive of possible mistake as to their hallucinatory nature.

We find that (*a*) in 7 cases, 4 of them in the most recent half-month, the figure was seen at some distance, either out of doors, or in a public room—circumstances which make a mistake of identity not improbable.¹

Again (*b*) in 2 cases, both within the most recent half-month, the figure was seen passing outside the door of the room in which the percipient was, or was seen inside the room as the percipient passed the door—circumstances which allow of only a momentary view, and suggest illusion as an explanation.

Thirdly (*c*) in 3 cases, of which one occurred within the most recent half-month, the light was bad and the circumstances not such as on other grounds to exclude the possibility of mistakes.

Thus altogether 12 cases out of the 42 must on the specified grounds be regarded as doubtfully hallucinatory. We will call these “the suspicious cases.” If we omit them, we get 30 as the number in the most recent quarter, 12 in the most recent month, and 5 in the most recent half-month; numbers which correspond to 120, 144, and 120 per annum respectively. From the approximate agreement of these numbers we infer that, apart from the suspicious cases, there was no material forgetfulness within three months; and we think that this period is not too short to be used as a basis for an approximate estimate of the whole number of hallucinations that actually occur. To be on the safe side, let us take 140 as the number of visual hallucinations that occur annually, omitting the suspicious cases.

¹ In one of the 7 cases, the figure was unrecognised, and the proof of its being hallucinatory was merely its unexplained disappearance while the percipient was looking away. A similar mysterious disappearance either behind an obstacle, or while the percipient was not looking, occurred in 3 out of the 6 recognised cases, but the evidence in such cases that a real person could not thus have been lost sight of can seldom be made strong. It is worth noting that in at least 4 of the 6 recognised cases the percipient was expecting the person he believed he saw, which would tend to make him accept too uncritically the impression that he saw him.

In estimating the whole number, it is convenient to limit ourselves to those which occurred since the age of 10 years, because memory is undoubtedly comparatively untrustworthy at very early ages, and hallucinations must be assumed to share the oblivion which overtakes most of the events of our earliest years; moreover, the power of distinguishing hallucinations from real objects is probably undeveloped in small children. Now our informants have on an average lived for 30 years since they were 10 years old, so that the number of visual hallucinations they will have experienced since that age, at the rate of 140 per annum, is 4,200. But the whole number they have reported is 1,112, and of these we infer from Table XI. that a little over 8 per cent., or about 90, occurred under the age of 10.¹ Subtracting these, we are left with 1,022, which we may take as roughly about one-fourth of the 4,200 which we estimate as the true number. We arrive at the conclusion, then, that, roughly speaking, the number of visual hallucinations reported must be multiplied by four to arrive at the true number experienced over the age of 10, omitting the suspicious cases of the specified types; and we propose to adopt this estimate in dealing with the theory of chance coincidence in Chapter XIII.

At the same time, it is, of course, improbable that none of the suspicious cases were genuine hallucinations; and, though other so-called hallucinations not included in our limited class of suspicious cases may not be genuine, it is perhaps unsafe to assume that the suspicious cases afford a true measure of the number of experiences mistakenly regarded as hallucinatory. If we include the suspicious cases, we shall obtain an outside estimate by calculating the whole number of visual hallucinations on the basis of the number reported within the most recent month. We thus get 6,840 as the whole number, which is equal to about $6\frac{1}{2}$ times the reported number. We may assume that the truth lies somewhere between the two limits thus found, and nearer to the lower limit than the higher; but, with the data at our disposal, it does not seem possible to arrive at a more accurate estimate.

It is worthy of remark that experiences of which the hallucinatory character is open to doubt on the grounds we have named, are reported in a much larger proportion for the most recent year than for more remote periods. Thus, among the particular class of realistic apparitions of living persons which furnishes the largest proportion of such suspicious cases, we find them distributed as follows over the last 10 years. The first column gives the number of suspicious cases, and the

¹ We infer this number, instead of counting it, because in some cases, even when dated, the age of the percipient is not given.

second the whole number of realistic apparitions of living persons, corresponding to the first line of Table IV.

In the most recent quarter	8	} 14 ¹	35
In the previous 3 quarters of the most recent year	6		
Over 1 year but not over 2	2	3	19
„ 2 years	„	3	.	.	.	6 ¹	15
„ 3 „	„	4	.	.	.	1	13
„ 4 „	„	5	.	.	.	3 ¹	15
„ 5 „	„	6	.	.	.	1	13
„ 6 „	„	7	.	.	.	5 ²	17
„ 7 „	„	8	.	.	.	2	12
„ 8 „	„	9	.	.	.	1	8
„ 9 „	„	10	.	.	.	0	10
Totals during most recent 10 years						36	157

The falling-off of reports of such doubtful hallucinations after a short time shows that they are apt to be less impressive than more clearly hallucinatory experiences. Either they are for this reason more quickly forgotten, or else a suspicion, often felt by the percipient from the first, that what he saw was a real person or thing, becomes intensified as the first impression of the oddness of what has occurred wears off. The prevalence of this type of experience among the recent cases partly accounts for the disproportionately large number of recent cases, especially among recognised apparitions of the living.

We shall deal more briefly with the case of auditory and tactile hallucinations. Of the auditory hallucinations reported, 65 occurred within the last year, and of the tactile, 21. The proportion of these numbers to the total numbers reported (494 and 179 respectively), and to the numbers within the most recent ten years (see Tables VII. and VIII.) shows that the forgetfulness of auditory and tactile hallucinations is more rapid than that of visual cases, so that a considerably larger correcting factor would be required. But the, in general, less careful reports of the auditory and tactile cases, as well as the smaller numbers we have to deal with, make any calculations respecting them less reliable, and it seems hardly worth while to go into further detail; especially as we should further have to take into account the operation of what we have called “superficial” forgetfulness (see p. 60).

Our readers may be inclined to ask what precise value is to be attached to the statistics in our tables, if so large a correction has to be

¹ These numbers each include a “collective” case in which the experiences of the two percipients concerned are counted separately (see p. 51, foot-note).

² This number includes a “collective” case, in which the experiences of the three percipients concerned are counted separately.

made for forgetfulness. To this the answer is twofold. In the first place, they furnish a fairly accurate record of the number of hallucinations which are remembered—*i.e.*, of those which are either recent or have strongly impressed the percipient—and of the proportion in which these remembered hallucinations are divided under the various heads. In the second place, they give us the means of comparing the number and the impressiveness of different kinds of hallucinations.

We can tell, for instance, from Table IV. that apparitions of the dead are better remembered than apparitions of the living, because more in proportion of the former than of the latter are reported for the period more than ten years distant. And this being so, we may infer further that the memory correction for apparitions of the dead should be somewhat below the average, while that for apparitions of the living should be slightly above it. The comparatively small number of apparitions of the dead reported in our Census may therefore be taken to correspond to the facts, not only as regards hallucinations *remembered*, but as regards hallucinations *experienced*. We may also infer that the more rapid forgetfulness of apparitions of the living depends mainly on the inclusion among them of trivial cases; for if we omit the 36 suspicious cases enumerated above for the most recent ten years—diminishing in number as the years become more remote—we find that the proportion of apparitions in the most recent ten years to those that occurred more than ten years ago is almost exactly the same for apparitions of the living and of the dead respectively.

There is one natural inference from Table IV. against which we must guard, *viz.*, that the small class of “Grotesque” apparitions is better remembered than any other. For here the disproportionately large number of remote cases is in the main due to hallucinations of this class being to a large extent experienced by children. Of the 33 reported, 14 occurred not only to children, but to children under 11 years old, and, owing to the limit of age fixed for informants, all hallucinations experienced under 11 years old belong to the remote period.

Passing to Table VII., we may observe that hallucinations of the voices of dead persons are somewhat better remembered than other vocal hallucinations.

Turning from the form of the hallucination to the conditions of perception, we infer on the same principle from Table VI. that apparitions seen when the percipient is fully awake in bed are somewhat better remembered than those seen when he is up. It seems likely that the freedom from external distraction, which we conjecture to be one reason why lying in bed is favourable to hallucinations (see Chapter IX.), also leads to their being better remembered. It is also worth noticing that there are probably fewer oppor-

tunities for a real person to be mistaken for a hallucination under these circumstances than when the percipient is up; and any suspicion of a possible mistake probably tends, as we have said, to diminish the impressiveness of an experience.

Hallucinations of the most impressive class will not only be better remembered than others, but will, we may reasonably suppose, be more often mentioned by the percipients to their friends. There is some interest therefore in trying to ascertain what kinds are most talked about and seeing how far these are also those shown by the tables to be the best remembered. So far as there is agreement, the inference as to impressiveness drawn from the tables will receive confirmation.

Now it is, of course, the kinds most talked about that will be most often known beforehand to our collectors; and though our instruction to mark the answers previously known to them has not, as we have already remarked, been completely carried out, still the marking that has been done gives us important information on the subject. Analysing the affirmative answers which are stated, by marking or otherwise, to have been previously known to the collectors, we find that of the reported realistic apparitions of dead persons 14 per cent. were known; of similar apparitions of living persons 11 per cent.; of all other kinds of visual hallucinations 10·5 per cent.; of auditory hallucinations 6 per cent.; and of tactile hallucinations 6 per cent.¹ The actual numbers are not to be taken as accurate, because we have not got complete information as to previous knowledge. But there is no reason to think that further information would affect the order of interest, and therefore of impressiveness, thus indicated; and this, as regards the superior impressiveness of visual hallucinations over auditory and tactile ones, and among visual ones, of apparitions of the dead, is the same as the order of impressiveness indicated by amount of recollection.

Possible Omission of Hallucinations under the age of 21.

(7) A seventh source of error in the statistics has to be mentioned. We have reason to believe that some of our collectors and informants—probably not many—interpreted the instruction not to receive answers from persons under 21 to mean that we wished to exclude hallucinations that occurred when the percipient was under that age. If this error had been at all widespread, it might have seriously reduced the

¹ In 4 cases of affirmative answers stated to have been known beforehand, no details are given, and 29 others belong to experiences of kinds not included in the Census, about 6 per cent. of these being thus stated to have been previously known.

number of affirmative answers as regards youthful experiences.¹ Owing to the age of our informants, however, it cannot practically have affected the most recent month or quarter, which has afforded the basis for our estimate of the whole number of hallucinations, and therefore its effect will be merged in that of forgetfulness, and the correction applied for the latter will cover both.

Summary of Chapter.

Summing up now the results of this investigation into the trustworthiness of our statistics, we find that, out of seven sources of error which we have thought of and discussed, five have had on the whole no appreciable effect. The sixth, however (namely, forgetfulness), possibly in combination with the seventh, has had a very large effect indeed, larger probably than most people would expect. We estimate that, in order to arrive at the true number of visual hallucinations experienced by our informants since the age of 10, the reported number must be multiplied by some number between 4 and $6\frac{1}{2}$, and that, in the case of auditory and tactile hallucinations, a still larger correction would be needful.

NOTE.—The accounts of their experiences given by our informants are for the most part written on copies of Schedule B (see Appendix A) in answer to the specific questions there asked, and only exceptionally in an ordinary narrative form. The accounts quoted are *verbatim* reproductions of those given by the percipients, any changes or interpolations—required to bring them into a narrative form—being indicated by the use of square brackets.

¹ This may partly account for the small proportion of hallucinations at early ages shown by Table XI. We shall recur to the subject of youthful hallucinations later (see Chapter VIII).

CHAPTER IV.

HALLUCINATIONS AND PSEUDO-HALLUCINATIONS.

In the discussion which occupies this and the following seven chapters, we shall not distinguish between veridical and merely subjective hallucinations. The discussion of veridical cases as such is deferred to Chapters XII. *et seq.* Further, we shall discuss chiefly hallucinations affecting the sense of sight, as, besides being the most numerous, they show much more variety than auditory or tactile hallucinations, and what has to be said about hallucinations in general can, therefore, usually be best illustrated from this class.

In this and in the next chapter we shall be mainly engaged in explaining, and illustrating from the cases in our Census, the most important lines of distinction between sensory hallucinations and other phenomena with which they are liable to be confounded. These other phenomena may be divided into four classes.

1. Ordinary sense-perceptions :
2. Dreams :
3. Mental images recognised as such, including what are hereafter called "pseudo-hallucinations :"
4. Illusions.

Under the first two heads there is not much that needs to be said.

(1) We follow the authors of *Phantasms of the Living*,¹ in distinguishing sensory hallucinations from ordinary sense-perceptions—as well as from ordinary mental images—by the characteristic that the hallucinatory percept² "lacks, but can only by distinct reflection be recognised as lacking, the objective basis that it suggests." In most cases the application of the distinction is simple and obvious : but occasionally the process of subsequent reflection, by which a percipient convinces himself of the lack of objective basis, is of doubtful certainty : as (*e.g.*) when a figure seen at some distance out of doors is inferred to have been hallucinatory because it disappeared in what the percipient regards as an inexplicable manner. We have already had occasion to notice this source of uncertainty in speaking of "suspicious cases" in

¹ Vol. I., Chapter X., page 459.

² We have allowed ourselves, for convenience, to use the term "hallucination" sometimes for the experience of apparently perceiving a physical fact that is not really presented, sometimes for the object apparently perceived ; for the latter use, however, we have, to prevent confusion, occasionally substituted the term "hallucinatory object" or "percept."

the preceding chapter; and we shall give further illustrations of it in the one that follows.

(2) The distinction between dreams and sensory hallucinations is different. In a wide sense of the term, indeed, dreams of the sensory sort may be regarded as "pure cases of hallucination"¹: since the dream-perceptions, like waking hallucinations, are at the time believed to have an objective basis, which they really lack. But in this Census we have confined ourselves to hallucinations in the ordinary sense, distinguished from dreams by occurring in the waking state. Ordinarily, of course, this distinction is quite clear: each person's dream-scenes are separated from our common physical world by an unmistakable chasm, which he crosses in the conscious transition from sleep to waking. There are, however, a small number of exceptional cases in which we have found some difficulty in drawing the line. Thus—as was stated in Chapter II., p. 36—we have, in seven answers, had reports of dream-images and nightmares persisting into the waking state, and, in twenty-one answers, of voices, or touches, rousing the percipient from sleep; which we, after consideration, decided to exclude from the Census, as belonging to the phenomena of sleep. On the other hand, we have included a small number of hallucinatory experiences at the moment of waking which were—manifestly or probably—connected with antecedent dreams; either because there was a distinct difference in nature between the sleeping and the waking phenomenon, or because the dream-image persisted under conditions of marked waking activity. Of the three instances that follow, the first exemplifies the excluded cases, while the second and third are specimens of those included.

(257. 3.)²

From Miss M. H. M.

February, 1890.

"About fifteen years ago, . . . I had gone to sleep without knowing it, a fire burning opposite the foot of my bed. Thinking I was awake, I thought I saw standing before my fire, at the right hand side, looking into it, with her back turned to me, so that I could not see her face, an elderly woman, rather stout, and dressed like an old-fashioned nurse or housekeeper, in a black cap tied close round the ears, and a large-checked shawl. The check was about four inches square, and black, pink, white and grey, the pink squares being specially distinct. Wondering what she was doing there, I sat up in bed to look at her, and the action of doing so woke me. I was fully conscious of suddenly waking, fully conscious that

¹ *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 460.

² The numbers in brackets at the beginning of the cases indicate their place in the collection.

I had been asleep, and had awoken with a shock, yet I still saw the woman distinctly, with my eyes open and wide awake. She faded gradually. My heart beat for a moment; but I thought it was only the impression of a dream still remaining in my brain that appeared to be seen with my eyes. So I lay down and went to sleep again, and saw no more."

(733. 5.)

From Mrs. S.

March 29th, 1892.

"I once dreamed that a large black butterfly was hovering over my husband as he lay in bed. I awoke and saw, by the aid of the nightlight, the butterfly of my dream fluttering over him. I called the servant and together we tried to kill it. I struck at it with my handkerchief and apparently succeeded in my object, but all our endeavours to find the body of the insect failed. The doors and windows were all closed and it could not have escaped. It was very large and could not have remained invisible. The black woman saw the butterfly as I did, till I struck at it. We are of opinion, as we searched so carefully, that it was merely hallucinatory."

(We need not here discuss the alleged sharing of the hallucination by the black woman, of which we only know at second-hand. Shared or "collective" hallucinations are treated of in Chapter XV.)

With regard to the form taken by the hallucination, the collector, Professor Alexander, writes:—

"According to a superstition widely spread in Brazil the black butterfly is supposed to be a sign of death. I have heard several tales similar to the account given [here] that tend to show that hallucinations are often shaped by popular beliefs."

(729. 17.)

From Dr. J. P.

February 20th, 1892.

"I woke one night hearing the words, 'John, don't you know me?' I opened my eyes and saw a Mr. L., who had died some years before, and with whom I had been very familiar. I got out of bed and followed the form from the bedroom into the dining-room, where it disappeared. This happened in the month of June or July of 1871.

"Health good. No grief or anxiety. Age 49.

"I was drowsy, even though I got out of bed."

As the abrupt oblivion of dreams on waking is a familiar occurrence, it seems not improbable that the apparition of Mr. L., in the last case, was a persistent dream-image: and this may, of course, be the case with other apparitions seen immediately after suddenly waking. But where we have no positive evidence of such a connection, we have not hesitated to include these among hallucinations.

(3) The third distinction presents greater difficulties. Between the vivid hallucination which looks in all respects like a real person or object, apparently occupying space, reflecting light, and hiding objects behind it, and the mere memory image or mental

picture, there are intermediate phenomena, which, as we shall find, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish and classify. We propose, accordingly, in the remainder of the present chapter, to discuss and illustrate fully this line of distinction; leaving the line between hallucinations and illusions to be drawn in the next chapter.

We will begin by giving typical instances of unmistakable hallucinations; taking them from the class of realistic hallucinations representing human beings, which, it will be observed, are far the most numerous in our collection. We take specimens from all the three classes into which we have divided these apparitions, namely: apparitions of the living, of the dead, and of unrecognised persons.

(284. 23.) From Mr. Joseph Kirk.

2, Ripon Villas, Upper Ripon-road, Plumstead, *April*, 1890.

“My experience occurred about four years ago, at the house I now occupy, and in daylight. I have always had an objection to a servant having to go out for anything before breakfast. But at this time it frequently happened that the milkman was not punctual to time, and milk had to be sent for. This was a cause of annoyance to us, because I was compelled to leave home by 9.30 a.m., and, after waiting for the milkman to the last moment, the girl had to run out in a hurry. I was always made aware, while still in my dressing-room, when this was the case. The latch-lock of the front basement door was out of order, and a strong pull from outside was necessary to shut it. This always resulted in a loud *bang*. (Note the *bang*.)

“On the morning I experienced the hallucination, I was in my dressing-room, and was about half-way through the process of dressing when I heard the sound I was so familiar with—this *bang*—and concluded that the milkman was again too late, and that the girl had once more to go for milk. I experienced a momentary feeling of annoyance only, so far as I can remember; at any rate, I had forgotten the subject before I left the room.

“My dressing-room is on the first floor at the back of the house, and I have only to step out of it and at once descend a flight of stairs to reach the basement. The breakfast-room is in front of the house on this basement, and there is a superior kitchen behind it. At this time it was a weekly custom to have the breakfast-room thoroughly over-hauled early in the morning, and the breakfast laid, for that morning, in the kitchen. It was so this morning. The foot of the stairs is close to the kitchen door.

“As I descended the stairs to breakfast, I saw Mary (the servant) approaching me from the basement door, dressed, as usual when on an errand, in her brown straw hat, black cloth jacket, and light print frock; and I had only just time to reach the kitchen door to permit her to *pass behind me*, without stopping, on her way towards the scullery.

“The instant I entered the kitchen I observed to my wife, ‘So Mary has had to go for milk again.’ ‘No,’ she replied, ‘she has not.’ ‘But,’ I exclaimed, ‘I have just seen her, dressed, come from the front door; and besides, I heard the door banged as she went out.’ ‘It is your fancy,’ she

returned. 'Mary has not been out this morning, and she is now in the breakfast-room at work.'

"There was no doubt that such was the case, and that, instead of having seen the real Mary, I had had a very vivid and life-like hallucination of her. It would be natural to suggest that it was the girl herself I had seen, and that she had merely left the breakfast-room for something she wanted from the scullery. But servants do not usually set about in-door work dressed in outdoor costume; and, had she not seemed to me to be wearing her hat and jacket, I should simply have thought it *was* the girl herself, and made no remark."

In the following case the apparition represented the percipient herself.¹

(555. 5.)

From Miss A. B. O.

January, 1892.

"In June, 1889, about 8-9 p.m., [it] being quite light at the time, I saw, near — in Scotland, a figure approaching me, which, on coming near, I discovered was the double of myself, except that the figure, which wore a white dress, had a charming smile. I also wore a white dress; the figure had black on its hands, whether gloves or mittens I do not know. I had neither. It was out of doors, coming down a garden walk. On holding out my hand to it, the figure vanished. [I was] 24 years old, in robust health, and not in anxiety or grief at the time."

(19. 23.)

From Miss C. C.

May, 1889.

"I was writing in my sitting-room at our home in Derbyshire one afternoon in summer. My table faced the open door. I looked up and saw my father coming in with papers in his hand, big blue official looking papers, and a look in his face I had seen a thousand times, a sort of amused look, as if some one had been very funny, in the unconseious way people *are* funny, and he was coming to share the amusement with me. For an instant I forgot he was no longer on the earth, and I looked up expecting him to speak, and half rose to push across to him the chair he liked to use—when there was just nothing. There is nothing for evermore.

"That is all. Just a vivid dream, I suppose, not worth speaking of, and I never have spoken of it to anyone. You ask for a date. My father left us on April 12th, 1883, and it was in the summer of 1884, about June, I think, that I thought I saw him, as I have said. I think he *did* speak, but if so, it was only to call my name or to claim my attention, just as a man would do on entering the room with his mind full of something he wished to impart."

(661. 5.)

From Mr. R. H. H.

(The account is a copy of notes made about an hour after the occurrence.)

April 24th [1892], 9 p.m.

"Saw standing in front of fire-place a tall well-proportioned man, in loud check suit (drab and black), very pale, dark hair parted in the middle

¹ Such apparitions of the "double" are rare. We have only seven instances in the Census.

and plastered down ; seemed thoughtful, and gaze was not directed towards me. The impression lasted about five seconds, but was vivid, and I experienced a strange feeling all over me—unlike former feelings, when I had distinct consciousness of a presence,¹ but saw none. I was too much astonished to speak. He looked like a fairly well-to-do mechanic in his best suit ; age about thirty-five.

“The impression faded, or rather seemed to collapse, very quickly, and in about two seconds had entirely disappeared. Total length of view about five seconds.”

(Note added a few days later.) “Distance between figure and myself 14 feet ; room well lighted by lamps and two candles, but a lamp above mantelpiece projecting from wall by a sconce was hidden by figure : lamp not lighted. I was coming out of my bedroom ; in good health and not in trouble of any sort. I am nearly 25 years of age.”

To these we may add a case from another class,—what we have called “incompletely developed hallucinations,”—in which, though the resemblance to any real object in nature is incomplete, still there is no question about the hallucination taking its place among these objects, and being, so far as sensation is concerned, of the same kind.

(527. 4.) The following account is given by a medical man, Mr. C. T. G. :—
April 14th, 1892.

“About six months ago, in small hours a.m., I thought I saw a figure of a young man. [I was] in very good health, no anxiety ; not the slightest fright at the appearance. I awoke suddenly, feeling absolutely awake. . . .

“I saw the figure in bright *moonlight*. Moon nearly vertically overhead, so that it could not shine *on* any part of me. The blind was drawn fully up.

“I could see it was figure of a man dressed in black morning coat, no hat ; figure was turned towards the window, so that I only could see a three-quarter *back* view and not the face. I hoped and wished it would move and turn round and become more distinct ; it did none of these. *Time* seen seemed about a minute or two—probably only a few seconds. I could see part of the window-sill through body of figure.

“It appeared of some semi-opacity all the time it was visible. It gradually faded. I must have gone to sleep again very shortly afterwards.

“Age, 28 years.

“I attached little importance to my hallucination, though I can’t explain or find any reason for my awaking suddenly and finding myself looking directly at the figure.”

In cases such as these the percipient, while experiencing the hallucination, is at the same time normally perceiving real objects within his range of vision, and the hallucinatory percept is brought into relation with these, so as to occupy apparently as definite a place in the field of vision. The phantasm appears to stand side by side with real objects, and the percipient is usually deceived for the

¹ For other experiences of the same percipient, see p. 86.

moment into thinking it as real as they. The conviction that it is not real is due, not to a difference in the hallucinatory percept, but to an exercise of the reflective judgment. The mode of appearance and disappearance, the appeal to another sense, the impossibility that a real person should have been there—points, in short, which are only apprehended by reflection—are the considerations on which the judgment depends.

To cases such as these, and they form the majority of our collection, there is no difficulty in applying the definition; the experience is clearly a hallucination. But in a certain number of cases there is a difficulty in deciding whether the phantasmal object appeared sufficiently external for the experience to be regarded as strictly a hallucination, or whether it rather belonged to the type conveniently called by Kandinsky "pseudo-hallucinations."¹

Pseudo-hallucinations may be defined as having all the characteristics of hallucinations, except that of complete externalisation. They are unlike the ordinary images of fancy or memory, which we voluntarily call up, in being spontaneous, and in being more vivid and detailed, and more steady. Like hallucinations, they cannot be called up, nor their form altered, at will. On the other hand, they are unlike hallucinations proper, in not seeming to the percipient to be perceived through the senses. It is with the eye of the mind, not the bodily eye, that he seems to see them; with the mental, not the bodily, ear that he seems to hear them; and accordingly they do not even suggest the presence of a corresponding corporeal reality. The difference between pseudo-hallucinations and hallucinations proper is well brought out by the following description, sent to us by a lady who had experienced both kinds.

From Miss C. B. M.

(This case did not come to us through the Census.)

"When I first saw persons who I knew were not creatures of imagination, nor yet corporeally present, they seemed to be pictured just within, instead of before my eyes. One afternoon in the fall of 1863, while engaged in some household work, an elderly woman suddenly appeared to me in that manner. She wore spectacles, was plainly dressed, and had an unsightly bend in the front of her bonnet, which showed she had not put it on before a mirror. She stood a few feet below my level, and her face wore a look of anxious inquiry as she tipped back her head to scan me through the spectacles. She remained several minutes with no change of attitude or expression. With my eyes open or closed, she was there.

"During the last six years, these phantoms have usually been projected into space, and I seem to see them by the ordinary method of vision. I have been near-sighted from birth and experience the same difficulty in

¹ *Kritische und klinische Betrachtungen im Gebiete der Sinnestäuschungen.*—Berlin, 1885.

discerning the unreal that I do when viewing real objects; unless the persons come near, I cannot clearly distinguish their features. However real the apparitions at first appear, a close inspection reveals that they have no solidity; other objects can be seen through them.

“The persons and places making up some scene of everyday life are generally enclosed in *globes*, I call them for convenience, which are apparently of the consistency of a soap bubble. These are sometimes white, sometimes shadowy, but oftener show one of the prismatic colours, like a dew-drop in the sunlight. The first that I noticed was in the evening, after the light was extinguished. In the dark, they have a semi-transparent whiteness, yet are illuminated within, so that what they picture is distinctly visible. This one revolved, not very rapidly, from west to east, one side in shadow, the other showing glimpses of trees, houses, &c. By-and-bye it steadied itself, as if it had been unrolling a coil and had reached the end. Then I saw a large house and a leafless tree at one end of it. A window in the second storey was uncurtained, and within, at a table on which a lamp was burning, sat a man writing. His back was toward me. He now and then paused and raised his head as if following some errant thought, showing by his movements as well as by his figure and heavy suit of dark hair, that he was young and athletic. While studying this new phase of appearances, I *felt* some one near, and turning my head saw close by my side an old lady in a poke bonnet. Her features were small and she fixed a pair of very black eyes long and searchingly on my face. As I moved again, directly in front of me was a young girl clad in white; her face was exquisitely fair and sweet. At the time I had an odd suspicion that these were connected with the writer in the upper room, that somehow he had sent them.

“Not long after, while conversing with friends, and seated where the rays of the sun came full into the room from an opposite window, a transparent globe sailed in on a beam of light with active persons inside, but I could not watch them without attracting attention. From that time, in the dark and in the broad glare of day, I have seen, enshrined in the globes, images of towns, cities, lakes, rivers, boats, ships, the interior and exterior of churches, workshops, dwellings, houses, carriages; in short, all the busy scenes of life and labour in their most intense activity. These pictures—as I believe, of actual life—seem literally borne on ‘the wings of the wind.’ Often when a door is opened, they rush in like messengers in haste. One November afternoon in 1882, on looking from my bedroom window, I saw a huge globe whirling rapidly in a dark cloud far away in the north-east. There was no breeze stirring outside then, but five minutes later a strong wind from that direction swept down the street. The globes have four apparent motions; they revolve, move forward or backward in a direct line, vibrate as a pendulum, or spring up and down like a catch ball attached to an elastic cord. Their size seems to depend mainly upon distance, being largest at the farthest point, diminishing in size as they approach. . . . I have never by an effort of will been successful in summoning any apparition. They come and go in their own way. It is when I am at my best physically, and my mental faculties keenly interested in something, that the pictures are most frequent and vivid. They are mostly quite the antipodes of my mental occupation.”

With the first experience described by Miss M., may be compared a veridical experience (No. 27) in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 209, which the percipient thus describes :—

“I was dressing one morning in December, 1881, when a certain conviction came upon me that someone was in my dressing-room. On looking round I saw no one, but then, instantaneously (in my mind’s eye, I suppose), every feature of the face and form of my old friend, X., arose. This, as you may imagine, made a great impression on me. . . .”

Kandinsky thinks the two phenomena, pseudo-hallucination and hallucination proper, so fundamentally different that if a percipient knows by his own experience what a genuine hallucination is, it is quite impossible for him to mistake a pseudo-hallucination for it.¹

We are inclined rather to think that there are circumstances where even a person accustomed to both experiences may be in doubt.² But in any case, as our informants have not generally had both experiences, and as pseudo-hallucinations are sometimes very impressive phenomena, it is necessary to scrutinise the descriptions with care, lest any pseudo-hallucinations have crept in unawares.

The difficulty in drawing the line occurs especially in two classes of cases.

(1) *Apparitions Seen in the Dark.*

The first of these is the class of apparitions seen in the dark when the percipient’s real surroundings are invisible, so that the phantasm cannot stand among them and be compared with them in the same way as in the light.

With sane and healthy people, mental images which, from their involuntariness and vividness, may be called pseudo-hallucinations, are not uncommon in the period between sleeping and waking, or of composing themselves to sleep—they are then the *illusions hypnagogiques* of Maury. These would, of course, generally occur with closed eyes, and therefore, would be excluded from our tables, as explained on p. 36, even if reported as hallucinations. This rule we adopted, not because we regarded a genuine visual hallucination with closed eyes as an impossibility, but because the great majority of the phenomena of this kind are at most pseudo-hallucinations, and we could not expect either to distinguish true hallucinations from the others by means of the descriptions given or to obtain a sufficiently complete record of them to serve any statistical purpose.

Things seen in actually complete darkness, but with eyes open—as

¹ He believes that the two phenomena are physiologically different, a part of the brain coming into operation in hallucinations which does not play any part in pseudo-hallucinations.

² Kandinsky seems practically to admit this in another part of his essay.

the percipient believed—belong to a somewhat different category, and have required careful consideration. Some of them are undoubtedly hallucinations, but in other cases there is some uncertainty. On the whole, we have decided that apparitions which, notwithstanding the darkness, seemed to the percipient to be seen occupying a definite place in his room—standing by his bed, for instance—should be classed as genuine hallucinations, and that others were to be regarded as probably pseudo-hallucinations. The number of apparitions seen in the dark thus included in our tables is 30.¹

In 17 of the 30 cases, the figure alone appeared illuminated, sometimes seeming phosphorescent or emitting a special light of its own, as in No. 607. 1 (see p. 117); sometimes surrounded by a luminous aura or halo, as in the case next to be quoted; sometimes merely appearing as a real person would in the light, but with nothing else visible round it, as in No. 192. 21 (see p. 139); and No. 740. 9 (Miss M.'s case, Chapter XVII).

(37. 13.)

From Miss H. Wilson.

October 18th, 1887.

“A long time ago I was lying asleep, or nearly so, one night, when I felt a hand laid gently on my shoulder. I was not surprised or frightened. I thought it was my sister Alice, who shared the same room with me, and I was too sleepy to rouse myself till I felt the hand pressing more heavily as if to wake me; then I said, ‘What is it, Alice? What do you want?’ and at the same time opened my eyes. No candle or lamp was in the room, it was quite dark; but close to my bedside stood, enveloped in light, a figure like my sister—it seemed my own sister Alice; there was the golden-brown hair, blue eyes, and fair complexion, and yet it looked like a being from another world, standing in light unlike any earthly light—a beautiful glorified being! It stood for a few moments, then vanished, and the room was all darkness again. I felt deep awe, but no fear.”

In 12 other cases out of the 30 the room appeared illuminated, though it was really dark; in three of these the figure seemed to emit the light (*e.g.*, No. 33.25, a case published in *Proceedings S.P.R.*,² Vol. V., p. 462); in the others, the room and figure both seemed to be lighted in an ordinary manner, as in the following:—

(196. 17.)

From Miss E. M. J.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“One night in the year 1882 or 1883, I awoke completely and sat up in bed. There was light enough in the room to see all the objects in it

¹ In the great majority of cases of hallucinations experienced when the percipient was in bed, the room was not completely dark.

² Eighteen persons, whose experiences had previously been published in *Phantasms of the Living* or the *Proceedings S.P.R.*, happen to have been included in the Census.

distinctly. My bed faced the door. Coming from the door, which was shut, I saw distinctly, and noticed the dress she had on, a lady friend staying in the house. She was advancing on her hands and knees. My first thought was that she had suddenly lost her reason. I asked her what she wanted. She did not answer but disappeared under the bed. I leaned over the side of the bed to see if I could see her, believing her really to be there ; almost immediately the room became quite dark. I had no feeling of fear, and I am sure that I was wide awake. I was teaching at the time, and had been overworking. I was in the habit of seeing the lady almost daily, and had done so for some years. She was presumably asleep in bed at the time on the other side of the passage. I was alone."

The remaining case, which follows, seems intermediate between these two types.

(53. 21.)

From Miss F. D.

(The account was written in 1889.)

"I saw two figures dressed in brown, monkish habits, with cowls over their heads, and long grey beards. They appeared to come out of a cupboard in my room and walk to the bedside. I had been asleep, but awoke in fright. Opposite the bed was a recess in the wall, not deep, which was illuminated by a phosphorescent light. The apparition, both of figures and light, continued for some minutes, until I had time to light a candle, when it disappeared. This took place in the year 1879."

If the following specimen of what we regard as a pseudo-hallucination—and therefore do not include in our statistics—be compared with the cases just quoted, the difference will be clear.

(37. 23.)

From Mr. J. W. A.

(The account was written in 1889.)

"Over and over again I have seen faces in the dark. Lying in bed, broad awake, faces have come out suddenly in the darkness near my bed, appearing, some hideous, some beautiful, and generally extremely vivid. Here is a particular instance. I had been reading of Brynhilda and lay in bed thinking about her life ; when out there came on the darkness a grand face—worth anyone's toil to transfer to canvas—and so vivid that now, after several years' interval, I could make a picture of it if I could only draw. In general, however, these faces seem to have no connection with any particular person or name. They occur most commonly when I am very tired."

It may interest our readers to give here two other instances of pseudo-hallucinations between sleeping and waking, which illustrate different types.

(38. 11.)

From Professor M.

May 25th, 1889.

"My imagination was vividly impressed by the Exhibition of 1851, and for long after, perhaps a year or more, I used to like to shut my eyes when I

went to bed and keep very still, and gradually out of the darkness there would come rolling towards me a gorgeous billow covered with bright objects, and then another, and then another ; and they would get brighter and brighter and then gradually fade away. In this sense I had no control over them, that I never knew what was coming next, and the first time they came it must have been entirely without any willing on my part. But afterwards my will used often to help them on. I recollect, however, that I could not always get them when I wanted. (The billow shape of the appearances probably had its origin in those long trestles, covered generally with red cloth, and laden with all manner of goods, that are to be seen at exhibitions.) I was in delicate health, subject to headaches of a severity which is, I believe, very rare, and apt to have my sensitiveness to outward impressions vary very much."

(478. 4.)

From Miss M. Bramston.

41, Dingwall-road, Croydon, *October 13th, 1892.*

"On the night of Thursday, October 6th, as I was settling to sleep, I saw before my eyes a picture of two strips of still shining water, with trees on their banks reflected in them, one behind the other ; the trees seemed to change as I looked, being sometimes ordinary hedgerow trees, then pollard willows, then hedgerow trees again. I watched the picture with great pleasure, thinking with my waking senses how pretty it was. The next day I was returning from Folkestone to London, and the floods were out in places beside the line. I saw two strips of shining water, one behind the other, with trees reflected in them, just as in my hypnagogic picture. As the train went on the tree reflections changed, and one strip of flood on the other side of the train had pollard willows reflected in it. I had not *consciously* realised that the rain we had been having was likely to produce floods, but certainly the reality seemed curiously to correspond to the hypnagogic picture.

"M. BRAMSTON."

Returning to fully externalised hallucinations seen in the dark, the apparent illumination of the real objects in the room, which, as we have seen, accompanies many of them, is a noteworthy phenomenon. It seems possible that it is of the same nature as an experience which is not uncommon with some persons, namely, that on waking in the dark the whole room appears light for a short time. One informant who has several times experienced this, describes the impression as "a momentary flash" ; in other cases there is merely a vague impression of dazzling light on first opening the eyes. It has been suggested that such experiences may be due to hyperæsthesia—a greater sensitiveness to light, and consequent power of seeing in what ordinarily appears to be darkness—just at the moment of waking, after the eyes have been for some time in a condition of repose.¹ Cases like

¹ Eight out of the nine cases in which the room seemed illuminated and a figure appeared in it occurred within a few moments after waking, and in three of these cases the experience recurred several times in the same way to the same percipient.

that of Miss Mason, one of our informants (quoted in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., p. 372), who saw her room as it really was, but not as she imagined it to be, certainly suggest the hypothesis of real vision of real objects; and there is an analogous case (not in our present collection) where the light accompanying an apparition revealed an object—a gun—in the place it really occupied, but not where the percipient fancied it was. This, however, is no proof that the vision of it was not an externalised memory image, as the percipient, having placed his gun in that particular position himself, must have been subconsciously aware of its true position, which was, in fact, that in which he had last actually seen it. A hypothesis which involves the assumption that an abnormal experience is in part hallucinatory, and in part due to a hyperæsthetic condition, seems somewhat strained in the absence of any direct evidence of a connection between hyperæsthesia and hallucination. It seems simpler to suppose the room to be seen hallucinatorily, like the figure in it, the illuminated room being an externalised memory image, suggested by the percipient's consciousness of where he is. There seems no reason to assume a fundamental difference between an apparent illumination of the real room in which the percipient is, and a vision of an illuminated room, like the following:—

(421. 9.)

From Mr. A. C. B.

March 7th, 1891.

“From the time when I was about 12 years old to my present age (22), I have often, when waking in middle of the night, found the room apparently blazing with light, heard loud music, generally of a band, and seen a number of men and women, generally dancing or in rapid motion; men and women in evening clothes, women in white. This has gradually disappeared in about 5 to 10 seconds from the time when I awoke. Sometimes the impressions were very distinct, sometimes weak. But I was always wide awake when they occurred, and often made distinct attempts to recognise faces, unsuccessfully, and to remember distinctly the impressions. Once about three years ago, after the usual impression had faded away, I saw a man in a brown dress of last century at the foot of my bed. I did not recognise his face, and there was nothing remarkable about him. These impressions never made me at all afraid.

“Age from 12—22. The impressions have lately occurred less frequently. My health has always been good, though I am slightly nervous. I have never suffered from any particular grief or anxiety.”

Mr. B. writes further:—

“As to the light, I did not see the room by it as it is, but a completely different room, of which I had only a very vague impression. There was always a mirror, the most luminous thing in the room, directly opposite me, though there might be no real glass in the room at all. There is no unfamiliar position of a familiar object. I imagine the light is altogether a part of the hallucination, which is of course purely subjective.”

(2) *Visions.*

The second class of cases in which the line between hallucinations and pseudo-hallucinations is often peculiarly difficult to draw is the class which we have called "Visions." By "visions," as already said in explaining the tables, we mean scenes or pictures, or sometimes single figures or faces, which do not seem to belong to the percipient's actual surroundings.

There is no question that the vision is adequately externalised when it is quite definitely located among the percipient's actual surroundings as seen at the time; for instance, when it is seen on a reflecting or other surface, as in No. 406. 25. (see p. 106); or when the wall seems to open and the vision to be seen through it, as in No. 442. 15 (Mrs. B.'s case in Chapter XVII). In other cases, the relation of the hallucinatory object to the percipient's surroundings is less definite, but the resemblance of the apparent perception to ordinary vision is still unmistakable; the case given on the preceding page, No. 421. 9, is an instance of this. But between these and mental pictures many gradations seem to occur, and neither the percipients nor ourselves can always feel sure on which side of the line dividing externalised from non-externalised visions particular cases should come. A couple of cases will illustrate the difficulty. The following is one which, after some hesitation, we have decided was a pseudo-hallucination, and have accordingly not included in our tables.

(42. 25.) From Miss C. P. M. C.

(The account was written in the beginning of June, 1889.)

"I distinctly saw a person whom I knew (M. T.) lying in bed, and the room and furniture exactly as I last saw it. I had the impression of hearing her voice. The impression was so vivid that for the time it stopped my reading, and I remember being surprised at it and wondering whether the woman were alive or dead. I had had a letter three days previously saying she was dying. She had been an invalid when I first saw her, so that I never knew her otherwise than in bed.

"Place: probably in the Geological Museum. Date: May 14th, 1889, Tuesday, in the morning.

"I was reading geology [at the time]. I was not out of health, but I was in anxiety on quite a different subject.

"I did not know the woman very well, and did not see her often.

"She died that day, but I do not know the hour.

"No [other persons were present at the time].

"I have had many such impressions, probably quite as vivid, but none that I remember much about, as at the time I took no notice of them. Once, when a child, being in bed but certainly awake, I remember hearing voices of people I knew well who were far away at the time."

Miss C. gave an account of this experience verbally to the collector, Miss Alice Johnson, before writing it down. For the exact date she referred

to a small diary, in which she had noted some incident that she remembered had happened on the same day as her vision.

We find from the Register at Somerset House that M. T. died at the Hospital for Incurables, Heaton Norris, Stockport, on May 14th, 1889.

Miss C. explained that the other "impressions" she mentioned were of the nature of vivid visualisations. She describes these further in a letter written some time later:—

July 9th, 1892.

"I perfectly well remember telling you my experience of having had a 'vision,' as you call it. The incident itself I still remember vividly, though the surroundings are rather dimmed. It happened one morning that I was doing practical work in the Laboratory.¹ Suddenly, as by a sort of flash, I saw M. T. before me, lying in bed as I had seen her last, and I remember thinking and wondering was she dead; and it struck me then how strange it was it should flash across me so suddenly, when I was intent upon my work; it required a considerable effort of will to return to my work afterwards. Of course it must be remembered that I knew she was very ill and likely to die; she was in an incurable hospital, and I had been interesting myself a few months previously in getting her elected as a free inmate.

"So much for the facts. I don't think I have ever had any other such experience which impressed me so much and of which I remember the details so well. This one occurred at the very time Miss T. died, or within half-an-hour of it. I think I told you I had a faint recollection of something like it having happened when I was a school-girl, but no distinct impression remains. It seems to me that everybody can more or less voluntarily visualise persons and scenes. I can do it so that the people are very nearly, if not quite, as vivid as if they were actually before me, and I can hold imaginary conversations with them.

"It sometimes happens that while I am quite occupied, spontaneously some one comes up before me whom I have not seen or thought about at all for a long time. I think about them for a little time, possibly saying to myself, 'Why do I think of so and so now?' and then I quite naturally cease to think of them, but I have never before found that anything happened to these people at these times.

"[The case of] Miss T. impressed me so much, first, because it was so vivid; second, because I heard a day or two afterwards that she had died at that time. You happened to speak to me about the psychological investigations soon afterwards, otherwise it would probably have faded from my memory. Of these vivid impressions of people I have just mentioned, I remember only two *for certain* since Easter; others may have occurred, but no impression remains."

On the other hand, we have decided to class as a hallucination the following case of a dream-like apparition, because the feeling of spatial relation to the vision was prominent in the percipient's mind.

¹ Doubtless a mistake from lapse of memory, as the previous account says, "in the museum." Miss C. was in the habit of working in both places about that time. [A. J.]

(660. 12.) From Miss C. M. Campbell.

[This case has already been printed in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., p. 324, in the *Record of a Haunted House*, by Miss R. C. Morton ; but as it is the best illustration in the Census of the particular point in question, we have thought it desirable to reprint it here.]

77, Chesterton-road, North Kensington, W., *March 31st*, 1892.

“On the night on which Miss Morton first spoke to the figure, as stated in her account, I myself saw her telepathically. I was in my room (I was then residing in the North of England, quite 100 miles away from Miss Morton’s home), preparing for bed, between 12 and half-past, when I seemed suddenly to be standing close to the door of the housemaid’s cupboard, facing the short flight of stairs leading to the top landing. Coming down these stairs, I saw the figure, exactly as described, and about two steps behind Miss Morton herself, with a dressing-gown thrown loosely round her, and carrying a candle in her hand. A loud voice in the room over-head recalled me to my surroundings, and although I tried for some time I could not resume the impression.

“The black dress, dark head-gear, widow’s cuffs and handkerchief were plainly visible, though the details of them were not given me by Miss Morton till afterwards, when I asked her whether she had not seen the apparition on that night.

“C. M. CAMPBELL.”

Miss Morton adds:— “Miss Campbell was the friend to whom I first spoke of the apparition. She suggested to me that when next I saw her I should speak ; but of course she had no idea when this would be. She wrote an account to me the next day of what she had seen, and asked me if I had not seen the figure that night ; but naturally did not know that I *had* done so, until she received my reply. Miss Campbell asks me to say that this is the only vision she has had, veridical or otherwise.”

Sense of Presence.

We pass to consider a kind of experience the discussion of which will further illustrate the difficulties of classification with which we are now dealing. This is an impression of the near presence of someone, in which no sensation, either of sight, hearing, or touch, appears to be involved. We cannot regard it as strictly a sensory hallucination, and accordingly we have not included any instance of it in our Tables ; still, it involves a more or less definite quasi-perception of the occupation of space in the neighbourhood of the percipient. The impression, in a slight degree, is familiar to most people, and is probably sometimes caused by slight sounds, movements of the air, &c., of which the origin is undetected, and the existence perhaps not consciously perceived. But, in the degree in which we are now concerned with it, the impression does not seem explicable in this way, and it is often so strong as to appear to the percipient a very striking phenomenon, and to produce a great effect on his mind.

Professor James, who has met with a good many instances of it among the affirmative answers to the Census of Hallucinations in America, says (*Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II., p. 322):—

“From the way in which this experience is spoken of by those who have had it, it would appear to be an extremely definite and positive state of mind, coupled with a belief in the reality of its object quite as strong as any direct sensation ever gives. And yet *no* sensation seems to be connected with it at all. . . . The phenomenon would seem to be due to a pure *conception* becoming saturated with the sort of stinging urgency which ordinarily only sensations bring.”

The effect of the experience on the percipient may be the greater from its being completely non-sensory, since this would make it appear more unaccountable. Similarly, voices or sounds coming from nothing visible are often more startling than visual hallucinations, as being *primâ facie* more unaccountable. This is perhaps the reason why stories of “haunted houses” in which nothing happens, except that mysterious noises are heard, appeal so strongly to the popular imagination; and when an impression is produced of the presence of an object imperceptible by any sense, the mysterious effect is heightened still further.

The narrative that follows describes a series of such impressions, occurring to the percipient of case (661.5) quoted above (see p. 74).

(661. 5) Mr. H. writes:—

February 29th, 1892.

“In September, 1890, I was reading for entrance [to the University]. About 11 p.m. I was engaged with Cicero, *De Senectute*, in a little room I have formerly used as a snug and studio for painting. I suddenly became conscious of a feeling that some one else was present. I looked round, expecting to see my mother, who had occasionally come in, for I had several times left the lamp burning all night; but I saw no one. I examined the room, measuring about 16 feet × 8 feet. I expected to find my mother hid behind a large studio easel; she is fond of practical jokes. There was no one there. Very puzzled, I commenced reading, or rather tried to do so, for I had only time to place the book in front of me when I became convinced of some one looking over my shoulder. I took an old constable’s staff which I used for a ruler, as though I intended to use it, and suddenly turned round and saw—no one. At this time I never gave spiritual phenomena a thought. I went round the room again and off to bed, very puzzled indeed. About a little more than a year afterwards—Oct., 1891—I was smoking in another man’s rooms here. I was alone, and was leisurely turning over Thomson’s *Laws of Thought*, and I experienced the same feeling very intensely. I did not at the moment think of my former experience, but, being a freshman, I naturally thought of some trick, but I found no one. I then began to feel—shall I say *know*?—that a woman was present. I put it down to hallucination and went down into the town. About June last year, after mature consideration, I came to believe that there was evidence enough to grant the possibility of spirit phenomena. Since then I have had several most vivid returns of similar

experiences, one when out for a walk, the rest being in my rooms at brief intervals, and always this woman. Why do I say it is a woman? And yet I *know* it is; I do not believe, I *know*—always when not thinking about it. The last was after a card party in my rooms. I was rather irritated at the time, and I am afraid said very sharply, “Oh go to the —!” Whether this adjuration was entirely efficacious remains to be proved, but the feeling of the presence suddenly ceased. If it was a spirit, she did not even give me an opportunity for an apology.

“About a week after this—I cannot ascertain at this moment the exact date—I was in the Assembly Rooms, directly opposite the gates, listening to Arthur Helmore in some of his sketches. I suddenly became seized with the idea that an old man in last century costume was present on the stage, and he gradually passed through the wings. I could have stood at an easel and painted it, yet I did not *see* him. This was the most vivid of all.

“I am often conscious of presences, though sometimes very vague, sometimes in the air, sometimes walking about, very seldom standing still. In every case my attention is called—shall I say, by the magnetic influence? I never fancy there is something, and then believe there is a visitor. My first experience of [these] sensations was in 1887. All were out of the house but myself, even servants. I was cataloguing my late father’s library. I distinctly heard the front door open, some one come down the hall, go upstairs. I went to the door of the room, expecting to see some one going upstairs; there was no one there, and the front door was bolted. It was the spring race meeting in the town. I thought that possibly some one might have walked in. I went upstairs—no one there! During the writing of this, I have been conscious of a draped figure coming in at the door and making a circle round the room and disappearing behind my back. Its colour was a delicate raw umber, almost the tone, but not the shade, of the ground of a plover’s egg.

“I am healthy, and take an enormous amount of exercise, and am considered an exceptionally strong man. I cannot put it down to hallucination, and yet how is it that I should *know* the colours? I have stood in my room and called upon them to appear, and they would not favour me. I once walked up to one, or rather tried to, and it backed through an india-rubber plant, through an engraving of Sir. F. Leighton’s “Solitude,” and the wall—and yet I did not *see* it.”

In this case, we see the experience in various forms, from the mere sense of presence, unaccompanied by distinct sensory impressions or images, and not very definitely localised in space, to the figure occupying a perfectly definite place in the real surroundings, and whose form and colour is clearly apprehended by visual images, which, however, were not externalised. It is important to notice that Mr. H. is a good judge of this, as he has experienced a complete visual hallucination as well, and can compare them. Compare with this a case quoted in *Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. VI., p. 53, where, however, the impression was dispelled by looking at the place where the figure was supposed to be seated.

Visual hallucinations which are undoubtedly fully externalised are sometimes complicated by a non-externalised element. Thus, Mrs. Verrall in her experiments in crystal vision (see *Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. VIII., p. 474) is sometimes aware that certain objects in the vision have certain colours, while conscious of not seeing the colour.

Auditory pseudo-hallucinations—sometimes described as the hearing of inner voices, which seem to be heard by the mind, and not by the ear—are not uncommon experiences with some persons. A striking instance is given in *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. I., p. 481, footnote). Some of these auditory cases, like some of the visual ones, seem to be on the verge of externalisation, and the percipient himself cannot always say whether they are externalised or not. Occasionally, even in cases that seem externalised, there is some quality that differentiates them from real external sounds.

Thus one percipient, Mrs. G., (682. 5.) writes :—

“The hallucination consisted in hearing myself being called by name, so distinctly that I have looked around to hear whom the sound came from ; though, whether from imagination or the remembrance of this having occurred before, the voice, if I may call it so, had a quite undefinable quality, which invariably startled me and separated it from any ordinary sound. This lasted for several years. I am quite unable to explain the circumstances, or that which impressed them upon me after ‘the voice’ ceased.”

It occasionally happens that a visual hallucination is associated with an auditory pseudo-hallucination ; a completely externalised apparition seeming to communicate something in words which the percipient apprehends, but without seeming to hear them. We have no case of the converse kind—*i.e.*, of a voice heard and felt to proceed from a pseudo-hallucinatory apparition.

[The following account, which was received independently of the Census, is taken from notes made by a member of the Committee during an interview with the percipient, Miss G., who having almost lost her eyesight, was unable to write it herself. She has had several other visual hallucinations.]

December 20th, 1891.

“Miss G. had once living with her as lady companion a Mrs. V., who died of consumption in a home at Bournemouth on Nov. 25, 1888. Mrs. V.’s two children, who had died before her, were buried in the Norwood Cemetery, and Miss G. had promised that, if she went to the cemetery, she would look at their graves and see that they were in good condition. On Monday, May 11th, 1891, she had an opportunity of going to the cemetery in the morning, and found the graves well kept, as it turned out that a relative of Mrs. V.’s had looked after them ; so she felt no more responsibility about them, and thought no more about them. She came home to luncheon, and afterwards her cousin Miss B. was reading aloud to her, when she suddenly saw Mrs. V. standing against a dark part of the wall, about 10 feet from her, in a black serge dress, dark blue cloth jacket, like one Mrs. V.

had made herself, a hat which she was familiar with, and tan gloves, like some Mrs. V. had once bought, but with plain silk stripes on the back, instead of little tufts which the original gloves had had. Miss G. recognised definitely all these articles of dress and looked up at the figure, expecting it to speak. She heard the words, "Thank you for going to see my babies." The voice seemed to come from the figure and was distinctly recognised by Miss G. as Mrs. V.'s voice, but yet it was not exactly audible like a real sound, so that she would not have expected another person to hear it,—she thought, because the lips of the figure did not move. On the other hand, the figure itself was so clearly *visible* that she did expect her cousin to see it, but she did not. It was perfectly natural and life-like—with sunny hair and bright colour like a consumptive person; the right hand was crossed over the left, the figure was tall and broad. Mrs. V. had been a rather striking-looking person. The attitude of the hands was characteristic.

"At this time Miss G. was nearly blind, but could see the apparition quite as clearly as a rather short-sighted person would ever have seen a real person at that distance, viz., about 10 feet."

An instance where the idea of the tactile and muscular sense comes similarly into play in a pseudo-hallucinatory manner, without actual sensation, and yet with a spontaneity and insistence quite unusual in imagined sensations, is the following:—

(446. 25.) From Mrs. W.

(The account was written in 1891.)

"A few years ago I received a letter from one of my sons, who was seeing America for the first time on his way to the Rocky Mountains. Amongst other things he described his visit to Niagara. It had evidently impressed him with the greatest admiration and delight, so that he could hardly tear himself away from the position he had taken above the Falls. His description was not minute, but the few words he did say were very expressive, so that I seemed to know a little what it was like, and what it was like to him as he stood there. I generally read my children's letters two or three times, and I am almost sure that it was not at my first reading of this letter, but at a second reading of it in the afternoon, and certainly in a room by myself, that I found myself experiencing a very extraordinary sensation of what I suppose I should have felt if I had been with my son at Niagara, and of what I suppose he felt. It was not seeing or hearing, not even feeling the spray as if actually wetting my face, but I should describe the sensation as the half-exhausting and yet delightful *exhilaration* and *breathlessness* produced by high wind and dashing water. I had made no *effort* to realise so completely what my son had seen and felt. The sensation distinctly *came* to me, and was such a very *palpable* impalpability that I stood or sat quite still, recipient of this strange effect, anxious to lose none of it.

"I do not remember the actual effect upon me of any fine waterfall, not having seen any for a great many years, and never any very remarkable one, so that the effect of the dash and grandeur of a *high sea* is the nearest

likeness I know to what I felt on this occasion. I stood still in fear of losing any of the strange visitation, until it began to lose power and to become only a faint effect, and then ceased, either because it had exhausted itself or because my receiving power was exhausted.

“Then I moved across the room, and I remember trying whether I could *revive* the effect—make it return—having the lately-read letter with me all the time, no doubt. But, to measure the power of the feeling in the form in which my mind’s eye has clothed it ever since (and no doubt did at the time), what had been an airy, cloudy column of force a foot and more high, would now only rise half a foot or less, then sink, then be renewed at my desire, only in *smaller* height (so my imagination described to me the lesser degree), then in smaller still, I suppose (though this *third* degree I cannot distinctly recall), and then no more, or I gave up the attempt. I felt no sensation of spray dashed up upon me, and actually wetting me, but all that was not *palpable* of it I felt. I was not made *actually* breathless, but had the sensation of it, without the actual thing.”

We will conclude this section with two cases, included in our Tables, which seem to be on the line between hallucinations and pseudo-hallucinations. The first we are disposed to regard as a pseudo-hallucination at the outset, turning into a fully externalised, though momentary, hallucination of the ordinary type at the end.

(584. 24.)¹

From Miss S.

January 22nd, 1892.

“Six years ago at Gibraltar, when standing washing her hands in dressing-room at A, with her back to C, Miss S.



‘saw with her eyes’ (she knows this was impossible because of the wall on either side of C, but she can only describe it that way) a friend of hers, then living in the West of Scotland, walk in at the door B, having a strange set smile on his face, and walk across

the room, and stand in doorway C. She then turned round and looked at him. She had only a glimpse of him after turning round, and then he vanished. She learned afterwards that he had died at that hour on that day. She mentioned what she had seen to no one beforehand. She was in very good health at the time.”

The difficulty in classifying the earlier part of this experience lies in the expression “saw with her eyes,” since this quality of seeming to be seen with the bodily eyes is precisely the quality which is lacking in

¹ This case is strictly speaking at second-hand, but the collector is very well known to us, has been a collaborator in various departments of Psychical Research work, and is known by us to be careful and accurate, and acquainted with the questions at issue. Failing to get the percipient to write an account, or to agree to sign it, she wrote it herself, after hearing it from her and questioning her about it.

pseudo-hallucinations. We are disposed, however, to think, notwithstanding this expression, that the first part of the experience was not an apparent sense-perception, since, if the percipient really felt as though she saw the figure with her eyes, why did she turn round to look at it?¹

The next case is a vision of great vividness, but it is somewhat difficult, at any rate in retrospect, to say whether it appeared to be seen with the bodily eyes.

(38. 24.)

From Mr. A. D.

August 8th, 1889.

“The details of the illusion are very simple. I was lying in bed, on a Sunday morning in November, 1876, quite awake and as well as usual at that time. The door between the bedroom and the keeping-room was shut, and the position in which I was lying would have made it impossible to see anything in the adjoining room, even had the door been open. Suddenly I saw on the table there a row of letters, laid one below the other, so as to leave the addresses and the stamps in sight. Their exact number I have forgotten, and it is of no consequence. The handwriting on the envelopes was in each case unknown to me, but the post-marks, which were all unusually distinct—as clear as the Bath stamp, if you have ever noticed that—all bore the names of places where the few relations I have were then living, and at once I knew that the letters contained the news of their death. For some time I lay there thinking, not in the dreamy and half-conscious state which sometimes comes from a sudden shock, but with a full and vivid sense of what had happened and of the difference which it would make in my life. At last, with a great effort, I got up, determined to read the details and to know the worst. I dressed first, and then went into the next room to get the letters. I cannot describe the effect of going to the table and finding nothing except the breakfast things. There was no feeling of relief; it seemed as if some violent convulsion were tearing one’s whole structure in pieces, and for some minutes after that I can remember nothing. Even then the illusion did not pass away. All that day I waited in suspense for the letters of the next day, expecting the news to come then; and with the force gradually failing, the same idea lasted on through the week, till at last it passed into a shadow and vanished away.

“The vividness of the thing you will best understand from this—that I have entirely forgotten the size and shape of the rooms, the arrangement of the furniture, and all the other details connected with them, except so far as they relate to this one incident. Where the bookcases were placed, and the position of the couch and the easy chairs, I could not tell, but the bed, the door between the rooms, and the table, I could mark down to an inch.”

Mr. D. adds, in answer to questions :—

“I was certainly awake, and with my eyes open, when the vision occurred. Looking back, it is impossible to say whether there was any consciousness of what was really before me, but my impression is that

¹ Compare a case in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. III., p. 114.

for the moment everything but the sight of the table and the letters was absolutely wiped out."

Visualising.

It seems appropriate to consider in connection with the question of externalisation, whether there is any relation between visualising power and hallucination. The power of visualising—that is, calling up vivid and distinct mental images of objects thought of—varies greatly with different individuals, as we know from Mr. Galton's investigations. (*Enquiries into Human Faculty*, pp. 83-114.)

MM. Binet and Féré ascertained (*Animal Magnetism*, p. 221) that most of the persons with whom they tried experiments in hypnotically induced hallucinations were, in the waking state, good visualisers, and they believe that persons who have the power of visualising are more susceptible of visual hallucinations than others. The two things, however, do not necessarily go together. One of the ladies whose crystal-seeing experiments Mr. Myers gives in *Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. VIII., p. 499.—Miss A.—who, moreover, has frequently spontaneous visual hallucinations as well as those she induces in the crystal, tells us that she is not a good visualiser; and many good visualisers do not see hallucinations. We should have liked to ascertain what proportion of the persons who have reported visual hallucinations to us are good visualisers; but the question seemed scarcely simple enough to put indiscriminately and without oral explanation to those who had not thought of it before; and we were, moreover, afraid of its increasing the trouble already imposed on our informants, so that we have not attempted any statistical inquiry on the subject. The accounts, however, which we have received from some of our informants lead us to conclude that the power varies considerably, not only in different individuals, but in the same individual at different times. It has been especially noticed by some persons that they have it in a much greater degree just before going to sleep, and in the condition between sleeping and waking. Mr. Galton gives two instances of this from bad visualisers. (*Op. cit.*, p. 91.) The following communications have been received by ourselves on the subject.

November 28th, 1891.

"DEAR MR. MYERS,—Since hearing your paper on the Subliminal Self, I have been making observations, as you suggested one should, on my power of visualising just before going to sleep, and I find that at this time the power is extraordinarily increased, so that scenes which at ordinary times present themselves to me in fragments appear as if they were really before me; I was myself quite surprised at the result.

"C. C."

“When falling asleep, and especially when dozing in a chair, my visualising powers are raised above their normal level. Visualised scenes, of the nature of dreams, but partly under control, take the place of what is going on in the room, or mix themselves up with it.

“H. BABINGTON SMITH.”

Mrs. H. Sidgwick writes :—

“My ordinary visual mental images are extremely vague. They exist,—it is, for instance, often by a vague visual impression of its place in a shelf that I can find a book,—but they are fragmentary and indefinite. I cannot recall clearly the faces most familiar to me. Occasionally, however, when half asleep, I have a flash of good visualisation. I remember one occasion. I was half asleep and had before me the usual vague kind of image of a number of persons, and, among them, one whose aspect I was very familiar with ; when suddenly, and for a brief moment, this person’s image came to my mental vision in a perfectly distinct and definite form, as clear and detailed as if he had been actually before me in the flesh, and altogether different from the previous vague image of him. This instance was more or less involuntary, and verges, therefore, I suppose, on a pseudo-hallucination ; but I also am sometimes able when half asleep to call up, voluntarily, clearer visual images than my ordinary waking ones.”

This increase of visualising power under conditions known to be favourable to pseudo-hallucinations looks as if the two things were related, at least to some extent, but it would not necessarily follow that genuine hallucinations were also related to general visualising power.

CHAPTER V.

THE RELATION OF ILLUSIONS TO HALLUCINATIONS.

In the last chapter we had to distinguish between hallucinations and non-externalised mental images. In this we have to deal with the limits of the class of hallucinations on the other side, and to discuss those cases where the doubt is not as to externalisation, but as to whether what is experienced is not merely an illusion, in which some real object is perceived, but misinterpreted as something else.¹

The following are good instances of well-observed illusions. As such they would, of course, be excluded from our statistics.

(703. 5.)

From Professor W. R. Sorley.

Cardiff, *July 29th, 1891.*

“Lying in bed, facing the window, and opening my eyes voluntarily in order to drive away the imagery of an unpleasant dream which was beginning to revive, I saw the figure of a man, some three or four feet distant from my head, standing perfectly still by the bedstead, so close to it that the bedclothes seemed slightly pushed towards me by his leg pressing against them. The image was perfectly distinct—height about five feet eight inches, sallow complexion, grey eyes, greyish moustache, short and bristly, and apparently recently clipped. His dress seemed like a dark grey dressing-gown, tied with a dark red rope.

“My first thought was, ‘That’s a ghost’; my second, ‘It may be a burglar whose designs upon my watch are interrupted by my opening my eyes.’ I bent forward towards him, and the image vanished.

¹ There is an experience with which we are all familiar, which is not an illusion in exactly the same sense as the above, since it involves no erroneous inference from what is seen, but which is instructive in considering the process involved in such illusions. The experience we mean is the interpretation of a pattern in either of two different ways at will, as when we see a rose on a wall paper, either as a face or a rose, as we choose. The most striking examples are the drawings in black and white, which have been a good deal sold of late years, which are so drawn as to represent two distinct things at the same time; for instance, one drawing may be either seen as a half-length picture of a coquettish looking young woman, or as the head of a cross old crone. Having seen the picture in one way, it is often only by a considerable effort that we can interpret it in its other equally real meaning, and then it is only by a similar effort that we can return to the first view.

When one of the interpretations is unreal, or unintended, as is, of course, the case when we are concerned with the ordinary objects or patterns surrounding us, it may vary with the condition of our eyesight, or other circumstances. A friend of ours informs us that on one occasion, when lying in bed unwell, and with temperature somewhat above the normal, the patterns on his wall paper, the folds of his curtains, &c., made themselves up into numerous very definite and quite persistent figures, which he was quite unable to reproduce when his illness was over.

The following is a curious experience apparently of this character, in which the

“As the image vanished, my attention passed to a shadow on the wall, twice or three times the distance off, and perhaps twelve feet high. There was a gas lamp in the mews-lane outside, which shed a light through the lower twelve inches or so of the (first-floor) window, over which the blind had not been completely drawn, and the shadow was cast by the curtain hanging beside the window. The solitary bit of colour in the image—the red rope of the dressing-gown—was immediately afterwards identified with the twisted mahogany handle of the dressing-table, which was in the same line of vision as part of the shadow.

“Place : 51 (?), Torrington-square, London, W.C. Time : About the end of November (?), 1886, probably 2 a.m.

“I had just had an unpleasant dream (quite unconnected with the image), and, on awaking, had turned round to lie on the other side, thus facing the window.

“If my recollection serves me rightly, I had that evening been discussing apparitions and illusions with Professor Croom Robertson and Mr. Carveth Read. Age 31.

“I wondered very much afterwards that I had not identified the image with my brother, who is about the same general build and height, and wears a short moustache, which he sometimes clips. Probably the identification was prevented by the burglar-scare occurring to me. I did not think at the time of any one in connection with the image.

“W. R. SORLEY.”

From Miss W.

“One evening at dusk I went into my bedroom to fetch something I wanted off the mantelpiece. A street lamp threw a slanting ray of light in at the window, just sufficient to enable me to discern the dim outline of the chief articles of furniture in the room. I was cautiously feeling for what I wanted when, partially turning round, I perceived at a short distance behind me the figure of a little old lady, sitting very sedately with her hands

influence causing the illusion is regarded by the percipient as telepathic. It reached us independently of the Census. Mrs. W. writes :—

“In 1873 we were moved to Montsioa’s country, my husband having been appointed missionary to that chief. Our home was at Mafiking. My two eldest girls, Eva and Jessie, seven and nine years of age, were in Grahamstown at school. While travelling to the chief’s great place in July—we were having breakfast—as I looked at my little Celia instead of seeing Celia’s face, I saw my Jessie’s face quite plainly, and wondered at the time, because the children did not resemble each other, and I had not seen Jessie since August, 1872. We all went to chapel, and each time I looked at Celia, I saw Jessie’s face. I remarked to my husband how strange it was ; he replied, ‘And they are not alike, are they?’ And so on at intervals during all the four days’ journey. I felt troubled about it, for we were so far from any post, and from my dear child. She seemed somehow to be near me. I began to wonder why no letters came. After a while I did not see her face so plainly, but always when I looked at Celia, this continued at intervals, far into August. In September we got letters from Grahamstown telling us how dangerously ill Jessie had been, for days hovering between life and death ; how they would not write until they knew what it was to be, life or death ; then they told of restoration to health. Then I said to my husband, ‘That accounts for the strange feelings I have had about Jessie, and seeing her so often before me.’ I was always wide awake, no dreams of the night. It is now nearly 19 years ago.

folded in her lap, holding a white pocket-handkerchief. I was much startled, for I had not before seen anyone in the room, and called out 'Who's that?' but received no answer, and, turning quite round to face my visitor, she immediately vanished from sight. 'Well,' I thought, 'this is strange!' I had left all the rest of the household downstairs; it was hardly possible that anyone could have followed me into the room without my being aware of it, and besides, the old lady was quite different from anyone I had ever seen. Being very near-sighted, I began to think my eyes had played me a trick; so I resumed my search in as nearly as possible the same position as before, and having succeeded, was turning to come away when lo! and behold! there sat the little old lady as distinct as ever, with her funny little cap, dark dress, and hands folded demurely over her white handkerchief. This time I turned round quickly and marched up to the apparition, which vanished as suddenly as before. And now being convinced that no one was playing me any trick, I determined to find out, if possible, the why and because of the mystery. Slowly resuming my former position by the fireplace, and again perceiving the figure, I moved my head slightly from side to side, and found that it did the same. I then went slowly backwards, keeping my head still until I again reached the place, when deliberately turning round the mystery was solved.

"A small, polished, mahogany stand near the window, which I used as a cupboard for various trifles, made the body of the figure, a piece of paper hanging from the partly-open door serving as the handkerchief; a vase on the top formed the head and head-dress, and the slanting light falling upon it, and the white curtain of the window completed the illusion. I destroyed and re-made the figure several times, and was surprised to find how distinct it appeared when the exact relative positions were maintained."

With less good observers, or less favourable circumstances for observation, it is clear that these illusions might never have been resolved into their constituent elements and might have been permanently taken for hallucinations. It is, therefore, not improbable that some of the cases reported to us as hallucinations were really illusions, and, this being so, it becomes important to consider under what conditions the mistake is likely to occur.

Imperfect vision of the object misinterpreted is the general condition of such experiences, and this may occur (*a*) owing to the light being bad, as in the cases we have quoted; or, (*b*) owing to defects of the eyes, such as astigmatism and short sight. For instance, a short-sighted friend of ours tells us that she has several times mistaken a certain projecting corner of a rough stone wall for a lady with flounced skirts. The following account also illustrates the effect of short-sight, and gives a probable explanation of some curious auditory illusions.

(251. 1.)

From Miss S. H.

November 28th, 1889.

"I consider the whole class of this kind of mental phenomena to be of the nature of *dreaming*. I am constitutionally a regular and sound sleeper.

But any occurring disturbance in health, either of body or mind, occasions dreams; besides which I am aware of an intermediate state between torpor and full activity of functions, which is apt often to run into the semi-dreaming which retains consciousness of being such. And this midway state grows upon me with age. It chiefly concerns *sounds*, while for some little time past I have been tending towards deafness; but it also respects partially my sense of *sight*, while I have known myself from early youth to be short-sighted. I should not know my own sister by her features across a room, judging people generally by their dress and mode of walking. I am, however, very imaginative, and it often happens to me, now that we two are living alone together, either to see her seated in a corner of our sitting-room as I enter it, when she is *not* there, or to miss seeing her when she *is* there. But I am much more affected as to *sounds*. We have lived at two houses in C—, first at B—, and now at the Cottage; while near to both, but almost close to the latter, runs the N— line of railway, and many have been the startling dreams that its night-trains have wakened me up into, especially if I have been weak in health. This began when at B—. I was confined to bed with bronchitis. I noticed time after time that my sister seemed to run hastily from her bedroom straight into her dressing-room, on the other side of the wall against which my own bed was placed, stop at her toilet stand, to fetch, as I supposed, some medicine or something wanted by her husband, and then return to him as hastily. After several repetitions, I mentioned it to her; she denied having done anything of the kind, and said, ‘Of course it was the train.’ I did not at once see a correspondence to my experience, and knew not how to accept her explanation, till I came to remember the *bridge* that crosses the road passed by the train. Here was actually the sufficing cause for the midway stoppage, and the advancing and retreating rushes which afforded the noticed perspective of sound. But since we have lived at the Cottage we lose the effect of the bridge, and have only the sudden bursting one, and then the retreating rush. Soon after our removal, I remember in particular being once startled up, and supposing that a man was running in a violent passion of anger along the passage behind my bed. Recently, my sound-delusions attach [themselves] to many sorts of common movements; any stir of furniture or blast of wind supplies to itself suggested words. I will now repeat and analyse [one] special instance of this semi-dreaming as to which I believe I can safely trust my memory.

“[It] was at B—, at a time when my bedroom was on an upper story, just over that of Mr. and Mrs. B. In the darkness of early morning I was suddenly roused by what seemed to me a voice calling, ‘S—!’ I jumped out of bed, and leaned over the banister on the landing, crying out, ‘What is it? do you want me?’ and even ran down and opened the bedroom door of my sister, asking the same question. ‘No,’ they had not called me, and sent me back to bed. And as I lay there I reflected how inevitably, if I had been superstitious, I should have taken it for granted that the voice heard was one of warning from my mother, who had died some time before. But it turned out that Mr. B. had that morning risen to draw up his window-blind, that he might be able to read in bed when the dawn should come. It must have been that blind’s drawing-up which I heard call to me ‘S—!’”

Again, (c) the imperfect vision may be owing to the distance of the object seen. Of course, distance may easily lead to a mistake of identity, but this is almost too obvious to need saying, and a percipient would seldom rest his belief that he had seen a hallucination merely on the fact that he thought he saw a friend who could not have been in the place, unless the distance was small enough to make any question as to distinctness of vision seem absurd. But there is another way in which illusions may arise from distance: a figure may disappear in a manner that seems quite unaccountable, when it has really only been hidden by some object whose exact relative position is not apprehended. We have no instance of an illusion proved to have arisen in this way, but the following case, in which one percipient is sure that the experience can be thus explained, and the other percipient is equally sure that it cannot, will serve well to illustrate the point.

(56. 18.)

From Miss E. R. B.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“On a summer evening in daylight, in or about the year 1867, I was walking with my father and sister between the North and South Camp, Aldershot, on a sandy, open space. Behind us we heard footsteps, and looking back saw a soldier, who followed us some few yards, when we missed him, and turning could not see him, so went back to look for him, but he was nowhere to be seen.

“I was out for a walk, in my usual health and spirits.

“Personally the soldier was quite unknown.

“My companions were my father and sister; both saw what I did. I am unable to say whether the former had any fixed opinion about it. The latter has always thought it a real soldier that somehow got away.”

[In this case we have allowed the view of the more sceptical sister to prevail, and have not included the case in our tables.]

Errors from this cause—vision imperfect owing to distance—are more likely to occur when the percipient is out of doors than under other circumstances, both because persons are then liable to be seen at greater distances than they can be indoors, and because possible intervening obstacles are liable to be less known and familiar, as well as more distant.

A fourth kind of imperfect vision (*d*) is due to the object seen being in the outer part of the field of sight. We have probably all of us at times imagined that we saw some person or thing out of the corner of our eye, which, on turning round, we found not to be there. When a supposed hallucination is thus seen out of the corner of the eye, it is generally felt to be a trivial and unimpressive experience, and this, combined with frequent doubt on our informant's part as to whether the experience was a hallucination or an illusion, has, we

believe, led to very imperfect returns under this head. For this reason we have, as explained in Chapter II., p. 37, left out of our tables all supposed hallucinations seen out of the corner of the eye.

It is not easy to estimate the extent to which the other three causes of indistinct vision may have led to permanent errors. Probably the second—defective eyesight—is the least important by itself, as those who suffer from it are in the habit of mistrusting and correcting their impressions, and, moreover, they correct the defects as far as possible with glasses. Defective eyesight would, however, sometimes enhance the drawbacks of feeble light.

Illusions seem to be relatively frequent just after waking from sleep. The small amount of light which there often is in the room under these circumstances would, of course, largely account for this, but other causes may also operate, such as the want of rapid adjustment of the eyes immediately after waking and the want of complete alertness of the judgment. To these would be added for short-sighted people the absence of spectacles; and for persons in general there would often be the loss of the important aid in judging of distance and solidity which is given by binocular vision, since, when a person lies on one side, one eye is apt to be buried in the pillow.

On the whole, it is obvious that poor light may be a very fruitful source of error, and though unmistakable hallucinations do of course sometimes occur in bad light, (as for instance No. 192. 21, p. 139), all alleged hallucinations occurring under these circumstances should have their credentials examined with especial care. We cannot say that this examination leaves by any means all those included in our tables free from suspicion. The following case, for instance, seems a somewhat doubtful one, especially as the percipient's expectation of seeing his brother would naturally predispose him to a particular interpretation of what he saw.

(145. 9.)

From Mr. G. M. C.

(The account was written in 1892.)

“In rooms of ———, Cambridge, on entering room expecting to meet a brother, [I] saw him distinctly leaning against mantelpiece, the time about 10 in the evening, in April, '89, the room only lighted by a fire. On looking more closely he was not there. [I was] just entering room. [Age] about 19. No [other persons were present.]

“I was expecting to see him, and was surprised not to find him.”

It appeared to us, however, that it would be useless to attempt a numerical estimate of the probable amount of error in our tables due to this cause, without a more accurate knowledge than we could hope to obtain of the exact circumstances of each case, and of the capacity of our informants as observers. But, after carefully considering the

reports sent to us, we have come to the conclusion that, in about ninety per cent. of the visual cases,—certainly not less—the circumstances reported afford no ground for the supposition that a real person or thing was mistaken for a hallucination. The proportion of cases open to doubt is, as already stated in Chapter III. (p. 65), considerably larger among the more recent cases than among the remoter ones.

There is a small class of apparitions in which the repeated reappearance of the same figure in the same place, as seen from the same point of view, like the illusion described on pp. 95-6, strongly suggests that some real effect of light and shade, or some real object, is continually misinterpreted in the same way, and that there is no genuine hallucination. The following is a case in point.

(196. 2.)

From Miss H. M.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“I think it was about two years ago, in the winter, at about 6.30 or perhaps earlier, but it was too dark to distinguish anything clearly. I was coming up a steep lonely bit of road about 300 yards from our own house, and I saw just ahead of me what looked like a person in some light clothes; it looked like a man in a smock-frock, and though it was too dark to distinguish details, the figure was distinctly light against the hedge on the side of the road. I watched the figure walking up in front of me, but thought it nothing at all strange, until at a slight bend in the road it entirely disappeared, though I looked all about for it. I was driving with my sister in a pony dog-cart; either she or I was driving, I don't remember which, but we were going only at a foot's pace.

“It was too dark to see anything but that it was a human figure moving up the hill, and keeping at about the same distance from us. I concluded it was a farm labourer, partly because this would be most probable, and partly because the upper part of the figure was lighter than the lower part, which gave the impression of its wearing a smock-frock.

“My sister was with me and saw the figure also. We knew the road was said to be haunted, but we are so accustomed to this bit of road at all hours that this fact was not at all in our minds. The figure looked so absolutely natural, that I was much surprised at its disappearance.

“This is the only time I have had this experience, though I have often come up the road in the dark since, and have always looked out for the figure.”

The other percipient, Miss M. M., writes :—

March 8th. 1892.

“One night I was driving home with my sister in a small pony cart, and I saw walking up the hill in front of us what looked like a man in a smock-frock; quite suddenly he vanished, and I thought it rather odd and that what I had seen could not have really been a man. I then found my sister had also seen the figure, and that she had the same feeling about its being mysterious.

“We were further puzzled by hearing that my father and brother had also seen the figure, and that he always vanished about the same place.

“I cannot remember who saw him first, and I have never seen him again.”

Besides the above, we have accounts from Mr. M—and his son, who have also seen on different occasions, twice each, a figure which they describe as like a man in a smock-frock, in the same place, at night, under similar circumstances, disappearing in the same mysterious way. Neither of them had heard of the experiences of any of the others until after his own.

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :—

February 25th, 1892.

“I have this evening talked over the apparition with Miss M. M—and her father. He has seen it twice at least ; she once with Miss H. M—, and her brother has recently seen it again. It is always seen in the same place and disappears suddenly at the same place. Always seen in the evening, but it has not been observed whether it is always with the moon in the same position, &c. The darkness has always been too great for distinct vision. It is difficult to suppose it a shadow because of the space over which it appears to move. But that it is some effect of light and shade is, they think, considering its uniformly appearing and disappearing in the same place and in a faint light, the most probable hypothesis.

“It seems likely that others may have seen it ; for once Miss M. M— was going up the hill in a pretty good light, following a farmer and his wife well known to her. The farmer’s wife looked round, caught sight of Miss M—, and threw herself into her husband’s arms, screaming as if with fright.

“I went over the ground of the ghost with Miss M—. Certainly seeing the place does not explain it ; it is a rather open place—hedges on each side and only a few hedgerow trees. The ghost walks about fifty yards in front of the percipients and continues visible for, say, one hundred yards, and then disappears near some farm buildings.”

The first apparition described in the next case is even more decidedly like the illusion of pp. 95-6. We have been unable to obtain first-hand evidence from the other percipients mentioned in this narrative. The appearance of a similar figure on the second occasion may have been due to expectancy, intensified by the general alarm of the household.

(588. 22.)

From Miss F. Lewitt.

The Downs, St. Neots, *February 2nd, 1892.*

“The following story has this morning been told Miss C. Cochrane [the collector] by her father’s housemaid (lately come), a quiet, steady young woman who came with a good character, and appears perfectly truthful. She was quiet and thoughtful while telling the story (assisted by questions from Miss C. Cochrane). Miss Cochrane then arranged the wording of the story and read it to Fanny Lewitt, who said it was quite right, and then signed it.

Fanny Lewitt’s Story.

“In the month of December, 1889, I was living as nurse with Mr. and Mrs. Bodley, at Alveston Hall, Nantwich, Cheshire. I was 25 years of age,

and had been there three years, first as housemaid, then as nurse. I had not heard anything about the house being haunted. One evening, shortly before Christmas, I was rocking the baby's cradle in the night-nursery at about 9 p.m., while the family were at dinner. The night-nursery opened into a passage with the school-room at the other end. The passage was partly lit by a lamp on the landing below. The night-nursery door was open at the time, and at the end of the passage I observed a strange middle-aged lady in white evening dress, with her side face towards me, standing against the school-room door, leaning her face on her hand. I watched her for a moment, and then went out to see who it was and what she wanted, but as I drew near she vanished away. I then went back to the baby, when there was the lady standing as before; I went out to her again, and again she vanished. After repeating this a third time I felt frightened, and did not look towards the door again, and I did not see the figure again that night. When I went downstairs I told the other servants what I had seen, and the housemaid then said that the governess had been complaining that some one always shook or opened her door when she was dressing for dinner, but no one could be found who had done it. The next morning, early, just before getting up, the housemaid saw a middle-aged lady in short petticoats, with something over her head, standing in the room. Two other maids slept in the room, but were not awake. The housemaid watched the apparition for a few moments, and then hid her head under the bed-clothes. About this time, the day before Christmas, the governess went away for her holidays, and the housemaid shut up her room and locked the door at night, but for several mornings afterwards, on going to unlock the door, she found it already open. She then told her mistress, and Mr. Bodley himself locked the door that night and put the key away, saying he would unlock it in the morning; but in the morning, when he went to do so, the door was open, and the key in the lock. The coachman was then put into the room to watch all night, and he said next morning that he had seen nothing, but had heard loud noises, and the door shook and the crockery rattled. The day after this, or the same evening (I forget which), at about 5.30 p.m., I again saw the same strange lady standing in the passage in the same position, only this time she was near the night-nursery door, and was wearing a morning grey dress, her profile towards me. I was carrying some linen out into the passage, and fell back startled and frightened, when the figure disappeared. I told my mistress what I had again seen, and she was so frightened that the whole family and myself left the house the next day, Sunday, January the 1st. 1890, and the servants on Monday, and did not return to it again.

“FANNY LEWITT.”

Notwithstanding the possibility of regarding the apparitions in the two cases last described as illusions, we have, on the whole, thought it right to reckon them as subjective cases of hallucination.¹

The two following cases we included with somewhat less hesitation;

¹Some cases rather similar to these were given in the *Journal* of the S.P.R., Vol. V., pp. 323-325.

although in the first there is the same feature of recurrence at a particular spot as seen from a particular point of view. But its occurrence in full daylight makes it comparatively unlikely that it was a mere illusion—especially as a similar condition of health in the percipient had been accompanied by a hallucination on a previous occasion.

(460. 14.) From Professor G.

February 11th, 1891.

“Saw an old woman with red cloak, nursing a child in her arms. She sat on a boulder. Place: a grassy moor or upland, near Shotts in Lanarkshire. Date: over twenty years ago. Early autumn, in bright sunny weather. Made several attempts to reach her, but she always vanished before I could get close up to the stone. Place far from any dwelling, and no spot where anyone could be concealed.

“[I was] walking; had been slightly troubled with insomnia—which afterwards became much worse. Age about 30.

‘No one [was with me]. I heard a vague report that a woman with red cloak was sometimes seen on the moor. Can’t now remember whether I had heard of that report before I saw the figure—but think I had not.

‘Saw many years ago (age about 21), a dog sitting beside me in my room: saw this only once: was troubled slightly with insomnia at the time, which became worse afterwards.’”

The percipient’s own view, the collector tells us, is that the experience on the moor was “entirely due to ‘nerves,’ as both then and previously when he saw the dog, he had been much overworked, and in each case a severe illness followed.”

In the next case, the fact that the percipient could go close up to the figure without its disappearing, makes it almost certain that, notwithstanding its recurrence night after night in the same place, it was a hallucination. An illusion would almost necessarily have been dispelled by so close an examination, and so complete a change in the point of view.

(643. 22.) From Mrs. Wilson, Westal, Cheltenham.

April 29th, 1892.

“I saw the figure of a ghost-like transparent draped woman always standing at a certain spot on a landing near my room at night when I passed. The apparition was exactly like a certain ghost described to me by a teller of ghost-stories. The tale was told me the night one of my babies was at death’s door.

“[I was] nursing an infant of six months, and sitting up for three weeks, in turns with my husband, with another child of 16 months, who was hopelessly ill. Health good. Age 35.

“It was merely the form told of in the ghastly story, blue, transparent, statuesque.

“I was ashamed of my weakness and spoke little of it ; it stood to meet me as I came out of my room, going up stairs, at any hour of the night, to nurse the baby. I never asked anyone to come and look at it. I often went up to it and put my hand through it, which assured me of its being merely brought [on] by my unstrung nerves, sorrow, and fatigue.

“I often think of it now as I pass, and remember the horror of it merely as a memory ; it worried me for some weeks—five or six.

“ MARY A. WILSON.”

This experience is no doubt attributable to the mental and physical strain under which the percipient was living, and its recurrence¹ in the particular spot would be accounted for by association of ideas and expectancy.

Another case of what was probably a hallucination, recurring in the same spot, will be found in *Appendix D*, in the course of an interesting hallucinatory history to which we shall have to refer more than once. The percipient, who was at the time, as it turned out, sickening for an illness, saw, whenever she looked towards it, a black dog sitting in a corner of the stairs. The case, however, differs from the last in that she appears to have seen the phantom only from a particular landing.

The following is a recurring illusion of, we believe, a rare type, its recurrence not depending on a constant objective basis. The percipient tells us that there had been a special sympathy between her and the sister spoken of.

(407. 2.)

From Miss M. H.²

November 6th, 1890.

“Always, in my room at night, the reflection of a light or of the moon, or anything white against the darkness, assumes the figure of a younger sister, who died a few years ago ; and whether she seems dressed in white or in a dark brown (and she is always in either one or the other), her hair is long and flowing, as she had not worn it for several years before her death. Except for this circumstance, which I noted with some curiosity, I always regarded it as a memory ‘materialising.’”

A case like this, though we have classed it, in accordance with the percipient’s view of it, as an illusion and not as a hallucination, seems to be almost on the line between the two, and we have introduced it here

¹ Recurrence is a feature much commoner among hallucinations experienced during some degree of ill-health than among those of normal health (see p. 164).

² Miss H. has also experienced a visual hallucination of a dying friend (see p. 250, foot-note).

to illustrate the transition.¹ It is hard to conceive how an illusion, produced under such varying conditions, should constantly assume the distinct likeness of a familiar human figure, unless the misinterpretation of sense-percepts is aided by a tendency to externalize an image with which the mind is much occupied.

The following case is similarly transitional.

(69. 14.)

From Mr. W. S.

May 24th, 1889.

“When I was about 18 or 20, I was travelling in the Highlands with my father and three other gentlemen. About ten miles on this side of Ballachulish ferry, he left me, saying that he would walk on towards the ferry, with one of the gentlemen. After half an hour’s delay, we drove on in the carriage, eagerly looking out for my father, for the night was at hand; he was a bad walker, and his comrade was a very reckless person. We saw no sign of him, nor had any one of the few travellers and shepherds whom we met. At last we got to Ballachulish; he was not there. I became painfully anxious, and sat down for a minute in the parlour of the little inn to consider what we should do. One of my hands, I remember, was pressed over my eyes. I took it away, and then I saw, floating, as it were, between me and the mantel-piece, the upper half of my father’s body.

“Do not be shocked when I tell you that the scientific element in me was too much for the religious, superstitious, affectionate—or whatever you choose to call it. I said to myself, ‘By Jove; here’s an apparition! Let’s see how it can be explained.’ So I looked steadily at my half-ghost, and saw how a spot in the mantelpiece, a knot in the wainscot, &c., &c., had combined to produce the spectral appearance. While I was doing this, the outlines became blurred, and the whole thing faded away.

“Five minutes afterwards my father arrived. He had left the road, gone up a corrie, bathed in a linn, and nearly been drowned.

“If he *had* been drowned, I should probably have believed in ghosts, or at all events in *half* ghosts, ever after.”

In this case, according to our informant’s description, the figure did not resolve itself into the marks and knots on the background

¹ A quasi-hallucinatory illusion of this sort may explain some of the extraordinary recognitions of supposed materialised spirits that are liable to occur at spiritualistic séances. The following is an instance quoted by D. D. Home (*Lights and Shadows of Spiritualism*, p. 342.) as the confession of an exposed medium:—“The first séance I held after it became known to the Rochester people that I was a medium, a gentleman from Chicago recognised his daughter Lizzie in me after I had covered my small moustache with a piece of flesh-coloured cloth, and reduced the size of my face with a shawl I had purposely hung up in the back of the cabinet. From this sitting my fame commenced to spread.”

Professor Sorley’s remarks (see p. 95) as to the resemblance of the illusory figure he saw to his brother, for whom he might have taken it if his mind had not been occupied with another idea—namely, that of a possible burglar—are instructive in this connection.

which had aided in its formation, but remained for a short time as a shadowy image while the percipient was contemplating these. The experience thus had a distinctly hallucinatory element, and we have accordingly classed it as a hallucination.

In the next case, the hallucinatory element is more obvious and predominant, though it is at first attached to a basis of actual sense-perception.

(722. 5.)

From Mme. A. H.

(The account was apparently written in 1891.)

“C’était en l’année 1884, Mme. A—H—, alors jeune fille de 20 ans, demeurait avec sa mère, veuve, à Moseou. La sœur aînée d’A—, Mme. H—S—, dont le mari était malade depuis quelque temps, occupait une autre maison non loin de là. Le malade mourut la nuit du 23 Mai, et sa mort attrista profondément toute la famille qui l’adorait. Le lendemain de ce jour, A— se trouvait au salon de sa mère, où sa sœur venue chez elles s’était endormie dans un fauteuil. Il était environ 8 heures du soir, et le jour commençait à baisser. Les pensées de la jeune fille étaient tristes, et se portaient au défunt, dont le corps n’était pas encore enterré, et posé dans son cercueil, restait encore au logement qu’il avait habité. Le regard d’A— tomba sur le rideau en tulle qui masquait la fenêtre, et dans les plis de ce rideau elle vit apparaître la figure de son beau-frère. L’apparition très indistincte d’abord se fit plus nette, et bientôt A— vit distinctement son beau-frère de la tête aux pieds dans son habit de tous les jours. Il paraissait regarder sa femme qui continuait à dormir. D’un geste silencieux A— l’invita à s’approcher de la dormeuse, mais l’apparition fit de la tête un signe négatif et disparut.”

In the following case, analogous to crystal-vision, the same kind of thing occurs—the real reflections in the carafe serving as a basis for what ultimately becomes a definite hallucinatory vision. (The first experience is somewhat different, but it is convenient to give the whole narrative intact).

(406. 25.)

From Mr. W. A. C.

May 9th, 1891.

“Some few weeks ago I was at a Spiritualist service. An uneducated man was reading a very long and rather wearisome account of how he felt when in a trance. I thought I would improve the time by looking for visions, which it seemed a good Spiritualist ought to see. I fixed my attention on a darkened space under the table, and near it was the foot of the reader. This you can take as the *suggestion*, for suddenly I saw another foot near it in the air. The upper part was outlined in light and the marks of the lacing were also short lines of light. The whole foot was, however, perfectly distinct. It was not unlike the real foot near it, which was about eighteen inches distant. I gave a sudden start, which showed me that I was getting into a semi-unconscious state with my eyes open and fixed, and the start was to shake it off.

“I then turned my attention to a round-globed carafe of water on the table, still in search of visions. Presently the various reflections in it took [a] form, [sketch enclosed] [which] reminded me of the view from my native place in the West Indies, only there should have been a line of sea. This I looked for, and presently it came. While thinking how remarkably like to the reality it was, (and, perhaps, also thinking of ships on the sea, though I am not conscious now of having done so), I suddenly saw a vessel which seemed to be shipwrecked. And now a curious chain of thought went leisurely through my mind, as I critically surveyed the scene. The ship seemed in full sail and was heeling over as shown. Now I had been to sea and I knew the following. A sailing ship had no right to be so near the land unless an off-shore wind was blowing. But if so, how did it get wrecked? The only conclusion possible was that it had been sailing near to the land with an off-shore wind, and had struck on a hidden rock. This seemed certain, for, had it been otherwise, the ship should have been heeling over *to* the land, and not from it. Also, the wreck was not caused by a storm, or the ship would not have been under full sail, and besides, the sea appeared calm. All seemed to turn on which way the wind had been blowing, and this I wanted to find out. I turned my attention to the dark foreground to see if there were any trees waving in the wind, but they appeared too far away to give a clue. I looked again at the ship, still speculating, when suddenly I saw what looked like a small cloud of vapour streaming from it. It was of a grey colour, though I do not think it was meant for smoke or steam. It seemed to be only a sign to me that the wind must be blowing in the direction in which it was drifting.

“No sooner had I accepted this as the answer to my query, than the whole scene vanished. All the lines in the glass seemed to run swiftly together, and as I looked, they took the form of a face. At first it had a painful look, such as I saw once on the face of a drowned man; but presently it got clearer, and I thought I knew it. It was sloping thus. This, perhaps, directed my attention to the fact that it was the face of a man who was sitting [on one side of it]. It was not a reflection of him, for in a globe such could only be in miniature, and this filled the glass; besides, when it vanished, as it did as soon as I had made sure of it, there was no such reflection there, and I could not even imagine one. The man I had never spoken to.

“All the above happened when I was wide awake and quite conscious of my whereabouts.”

Cases such as these suggest that it is easier to build up a hallucination from something of the nature of an illusion, than to make it up independently of all external objects. And experiments support this view. It is often easier to induce a hypnotised person to take a real object for something entirely different, which the hypnotiser wishes him to see hallucinatorily, than it is to give him an independent hallucination. He will often, too, when a hallucination is imposed, spontaneously attach it to something real—to what MM. Binet and Féré call a *point de repère*.

In connection with this, we may refer to some experiments which Mr. W. A. Dixey, the well-known optician of New Bond-street, has recently carried out with "Miss X.", on the effect of different kinds of lenses on her crystal visions, the conditions being arranged so that she did not know the normal effects of the lenses on real objects.¹ In 5 out of 8 experiments, the crystal pictures changed in appearance in the same way that real objects would have done on applying the lenses, but in the other three the changes that followed in the pictures on applying the lenses were not those that would have been produced in real objects.

Mr. Dixey has since repeated these experiments, under as nearly as possible the same conditions, with Mrs. Verrall, who found, on applying the lenses, that her crystal pictures either disappeared or remained unaffected, except in one case, where a temporary enlargement of the picture—which was not the normal effect of the lens—took place. These negative results are of special interest, because Mrs. Verrall, unlike most crystal-seers, is conscious of using *points de repère* in her visions, and informs us that on this occasion they were more conspicuous to her than usual when the pictures began to develop, though, as usual, she lost sight of them when the pictures became fully formed.

The part played by the *point de repère* may be further illustrated from some experiments made by Mrs. Sidgwick in 1889, and described from notes made at the time, as follows:—

The object of the experiments was to ascertain whether a moving hallucination would be attached to a *point de repère*, and, if so, how it would be managed. The person experimented with was a boy named Goade, who was hypnotised by Mr. G. A. Smith. Goade having been made to see a beetle on a (real) sheet of plain black paper spread out before him, was asked to point to it, upon which he pointed to a minute white speck in the texture of the paper. He was then with great difficulty persuaded that the beetle was running about, and when he did realise this, he traced its course from one tiny white speck to another. Whether he saw it between the

¹ See *Borderland* for January, 1894. The lenses were fitted into four pairs of eye-glasses, and, with normal binocular sight, their respective effects on real objects at the given distance would have been: (A) to duplicate the object vertically, (B) to blur it, (C) no effect, (D) to duplicate the object horizontally. Mr. Dixey handed the lenses to "Miss X.", and the eight experiments were as follows: (1) A. gave distance. (2) B, the picture disappeared, but after about a minute the colours became intenser, and the shadows more defined. (3) C., no difference. (4) D. duplicated the picture horizontally. (5) A. duplicated it vertically. (6) A. lowered part of the picture. (7) D. moved it to the right. (8) B. the picture disappeared. In experiments (3) (4) and (5) the results were what they would have been on real objects, while in (6) and (7) they were what they would have been if the right eye only had been looking at a real object. In (1) (2) and (8) the effects were not similar to what would have been produced on real objects.

specks seemed doubtful, for when asked to follow it with his finger, he moved the finger rapidly in a straight line between the almost invisible white specks and paused at the specks. There was, however, one thing that looked as if he saw the beetle in continuous movement, namely, that having been told to take care that it did not run off the paper, he from time to time, while seemingly watching it, snatched at the edges of the paper, as though to turn the insect back. The paper, it should be said, was an ordinary sheet of what would generally be called quite black paper, without marks on it. It required somewhat close observation to notice the specks.

On a subsequent occasion Goade was given a hallucination of a teetotum spinning on a (real) sheet of white paper that lay before him. He was easily made to see the teetotum, and to revive its spinning from time to time by spinning it with his fingers. Mrs. Sidgwick continues:—"I asked him to point it out to me, and he then identified a very tiny black smut as it. I blew this away, upon which he looked about, saying the teetotum had disappeared. I advised him to look on the floor for it, and while he was doing so, placed a scrap of black paper about $\frac{1}{8}$ inch square on the white paper, and said 'Oh! here it is.' He accepted it at once and said 'And ain't it grown!' As we blew the scrap of paper about, he followed it with excitement, and when it fell on the floor, picked it up to replace it on the paper, and spun it in imagination more than once, holding his finger and thumb above it in doing so. With a little trouble, I succeeded in removing it, and making him take a speck of dust for the teetotum instead, and when that was blown away, I pointed to an empty space on the paper, and told him the teetotum was there. He accepted this after a moment or two, and then, I think, saw his teetotum moving about freely, and *not* attached to particular specks."

Of course in experiments of this kind, it is a little difficult to feel sure how far the hallucination went, and how far it was supplemented by the kind of imagination a child exercises when it uses a walking-stick for a horse. There was not such conclusive evidence of hallucination in this case as one sometimes has with hypnotic subjects. The words and gestures of Goade, however, left no doubt at the time on the minds of the spectators that he saw a hallucinatory teetotum.

It seems not improbable that the reason why gazing at a reflecting surface, or into a refracting body like a crystal, is found in practice to be a way of inducing hallucinations is that convenient *points de repère* without enough meaning of their own to distract attention are thus obtained. Such reflecting surfaces are also apparently favourable to spontaneous hallucinations. We have seventeen instances in the present Census of hallucinations seen in reflecting surfaces, which seems a large proportion out of the whole number.¹

¹ Of these, one was seen in a ship's compass, No. 452. 10. (see p. 238), one in a carafe of water, No. 406. 25. (see p. 106), five in mirrors—(for an instance, see p. 187), and ten in windows of which the two sides were unequally lighted, the figure appearing on the darker side, *e.g.* No. 728. 16. (see p. 309).

But, though *points de repère* may facilitate the formation of a hallucination, there is no ground for supposing that every hallucination is capable of being regarded as a kind of monstrous illusion. Mr. Gurney pointed out in *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. I., pp. 470-472), how difficult it is to apply such a hypothesis to a ghost standing in the middle of the room or moving across it, and the present collection certainly supports the view that many hallucinations are entirely independent of *points de repère*, since, in more than half of the visual cases, the figure is seen to move in various ways.

The following case, which is quite a typical one of a moving hallucinatory figure, may be taken as an instance.

(400. 16.)

From Mr. A. E.

March 23rd, 1891.

“I saw my mother pass from the hall into the card-room which communicated both with the hall and the drawing-room. This occurred in 1880 in Valparaiso (Chilé), the time being about seven in the evening. I was standing at the piano, singing, and was in no way out of health or anxious. My age would be 14. So struck was I by her going into this room that I stopped singing and called her name; on going into the room it was empty, and I found my mother sitting in the dining-room. My sister was playing for me, and remarked that I must be dreaming, as she saw nothing. I never experienced anything since or before.”

The collector made further enquiries of Mr. E. as to the details of his experience, and wrote to us as follows:—

“Mr. E. was in the drawing-room [at] the piano, when his mother passed within a yard of where he sat. He says he saw her distinctly pass him and enter the card-room, which said card-room led out of the drawing [room], the drawing-room itself opening on to the hall. The card-room was in darkness, so he got up, followed the figure, and asked: ‘What are you doing there in the dark, mother?’ No voice responding, he immediately went and found his mother in the dining-room, which dining-room opened from opposite side of hall. She, his mother, laughed, and told him he must have been dreaming; but he certainly was much impressed by the vision, and has still a most vivid picture of it in his own mind. His eyesight was, and is, very good.”

The question whether an experience is a hallucination or an illusion is from the nature of the case more difficult to decide in auditory than in visual cases. Illusions of hearing are extremely common, partly because of the difficulty of localising accurately the sources of sounds, and partly because the acoustic properties of any locality—especially any building—are so complicated that it is, in most cases, practically impossible to know what the limits of hearing by ordinary means are. One cannot in any case see through a brick wall, but

whether one can hear through it or not depends on a number of conditions, which are not easy to determine. Further, the capacity of the ear for hearing varies a good deal at different times in the same person; and a hyperæsthetic state of the ear—such as is reported to occur sometimes in the hypnotic state, and in certain cases of illness—might extend the ordinary limits of hearing in a way that could not be paralleled by any known form of hyperæsthesia of vision, because of the different nature of the obstacles to perception in the two cases.

We are therefore inclined to allow considerable scope to the possibility that supposed auditory hallucinations are real sounds misinterpreted. This applies especially, among the kinds included in the Census, to the type that we have distinguished as “voices,”—*i.e.*, the hearing of vocal sounds, where definite words do not appear to have been heard. It also applies in some degree to hearing the name called, since we are so much accustomed to having our attention drawn by this means that we are probably always—unconsciously—more or less on the watch for it, and may therefore be liable to interpret as such any sound indistinctly heard. It should be observed, however, that the probability of illusion is decidedly less where the voice heard is recognised—especially if it is that of a deceased or absent person.

In some tactile cases, it is also difficult to draw the line between hallucination and illusion. Involuntary muscular twitches, for instance, may give rise to tactile sensations like those ordinarily produced by contact with an external body, and the absence of such a cause for the sensations could hardly ever be demonstrated. Thus one percipient (Dr. J. W., No. 81. 9.) writes:—“I have felt a slight sensation as of my shoulder being touched, which is entirely due to muscular action.” The next case may also be very plausibly put down to a similar cause, but as it is impossible to prove that the experience was thus produced, we have thought it best to include both these cases in our tables as hallucinations of the purely subjective class.

(50. 12.)

From Mr. W. B.

April 16th, 1892.

“About 2 years ago, age 33, good health, though working hard, I was going home from college, and being in a hurry I took a tram car to within 200 yards of my lodgings. I then left the car and walked smartly about 100 yards, when I thought I felt some one touch me on the shoulder as if [he] wanted to speak to me. The impression was so vivid that I stopped suddenly and looked round, when there was no person even near me. I thought it strange and began thinking what it could have been. So rummaging through my mind for a physical cause (it never for a moment struck me then, nor even now, that it was ultra-physical) I remembered that I had sat on the top of the car with my back leaning against an iron bolt; and so at once concluded that it was simply a muscular contraction due to the

pressure of the bolt. The impression of being touched by some one was very vivid, and I remembered it at once when the form (A) [was put] into my hand."

The possibility of illusion is not entirely excluded in some of the cases where the impression is made on more than one sense, especially when the affection of one of the senses is of an indefinite or rudimentary kind; for instance, when non-vocal sounds, as foot-steps, are heard accompanying an apparition. In 56 out of these cases, the sound—of raps, foot-steps, doors being opened, etc.—was heard first, and we think it probable that it may sometimes have been a real sound, which led to the seeing of the apparition through expectancy.¹ In a few cases the probability that the sounds were real is considerably increased by the fact that they were heard by more than one person, only one seeing the apparition afterwards.

¹ This point is further discussed, with illustrations in Chapter X.

CHAPTER VI.

FORM AND DEVELOPMENT OF HALLUCINATIONS.

One of the facts brought out most strongly by our Tables is the tendency of hallucinations to assume familiar forms. The ghastly or horrible apparitions dear to writers of romance seem to be very rare among healthy grown-up people¹—at least, among those who are educated. The great majority of hallucinations are like the sights we are accustomed to see, or the sounds we are accustomed to hear, and even when they are not so, they often suggest, as we shall see, a sort of incompleteness in a hallucination of a natural object, rather than a hallucination representing something unnatural. In the exceptional cases where the hallucination does represent a non-natural being, we find it assuming the conventional form. An angel, for instance, takes the form with which art has familiarised us, and we should be surprised to find one appearing to a grown-up person arrayed in “blue boots”—like those seen by Mrs. D. when a child (see *Appendix D.*)

Most visual hallucinations represent human beings,² and most of these resemble human beings of the present day in all respects. According to our statistics, more than two-fifths of the realistic human apparitions represent living persons known to the percipient, and, of these, 45 per cent. represent inmates of the same house as the percipient, or persons frequently, or (in a few cases) very recently, seen by him, while in another 20 per cent. they represent near relatives of his—that is, parents, grandparents, children, husbands, wives, brothers or sisters. We have included among hallucinations representing familiar figures the comparatively small class of cases (seven in our collection) in which the percipient sees his own apparition. For an instance of this see No. 555. 5 (p. 74).

In the great majority of realistic cases, the apparition represents a single figure only, though there are exceptions. A very peculiar case of the contrary is No. 464. 15 (Miss Dodson's case in Chapter XVII).

As far as the reports as to dress enable us to judge, phantoms, both recognised and unrecognised, generally appear in ordinary modern dress, and do not affect old-fashioned costumes any more than real people do. When they move, which, as we have said (p. 110), happens

¹ Of the 33 cases classed by us as “grotesque, horrible, or monstrous,” more than half were experienced by children, and 3 others by persons not in their normal state of health. Among the 23 cases excluded from the Tables because they occurred during illness of the percipient, 4 are “grotesque.”

² In the present collection, 830 out of 1,112 do so. Mr. Gurney found that in his collection, out of 302 subjective visual hallucinations, only 20 represented objects other than human beings. (See *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. 1, p. 503).

more often than not, the movement is almost always such as we are accustomed to see. The phantom stands on the ground and appears to walk along the ground, and seems to leave the field of vision as a human being would, by walking out of an open door or passing behind some obstacle. A position impossible for real persons,—such as being up in the air,—when the figure is otherwise realistic, is very rare. We have only one instance of it. The proverbial gliding movement, supposed to be characteristic of apparitions, is rarely reported. (For an instance, see No. 256. 17, p. 310.) Appearance or disappearance by an unrealistic means is also rare, though there are about a dozen cases in our collection in which the ghost seems to enter or leave a room through a wall, book-case, closed door, or window, or by passing up through the ceiling or down through the floor.

Even when a phantom is stationary, it does not usually either suddenly appear out of empty space, or similarly vanish before the percipient's eyes, but is generally seen by the percipient on turning his eyes that way, and vanishes, he does not know how, or when he is looking away. There are, however, instances of sudden appearance and disappearance in free space. See, for instance, No. 118. 20 (*Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 462.) Again in No. 338. 20 (see p. 261), the percipient "simply ceased to see the figure;" and the following is another case of this sudden disappearance, which happened in a clear space and in good light.

(243. 14.)

From Mrs. M.

(The account was written in 1889.)

"At —, in Dorsetshire, at one o'clock in the day, about 1866, on going into my bedroom just before lunch, I found an old gentleman sitting on the sofa, dressed in a sort of shooting costume of grey tweed with gaiters; his hands were clasped in his lap and his head bent down: the figure appeared perfectly natural, and I looked at it for several seconds in surprise, thinking it was someone who had mistaken the room, when it suddenly disappeared, which alarmed me so that I ran out of the room, and related the experience.

"I was paying a visit to my uncle, who had lived in the house for several years. I was in perfect health and spirits.

"The impression was that of a complete stranger.

"There were no other persons present at the time, but my aunt afterwards told me she had had a similar experience in the same room; and that the maids would not enter it alone because the bell rang occasionally when it was unoccupied."¹

¹ As we have not been able to obtain first-hand evidence from the other percipient mentioned, we have not felt justified in treating this case as anything more than a subjective hallucination.

An instance of a nearly, but not quite, sudden disappearance of this kind occurs in the case quoted on p. 74 (No. 661. 5) and another will be found in the course of Mrs. D.'s account of her experiences (*Appendix D*).

In the following case, in which, if the account is accurate, the cause is *primâ facie* telepathic, the process is slightly different.

(692. 2.)

From Mr. G. Q.

April, 1892.

"Early in November, 1879, as I was walking up Collins-street, Melbourne, Australia, about four o'clock in the afternoon, I was amazed to see, amongst a number of people on the other side of the street, a very intimate friend, whom I believed to be in New Zealand at the time.

"I ran across the street to speak to him ; and, as I neared the kerb-stone, it seemed that a hand was passed momentarily before my eyes, its direction being downwards. In that instant my chum was gone ; and, though I looked everywhere round me, and could distinguish others I had seen before the curious darkness, I never saw him again. About three weeks after, I learned that he died that very day and hour, (Nov. 3rd or 5th, about four o'clock : I cannot remember the exact date). I was, of course, broad awake. I was also in the best of health and spirits ; not thinking of my friend, and never dreaming of meeting him in Melbourne."

Changes of Form.

Though realistic apparitions are usually realistic from first to last, some pass through stages in the course of development or of disappearance, which, on the assumption that both the initial and final stages are constructed by the mind of the percipient, stand in need of some explanation.

In some cases it may be reasonably supposed that one stage of the hallucination creates an expectation of the next, which tends to work itself out. This probably often happens, for instance, in cases where more than one sense is affected and where a sense of presence precedes the seeing of a ghost. The effect of expectation will be more fully discussed in Chapter X.

In other cases, the whole process is like what we are familiar with in dreams, one idea or image leading on to another by transitions outside the conscious thought of the percipient. The following are instances of this :—

(39. 3.)

From Miss E. A.

October 2nd, 1891.

"I saw a figure standing by my bed. I had been awake some time. It was a summer morning, about 5 o'clock, and I saw the figure quite distinctly. It was tall and dressed in something grey, falling in long folds. The face was kind and I was not frightened at first, but it suddenly changed and the whole

figure and face, as it were, fell to pieces in the most ghastly manner and vanished. I was about 22. It must be nine years since it [happened].”

(150. 4.)

From Mrs. L. H.

November 2, 1891.

“I think the vision that I am about to describe occurred in March, 1891. I was asleep, when I woke with a start, it then being early morning. On looking round the room, I distinctly saw the head of a skeleton floating in the air, about a foot from the ceiling. I gazed at it intently (being now quite awake), when I saw it gradually change to my mother’s head and face and float away, seemingly through the ceiling. My age [was] 35.”

The process of development is less easy to explain in some other cases—those, for instance (four in our collection) in which an indefinite cloud-like form is first seen, and then a clearly defined figure, either developing out of it or appearing in the midst of it. It may perhaps be compared to the process of groping after an idea in thinking out a difficult subject;—the idea comes to us vaguely at first, and only gradually acquires definiteness. An instance of this is No. 458. 9. (see p. 322) and the following is another.

(495. 6.)

From Mrs. Gordon Jones.

Cheam Lodge, Anerley, Surrey, November 4th, 1891.

“In the autumn of 1881 a party of young people and myself determined on All Hallow’s Eve to play at the childish game of sitting separately in dark rooms, with supper laid for two, with the intention of awaiting the appearance of a future husband or wife. Thinking the whole thing a joke, and not in the least expecting to see anything—alone—I distinctly saw—first a filmy cloud which rose up at the other end of the room—then the head and shoulders of a man, middle-aged, stout, with iron-grey hair and blue eyes—not in the least the picture which a young girl would *imagine* she saw on such an occasion.

“[I was] in perfect health and spirits. Age 17.”

It may be added that the gentleman whom the percipient subsequently married had no resemblance to this apparition, not even in regard to the colour of his eyes. Two or three years before, Mrs. Jones had had another experience, in which the apparition went through a similar process of gradual development, and a third experience of hers is given on p. 127. †

A few more or less similar cases are given in *Phantasms of the Living* (e.g., Vol. II., p. 176 and p. 182), and with some crystal-seers the pictures seen go through similar stages of development. Mr. Myers, in fact, mentions the process as one generally characteristic of crystal visions. (*Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. VIII., p. 478.) Miss A. says (*Op. cit.* Vol. VIII., p. 500): “After a minute or two, I seem to see a very bright light in [the crystal], which disappears after a few seconds, and then the surface appears cloudy and thick. This mist clears

away, and I see sometimes views, sometimes faces, sometimes letters. . . They only last for a few seconds or sometimes minutes, and between each new picture I see the same light and then mist."

Another case somewhat similar to those given above, but where the development is even more gradual, is No. 328. 5 (see p. 235).

In other cases, a vague shadowy form is first seen, which gradually acquires definiteness. Some instances are given in *Phantasms of the Living* (e.g., Vol. I., p. 526 and p. 527). The following is the only case exactly of this kind in the Census:—

(607. 1.)

From Mr. T. A.

May 9th, 1892.

"I saw a darkish vapour leave my father's head when he died, about 12 years ago, and it formed into a figure, full-sized, and for seven consecutive nights [I] saw it in my own room and saw it go each night into the next room, in which he died. It became more distinct each night and brighter each night, till it was quite brilliant, even dazzling, by the seventh night. It lasted, say, $1\frac{1}{2}$ minutes. It was dark when the phantom used to appear. I was quite awake, going to bed; [age] 32."

In some cases, what is first seen is a glow of light—the apparition subsequently appearing in it. See, for example, No. 290. 3. (p. 293), and No. 33. 25. (printed in *Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. V., p. 462).

It is possible that in some cases where the initial impression is vague, it may really be of the nature of an illusion, which works itself out into a definite sensory hallucination owing to the habitual impulse to interpret our sensory impressions definitely: but we have not any clear evidence of this.

Gradual disappearance is, perhaps, rather more common than gradual appearance, and sometimes similar stages are passed through, as will have been noticed in examples already quoted. More often the percipient simply tells us that the phantom "gradually disappears," by which we must probably understand a gradual fading and becoming indistinct, as the real objects, temporarily obscured for the mind by the phantom, reassert themselves. This is sometimes described by saying that the apparition becomes transparent. Possibly No. 69. 14, (see p. 105), is an instance of this; and the following (a case originally belonging to Mr. Gurney's Census) is a very interesting one.

From Dr. H. C.

June 29th, 1889.

"In the year 1863, (I think I could find out the very day and year, with a little trouble. It was a Tuesday, five days before the death of a lady whom I used to connect in my mind with my vision. But I did not do this when I related my story in the morning after, nor till after the death of the lady; and I now reject this connection as a fanciful *addendum*.)

being about 26 years old, I was sleeping alone, without having indulged in any heavy supper. I woke up suddenly and with my wits all about me, but with a clear feeling that somebody was in the room. There was enough light to make things perceptibly visible, and that was all. There was no moonlight streaming in to cause lights and shadows. As I started up and raised myself on my elbow, I saw a tall lady in a rich black dress (silk I think, with black beads and a train behind,—I knew once, but I have forgotten,) looking steadily at me with a most gentle, meditating gaze. About 40, I should say. I now say that I [did] not at all recognise the face. There was a far-away look in her eyes, and I felt as if she had been reading me through. She rested the elbow of one hand in the palm of the other, and in the first hand there was a little duodecimo volume with rubric and, I think, ‘black letter.’ I was entirely calm, eagerly interested, but rather scientifically than imaginatively. I pinched myself to find out if I was really awake. I took my watch and held it to my ear to hear whether it was ticking. I tried my pulse, which was normal. I then said aloud (in order to test my sobriety and calmness), ‘This is an optical delusion. I shall now put my hand through this appearance.’ I did so, and my hand went through as it would through water, (only without the slightest sensation,) the clothes kept their folds and position (as water keeps its level) making no break. My hand with the white night-shirt sleeve was wholly hid, and when I withdrew it, there was no hole left behind, any more than when one withdraws one’s hand from water. After some 40 or 50 seconds I saw a straight white line crossing the figure. I could not make out what it was, till I perceived the apparition was slowly vanishing away in its place, and the white line was the top of my towel on the towel-horse behind. Bit by bit the white towel and other dimmer objects in the room came into sight, behind what was becoming a faint mist. In about 20 seconds it had completely vanished.”

This interpretation of gradual disappearance—that it is due to real objects of vision reasserting themselves—seems the most natural one. We can hardly suppose that it is due to the idea going through an indefinite stage, which seems a possible explanation of gradual appearance. On the other hand, the gradual appearance of a hallucination would be likely to create an expectation of its gradual disappearance, and so bring it about by suggestion. This may account for the hallucinations which disappear through the same stages as those they pass through in appearing, as in No. 290. 3 (see p. 293). A change into a cloud-like form in the course of disappearance does not, so far as we know, occur when the same modification has not occurred in the course of development.

Many hallucinations never attain a completely realistic form;—their development is, as it were, arrested, and they remain in some sense incomplete to the end. These are included in the class of “incompletely developed apparitions” in our Tables, but they are of various kinds. There are (*a*) the transparent or shadowy figures, which seem to represent a perfectly definite idea, but, as sensory

hallucinations, fail to assert themselves completely among the real objects of vision. There are 33 of these cases. In only 12 of them is the figure definitely described as "transparent," in whole or in part; "shadowy," however, is probably sometimes used in this sense (in the case, for instance, of "a shadowy black dog"); and possibly "misty" may sometimes mean semi-transparent, as well as colourless. It seems possible that in some of the cases in which a transparent apparition was motionless, it may have been an illusion, rather than a hallucination. But other cases of motionless transparent apparitions seem to be clearly genuine hallucinations, for instance, No. 643. 22 (see p. 103) and No. 402. 8 (see p. 284). In five out of the twelve cases also, the transparent figure was seen to move in such a way as to make it almost certain that it could not have been an illusion. The following is an instance of this kind:—

(546. 19.)

From Mr. G. B. L.¹

(The account was written in 1891.)

"[I saw] a figure of a man which was perfectly transparent, and which came into the room and sat down on a chair by my side. It was about ten years ago. I was in bed and had been suffering from severe illness, which had affected my head. My wife [was present]. She saw nothing, though I mentioned it to her."

For another case of a moving transparent figure see No. 49. 5, p. 143.²

Secondly, there are—among incompletely-developed apparitions—(b) cases where the incompleteness of the figure seen seems to be due to the vagueness of the idea underlying it. This is the natural explanation of very rudimentary and vaguely defined figures, such as No. 554. 13 (see p. 268) and Nos. 49. 2 and 3 (see p. 312). But it is probably also applicable to cases where the figure is distinct, but completely veiled or shrouded, so that no details of features or hands are perceived. The following are instances:—

(233. 7.)

From Miss A. F. K.

May, 1889.

"[About 14 years ago] I was awakened in the middle of the night with very acute pain in the middle of my back; I sat up in bed and saw a

¹ This case is not included in our Tables, and, therefore, is not one of the twelve cases just mentioned, because it occurred during an illness of the percipient's, to which it may have been due.

² In another case, a semi-transparent figure, dressed in a black hat, surtout and blue waistcoat, was seen in the middle of the day to emerge from a wall, cross part of a garden, and disappear into the opposite wall, and a short time after come out and retrace its steps, disappearing finally into the first wall. But the percipient is not included in the Tables, because he was only twenty at the time he answered the Census question.

draped and shrouded figure standing near me ; the face I could not see, it was shrouded ; the arms were crossed and the head bent—it did not move nor speak, but gradually faded. It was a light night and there was *no drapery* about the bed, nor about the room, to account for it.

“I was in good health and in no sort of anxiety—about 25 years old at the time.

“As I could not see the face, I could not recognise the person ; but was so fully awake that I thought it might be some one with a message to me, and sat quietly waiting for it to speak ; this it did not do.

“I was alone.

“I have not seen anything of the sort at any other time.”

(190. 15.)

From Miss H. T.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“I have seen a figure three times. I cannot remember the exact dates ; the figure appeared to me between the years 1867 and '76. The form appeared each time directly I got into bed. I have always been in good health. [It] always appeared in the same way ; that is, on getting into bed and putting the light out, there would be a sort of movement in the air, which gradually took the form of mist and then developed into a dark veiled figure, which came nearer to me and when bending over and about to touch me I threw my hands into it, and it vanished. Until it was almost touching me, my terror was so great that I could neither call my sister, who was asleep beside me, nor move hand or foot. I am pretty nearly certain that I was 17 when I first saw the figure ; the last time I do not remember, excepting that I was over 18 and most probably over 20. I don't remember about the light, excepting that there was enough for me to see everything plainly.”

This last case is an interesting example of gradual development from the mere impression of a movement in the air up to the incomplete form which the hallucination finally reaches.

A third group of incompletely developed apparitions—that, namely, in which the face or head of the figure is indistinct—seems to belong to the class where the idea represented is probably vague. The following is an instance :—

(68. 25.)

From Mrs. A. W. Verrall.

March 12th, 1887.

“One evening about the middle or end of September, 1879, as I was washing my hands in a little room at the end of the passage leading to the front door, at 24, Vernon Terrace, Brighton, I heard footsteps, and looking up saw a little old lady coming towards me. She was dressed in a dark dress gathered round the waist in full folds, a grey knitted shawl over her shoulders fastened with a brooch in front, and a cap. I did not see her face, although she was walking towards me. I knew at once that it was a hallucination, but was neither startled nor alarmed. The figure disappeared before reaching the room where I was. During the next two or three weeks, I saw ‘my old lady,’ as I called her, more than once—always facing me, and in the

act of approaching. I am not sure how many times I saw her at Brighton, but I can distinctly remember three occasions beside the first, and have an impression that there were others. I spoke of her to my mother and sister, and though I usually saw her when I was alone, I remember once seeing her when my sister and I were sitting in the dining-room. Gradually I came to see further details—the brooch fastening the shawl was like a circular brooch with a hole in the centre worn by my great-grandmother, Mrs. Watkins, who had died some ten years before. In the end I called the figure my great-grandmother, but I never saw the face.

“I came back to Cambridge on October 13, and entirely forgot my hallucination, till one evening, as I was going upstairs to my room, I heard footsteps coming along the passage at the top of the house, and looking to the left (instead of turning to the right to my room) to see who it was, saw my old lady coming towards me. There was no one else in the passage; the gas was lighted, and I saw the figure plainly. This was the last time I saw it. On the first and last occasions of my seeing the figure, I had heard the sound of footsteps, on the intermediate occasions the impression was only visual. The figure always took its place in the surroundings (*i.e.*, hid the things behind it), and was always in movement—coming towards me; the only odd thing about it was that I never saw the face—there seemed a blank within the cap. I ought to say that although at the time I saw the figure I had no reason to suppose that I was not well, I had had a short illness in Switzerland some two weeks earlier, due, it was thought, to over fatigue, after some weeks of considerable strain in other respects.

“M. DE G. VERRALL.”

Of the three different groups which we thus place in class (*b*) of incompletely developed apparitions, there are in our collection 21 of the first, 19 of the second, and 6 of the third.

The remaining hallucinations included among the incompletely developed apparitions are incompletely developed in a different sense. The great majority of them (47 cases) represent parts only of human bodies, and it is merely on account of their fragmentary character that we have thus classified them; since the percept, as far as it goes, is distinct and definite, and there is no reason to think that the mental impression which gave rise to it is in any way vague, though it certainly seems in some cases to be freakish and dream-like.

Instances in which the head or face is represented are No. 495. 6 (see p. 116), No. 69. 14 (see p. 105), and No. 191. 3 (see p. 240). The following is another which also illustrates a process of piecemeal development unique in our collection.

(80. 7.)

From Miss G. O.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“I saw in 1871 [when aged about 12] the face of an aged woman which was grey and thin. The features formed themselves one by one—first one eye and then the other and so on. It disappeared in the way it came,

leaving a blue mist. The face was decidedly ugly and unhappy looking. I had just got into bed and extinguished my candle. . . . I saw in 1874 a very pretty child's face; it appeared in exactly the same way as the other. On each occasion the apparition appeared on my left side."

In 15 cases a hand, or hand and arm only, are represented (see No. 579. 25, p. 241), and in three cases, legs. These fragments are seldom recognised as the limbs of any particular person, though it happens that the instance of a hand quoted, as well as one instance of legs, are exceptional in this respect. The following is another case:—

(460. 12.)

From Dr. C. G. H.

August 22nd, 1891.

"Place, Osmaston Park, Derbyshire. Autumn of 1870 (somewhere about then), about 7 p.m. I was crossing the park with my brother, 2 years younger than myself, and saw distinctly as it were two black legs walking towards us; so much so that I stopped and called my brother's attention to them; he failed to see anything. I pointed where they were and then they vanished. We walked to the spot, as it appeared to me, about 10 yards off and could see nothing, neither did we hear anything. I saw the legs most distinctly and went next morning to see the spot, so vivid was my recollection. As regards daylight, it was clear and only just getting dusk. [I was] simply going to the post, in good health, no grief or anxiety; 17 years of age.

"My brother could not see anything, though I pointed to the legs and saw them at the time I pointed.

"I had time to see them and stop walking, *point* to them, and say to my brother, 'Look! there they are, two legs. Can't you see them?' and they were then gone."

Dr. H. adds later:—

"The legs ended abruptly, absolutely abruptly. I could make out no body or semblance of one. The vision was most vivid and I have never experienced anything similar. The evening was darkish, but perfectly clear and bright."

We have thought it convenient to class with incompletely developed apparitions, instead of making a separate heading for them, five cases of hallucinations which do not appear solid, but are like a picture, or seem to be projected on a flat surface. The following is a case of this kind:—

(707. 1.)

From Mrs. B.

December 11th, 1891.

"I distinctly saw my mother's face upon the wall; it smiled and passed along the wall and faded away. The time was a little before eight o'clock p.m., on August 4th, 1837.

"I was saying my prayers before going to bed. I was in good health and had no worry. I was nine years old.

“I afterwards heard that my mother died at that time in London. I was at Ramsgate.”

Mrs. B. states that this is the only hallucinatory experience she has ever had.

Miss Porter writes :—

“I called upon Mrs. B. on December 18th, [1891]. As the experience took place so long ago and no corroboration is now possible, I did not ask for an account in narrative form.

“Mrs. B. described the apparition as exactly like a coloured picture of her mother, head and shoulders, which passed along the wall and faded. She did not mention what she had seen to anyone, and the following evening an aunt of hers arrived from London to tell her that her mother was dead. The aunt had started that morning by the steamer, the death having taken place the previous evening. On her return home the child told her father what she had seen. He asked her what time it was, and on her replying that it was nearly 8 p.m., he said that her mother died at a quarter to eight, and that the last thing she had done was to speak of her one little daughter, and beg him to take care of her.

“Mrs. B. at the time was in no sort of anxiety about her mother. There was a baby expected (which the child did not know) and the mother had been unwell, but the week previously an aunt had been at Ramsgate and had told the child that her mother would now soon be well and would be coming to stay for a time at Ramsgate.”

The cloud-like forms which hallucinations sometimes pass through in development suggest that the experiences which we have classed as “apparitions of indefinite objects” may really be undeveloped hallucinations. We have only 17 instances of them. They are vague shapeless forms, not suggesting anything in particular, sometimes described as like a shadow, or puff of smoke, or cloud, or a dark mass. They seem generally to be visual percepts of the simplest possible kind, and show the power of the mind in constructing hallucinations at its lowest point. Instances are No. 37. 13 (see p. 313), No. 191. 17 (see p. 134) and the following :—

(464. 11.) From Miss F. M. D.

September 11th, 1891.

“One evening at [my home], in the hall, I saw on the staircase landing what looked like a column of smoke about two feet high, nearly white, which passed into a room through an open door and then turned suddenly to the left out of sight. I ran up stairs after it and went into the room, but could discover nothing. This was about five or six years ago, but I cannot remember the date.

“[I was] in perfect health ; age about 17.”

Hallucinations of lights, which are comparatively rare—being only 17 in number—may also be sometimes, as Mr. Gurney suggests (*Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 73), incipient or rudimentary

hallucinations which fail to reach a fully-developed form. As we have seen, hallucinations of realistic human figures are occasionally evolved out of vague luminous forms, and some of the cases of hallucinatory lights suggest that the hallucination has been arrested at this preliminary stage, and has failed to reach a more definite form; *e.g.*, No. 408. 11 (see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VI., p. 351). But there are other cases where the hallucinatory form is very definite and does not itself suggest that greater definiteness might, under different circumstances, have been attained. The only reason for regarding such hallucinations as undeveloped is that in some instances we seem to be able to trace them to suggestion, ordinary or telepathic, and that the suggestion in question would naturally be expected, if it produced a hallucination at all, to produce a human figure. The following is a case in point.

(191. 2.) From Miss Williams.

“11, Cleveland-terrace, Coatham, Redear, *September 23rd*, 1889.

“I was living at home with my parents at *Eston-in-Cleveland*. There was a working man called Long living in the village, not far from our house, whose wife was taken ill. Dr. Fulton, who at that time was staying with us, came in one night between 9 and 10 o'clock and said Mrs. Long was dying. After that we sat talking over the fire a good while, and then my sister Isabella and I went off to bed. We slept in a back bedroom, and after we got to this bedroom I said, ‘Oh, I’ve forgotten something in the large bedroom!’ To this latter I proceeded by myself, and, as I approached the door, something seemed to say to me, ‘You’ll see something of Mrs. Long, living or dead!’ But I thought no more of this, and entered the bedroom, which I had to cross to the opposite end for what I wanted. When I had got the things in my hand, I noticed a lovely light hanging over my head. It was a round light—perfectly round. I had taken no light with me, but went for the things I wanted in the dark. I looked to see if there was any light coming in from the windows, but there was none: in that direction there was total darkness. I grasped one hand with the other and stood looking at the strange light to be sure that I was not deceived and was not imagining it. I walked across the room to the door, and all the way the light was hanging between my head and the ceiling. It was akin to the electric light: something of a cloud, though every part of it was beaming and running over with light. It left me at the bedroom door. On first seeing it a strange impression seized me, and after it left me I was so impressed that I could not speak of it to anyone for a day or two. I wondered at the time whether it had anything to do with Mrs. Long, and on inquiry I found that she died just about the time when I saw the light. If there was any difference, I judged it would be a little before, but there would not be much in it. This would be about 11 p.m., and about four years ago. It left an impression on my mind which I have never forgotten, and never shall forget. Mrs. Long was not ill many days—about two or three; she died rather suddenly. I was rather interested in her. I did not see her during her illness, but had often seen her and talked to her before.

I was perfectly well at the time, and was in no trouble or anxiety. My age at the time was 23. I have had no experience of the kind before or since. I saw no figure, only a lovely light. Before telling my sister I made her promise she would not ridicule me nor call me superstitious.

“To the best of my recollection this is a correct statement.

“MARY HELENA WILLIAMS.”

“P.S.—The light which I saw was a palish blue. It emitted no rays, so that all the rest of the room was in darkness. It was wider in circumference than my head, so that as I walked I could see it above me without raising my head. As I left the room it remained, and when I looked again was gone. It was in a corner, where the darkness of the room was deepest and the least chance of illumination from the windows on the right and left, that I first saw it above my head. I had no fear, but a kind of sacred awe. The light was unlike any other that I ever saw, and I should say brighter than any other, or, at least, purer. Looking at it did not affect the eyes. It was midway between my head and the ceiling.”

The sister who was with Miss Williams at the time corroborates her account as follows :—

“August 8th, 1891.

“I recollect my sister Lily seeing the bright light. When she came back to the room where I was she was quite pale, and sat down on the floor. She was so awe-struck that she did not tell us what she had seen till the next day. I remember that a woman who lived near us died about the time my sister saw the light, and that we connected the two circumstances together.

“ISABELLA FULTON.”

Here, the hallucination, if not due to a telepathic impulse, would seem to have been due to the occupation of the percipient's mind with the idea of the imminent death. Why, then, should it take the form of a light, unless this was, as it were, a rudimentary condition of a hallucination which failed to reach the human form?

Among the lights in our collection, 9 are described as round or oval lights, or balls of light or fire; of these 7 are connected by the percipients with some individual who is stated to have died at or about the time of the experience. Of the remaining 8 cases of lights, two are described as columns of light, or luminous clouds about the height of a human being, 3 resembled bright points of light, as stars or candle flames, and 3 appeared like a general glow of light.

Symbolic Forms.

The discussion of lights leads us naturally to another cause of the form of hallucination which deserves to be noticed, namely, symbolism:—as this would seem to be certainly in some cases an explanation of lights. The idea of light as a symbol of the soul or spirit—and consequently as associated with death—is a very wide-spread one. The “corpse-candles” of the Celts are a familiar instance, and the same

idea prevails among the Tartars. No doubt, when a superstition of this kind has become established, it is likely that any unexplained phenomenon fitting in with it will tend to be regarded as supernatural, and this probably accounts for many of the Welsh stories of mysterious lights foreboding or coinciding with deaths. We have received several accounts of such lights in the course of the present Census, but most of them were seen out of doors at night and some way off, so that there seemed to be no adequate reason for regarding them as hallucinatory at all. But though real lights are likely to be taken for "corpse-candles" in regions where such a superstition exists, it may be taken as certain that the superstition will sometimes determine the form of a hallucination which in other regions would have taken an entirely different form, and thus the hallucination, whether veridical or purely subjective, may justly be described as symbolic. Such symbolic representations need not, of course, be confined to uneducated percipients, since the symbolism may exist in the minds of persons who attach no superstitious value to it. The following is a case in point.

(305. 4.)

From Mr. P.

February, 1891.

"Our third child, a boy, lived only 16 days. From the first it was evident that his life would be a short one; but, perhaps all the more on that account, every effort was made to prolong it. I had taken a small share of the watching, and just before the boy died was lying on a sofa in that state of wakeful weariness that comes of death-bed watching. Lying thus, I saw, a few feet above my head, a blue flame. It was about an inch and a quarter long, and surrounded by a slight haze or halo. It hovered above me for a few seconds, then took an irregular diagonal course towards the corner of the room farthest from me, finally seeming to pass through the ceiling. As it vanished a voice from nearly the opposite side of the room said, 'That's his soul.' No person other than myself was in [the room] at the time. A few minutes later the child died.

"Having never at that time heard or read of a similar appearance, I know of nothing that could have predisposed me to, or in any way led up to, this hallucination. The date was January 17th, 1867."

Special symbols, signs, or warnings are, as everyone knows, connected with death in some families, and if hallucinations occur to members of these families, they are not unlikely to take a form with the idea of which family tradition has rendered the percipient familiar. We have in the Census two or three accounts of families, several members of which have experienced hallucinations of white animals—for instance, dogs or rabbits—which are regarded as a family symbol of death. With these may be compared No. 733. 5 (see p. 72),—a case received from Brazil, where, as Professor Alexander informs us, a black butterfly is supposed to be a sign of death.

Apparitions of Animals.

Most of the apparitions of animals in our collection have, however, no symbolic character, but, like the realistic apparitions of human beings, are hallucinatory reproductions of familiar objects. The 25 cases divide themselves into 13 cats (for instances see Nos. 535. 2 and 3, p. 305 ; and No. 561. 24, see p. 156) 4 dogs, 1 rabbit, 1 mouse, 1 bird, 1 butterfly, 1 horse with carriage, besides 3 recurring cases in which the percipient often saw cats, and 2 in which both cats and dogs appeared. In only 3 or 4 cases was the animal recognised. No. 319. 1 (see p. 181) is an instance, and so is the following.

(495. 6.)

From Mrs. Gordon Jones.

February 22nd, 1892.

“I have the strongest aversion to cats—a tendency which I have inherited from my father, who could not endure a cat’s presence. After my marriage, I would never have one in the house, until obliged to do so on account of mice. The one that I then allowed to come was an ordinary grey and black striped one—but I very seldom looked at it, and it was never allowed to come upstairs.

“One day I was told that the cat was mad and asked if it might be drowned. I did not look at the animal myself, but said, yes. I next heard that it had been drowned by the groom in a copper. As the cat was not a pet and had never been my companion, its death made no impression on me. It was drowned in the morning. The same evening I was sitting alone in the dining-room. I am sure that I was not thinking of the cat or of possible apparitions. I was reading ; presently I felt impelled to look up, the door seemed to open, and there stood the animal that had been drowned in the morning ; the same cat, but apparently much thinner and dripping with water—only the expression of the face was changed—the eyes were quite human and haunted me afterwards, they looked so sad and pathetic. I felt so sure of what I saw that at the moment I never doubted that it was the living cat who had escaped from drowning. I rang the bell and when the servant came I said ‘There’s the cat, take it out ;’ it seemed to me that she could not but see it too—it was clear and distinct to my eyes as the table or chairs. But the servant looked frightened and said ‘Oh, ma’am, I saw the cat after William had drowned it—and then he buried it in the garden.’ ‘But,’ I said, ‘there it is.’—Of course she saw nothing, and then the cat began to fade, and I saw nothing more of it.”

In an accompanying letter, Mrs. Gordon Jones says that this incident occurred “two or three years ago.”

Inanimate Forms.

Of the remaining classes of hallucinations in our Tables, visions have been sufficiently discussed in Chapter IV., and grotesque apparitions will be best considered in Chapter VIII. in connection with childish hallucinations. But it may be mentioned that the “appari-

tions of inanimate objects" include 3 cases of apparent movements of real objects (which may, perhaps, have been mistakably regarded as hallucinatory); 2 cases of appearances while the percipient was in bed (one of wings and one of an ostrich feather) waving and growing in size, which might, perhaps, equally well be classed with grotesque cases; and 9 cases of ordinary realistic inanimate objects, such as a bird-cage, a chair, flowers, a bonnet, a brass plate on a door, a railway train.

Religious Phantasms.

Several of the religious phantasms are more or less impressive appearances of angels; which in some cases—*e.g.*, when they appear with the conventional wings—may be regarded as symbolic. But in other cases, the experiences are of so exceedingly intimate a nature that it is with difficulty our informants have brought themselves to speak of them at all, and in one instance, at least, and probably in others, information has been refused. In one case, at least, of those reported, the percipient has only described what occurred in the hope that, as the experience had been of very great help to herself in a period of doubt and trouble, the knowledge that such a thing has happened might be of use to others; and in more than one case these experiences have had a lasting effect on the convictions and actions of the percipients. Under these circumstances, we are reluctant to print them in a treatise such as this, though we are willing to communicate the most interesting of them privately, and without names, to serious enquirers.

We will here only mention further one fact about such experiences which is of interest to psychologists, namely, that the kind of vision which to Roman Catholics takes the form of the Virgin Mary will to Protestants take the form of Jesus Christ. We judge this, not only from the present collection, but from cases received through other channels. As it happens, there are not in our Census any visions of the Virgin Mary, but our readers will remember instances of these in *Phantasms of the Living*, and in more than one paper in the *Proceedings S.P.R.*

Deferred Recognition.

In this chapter on form and development, we must notice a kind of gradual development in hallucinations which is unlike any that we have discussed above. It is the very curious feature of deferred recognition. Here there is no development in form, nor, it would seem, in the underlying idea. The figure is seen quite clearly, but, though familiar, is not recognised at once—sometimes not till long after it has disappeared. There are two cases of this in our collection, No. 49. 5 (see pp. 144-5), and No. 402. 8 (see p. 284.) The phenomenon resembles

that of automatic writing when the writer is unaware till afterwards of what his hand is writing. It has also some analogy with a phenomenon observed by Mr. Myers¹ in certain cases of post-hypnotic hallucinations, when the idea communicated to the hypnotised subject is more or less correctly embodied in a post-hypnotic hallucination, but not recognised by the percipient.

A sort of mistaken recognition which seems to occur in some coincidental cases may be due to a similar divergence between the unconscious and conscious working of the mind—see, for example, two cases in *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. I., pp. 428 and 429) where an apparition seen at the time of the death of one person was thought at the time to represent another person, who, however, resembled the decedent. In the following odd case from our collection, which in some ways resembles these, there was, however, at the time, a sort of double recognition.

(407. 3.) From Mrs. H. H.

October 4th, 1890.

“[At] Taunton, Mass., U.S.A., September 9th, 1862, about 5 a.m. or perhaps a little later, I was awakened very suddenly and sat upright in bed, thinking that someone was present; and saw by my bedside the figure of an old man, who was somewhat like one who lived in the same street. His head was bound with a handkerchief, and he stood gazing at me for what seemed to be a few seconds, then vanished. Though recognising him perfectly, I all the time thought that it was my husband.

“I had been asleep all night, was in good health, but of course somewhat anxious, as my husband was in the war and in poor health, owing to what was called ‘swamp fever.’ My husband was at Fortress Monroe, Virginia, and died at 5 o’clock on that day. He had aged very much, was quite gray and a perfect skeleton. For four days before he died, his memory had gone altogether and his only words, hour after hour, were ‘Write home.’

“My children were in that room and the next, but were not disturbed, until I spoke to the eldest and asked if she had heard anyone about. I received a telegram at 10.30 a.m.”

¹ See his paper on “The Subliminal Consciousness,” in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, No. XXIII., Vol. VIII., page 459 *seqq.* We quote one instance from Mr. Myers’ account. It must be understood that P. has been told that he will see the scene as described, after he has been awakened. “I told P. (hypnotised) the story of *Robinson Crusoe* finding the footprint and fearing savages. . . . Awakened and set before the glass of water, P. at once exclaimed, ‘Why, there’s Buffalo Bill! He’s dressed in feathers and skins round him; almost like a savage. He’s walking about in a waste place. . . . He is all alone. . . . I can see something else coming from another part—it’s a blackie. . . . Look at them; how they are arguing! Buffalo Bill and his black man!’ P. had read *Robinson Crusoe*; but Buffalo Bill was fresher in his memory.”

Mrs. H. informed us that she mentioned her experience at the time to her eldest daughter, who now remembers it, but only vaguely. No written record was made.

Auditory and Tactile Hallucinations.

Some points with regard to auditory and tactile as distinct from visual hallucinations require notice. In comparing hallucinations from a statistical point of view, the most obvious and striking fact brought out by our Tables is the comparative rarity of the auditory and tactile classes. These constitute 28 per cent and 10 per cent. respectively of all the hallucinations reported, the remaining 62 per cent. being visual.¹ These proportions, however, need correction on two accounts. First, we have already seen (Chapter III., p. 66) that auditory and tactile cases tend to be forgotten considerably more than visual cases, so that the actual frequency of the auditory and tactile cases is greater in proportion to the visual than would appear from the totals reported. If we take only the totals reported as having occurred during the last year, we find that 50 per cent. are visual hallucinations, 38 per cent. are auditory, and 12 per cent. are tactile. Secondly, it appears from the Supplement to Table II. that there are 159 cases where auditory hallucinations have been experienced more than once, but where the exact number of times has not been reported, so that they are counted as one hallucination only; whereas this has happened in only 119 cases of visual hallucinations. It has happened also in a comparatively large number of tactile cases, viz., 41.

After taking into consideration these two points, it seems to us that our statistics do not justify any definite conclusion as to the relative frequency of the auditory and the visual hallucinations of the sane, when we are considering the whole aggregate of phenomena classed under either head. We think it, however, legitimate to infer that *impressive* hallucinations of the visual class are considerably more frequent than those of the auditory,² and that auditory hallucinations in general are considerably more frequent than tactile.

Among hallucinations of insane persons, there seems to be no doubt that auditory cases are much more frequent than visual, the proportions being estimated by some authorities as 3 to 1, by others as 5 to 1, (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 22). These figures

¹ These percentages are calculated from the totals given in Tables IV., VII. and VIII., which include under each sense all hallucinations affecting that sense, whether or not any other sense was affected at the same time.

² This does not agree with the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Gurney, in whose Census the number of auditory hallucinations was more than double the number of the visual (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 22).

contrast strikingly with the proportions among sane persons, as reported in the present Census.

As we have seen, auditory hallucinations are on the whole much less impressive than visual ones. It appears from Table VII. that nearly one-half of those reported consist in the percipient's hearing his name called (including under the term "name" any title by which he is in the habit of hearing himself called, such as—Father, Mother, Madame, etc.) and about another sixth consist in the hearing of "voices" when no distinct words are heard—or at all events are not reported. Experiences so trivial as these usually are will no doubt be often forgotten altogether, and the probability is that a very large part of those that have lapsed from memory are of this trivial kind.

To hear a complete phrase or sentence apparently spoken is no doubt, as a rule, a much more impressive experience. Rather more than a third of the hallucinations included in Table VII. are of this type. It should be observed, however, that in only half of these cases is the impression that of a voice alone. In the other half, the hallucination also affects the sense of sight or of touch, or both, the words seeming to be spoken by a visible apparition, or being accompanied by an impression of touch. For an instance of the latter, see No. 41. 3 (p. 295). For a case of a sentence alone being heard, see No. 23. 11 (p. 256). The affection of another sense at the same time is found much less often among the other classes of auditory hallucinations—there being 89 such cases in the class of "words heard," and only 28 in both the other classes put together.

Tactile hallucinations are for the most part even more trivial than auditory ones, and there is, naturally, not much variety in them. They are sometimes quite vague tactile impressions, not associated with any definite idea of an external object (*e.g.*, No. 338. 26., p. 258). Sometimes, however, the impression is more definite and less easy to forget: as in a few cases where the feeling is that of a kiss. More often they are impressions of being touched by human hands, as in the following case:—

(283. 8.)

From Mrs. J. H.

(The account was apparently written in the early part of 1890.)

"On February 11th, while on a visit to my cousin's, Miss O., at 9.45 p.m., while ascending the stairs to my bedroom I suddenly felt an indescribable feeling of foreboding evil, which was accompanied by a distinct feeling of a hand grasping my left arm momentarily with a slight pressure. Within a few minutes I rejoined the family below, to whom I immediately related my experience, telling them I feared I should hear of some bad news, at which they pooh-poohed.

“I was in my usual health, and in neither grief nor anxiety.

“I took no notes, but have often related the matter to my friends, as at 1.30 the same night I was fetched home in consequence of my father’s sudden death at my aunt’s house. I had no knowledge until then of my father being ill, and, as a matter of fact, he did not feel unwell until a few hours before his death, which occurred at 9.45 p.m. of the above date,¹ the time being noted by my uncle, who was sitting with him and looked at his watch. So sudden and unexpected was his demise that my uncle at first thought it was a fit.”

Mrs. H. says that she has had no other hallucinatory experience besides the one given. She wrote to her cousins, but found that they had forgotten her having told them of it.

In the great majority of tactile hallucinations, the idea produced is that something is touching the percipient. In six cases only does the percipient have the impression that he is actively touching the hallucinatory object, and this impression is—in all but one case—combined with the affection of another sense. In four of these cases the percipient sees an apparition and puts out his hand and touches it. The remaining case is No. 41. 3 (see p. 295), already referred to, where a voice is heard at the same time. So far we have been speaking of first-hand cases: but, to illustrate the combination of seeing with active touching of an apparition, we propose to give a second-hand case, which happens to be the most interesting one of the kind in our collection. The account which we quote was written by the collector, the late Miss A. J. Clough, the day after she had heard it from the percipient, an old housekeeper, who, Miss Clough says, “has lived in the same family 33 years and has always told the same story.” She was then 74 years of age, and could not write easily.

(73. 20.)

July 16th, 1889.

“E. H. and her sister were in 1829, in the spring of the year (she does not remember the day), with a Mr. and Mrs. —, in a house in Little Holland House grounds—in London. Her mother had been fully a year dead. On the afternoon of the day in question, some people had been spending the day, and she had been amusing some boys in the garden and very merry: she went to bed rather later than usual, about 11 o’clock, and she had intended to get up early as she wanted to do some fine washing. Her sister Caroline was sleeping with her. It was very light and she got up thinking it was late. The moon was shining and she went to the window to look out. She thought perhaps she should hear the watchman calling the hour for, as she observed, they had watchmen in those days in London. The bed was directly opposite the window. She walked straight to the win-

¹ In a letter dated March 13th, 1890, Mrs. H. says: “My father died February 11th, 1885.”

dow, and then she turned round and in the bed she saw two faces, her sister's and some one else. She went to the bed and looked ; it was her dead mother dozing beside her sister. She touched the figure but it did not move, and was not cold or hot. There it lay, there was the cap her mother used to wear with a border around it. She walked round the bed and kept her eye on the dozing figure all the time. She felt afraid it would follow her, and she was dreadfully frightened. Mr. and Mrs. — were sleeping in a room next to hers. She went to their door and knocked. Mrs. — opened it. She went into the room and told her story. Mr. — got up and they went into the room and found no one but her sister, still sleeping soundly. She was only 14 at the time.

“I heard all this story from the old woman yesterday afternoon, July 15, 1889. She was very collected [in] telling it.”

In a few tactile cases, the percipient not only feels a touch, but has a sense of being pushed or pulled by an external force ; see case of Mr. B. S. (No. 262. 6) in Chapter XVI.

CHAPTER VII.

PHYSIOLOGY OF HALLUCINATIONS.

In discussing the physiology of hallucinations we shall not enter upon any consideration of the physiological processes involved in veridical hallucinations as such ; since—as has already been explained in the introductory chapter—any such consideration would appear to us premature in the present condition of our knowledge of the subject. We shall confine ourselves to the phenomenon of hallucination, regarded on its physiological side, apart from whatever causes external to the percipient—whether physical or psychical—may have initiated it.

The first question of interest is how far the hallucination, regarded on its physiological side, is generated in the brain or in the special organ of the sense affected.

There seems to be no doubt that in a limited number of cases, of special types, hallucinations are initiated by the condition of the sense-organs. Thus, in the case of unilateral hallucinations (which, if spontaneous, are probably always accompanied by pathological conditions), a distinct lesion is sometimes found in the sense-organ of the same side, and the hallucinations often cease when the lesion is cured. Also hallucinations that move as the eye moves probably depend—partially, at least—on something in the eye. This type, however, is very rare among persons in a normal condition. In the Census, we have only one apparent instance of it, as follows :—

(191. 17.)

From Mr. H. B. K.

October 12th, 1889.

“ [About 20 years ago] I was walking, about 9 o'clock one night in winter, when a quadrupedal form, something like a huge calf, suddenly seemed close upon me, and wherever I turned was always in front of me. I swept round me freely with my stick, but there was no contact. [It was] something different from what I had ever seen before. It approached me quite closely, but was shadowy, so that I could not tell its expression. It disappeared down a lane leading off at right angles to the one I was travelling. [I] was well and free from trouble ; from 25 to 28 years of age.”

Again, hypnagogic hallucinations of such types as stars or luminous points or objects, arranged as patterns or designs and shifting in a kaleidoscopic manner, or in which the figures move and swarm and change, may sometimes be genuine hallucinations having their origin in the “self-light” of the retina, and this explanation is also applicable to dreams of a similar nature. On the other hand, an observer quoted below (p. 141) who has recently sent us an account of his own experience of hypnagogic hallucinations, remarks :—

“It is important to note that these visions are not based on any affection of the retina, [since they] retain what we estimate to be their positions in space, notwithstanding that the eyes be moved about.”

He compares them in this respect with memory images, remarking that the fact of both kinds of images being unaffected by the movements of the eye shows that the train of physical causes leading up to them originates in the brain.

Again, diseases of the eye or ear are sometimes accompanied by visual or auditory hallucinations; but our evidence seems to show that only a very small part of the phenomena reported to us can be referred to this cause. The seven following cases are the only ones in the Census in which any defects of the sense-organs are reported.

(1) No. 607.1. is a percipient subject to hallucinations. The collector writes:—“He has a curious weakness of the eyes, which for eleven years, from 17 to 28, quite incapacitated him from reading print. His sight for other things, such as fine lines in a drawing, was excellent, but letters in type all ‘ran together.’ He is better now, but has still some difficulty in reading.” It is not clear from this description exactly what the defect is, but it is most probably some form of astigmatism, which is especially troublesome in reading, and would not obtrude itself so much in looking at other things, such as drawings.

(2) No. 118.21., who has sometimes seen phantasmal cats and dogs, is very short-sighted.

(3) No. 68.25. has occasionally had both auditory and visual hallucinations. The two eyes are of very different focus, the left eye being far-sighted and the right short-sighted, so that the percipient cannot use both at once without glasses.

(4) No. 49.9., while blind from cataract, ‘saw phantasmal figures.

(5) No. 725.11., after having been operated on for cataract, saw two figures cross the room.

(6) No. 430.15., who is quite deaf, frequently imagines that she hears music, both vocal and instrumental.

(7) No. 704.10., has sometimes fancied he heard himself called, is increasingly deaf, and puts the fancies down to this cause.

The last four cases mentioned are not counted in the Tables, on the ground that the hallucinations were probably due to the abnormal physical condition (see Chapter II., p. 36).

It is to be observed that, from the nature of the ear, many defects in it, which from various causes give rise to deafness, may produce vibrations in the tympanum, which might initiate auditory hallucinations. This is much more probable than that defects in the eye should produce visual hallucinations.

Of course, such common defects of vision as those mentioned in the first three cases must exist in more than three persons out of the 1,494

whose experiences are included in our Tables. But these are the only ones who have thought them of sufficient importance in connection with their experiences to mention them. Any actual disease of the eye or ear would probably have been recorded in the majority of cases where it was present, and this has only been done, as stated above, in the four cases excluded on that ground.

It happens that three of the crystal-seers whose experiences have been recorded at length in the *Proceedings* have certain defects of vision. With Mrs. Verrall, the left eye is far-sighted and the right short-sighted. (*Proceedings* S.P.R., Vol. VIII., p. 473.) "Miss X." is also longer-sighted with one eye than the other. Miss A. is very short-sighted. (*Op. cit.*, p. 499).

Now, it is well known that such imperfections of visions frequently lead to illusions, but there is no evidence to show that they are likely to produce hallucinations, and it is very improbable that the crystal visions in these cases are connected with them. Mrs. Verrall is, however, inclined to think that the movements that occur in her crystal visions are due to the movements of her eyes in attempting to bring the sight of the two eyes into correspondence, when not using her glasses. She is able to see pictures with either eye, but she has observed that movements in the picture do not occur when she is looking at the crystal with only one eye. A similar explanation was suggested by the lady whose hallucinatory history is given in *Appendix D*, of some of her experiences. Her right eye is shorter-sighted than her left, also binocular vision of any given object involves an effort, and it is to the movements of the eyes in such vision that she traces the movements of the hallucinatory cats and rats, which always appear to leap in the same direction, from right to left. If this explanation is the true one, it may be that the apparent movement of real objects caused by the movements of the eyes is transferred by suggestion to the hallucinatory object, but there is no ground for supposing that the hallucination itself is due to the defect of sight.

Our general conclusion, then, is that the great bulk of the hallucinations included in our Census are not in any way dependent on the condition of the sense-organs of the percipients.

The view that many—if not most—hallucinations are originated centrally, in the brain and not in the sense-organs, is that now generally held by physiologists,¹ as well as by psychologists. The chief grounds for this view are brought forward in the discussion on the subject in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol I., pp. 464-495, and the great majority of the hallucinations included in the Census exhibit characteristics which are there shown to be much more easily referable to a central

¹ See Foster's *Physiology*. 5th Edition, p. 1270.

than to any other origin. Thus, the percipients are generally, as far as we know, in a normal physical condition in all respects; the hallucinations are generally unique in their experience; they sometimes take a form which is undoubtedly connected with some idea in the percipient's mind at the moment (for examples, see Chapter IX., p. 170); they occasionally develop from a non-sensory to a sensory stage, *e.g.*, No. 555. 5 (see p. 286); in many instances, they affect more than one sense at the same time, and it is very unlikely that two sense-organs should happen to be temporarily affected—in an imperceptible way—at the same moment, so as to produce such a correspondence.

Professor Sully thinks that while vague rudimentary hallucinations of sight and hearing may most reasonably be attributed to the action of the peripheral parts of the nervous system, what he calls "completely developed" hallucinations—*i.e.*, of the kinds included in the present collection—are generally caused by the automatic activity of the nerve centres. (*Illusions*, p. 115.) Speaking of persistent dream-images, he remarks (*Op. cit.*, p. 143) "That the visual images of our sleep do often involve the peripheral regions of the organ of sight seems to be proved by the singular fact that they sometimes persist after waking." The cerebral activity that produces a hallucination "may probably," he maintains, "diffuse itself downwards to the peripheral regions of the nerves" (p. 113), so that the sense-organs may thus become involved secondarily.

Wundt takes the same view of the physiological action involved in fully externalised hallucinations,¹ but he seems to base his view partly on the assumption that hallucinations move with the movements of the eye. As mentioned above, this is only recorded in one out of our 1,295 cases of visual hallucinations, so that it cannot be regarded as one of their general characteristics.

We pass, then, to consider this hypothesis of the secondary participation of the sense-organs in hallucinations through a downward sensory impulse from the brain. We may begin by remarking that it is inconsistent with generally accepted physiological theories of the action of the nervous system; or, at all events, that no physiological facts are known which lend it any support. It is true that many persons by dwelling on the idea of a sensation, such as warmth, cold, pressure, can apparently excite the sensation in any part of the skin, accompanied by definite peripheral effects, *e.g.*, reddening of the skin.

¹ *Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie*, Vol. II., p. 432. "Visual hallucinations occurring before going to sleep are sometimes so vivid that, as J. Müller, H. Meyer and others have observed, they may be followed by after-images. In such cases, it seems as if the excitation of the central sensory tracts had extended itself to the retina. The same thing may be said of such phantasms as, in full daylight, mingle with external visual perceptions."

Such effects give rise to sensory impulses, which, being transmitted to the brain, add to the vividness of the sensation perceived. But there is still no evidence of any downward sensory impulse to the periphery: for all the peripheral effects may be accounted for by motor impulses from the brain, causing contractions of the muscles and dilatations or constrictions of the blood-vessels of the skin, etc. And a similar explanation is still more obvious in other cases of peripheral activity accompanying mental images like a faint echo of the cerebral activity involved—as, for instance, when the idea of a movement is accompanied by incipient movements of the kind imagined.

The chief argument for the existence in hallucinations of a downward sensory impulse, whereby the sense-organs are supposed to be affected, appears to lie in an alleged resemblance between hallucinations and the retinal after-images which, in ordinary vision, follow on the sight of an object. The parallel is drawn closer by showing that hallucinations occur corresponding to both positive and negative retinal after-images; the hallucinatory colours in the latter cases being complementary to those seen in an antecedent perception, real or hallucinatory. Now retinal after-images are dependent—partially, at least—on exhaustion of the retina; hence it is argued that, in the hallucinations that resemble after-images, the retina must also be concerned; and that, where the proximate origin of the hallucination is clearly cerebral, a downward sensory impulse from the brain to the retina must be assumed. This argument requires careful consideration.

In ordinary vision, positive after-images of real objects are obtained when a strong stimulus has been applied to the eye for a short time, *e.g.*, when a bright light is looked at for a few moments. The sensation then persists for some time after the withdrawal of the stimulus, giving rise to an after-image, which is perceived continuously, though it may wax and wane in a rhythmical way, and its apparent intensity depends partly on contrast with the background on which it is projected.

Now such after-images might in all cases be regarded as in a certain sense hallucinatory; but our inquiry was framed to exclude familiar experiences of this kind, and accordingly they have not been reported to us. It is held, however, that a phenomenon similar to such an after-image also occurs when images seen with closed eyes persist after the eyes are opened: and of this our Census does afford examples, in the cases of persistent dream-images of which specimens were given in Chap. IV. An account of Meyer's experiments on this point is given in Professor James' *Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II., p. 67. After long practice in improving his powers of voluntary visualisation, Meyer found that the images called up with closed eyes, "especially when they were bright, left after-images behind them

when the eyes were quickly opened during their presence. For example, I thought of a silver stirrup, and after I had looked at it a while, I opened my eyes, and for a long while afterwards saw its after-image."

J. Müller, who had spontaneous experiences of a somewhat similar kind, writes ¹:—"On waking in a dark room, it sometimes happens that images of landscapes and similar objects still float before the eyes. . . . It has become my custom, when I perceive such images, immediately to open my eyes and direct them upon the wall or surrounding bodies. The images are then still visible, but quickly fade. They are seen whichever way the head is turned, but I have not observed that they moved with the eyes."

It is cases such as these that Wundt quotes as instances where the central nervous excitation seems to have extended itself to the retina.

There does not, however, appear to be any physiological evidence tending to show that the retina is involved in these quasi-after-images. Moreover, in order that this hypothesis may supply a complete explanation of their occurrence, we require to assume, not a mere affection of the retina, but a stimulus applied over a certain definite area of the retina, of the same shape as the image seen; and it is difficult to suppose that such an effect could be produced by a downward impulse from the brain, in the absence of any special mechanism for directing the stimulus to any particular part of the retina.

There is a still greater difficulty in supposing the retina to be involved in another class of cases—the so-called "deferred after-images,"—where a considerable interval of time elapses between the original percept and the hallucination which is supposed to be its after-image.

The following is the only clear example of this class which our Census affords: but it is not improbable that this is the real explanation of the hallucination in other cases, in which the original percept has been forgotten.

(192. 21.)

From Mrs. A.

"October 21st, 1889.

"I was staying at an hotel at North Berwick, N.B., in the autumn of 1884. My daughter had joined me there, and we sat up together till a late hour. She wore a bright red dress and sat in bright gas-light, and as we talked I had my eyes constantly fixed on her. I had been sound asleep for about an hour when I woke suddenly and saw an image, as it were, of my daughter lying beside me, the bright dress and complexion illuminated in

¹ *Elements of Physiology.* (Translation by W. Baly, London, 1842), p. 1394.

a bright light. The figure had a wooden, rigid look. I had time to sit up in bed and stretch out my hand to light a match before the figure vanished.

“I was not out of health or in grief or anxiety. I was quite alone.

“I have never had any such experience before or since.

“My own impression is that it was an optical delusion. I had had my eyes fixed for a considerable time on my daughter’s face, but then I had undressed and been some time in my room before I went to sleep, and the vision was so clear and vivid, as it seemed to lie beside me, that it startled me much.”

Some experiments, resembling the case just quoted, in producing on waking in the morning the image of an object seen just before closing the eyes at night, are described in *Proceedings S. P. R.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 450-2. The plan of the experimenter, Mr. Bakewell, is on waking to “open his eyes on a plain white ceiling and instantly close them again, having just admitted a vague flash of light into the eye.” He is inclined to regard the images seen as “secondary or tardy positive after-images; as if, in addition to the first positive after-image immediately arising, there was a feeble series of vibrations, which, if left undisturbed by counter-vibrations, gradually by their summation came to be of sufficient importance to give a bright positive image, provided any sudden uniform stimulation of the retina should set these banked-up energies off.”

With regard to the part supposed to be played by the retina here, it is to be remarked that the conditions under which the “after-images” are seen are exactly the reverse of those which favour the development of true retinal after-images. The latter are the result of retinal activity and the stronger the stimulus or the more sensitive the retina, the more vivid is the image, which persists for some time and then gradually fades. In Mr. Bakewell’s experiments, on the other hand, as in Mrs. A.’s case quoted immediately before, the image follows on a condition of the greatest possible repose of the retina, when the eyes had been for a long time closed, and in the dark. It would therefore seem much more probable that it is merely a memory-image,—that is, that it originates in the brain and has nothing to do with the retina. This interpretation is applied by another percipient, Dr. Flournoy, to a similar set of experiences—hypnagogic hallucinations which reproduced real objects on which he had concentrated his attention for a long time during the previous day—quoted in the same paper (*Op. cit.*, pp. 453-4). Dr. Flournoy remarks, “I regard these hypnagogic images and all memory-images, however recent and intense, as radically different from the ‘after-images’ of the eye.” Other instances of this type are given in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I, p. 490. The following case is taken from a paper “On the Limits of Vision” by Dr. G. J. Stoney, published in the *Philosophical Magazine*

for March, 1894. It will be seen that Dr. Stoney takes the same view as Dr. Flournoy of the origin of the images.

“The experience I had myself was one which frequently occurred to me when a lad. Several of us boys were fond of witnessing sham fights in the Phoenix Park, at which some of the most conspicuous objects were the single horsemen who now and then galloped at full speed, with orders, from one part of the field to another. Almost always, after a day spent in viewing this spectacle, as I lay in bed at night I saw vividly what seemed to be a tiny horseman galloping violently from right to left, or from left to right, as the case might be. All the movements of the horse were reproduced, the dashing about of the sabre-tache, the coloured uniform, the movements of the horseman. It cannot have been in the retina that this revival took place. It must have been in a much more deep-seated part of the brain.”

This explanation seems also applicable to the following case which appeared in *Nature* for October 5th, 1893 :—

“A remarkable case of resuscitation of an optical image is described from personal experience by Professor T. Vignoli in a paper recently communicated to the *Reale Istituto Lombardo*. On the morning of July 3rd, after a railway journey in a bright sun, and two days' walk in a suffocating heat, he happened to be in a room with several other persons, and during conversation looked at a balcony bathed in bright sunlight, but without taking any special interest in it. The balcony was decorated with trellis-work and ivy. Flowering creepers were arranged in vertical columns, each column being crossed below by the iron bars of the balcony, and above by sticks supporting the plants. A cage with two birds hung up in the middle. Two days afterwards, very early in the morning, the professor was in bed, but perfectly awake, and in ordinary health, when, to his astonishment, he saw on the ceiling, by the light coming through Venetian blinds of two large windows, an exact reproduction, in all its colours and details, of the balcony referred to. The phenomenon lasted long enough to permit some detailed investigation. On closing the eyes, the image disappeared, to appear again when they were opened. It was unaffected by regarding it with each eye alternately. A finger placed between the eye and the image intercepted it in the same manner as it would any ordinary object; in short, the phenomenon obeyed all the optical laws of vision. And not only was the cage of birds reproduced, but also its swinging motion noticed before.”

Similarly, in the following case, taken from our Census, there is a considerable interval between the original impression and its hallucinatory reproduction, which makes it practically certain that it could not have been due to retinal action.

(733. 18.)

From Mr. F. De V.

March 29th, 1892.

“I heard a noise in the corridor, and on looking that way I saw a man in grave clothes, standing at the entrance. I was much terrified, and rushed out into the back premises, whither my father followed me to find

me stretched upon the ground. Place Maceio, capital of Alagoas, Brazil, year 1858, 8 o'clock in the evening more or less. The man seen had very long hair. The impression was very vivid.

“I was studying, but was in a very nervous state. Age 11.

“My imagination was tormented by the image of the man who appeared to me. I knew [him], and I had found him shortly before lying in his coffin in the church. The sight of the corpse had produced a profound impression on me, and was the cause of my nervousness. The sound might have had a very natural cause.

“I was alone in the room.”

All these hallucinations seem to be of essentially the same type, differing from one another chiefly in the length of time between the vision of the real object and that of its hallucinatory reproduction, but by such comparatively small degrees that it would be arbitrary to draw the line at any point, and to say that one of them was a retinal after-image and another a memory-image. In all cases, the retina must have long recovered from the effects of the original stimulus, and—except when the hallucinations occurred on waking—had been subjected to a great number of subsequent stimuli. There is nothing in the physiology of the retina, so far as this is known, to suggest the possibility of any such selective retention of after-images as would be implied in recurring to a long-past impression, after passing through a subsequent series of impressions. On the other hand, a memory-image can, of course, recur at any time.

The repetition of a hallucination, after a shorter or longer interval, seems to be a phenomenon of the same kind. The second hallucination may be called an “after-image” of the first, but is probably nothing more than a revival of memory of the first, excited by some association of ideas, as that of being in the same place, or under similar circumstances again. For instance, hallucinations induced during one hypnosis may recur spontaneously in a subsequent hypnosis.

Some interesting instances of hallucinations traceable to the revival of memory of long past scenes are to be found in the experiences of “Miss X.” (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. V., pp. 506-510) which seem to be of essentially the same nature as the “deferred after-images” already quoted, though the interval before the recrudescence of memory was much longer—so long that the percipient had often forgotten the scenes pictured till she was reminded of them by seeing them again represented. The first experience described in the following case is somewhat analogous.

(49. 5.)

From Mrs. L.

(The account was written in 1889).

“In September, 1854, I was thrown from a dog-cart on to my head, and stunned. My life flashed before me, but the only thing that remained was

the appearance of a red setter dog, running at me. This continued many days, and I could not speak of it. My mother came and then I told her I feared my brain was injured, as I was haunted by a red setter dog. She said directly that, being very nervous, she had not wished me to be told or talked to about it, but that, before I could speak, the nurse put me down on the lawn, whilst she ran back to the house. I had on a little grey fur pelisse, and before they could reach me, a large red setter dog of my uncle's had run at me, and shaken me nearly unconscious, taking me for a rabbit. After this explanation, the dog never appeared to me again."

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :—

" July 14th, 1889.

" I saw Mrs. L. — yesterday and questioned her about the dog case. I think it was an externalised hallucination. She could not describe the impression very clearly. A dog's head at her side snapping at her seems to have been what she saw, and she gave me the impression by her gestures that it was continually—during the few days that she was haunted by it—appearing sideways, but in the direct line of vision, and disappearing when she looked full at it. At all events it was not, apparently, a full view of a whole dog which could be followed with the eyes and taken for a real dog. She is quite clear as to the correspondence of her visionary dog and her mother's account of the real one, but of course the recollections are not now independent. It is some confirmation of the correspondence, perhaps, that, while stunned with the blow, remembered scenes of early childhood passed vividly before her—in particular some connected with the illness of a favourite dog, which died when she was about six years old. These remembered scenes did not, however, haunt her, and probably they were not fully externalised ; they occurred during the more definite brain disturbance at the time of the fall. She probably had a slight concussion, but went about as usual, though feeling and looking very ill, and saw no doctor till two or three days after the accident, when her mother came. It was during these few days that the dog haunted her and gave her the impression that her brain had been injured, till her mother dispelled it."

It will be convenient to quote in connection with the above another experience of the same lady's, though here the hallucination was probably not a reproduction of anything actually seen, but of a scene vividly imagined at a remote period, and afterwards recalled through association of ideas, of which the links can be traced.

" About September, 1881, aged 46, and 18 months after the sudden death of my mother, which had shaken my nerves very much, one night towards morning, being awake to the best of my belief, I saw a woman come through the door. Her face was sideways and I distinctly saw her features. She passed slowly from the door and went out at window opposite, thus passing across the foot of my bed. She had on an old-fashioned bonnet and an old-fashioned caped cloak, and she was carrying a basket in front of her such as country women carried their husbands' dinners in. The whole figure was semi-opaque, neutral tinted, like thick smoke or cloud. A great hurricane was blowing. I was dreadfully disturbed and hysterical next day,—the

impression so vivid, and yet unable to say who it was. About a week after, the revelation came. I sat down to dinner, became very hysterical and faint, and went into another room alone in the dark. All at once I jumped up saying, 'It is Mrs. Beasant.' Mrs. Beasant was the pretty young bride of a farmer with whom when about ten years old we used to go and take tea at a farm two or three miles from the vicarage. One day she went with her husband's dinner as usual and he was felling a tree. She passed the wrong way and the tree fell on her and killed her. I remember watching her funeral with my nurse, and the anguish of spirit at her death, but never remember speaking of it or the circumstance since. The day before the appearance, a nurse of the name of 'Beasant' had disturbed and annoyed me. A few months before, a large elm-tree had fallen in our garden and partly on the house. A hurricane was blowing at the time, and I remember thinking 'what a lucky thing that tree can't fall on the roof.' I was sleeping alone."

We have now to consider the class of hallucinations that resemble complementary or negative after-images of some antecedent hallucinatory percept or voluntarily produced image. It is claimed that the antecedent percept must have involved an affection of the retina, and so produced a negative after-image; and, since it is clear in most—if not all—of the cases in question that the first percept originated in the brain, a downward sensory impulse from brain to retina has to be postulated, in order that the retina may be involved.

We will give examples of hallucinations of this class before discussing their explanation. MM. Binet and Féré, who have tried many experiments on hallucinations of colour induced in their hypnotic subjects, with results more uniform than those obtained by most other observers, say, (*Animal Magnetism*, p. 191):—"We have seen subjects who could at pleasure, and in the waking state. . . when looking attentively at a sheet of white paper, cause it to appear red, blue, green, etc., and the colour thus evoked would be sufficiently distinct to give birth in due succession to the complementary colour, which the subject could indicate correctly." M. Féré found that he could picture to himself the idea of red so intensely that at the end of a few minutes he was able to see a green patch upon the white paper; but repeated efforts were required before he was able to associate an *outline* with the colour. (*Op. cit.*, p. 255).

With their hypnotic subjects, they found that complementary after-images, resembling in all respects a normal negative image, followed on induced hallucinations of colour, and the experiments were repeated by Charcot. They state that these experiments have always succeeded with subjects who were certainly ignorant of the sequence of complementary colours, and the answers were always given correctly in the first experiment. Their results are confirmed by previous observations made by M. Parinaud on the phenomenon of simultaneous con-

trast; he found that a piece of paper divided by a line, on being presented to a hypnotised subject, to whom it was suggested that one-half of the paper was red, appeared to her green on the other half. (*Op. cit.*, p. 250).

MM. Binet and Féré also experimented on the mixture of imaginary colours and found that it gave resultant shades which were in conformity with optical laws. (*Op. cit.*, p. 256.) Similar experiments have been tried with the same results by Professor Lombroso, who made his subjects look through a glass of some given (hallucinatory) colour at hallucinatory images of the solar spectrum. (*Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol. VIII., p. 447). So uniform were the results obtained by MM. Binet and Féré that they generalised from them thus (in speaking of after-images):—"We have ascertained that hallucinatory vision is subject to the same conditions [as ordinary external vision]; every hallucination of some persistence is succeeded, on its disappearance, by an after-image, just as in the case of ordinary sensations which affect the retina." (*Op. cit.*, p. 252.)

Further, Dr. C. T. Green, of Birkenhead, records an experiment with one of his hypnotic subjects, who, after being made to see a hallucinatory red cross, soon saw the complementary colour spontaneously¹; but the results of other observers and experimenters have varied a good deal. Again, with regard to colours voluntarily visualised, Mr. Keulemans (*Proceedings*, S.P.R., Vol VIII., p. 480) states that after calling up mentally a bright red he can sometimes see the complementary colour on the ceiling, though he cannot get the complementaries of pale shades, such as lemon yellow, and lilac, greys or brown.

A few cases have also been recorded of dream-images persisting with complementary colours. Gruithuisen (quoted by Professor Sully, *Illusions*, p. 144), "had a dream in which the principal feature was a violet flame, and which left behind it, after waking, for an appreciable duration, a complementary image of a yellow spot." The following somewhat similar case was received by us a short time ago, from the Hon. Mrs. Drummond:—

"64, Lower Leeson-street, Dublin, *November 4th*, 1892.

"I was dreaming of being in a drawing-room furnished with a variety of knick-nacks in glass and china, when my attention appeared to be arrested by a large green vase of particularly graceful shape. I felt myself gazing intently at this object, when I awoke very suddenly and completely.

"I occupied a few seconds in looking about me, collecting the letters which had been brought in, when a slight uneasiness in my eyes made me close them. I then saw the vase at which I had been staring in my dream

¹ *Borderland*, January, 1894, p. 225.

appear within the closed eyelids in red, the complementary colour of green, exactly as it would have done had I looked as long at a real object and then shut my eyes."

Mrs. Drummond wrote later :—

" December 5th, 1892.

" I think the incident in question happened about four years ago.

" I regret that I did not at the time write down any account of what I had seen ; but I was profoundly impressed by the circumstance, the only one which ever led me to doubt for an instant that we are right in speaking of ' the *baseless* fabric of a dream.'

" I am sure that there was nothing in the room which could produce the after-image of the vase I had seen in my dream, a two-handled vase of a beautiful and classical pattern.

" ADELAIDE DRUMMOND."

There is, therefore, sufficient evidence of the interesting fact that hallucinatory percepts are occasionally followed by negative after-images. But the inference of several psychologists¹ that the retina must be involved in such cases seems to us quite unwarrantable. As Mr. Gurney points out, such after-images do not " imply more than the brief continuance of excitation at the *central* cells"²; and M.M. Binet and Féré themselves do not think of inferring from their experiments any affection of the retina: they merely infer from them that hallucinations involve an excitation of the sensory centres in the brain.

It is probable that even ordinary retinal after-images of real objects are not dependent solely on fatigue of the retina,³ and Professor Hering leaves the question open as to whether the physiological processes which he considers to be associated with the formation of after-images take place in the brain or in the retina.

That cerebral action alone is at all events capable of producing similar effects seems to be shown by some experiments published by Mr. John Gorham in *Brain* (1881-2), Vol. IV., p. 465, in which colour-sensations received through one eye modified those received through the other. In one experiment, (a) the effect of simultaneous contrast,

¹ The views of Professors Sully and Wundt have already been quoted. Professor James also says :—(*Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II., p. 70). " The current demonstrably *does* flow backward down the optic nerve in Meyer's and Féré's negative after-image. Therefore it *can* flow backward ; therefore it *may* flow backward in some, however slight, degree, in all imagination." He applies the same theory to the complementary hallucinatory colours in M.M. Binet and Féré's hypnotic experiments.

² *Phantasms of the Living*. Vol. I., p. 487, foot-note.

³ " We have no right to suppose that the exhaustion takes place in the retinal structures only ; it may occur in the central cerebral structures during the development of visual impulses into sensations ; indeed the chief part of it is probably of such a cerebral origin." (Foster's *Physiology*, 5th edition, p. 1266.)

which is generally associated with the action of one part of a retina on another part of the same, was produced by the apparent action of one eye on the other. While green light was falling into the right eye, and white light—through a pin-hole—into the left, the left eye seemed to see a small pink disc. In the next experiment (*b*), the conditions of (*a*) were maintained until the effect just described was produced, and then the green light was removed from the right eye. The pink disc apparently seen by the left eye then turned green. In repeating these experiments, we have observed that the green colour in experiment (*b*) is much more obvious than the pink in experiment (*a*). A somewhat similar experiment, though with a different result, is described by Professor James (*Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II, p. 71, foot-note). On looking with one eye open at a coloured spot on a white background, then closing that eye and looking with the other at a plain background, a colour complementary to the first will appear. We have not, however, been able to verify this result from personal experience.

In all these experiments, the appearances seen, as far as the eye which receives only white light is concerned, can hardly be due to any action of the retina of that eye, and must, therefore, depend on cerebral action. The cerebral action is, of course, initiated by the stimulation applied to the other eye; but the effect, which is apparently produced on one eye through the influence of the other, is actually a cerebral effect.

This view is confirmed by "Miss X.'s" experiences in crystal-vision (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., p. 484); of which a noteworthy feature is that while one crystal picture shows a colour complementary to that of the preceding one, the form of the second picture may be entirely different from that of the first. Thus, a lady in a blue gown is replaced by a little boy in a bright orange garment; a pale green picture of a man tearing up palings is followed by a red picture of the corner of the library. This phenomenon clearly cannot be compared with an ordinary retinal negative after-image. Miss X. also says that after staring at a (real) red flower she can see a green one in the crystal (such a case may, however, be simply a negative after-image of the ordinary kind), and that on summoning up a (hallucinatory) red flower in the crystal, she can see a green patch on the wall, or in another crystal. Or a blue picture, conjured up with closed eyes, on being transferred to the crystal, would appear as orange. "Or," she says, "if I merely *desire* a change of colour in a crystal picture, I find that blue is followed by orange, yellow by purple, green by red. . . . It may be worth noting that a distinct effort is required to convert a scene—lighted, for example, with red—to its natural colouring, or even to a neutral tint. It is

necessary to close the eyes, or to look away for a moment ; so that what follows is a second edition rather than a prolongation of the first picture. On the other hand, the mere desire for change will produce a green light rapidly alternating with the original hue." (*Op. cit.*, p. 487.)

Our general conclusion, then, is that the phenomena of hallucination do not require, nor in any degree support, the difficult physiological hypothesis of retinal action. It is simpler to suppose that hallucinatory percepts, being subjectively indistinguishable from those produced by real objects, involve cerebral activity closely similar to that normally excited by visual impulses from the retina, and thus tend to be followed by cerebral exhaustion—similar to that resulting from such retinal impulses—and consequently by similar after-images.

It should be observed that the activity involved is no less purely cerebral if, as we are inclined to think, in many of the cases we have given, expectation is, in whole or in part, the real cause of the phenomena. Expectation can hardly be excluded in the case of educated observers, when their attention has once been called to the possibility of producing the complementary colours. Again, the activity also remains cerebral if, as is further possible, the sequence is due to another cause, namely, that the mind being weary of seeing one colour, consciously or unconsciously attempts to call up for a relief the complementary colour, because it is accustomed to associate this sequence with the idea of relief. Thus "Miss X." found that the mere desire for change in her crystal pictures would sometimes produce a green light rapidly alternating with the original hue—green being the colour most restful to the eyes and therefore perhaps, by association, to the mind.

CHAPTER VIII.

AGE, SEX, HEREDITY, NATIONALITY, AND HEALTH.
RECURRENT HALLUCINATIONS.

Age.

The ages at which the hallucinations included in our Census occurred, range from about three to about eighty years, and there is no reason to doubt that hallucinations may occur at any age at which visual perception is possible at all. Nor does there seem to be any much greater disposition to hallucinations at one age than at another, though it will be seen from the last line of Table XI that the proportion seems to be somewhat higher between 20 and 30 than at other ages. It is noticeable that this is the period of life when the organism has reached its full development, but has not yet begun to decay.

As already stated, however, in Chapter III, pp. 65 and 68, we believe our information to be specially defective as regards the number of hallucinations at early ages, so that the small proportion of youthful hallucinations reported cannot be taken as evidence that hallucinations are rare in early youth. Indeed, it is, of course, impossible to know much as to the nature and frequency of hallucinations among young children. Their memory, and in some respects their observation, is untrustworthy, and when they are too young to express themselves, evidence about their hallucinations—like that about hallucinations supposed to be experienced by animals—can only rest on the inferences of others from their actions. Still, there are clear cases of hallucinations being experienced by children, and some observers have even been disposed to think that children are specially liable to them. An instance of an apparition of a person recently dead being seen by a child just under two years old is recorded in the *Annales des Sciences Psychiques* (January—February, 1894, p. 7). This is perhaps the earliest age at which such a case has been authenticated.

As regards the kinds of hallucinations experienced by children, we have only noticed one peculiarity, and that is the relative frequency among them, compared with adults, of apparitions representing grotesque or fanciful objects.¹ Of the apparitions in the present collection classed as “grotesque, horrible, or monstrous,”

¹ The following is a rough analysis of the hallucinations of this class included in our Tables :—

Childish cases.—Diminutive figures of men or animals, often “swarming,” 5 cases. Out-of-the-way figures, viz., Red Indian, Turks, Halberdier, 4 cases. Bedroom frequently peopled with strange beings. Procession of toy cocks. Procession carrying headless negro. Figure with parasol walking across sky. Immense

more than half occurred to children, and 12 out of 33—or 36 per cent.—to children under 10 years old, whereas of all kinds of visual hallucinations together, only 8 per cent. occurred to children under 10. The reason, doubtless, is that children's judgment of what is likely to occur is less clearly formed; they do not instinctively draw the same line between the expected and unexpected that adults usually draw. The same difference is shown in ideas that do not develop into hallucinations. An imaginary lion under the bed is a source of infantine terror, but similar nervousness in a grown-up person suggests that there is a burglar there. In dreams, when our judgment is more or less in abeyance, and in delirium and insanity, hallucinatory figures unlike real life are apt to occur to adults, just as they seem to do in ordinary life to children.

The following are instances of youthful hallucinations:—

(350. 18.)

From Mr. H. C.

August 31st, 1890.

“When at Wells, being at the time a schoolboy, I followed a party of friends to see the Cathedral. I was detained by work a few minutes, and ran after the party. On entering the Cathedral I found it quite empty, my friends, I fancy, having gone up the tower. I heard a noise, and looking up saw a figure, dressed in the armour of a halberdier, moving along the gallery above the arches of the nave. The apparition was only momentary. This occurred about the year 1865. I was aged about ten.”

(324. 12.)

From Mr. W. K. S.

(The account was written in 1889).

“Once, when a very small child, on looking out of the nursery window, in London, on a fine cloudless day (in the morning), [I] saw a gaily-dressed figure, with a bright-coloured parasol, walk across the sky. It produced a very vivid impression on [my] mind at the time, and for some considerable period afterwards.”

(390. 1.)

From the Rev. A. H.

January 23rd, 1891.

“Long ago, certainly more than fifty, probably nearly sixty, years ago, when I was a boy—so young that I slept in a little bed in my father and mother's room—I was lying awake one summer morning, and there I suddenly saw on the ceiling of the room a procession of white cocks. They were not pure white, but had that slight tinge of yellow, or whatever you may

tower. Kitchen clock pursuing percipient. Boots trotting across room. Tree at foot of bed.

Adult cases.—Skulls or skeletons, 3 cases (one of them recurring). Horrid figures, e.g., corpse, 2 cases (one of them recurring in various forms). Figures taken for the devil or for an evil genius as described by Swedenborg, 3 cases. Grotesque animal, 1 case. Queer things seen in a bad light out-of-doors, 6 cases (the most definite of these was a brougham with a headless coachman.)

call it, which appears on white fowls, and with red wattles, exactly as white cocks have. They glided *backwards* in single file along the roof before my eyes, and disappeared, one after another, behind the curtain of my mother's bed without making any motion, except that each cock, just before it disappeared, went through all the motions of crowing, but emitted no sound. There must have been from 8 to 12 of them, and when the last of them disappeared behind the curtain I saw them no more. I knew perfectly well that they were not there, that they were what I should now call optical delusions, but I saw them as plainly as ever I saw a real fowl in my life. I could recall them (*i.e.*, their appearance) whenever I chose, just as I can at the present day, but the difference between the image which I called up and the delusion which I witnessed was as great and as real to me as is the difference between the presence of a person and the image I form of him in his absence. I was awed but not frightened at the sight, and said nothing about it to my mother or to anyone, for I knew I should be checked for telling a story. The procession lasted, I suppose, for about a minute, and I saw nothing more that morning. I never saw these cocks again.

Next morning I am quite sure I saw nothing at all, and perhaps for another morning or two I saw nothing, but soon afterwards I began to see on the ceiling great numbers of moving figures. The cocks which I saw were associated in my mind with toy stucco cocks, which were sold in the crockery shops, coarse clumsy things which had no proper legs, but stood on a mass of stucco. My cocks were as perfect as nature, but they, too, had no proper legs; they had a mass below their bodies, which supported them, and so I have no doubt that these toy-cocks were the basis of my vision. The figures which I now began to see bore a great resemblance to another set of toys which I used to see in the shop windows—*i.e.*, pewter soldiers, horses, gigs, &c., &c., but, unlike the toys, they were (like the cocks) perfect in form, coloured like nature, and moved naturally. The horses trotted, the wheels turned round, the men walked, and so on. These I continued to see in great numbers many days; all dread and awe of them entirely disappeared, and I became extremely interested in them, and liked to watch them. One thing I remember; I had not the power of controlling their motions; like my ships, they went about where they liked. They lasted in the morning till I got up, and I never saw any during the day. I do not know how long these visions continued; certainly, however, for many days during that summer, but, though I could, and even now can, recall their appearance completely, I never saw any more at any other time.

“I give you the history of this childish hallucination for what it is worth. I have often thought over it, and though it happened so long ago, I think you may rely upon the absolute accuracy of my narrative.”

.

“On reading the above to my son, a youth of 20, he told me an incident of his childhood, which I asked him to write out, and which I now enclose. He was then a child in petticoats.”

The following is the account referred to¹ :—

¹ This case is not included in our Tables, as the percipient was under 21 at the time the account was sent us.

“One of my earliest recollections—the earliest of all, I think—is a story-book with a picture of some hideous animal on the cover. Of this animal I was much afraid, and one day, on going alone into a room, I suddenly saw this animal (about the size of the picture) standing on the carpet. I promptly turned and fled, and for a long time after nothing would induce me to go into that room.

“E. M. H.”

(152. 9).

From Mr. J. S.

April 27th, 1892.

“I am now on the verge of seventy-six. About seventy years ago I had to lie on a board for two years, one fold of blanket under me, for spinal complaint. Once during this time I was amused by seeing a number of little dogs, busily running in and out of holes they had made in the ground; to me the sight was real, and exceedingly amusing. On another occasion I saw, or believed I saw, the washhand-basin on the table close to the window, and a number of little men and women (black), about three inches high, running about and getting into and out of the water; this lasted some time, to my great amusement, and seemed to me more real than the other, my recollection of both being very distinct even now. I cannot be sure I had these delusions more than once, and supposed myself wide awake at the time.”

Other cases of childish hallucinations are Nos. 164. 20 and 164. 24 (see p. 156), No. 623. 9 (see p. 181), No. 707. 1 (see p. 122), and No. 191. 3 (see p. 240). The last two of these are “death coincidences.”

Influence of Sex on Hallucinations.

It appears from Table I. that 7·8 per cent. of the men, and 12·0 per cent. of the women who have answered the Census question, have answered in the affirmative. From this we may infer that, so far as our informants are representative, the number of men who experience sensory hallucinations and remember them is to the number of women who do so in the ratio of nearly 2 to 3.

Mr. Gurney found that among 509 informants from whom he had received accounts of apparently subjective hallucinations of sight and hearing, the proportion of males to females was almost exactly 2 to 3, but among the 527 percipients concerned in the hallucinations of sight and hearing which are included as telepathic evidence in *Phantasms of the Living*, about 46 per cent. were males and only about 54 per cent. females. (See *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 3, foot-note.)

Our numbers are not exactly comparable to those of either of these two groups of Mr. Gurney's; because (a) we do not know what was the proportion of men to women among the persons from whom Mr. Gurney's cases were drawn, and (b) our answers not only group telepathic and purely subjective hallucinations together, but are not limited, as his

were, to visual and auditory hallucinations. We have, moreover, reason to believe that Mr. Gurney had not, among his purely subjective cases, any of the trivial and doubtful experiences which, as we have seen (Chapter III., pp. 64-66) form a not unimportant percentage of ours. But the general conclusion that women are more subject to hallucinations than men, or remember them better, receives considerable confirmation from the fact that it holds in Mr. Gurney's more selected types as well as in our wider collection.

In order to judge whether some kinds of hallucinations are specially frequent among women, we have examined certain classes in detail. We find that the visual hallucinations experienced by men within the last 10 years amount to 18 per thousand of our male informants, while those experienced by women are proportionately twice as numerous. And subdividing further, the preponderance of those seen by women is slightly greater among apparitions of living persons and incompletely developed apparitions than among apparitions of dead or unrecognised persons. Of 40 cases of realistic apparitions of living and dead persons which appear to us doubtfully hallucinatory, 13 were experienced by men and 27 by women.

If, going beyond the last 10 years, we take, either the 80 cases of apparitions reported in the Census to coincide with the death of the person seen, or the 130 hallucinations of all kinds reported to coincide with the death of an absent friend, we find that 44 per cent. of these are reported by men and 56 per cent. by women,—proportions not very different from those found in *Phantasms of the Living* (see preceding page),—so that, relatively to other hallucinations, men report a large proportion of these.

Men appear to forget their hallucinations more rapidly than women, at least so far as the visual hallucinations within the last 10 years are concerned. Within the most recent year, men report 35 visual hallucinations, or 4·2 per thousand, and women 52, or 6·0 per thousand. But for the previous year the men report 18, or only half of their number for the most recent year, and the women 39, or three-fourths of theirs; and the average annual number from five to ten years ago is 11 for the men and 24 for the women.

It may be interesting to consider, in connection with the present section and the last, the conclusions arrived at by Mr. F. Galton, in his *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, as to the variation of the power of visualising in the two sexes and at different ages; although, as before remarked (see p. 92), it has not been shown that persons who have strong visualising power are specially liable to see hallucinations. Mr. Galton's view is that there is no necessary connection between the vividness of dreams and the power of visualisation (*Op. cit.*, p. 97); and dreams are, in some important respects, analogous

to hallucinations. (See *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 296-297 and 389-391). Mr. Galton says (*Op. cit.*, p. 99):—"The power of visualising is higher in the female sex than in the male, and is somewhat, but not much, higher in public school boys than in men. After maturity is reached, the further advance of age does not seem to dim the faculty, but rather the reverse, judging from numerous statements to that effect; but advancing years are sometimes accompanied by a growing habit of hard abstract thinking, and in these cases—not uncommon among those whom I have questioned—the faculty undoubtedly becomes impaired. There is reason to believe that it is very high in some young children, who seem to spend years of difficulty in distinguishing between the subjective and objective world. Language and book-learning certainly tend to dull it." The results were similar in the cases of two special kinds of visualisation investigated by him, namely, the visualised forms associated with numbers and dates, and the colours associated with letters—especially the vowel sounds—by certain persons.

Heredity in Relation to Hallucinations.

Our statistics are not calculated to give more than fragmentary information on the subject of the comparative frequency of hallucinations in different families, because in most cases we have no means of knowing whether our informants are related to one another or not. We have, however, analysed such facts bearing on this subject as we have been able to trace, with the following results:—

(1) Taking three generations of linear descendants into consideration we find that in 34 families hallucinations have occurred in at least two generations. In two of these families, a great grandparent has had hallucinations as well. In three other families, both parents and two or more sons or daughters have had hallucinations.

(2) In 41 families, hallucinations have been experienced by two brothers, or two sisters, or one brother and one sister, or sometimes by more than two members of the family of the same generation. In one family, two sisters, a father, grandfather, two uncles and two aunts were all subject to visual hallucinations.

(3) In 7 cases, hallucinations have been experienced by at least two persons related to one another as uncles or aunts to nephews or nieces, or as cousins.

(4) In 3 cases, we are told that hallucinations have been experienced by "other members of the family," whose exact relationship to the percipient is not stated.

Though these numbers are not large in proportion to the whole number of persons included in the Census, still—considering that the information about relationships has only come to us accidentally—

they seem to afford some evidence that hallucinations tend to run in families.

The numbers given above do not include hallucinations stated to have been experienced *simultaneously* by members of the same family. The following table shows the relationship to one another of the percipients in our first-hand cases of "collective" or joint hallucinatory perception.

	Visual cases.	Auditory cases.
Parents and Children	18	6
Brothers and Sisters	26	6
Cousins or aunt and niece ...	4	2
Husbands and Wives	12	1
No relationship	35	19
	95	34

From this it appears that, in half the visual and in nearly half the auditory cases of collective hallucinations, the percipients were related to one another. From this large proportion of cases where the hallucinatory experience is shared with a member of the same family we may perhaps infer that the similarity of temperament existing more or less in most families facilitates the sharing of the impression. It is true that most persons are probably more often in the company of members of their own family than of others; but this hardly seems a sufficient explanation of the result in question, since it will be observed that the hallucination is only shared by husbands and wives—who are specially likely to be in each other's company—in 10 per cent. of the cases.

We think that the Census also affords some evidence that hallucinations running in families tend to take similar forms. It is possible that this may in some measure be attributable to the influence of heredity, but, as was before suggested (see p. 126) it may be due to family tradition, moulding the ideas of the percipients. A lady (No. 671. 20) who has constant hallucinations, which generally take the form of a yellow cat or black dog, tells us that the phenomenon is common in her mother's family. We are also told, by a collector, of a family, of which the members are said to see apparitions of a white dog, before a death in the family: several instances are mentioned, but the percipients refuse to give any first-hand accounts.

In the following case, a mother and daughter, at different times, see an apparition of a cat.

(561. 24.)

From Mrs. E. L. Kearney.

January 17th, 1892.

“My step-grandfather was lying ill in my father’s house. I was coming down stairs when I saw a strange cat coming towards me along the hall. When it saw me, it ran behind a green baize door which separated one part of the hall from the other. This door was fastened open, and I went forward quickly to hunt the strange cat (as I thought) away, but to my utter astonishment there was no cat there, or anywhere else in the hall. I at once told my mother (and she told me the other day that she remembers the occurrence). My grandfather died next day. Taken in connection with the above, the following is interesting. My mother told me that the day before her father died she saw a cat walk round her father’s bed; she also went to hunt it out, but it was not there.”

As bearing on the general subject of heredity, we may add that Mrs. Kearney informed us that her maternal great-grandmother had seen an apparition of her husband at the time of his death by drowning. This she had heard from her mother. The latter was at one time interested in Spiritualism, and exhibited an automatic capacity for drawing flowers, etc., in which she had normally no ability at all. Later, circumstances determined her to have nothing more to do with the subject.

The following are accounts of similar “grotesque” apparitions seen at different times by two sisters when young children:—

(164. 20.)

From Mrs. M. H.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“About the year 1869, whilst lying in bed one morning (about 6.30 a.m.), when about 7 years old, I had a distinct impression of seeing a man dressed in Eastern costume, with turban, flowing robes, and yellow slippers, standing at the side of the foot of my bed. I covered my face with the bed-clothes, and then looked again, and the figure was slowly sinking down into the floor. As far as I know, I was in a healthy state of body and mind. I never saw the apparition before. My little sister and a nurse were in the room, but asleep at the time. This was the only time I ever had such an experience. My younger sister, at 4 years old, saw the same apparition, but did not tell me of it till after I had seen it. Her account exactly corresponded with mine. I have been since told that there was at the time, in a loft close to my room, a Turkish sword, brought from Sebastopol by an uncle of mine. Might this have something to do with the apparition?”

(164. 24.)

From Miss E. S.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“When about 5 years old, I was lying awake in the dark one night, when the door by the head of my bed opened, and a man in Eastern dress (turban and long flowing robe) came in; he passed by me, and stood at the

side of my sister's bed. I have an idea that he held something in his hand, but whether it was a light, I do not know. I was perfectly well. The nurse and my elder sister [were present]. My sister saw a man answering to this description about a year and a-half afterwards in the daylight. I never told anyone of the apparition till my sister spoke of it."

In this case the existence of the Turkish sword, brought by an uncle from Sebastopol, makes it possible that Eastern dress and manners may have been specially interesting to the household, and that conversation may have suggested the form of the hallucination to each percipient.

In the following case there is evidence of a similar figure being seen independently by percipients of three generations, which seems to indicate a hereditary tendency to see apparitions—though this, no doubt, is not a complete explanation of the phenomena as reported.¹

(483. 10.)

From Mr. T. A. Quin.

October 24th, 1891.

"I saw a nice gentlemanly-looking young man in evening clothes, in the house I live in, for many years, at different hours of the night and day, and in various parts of the house. I was sometimes in bed and sometimes about the house, in my usual state of health, and with no grief or anxiety to agitate the mind; from under thirty [upwards]. The man had been dead many years before I was born; my father knew him when alive. On some occasions others were present, but did not see him. I saw him often.

"T. A. QUIN."

Mrs. Quin writes:—

"With regard to the apparition seen by Mr. Quin, my husband, I will write down all I have heard about it. To begin with, the house is situated on the town lands of —; the estate belonged to a family named F., the male members of which have all died out, and it has gone in the female line. The last survivor of the brothers, Tom, lived at — House, and I have been told by two ladies who were acquainted with him during his lifetime and while he lived in the place, that he himself often saw a gentleman about the house, but he never saw his face. He died in London of consumption; my husband's father afterwards took the house, and one night he woke up and saw Tom F. standing by his bedside; he tried to wake his wife (from whom I heard the story) but could not succeed, and told her the next morning what he had seen. I am not sure if the ghost ever appeared to him again, but his wife's brother, who lived with him, one evening before dinner turned into a bedroom which had been prepared for a guest to see if it was all right, and saw a gentleman either sitting or standing before the fire; thinking it was the guest expected, apologised for his intrusion and left the room. When he went downstairs, he found my father- and mother-in-law

¹ The evidence for what is commonly called "haunting" will be discussed in Chapter XVI.

waiting for dinner and wondering why so-and-so was so late. 'Why,' said Mr. B., 'I saw him in his room just now,' and they said he must have been mistaken as he had not arrived at all. He persisted that he had seen and spoken to him, so they went upstairs and found there was no one in the room. After my father-in-law's death, other tenants took the house, and the daughter of the people who had it before my husband took it told me some time afterwards that none of their people had ever seen or heard anything there. My mother-in-law never saw anything in the house. When my husband decided upon taking it, he was very anxious to know what his father had seen, but his mother would not tell him. At the same time she said, if he ever did see anything after living there, and would write and tell her what it was, she would then let him know what his father had seen. After being in the house a short time, he was in bed one night, having looked the door, a bright fire in the room. He suddenly saw a gentleman standing by his bedside, dressed in evening clothes. It was the time of the Fenian rising, and, being almost alone in the house, he had a loaded pistol under his pillow, which he at once tried to feel for, thinking someone had got into the house, but he saw the figure gradually moving towards the door, when it disappeared suddenly. He wrote the next day to his mother, describing exactly what he had seen, and she answered back it was exactly what his father had seen. He was only two years old when his father died, so he could have had no recollection. He often saw the same figure afterwards, at different times of the day, and in different parts of the house. I lived there after I was married for sixteen years, and never saw anything, nor had I any trouble about servants, though the house had always the reputation of being haunted, and I have been about the house all hours of the night. My eldest son, when he was little, slept in his crib beside my bed. [Being] subject to asthma, he was suffering one night, and could not sleep. At last I thought he had gone off, and was trying to sleep myself, but, after some time, I heard him awake, and spoke to him. 'I thought you were asleep, my pet?' 'No, mamma; a man's face has been looking at me.' 'You are dreaming, my darling.' 'No,' he said 'and there it is again,' and he got rather frightened and clung to me. His father next day was asking him about his dream and what he saw; he said it was a man's face, with hair on it. 'Was it a beard?' 'No, only side whiskers,' and that was the same kind of face he himself saw. The child was very young, and has no recollection of it at all, as I never reminded him about it; nor while we were in the house did I allow the children to hear of the ghost, or be told about it. Since we left it a gentleman took it, and he said he never saw anything, and I hear the family who are living there now say they never have seen anything."

In another case (No. 563. 24.) a girl of about 18 saw an apparition of herself, apparently standing before a mirror. She was living at the time with an aunt, who had, as a girl, twice had an experience of the same kind, the apparition representing herself. In another case (No. 545. 18.) the percipient was awakened by a crash and saw a large ball of fire, which seemed to light up the room, at her bedroom

window, on the night of her mother's death. The latter is said to have had a similar hallucination at the time of her husband's death by drowning.

Nationality in Relation to Hallucinations.

Table IX. gives what information we have been able to gather from the Census as to the influence of nationality on hallucinations. As will be seen, the great majority of the persons—nearly 16,000 out of 17,000—included in the Census are English, or, at least, English-speaking, a few Americans, as well as Australian colonists, being included in the English group. The next largest group is Russian, collected chiefly by Mr. Aksakoff, either personally or through friends; the Brazilian collection is due entirely to the efforts of Professor A. Alexander. The remaining section consists of collections made in various countries,—Austria, Germany, France, Italy and Sweden—the total numbers being so small that it seemed best to group them together. It is probable that a few foreigners are also included in the English group, but the great bulk of this is certainly English.

The relative proportions maintained within the groups are similar throughout. In each, a larger proportion of women than of men answer the Census question in the affirmative, and in each the visual hallucinations are the most numerous, and the tactile least so. Still, very striking differences are seen in comparing the groups with one another. Taking the first three sections,¹ the Brazilian percentages of affirmative answers and of hallucinations are highest throughout, being, roughly speaking, between two and three times as high as the English, which are the lowest in every respect. The Russian percentages are also considerably higher than the English.

Another noteworthy feature is the large proportion among the foreigners, as compared with the English, of hallucinations affecting more than one sense. These amount to 39 out of 160 described experiences, or 24·4 per cent., among the Russians; 21 out of 93, or 22·6 per cent., among the Brazilians; and 176 out of 1,675, or 10·5 per cent., among the English.

Health in Relation to Hallucinations.

It was important to enquire to what extent the hallucinations included in the Census could be regarded as due to ill-health, and therefore one of the questions put to all percipients was, "Were you out of health?" But as our desire was, not to investigate experiences of delirium or insanity, but to confine ourselves to hallucinations

¹ The last section is anomalous in several respects, but the number of persons in it is so small that we should not be justified in drawing conclusions from it.

occurring to persons in a normal condition, we stated, in the instructions to collectors on the back of Schedule A, that "the question should not be asked of persons who are known to have been at any time insane, and it is not intended to include experiences of delirium."

Of all the hallucinations coming within the scope of the Census question, of which we have first-hand accounts, a certain degree of ill-health is reported in 146 cases. All these cases were carefully considered, Dr. Myers giving special attention to their medical aspect, so far as this could be judged of from the information given.

In 23 of them, the hallucination took place in a state of illness when delirium is known to occur frequently, *e.g.*, in scarlet or typhoid fever, or in a state of temporary injury to the brain, *e.g.*, from a fall on the head. In these cases it may well be supposed to be due exclusively to a morbid physical condition; these 23 hallucinations are accordingly not included in the Tables,¹ and the persons who experienced them are counted as having answered "no" to the Census question, unless they have had other hallucinations when in good health.

In the remaining 123 cases,² though morbid conditions may have had something to do with producing the hallucinations, it is so much more doubtful than in the 23 already mentioned that we have thought it better to retain them. Of the first-hand cases included in the Tables, therefore, there was a certain degree of ill-health in rather over 7 per cent. In 21 of them the percipient was in a state of convalescence after some illness,—the nature of which is not always specified, but which was apparently acute,—or recovering from a recent operation, or on the verge of a severe illness. In 55 cases the percipient was in a state of depressed health or minor illness—*e.g.*, "in a nervous dyspeptic condition," "in a very low state of health," "bronchitis with weakness of heart"—the condition being one with which hallucinations are not supposed to be generally associated, though it may have rendered the patient more liable to them than a person in normal health would be. There remain 47 cases of still slighter indisposition than the above, such as being "a little below par, and somewhat nervous and excited," where it seems very doubt-

¹ Three second-hand cases are also excluded from the Tables on the same ground. Of the 23 first-hand cases, 7 are apparitions of living persons, including 2 representing the percipient himself; 1 is an apparition of a dead person, and 2 of unrecognised persons; 3 belong to the class of "grotesque, horrible, or monstrous apparitions"; and, of the remainder, 6 are visual hallucinations of other kinds and 4 are auditory hallucinations.

² In 29 of these cases there was a certain degree of anxiety or mental distress as well as of ill-health. The possible effect of such emotional conditions in producing hallucinations is discussed in the next Chapter.

ful whether the physical condition had any share in producing the hallucination.

In 780 first-hand cases (that is, 48 per cent.), no statement at all is made as to health. The assumption in these cases is that the percipient was in good health. Often it is clearly to be inferred from all the circumstances stated. And as the question, "Were you out of health?" was put to all the percipients, they would probably have answered it if they had been so. Considering the extremely slight nature of many of the ailments that were mentioned, it seems that the tendency was rather to exaggerate than to overlook any possible connection that there may have been between the hallucination and the state of health at the time. Some persons appeared anxious to show that their hallucinations were due to their state of health, even if they could not point to any other symptom of ill-health than the hallucination itself.

In 719 first-hand cases, that is, about 44 per cent., a positive statement is made that the percipient was in good health at the time.

On the whole, therefore, it appears that, in the great majority of hallucinations included in the Census, there is no reason to think that the physical condition of the percipients was in any way morbid. No symptom of disease appears, unless the hallucination itself is to be regarded as such, which is not the view now generally taken by the majority of competent observers familiar with the phenomena of hypnotism.

In considering the kind of hallucinations that occur during ill-health, it is convenient to take the whole number, whether excluded from the Tables or not, into account. Dividing, according to the sense affected, the 146 first-hand cases in which any degree of ill-health is mentioned, we find that 106 are visual hallucinations, 28 auditory and 12 tactile. In this respect, therefore, the proportions are not markedly different from those in the whole collection. The proportion of realistic human apparitions (69 out of the 106 visual cases) is, however, distinctly small. And the non-realistic apparitions include a disproportionately large number (namely, 9), of grotesque, horrible, or monstrous apparitions.

The following are two cases of hallucinations occurring during ill-health :—

(112. 22.)

From Mrs. Girdlestone.¹*January, 1891.*

"I felt, more than I saw, many animals (principally cats) passing by me and pushing me almost aside, as I went downstairs in broad daylight in our

¹ The kind and degree of illness in this case was judged to be sufficient to exclude it from the Tables.

house at Clifton during several months in 1886 and 1887. Also often during same period, and even now occasionally, I saw and see frightful faces ; only faces, no other part of the body ; faces of no one I ever met in life, and faces made hideous through terrible disease. I might be walking, or reading, or talking. Occupation had no effect, neither time of day. In 1886 and 1887 I suffered from overwork (mental) ; I was always conscious that the sights were illusions, except for the animals pushing me, or perhaps a shadowy shapeless form, from which I suffer still, though quite well. [This happened] many times ; and, as remarked above, I still feel in broad daylight as if someone or something pushed past me ; so much so that I invariably go aside to let pass whatever seems in the way, though realising almost immediately that there is nothing. Opiates act most quickly and peculiarly upon me. 1-16 of a grain of morphia given by the mouth makes me lose for some hours my sense of identity. Belladonna plaster on the back invariably causes many cats to swarm around me.”

(13. 5.)

From Mr. J. S. R.

(The account was written in 1889).

“In the summer of 1870, after very prolonged intellectual exertion, and want of sleep, when the strain was over, and I was in a state of exhaustion, I was conscious of elaborate music being played, and forms moving in and out of the room, of the unreality of which I was well aware. The impressions persisted for some hours, and were only removed by a deep sleep. [I have] only once [had such an experience].”

It will be observed that these hallucinations are of quite a different character from the majority of those reported to us, being more complicated and dream-like. In this respect, they have some resemblance to the visions produced by opium, hasheesh, and other such drugs, which are frequently very complicated, as well as prolonged (*e.g.*, a case quoted by Professor James, *Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II., p. 121). Several hallucinations of this kind occur among those accompanying some degree of ill-health, but none in the rest of our collection.

Some other cases of hallucinations occurring to percipients in more or less abnormal physical conditions are given as illustrations of other points, *e.g.*, Nos. 546. 19., 49. 5., and 460. 14. (see pp. 119, 142, and 103). For another case, see *Appendix E*.

Number of Persons who have had more than one Hallucination.

In Table III. the noteworthy fact appears that, of the persons included in the Census who have experienced hallucinations, only 34 per cent.,—427 out of 1249,—of those who give first-hand accounts have had more than one such experience. Table III. also shows that there

is a good deal of variety in the experiences of these persons, both as to the kind and as to the number of their hallucinations: nearly half of them have only had visual hallucinations; about a quarter have only had auditory hallucinations; and a few only tactile. Nearly a quarter have had hallucinations, some of which affected one sense and some another. As to the number experienced, about half the percipients report themselves to have had several or many hallucinations, but do state the exact number; rather more than a third of them have had only two hallucinations; the remainder have had numbers varying from three to six.

When several hallucinations are experienced by the same percipient they are in some cases scattered throughout his whole life, or a long period of it, and in others, even when numerous, they are confined to a comparatively short period. As a specimen of the former kind described by an exceptionally intelligent witness, see the case of Mrs. D. (*Appendix D*), also No. 422. 22 (Mr. Mamtchitch's case in Chapter XVII). Instances of the latter kind are Nos. 327. 25 (p. 196) and 488. 14 (p. 353). Again, while in most cases the successive hallucinations are apparently quite miscellaneous, in others they show a more or less marked tendency to repeat themselves, the same hallucination recurring again and again. We find 71 cases of this kind of recurrence in visual hallucinations. By "recurrence" we do not mean necessarily an exact reproduction, but that the general resemblance is enough to make the percipient regard the successive hallucinations as representing the same person or thing, or, in the case of animals, the same species of animal. Thus, in No. 37. 13, the percipient was awakened by clothes falling off her bed, and saw a figure in profile, with a lilac print dress and white apron, standing at the other end of the room. On another occasion she was awakened by feeling her hand clutched, and saw a figure of a woman in a similar costume facing her. Here the general resemblance was enough to make the percipient regard the figures as representing the same person. Again, in No. 280. 20, the percipient saw the face of his brother in a wide-awake hat look in at the door of his room in the evening. The same night he woke and saw the upper half of his brother standing by his bed, looking at him. We count both these cases as recurrent, in spite of the slight differences between the impressions on the different occasions. In most of the recurrent cases, the various appearances seem to have resembled one another more closely than in these.

The following Table shows the number and kind of these recurrent visual hallucinations.

Recurrent Visual Hallucinations.

	Number of times the hallucination occurred.				Total.
	2	3	4	In-definite.	
Realistic apparitions of living persons	5	—	—	3	8
,, ,, dead persons	2	2	—	9	13
,, ,, unrecognised persons	10	4	3	9	26
Incompletely developed apparitions ...	4	1	1	5	11
Other visual hallucinations	3	2	—	8	13
Total	24	9	4	34	71

Of the percipients included in the above Table, 28 have had other hallucinations of a different kind from the one which was repeated.

Auditory and tactile hallucinations appear to be repeated much more frequently in proportion than visual hallucinations,—146 cases of recurring auditory and 35 of recurring tactile hallucinations being reported in the Census,—but this seems to follow naturally from the smaller variety of form to be found in auditory and tactile cases.

The repetition of hallucinations is—as might be expected—especially marked in cases occurring during ill-health. Of the 106 visual cases reported to us in which the percipient was in ill-health, 16, or 15 per cent, were recurrent. It should be said that 7 of these are among the 19 cases which seemed so clearly due to ill-health that we have excluded them from the Tables; but recurrence is also found in over 10 per cent. of the remainder, whereas, of all the visual cases included in the Census, only 71, or 5·5 per cent., were recurrent.

The connexion between recurrence and ill-health is less marked in the auditory and tactile cases. Of the 40 auditory and tactile cases reported to us as occurring during ill-health, 18, or 45 per cent., were recurrent, while of all the auditory and tactile cases included in the Census, 181, or 36 per cent., were recurrent.

We have not included among recurrent visual hallucinations about 20 cases in which a visual hallucination is repeated once or more within a very short period—one or two days, at most—because the phenomenon appears to be of a somewhat different kind from repeti-

tions at longer intervals.¹ It may be regarded as a single hallucination of more than average force and persistency, analogous to those very rare cases where the hallucination continues for a long time—say, as much as half an hour—and it would be very difficult to draw the line between such cases and those where an apparition is seen again after looking away from it, or after closing the eyes and then looking at it again. We have in No. 450. 18. (p. 234) a rather striking instance of an intermediate kind.

Analogous auditory cases, which must obviously be regarded as single hallucinations, are those where the percipient hears himself called two or three times in succession.

¹ We have therefore, as stated on p. 52, counted these cases each as one hallucination, unless there are some special features of difference between the different appearances, as in No. 280. 20, referred to on p. 163

CHAPTER IX.

MENTAL AND NERVOUS CONDITIONS IN CONNEXION WITH
HALLUCINATIONS.

In the last Chapter we have been dealing with general physical conditions, whose influence on the phenomenon investigated is, for the most part, only statistically traceable. We now pass to consider, in the light furnished by our statistics, certain conditions of the mind and nervous system, whose connexion with hallucinations is commonly held to be of a more direct and important kind. The chief of these are anxiety, grief, and the state of overstrained nerves which—though it may, of course, be an effect of prolonged or intense anxiety or grief—may also result from mere overwork and mental fatigue, when neither of the before-mentioned emotions is present. We shall treat the three conditions separately, as far as possible: and shall begin with the state of nervous overstrain, since in some cases—where the overstrain has gone so far as to cause illness—its effects have already come under our notice¹ in the preceding chapter. Omitting cases where definite or permanent ill-health has been produced, the percipient states himself to have been—at the time he experienced a hallucination—overworked, overstrained, extremely tired, in a state of overwrought nerves, or in some similarly described condition, in some 25 cases in the present collection. And, though not mentioned, it is probable that such overstrain existed in a certain proportion of 17 other cases where the percipient was in constant attendance on a friend or relative who was dying or very ill. In 8 of the 25 cases, a definite cause of anxiety is mentioned, and in 3 others, the percipient speaks of himself as worried.

The following is a case where the hallucination and overwork were clearly connected.

(287. 1.)

From Mr. W. H. F.

January 17th, 1890.

“I saw what seemed to be the end of a ladder placed against the lower part of my bedroom window. Slowly the head and shoulders of a man (ordinary workman’s dress) appear until he is high enough to unfasten the window catch, an operation he immediately proceeds to try to perform. Place: my rooms at Oxford. Time: always between 12 and 2 a.m. Dates: I do not remember, but at least twice respectively in the winters 1884-5, 1885-6, 1886-7, 1887-8, never since. [I was] lying sleepless and worried in

¹ It is to be remembered that cases in which the resulting illness is of a kind known to produce hallucinations have been excluded from our Tables.

bed, but in perfect health in other ways, the 'worry' due entirely to overwork. Age 24-29. [The man was a] perfect stranger; actions suggestive simply of burglary. (N.B. I have never been in any house which has been burglariously entered.) The experiences [were] always exactly the same. [I] always regarded it simply as my sign that I was overworking. As soon as I could rest, the hallucination disappeared; if I couldn't rest immediately, it appeared nightly."

The following is a case in which overwork seems mainly responsible for the hallucination, but where its form was apparently determined by anxiety.

(426. 13.)

From Dr. A. H.

November 22nd, 1891.

"Spring of 1880. I was seated in the train at Cannon Street Station, when a train drew up beside mine. In the carriage which stopped beside mine and in the seat nearest to me was seated (as I thought) my brother Leslie. He was the sole occupant of the carriage. I let down the window of my carriage, knocked at his carriage window, and otherwise tried, without result, to attract the man's attention. [I was] extremely overworked; [age] 24. My brother was in the West Indies. The last despatches spoke of yellow fever on board the ship, and other things which had made me anxious. He was not ill."

Other cases where overstrain seems to be the probable cause of the hallucination, are No. 460. 14 (see p. 103) and No. 643. 22 (see p. 103). To these may be added one or two cases—not included in the numbers above given—where the percipient, being subject to hallucinations, finds them more frequent in periods of overstrain: and we have also, of course, to take account of the cases where the overstrain has been allowed to reach the point of a breakdown of health.

Effect of Emotion in producing Hallucinations.

We endeavoured to obtain information as to the influence of emotion on hallucinations by asking all percipients whether they were in grief or anxiety at the time of the experience that they described. The positive information given in answer to this question is no doubt a good deal coloured by subjective bias; for percipients will vary in their readiness or reluctance to give such information, and some will exaggerate, and others underestimate, the degree in which emotional agitation was really present. It is therefore best not to attempt to decide what degree emotional disturbance ought to reach before it is reasonable to take it into consideration at all as a possible cause of hallucinations, but merely to draw such general conclusions as we can from the cases where emotion is mentioned, or where the

circumstances seem to warrant the assumption that unusual emotion was present.

Taking all hallucinations, whether of sight, hearing, or touch, of which we have first-hand accounts, we find that anxiety, more or less grave, about the illness of a relative or friend, is stated to have been present, or appears from the evidence to have been probably present, in about 89 cases.¹ In 54 other cases, we find mention of anxiety, or worry, or serious trouble about other subjects than illness,—or at least not stated to have been about illness. Then there are about 49 cases, in which the percipient appears to have been in grief, or unhappy (besides some, already counted, in which he states himself to have been in anxiety, as well as in grief); and if we add cases of depression (5) and of agitation in various forms (23),² we get altogether, out of 1,622 hallucinations, about 220 cases in which emotional disturbance accompanied the hallucination. In 437 cases, a positive statement is made that no grief or anxiety existed, and there seems to be no reason to suspect the presence of either in the great majority of the cases where no answer is made to the question about emotion, nor any information given bearing on the subject.

In 42 of the 49 cases of grief, it is due to the recent death of friends; so that altogether anxiety about illness, or grief about death, was present in 131 cases of hallucinations, that is, about 8 per cent., or nearly $\frac{1}{12}$ of the whole number of hallucinations. It seems practically certain that our informants have not, on the average, been in a state of anxiety about the health of their friends, or in grief for their recent loss, during $\frac{1}{12}$ of their lives—the period required to account by chance alone for the number of hallucinations occurring under these circumstances: at first sight, therefore, it would seem clear that anxiety and grief did cause hallucinations. But further examination makes it doubtful whether this inference from the facts is legitimate. In 42 of the 131 cases the hallucination is stated to have occurred at the moment of death, or within 12 hours (generally very much less) of it, the death being unknown to the percipient, and the hallucination connected in some way with the decedent: and, in several other cases,

¹ We say “about,” because the extreme difficulty of deciding what the emotion amounted to makes it desirable to regard the numbers we give as approximate only. We include, among these 89 cases, some where no anxiety is mentioned, but where we have reason to think that the critical nature of the illness of a friend or relative was known, or may have been known. In the case of an illness of long standing and not known to be approaching a crisis, it is, of course, probable—unless the contrary is stated—that no special anxiety was felt.

² Some cases, in which seemingly small degrees of annoyance or agitation are mentioned by our informants, have been included in this number. The fact of their being mentioned has some tendency to show that more important degrees of emotion are not likely to have been passed over in silence.

there is an element of coincidence suggesting a possible telepathic explanation. In these coincidental cases, it would be begging the question to assume that anxiety about illness, or grief about death, is the sole cause of the hallucination ; and, if we omit these cases, those that remain are hardly sufficiently numerous to afford a clear statistical proof of the tendency of these emotions to produce hallucinations.

At the same time, the general view that emotional excitement sometimes causes hallucination is supported by an examination of particular instances which strongly suggest a connexion between the two ; but in the best cases of this in our collection the emotion was different from those just considered. The most undeniable instance is No. 733. 18 (see p. 141), where a boy, who had received a shock from seeing a corpse lying in an open coffin, afterwards saw an apparition of the same figure : but the connexion between emotion and hallucination is, at any rate, highly probable in the following cases of hallucinations occurring during obvious and imminent peril of death.

(34. 7.)

From Mr. A. L.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“ When driving in the wilds of North Devonshire, the post-boy, in giving a gruel to the horse, took off the head collar in the road. The horse, startled, set off at full gallop with me in the gig, with only the reins holding to the rings of the collar. I said, ‘ Your life is sacrificed by the folly of a fool.’ I heard a voice distinctly say, ‘ No, it is in the hands of God.’ [I was] in strong health [at the time]. No [other persons were present.]”

(453. 3)

From Mr. J. L. C.

September 24th, 1891.

“ When going from Glasgow to New York per Anchor steamer *Europa* on March 4th, 1871, we were overtaken by a severe storm, which somewhat alarmed all the passengers. At 10 o'clock p.m. we were startled by the news that the bridge had been swept away, carrying with it the captain and two principal officers, who were lost. In the excitement, the vessel fell off into the trough of the sea, which increased our fears. We were all gathered together in the cabin, the Doctor reading from the Prayer Book, as we thought our last hours were come. While sitting lonely and sad, thinking of my loved ones at home, I lifted my head to look across the cabin, and saw, as I thought, my mother standing with my little boy waiting for me at the sea shore.¹ I saw them very distinctly, just as I had seen them moving

¹ The collector writes :—“ As I had previously heard the incident, there was no mention of ‘ sea-shore,’ and ‘ waiting for me ’ is plainly an inference, the clause being doubtless innocently prompted by the hymn—

‘ We are watching by the river,
‘ We are waiting by the shore.’ ”

about before they died. My mother had died about a year before this, and my boy about six months. Coming to me in this hour of deep grief, it gave me a thrill of real joy. The vision only lasted for a few moments. I was then 44 years old. About 20 were in the cabin, but no one shared the experience ; [it] was personal to myself."

Crises of this kind are brief and comparatively rare, so that we think it reasonable to conclude that the hallucination did not occur then by accident; and the intense emotional agitation connected with the crisis seems the most probable cause.

We may add two other cases of less violent emotion.¹

(287. 15.)

From Mrs. H. R.

(The account was written in 1890. For another experience of the same percipient, see p. 201.)

"I was in bed, unable to get any sleep. I recollected a bad dream I had had in the same house, and a sudden feeling of fear of the invisible made me pull the clothes closely round me. As I did so, I distinctly thought I heard a voice behind me say, 'It is of no use doing that.' At the time I was so frightened that I jumped out of bed and lighted a candle. This occurred in July, 1883. I was not in very good health at the time."

(424. 7.)

From Mr. C. H. G.

(Late Senior Assistant Medical Officer at —).

February 17th, 1891.

"Quite recently, viz., two months ago, half an hour after retiring to bed, 9.30 p.m., when quite awake, I heard the captain of my ship, the *Elbe*, come into the cabin and ask for the key of the medicine chest. Upon enquiry next morning, I was informed that no such occurrence had taken place. At the time I was to some extent suffering from mental worry, owing to an epidemic amongst my people, viz., 600 coolies. At the time, the captain was in his cabin on the upper deck (mine being below) reading. No one [was] present at the time. [I have] only once [had such an experience.] Two nights later, the captain had a similar experience at about the same hour, and came out of his cabin imagining that I had called him."

These cases, taken together, seem to show that emotion does to some extent tend to produce hallucinations. There is no reason, however, to think it a very fruitful source of hallucinations, and

¹ In none of these cases, it will be observed, is there any expectation of seeing or hearing what is seen or heard. Cases where there is such expectation, even if acute emotion is also present, cannot be regarded as necessarily due to the emotion, since the expectation may itself produce the hallucination (see Chapter X).

certainly only a very small proportion of those in our collection can be thus accounted for.

Rest and Abstraction.

There is stronger statistical evidence tending to show that a state of rest is favourable to hallucinations. We find from Tables V. VII., and VIII., that in 38 per cent. of visual, 34 per cent. of auditory and 44 per cent. of tactile cases, the percipient was in bed, or (in a very few cases) had been sleeping in his chair or elsewhere. Considering what a small part of our lives we generally spend awake in bed, the fact that over $\frac{1}{3}$ of the hallucinations occur under these circumstances is certainly remarkable: and the proportion that occurs immediately after waking—about 12 per cent. of visual hallucinations—is still more striking. We are inclined to attribute this result to a combination of causes. In the first place, it seems probable that the transition from sleep to complete wakefulness—and the transient states intermediate between sleep and waking, which probably often occur during the times of general wakefulness in bed—are not very dissimilar in their characteristics to the hypnotic condition, except for their extreme instability. Now the hypnotic condition is well-known to be one in which it is very easy to induce hallucinations of all kinds, and in which they sometimes occur spontaneously: we have observed this several times with our own subjects, and it is probably familiar to all investigators of hypnotism.¹ It must be remembered that no experience occurring when the percipient does not believe that he was fully awake is counted in our Tables; but this is not incompatible with the supposition that the hallucination may sometimes have begun when his state was verging on half-sleep and have roused him completely before it vanished.

In some cases of hallucinations immediately after waking a somewhat different cause has operated,—the influence of impressions from the dream-world of complete sleep. We have already (Chap. IV., pp. 71-2) given two instances of this—besides a specimen of the seven cases excluded from our Tables, in which dream-images or nightmares persisted into the waking state—and the following is another example.

(724. 3.)

From Mr. B. L. L.

April 28th, 1892.

[We give an abstract of the original account, which was written in French.]

Mr. B. L. L. was French professor at the Ecole réale of —, present age 45. Towards the end of July, 1870, being at Paris, he dreamt vividly that

¹ For examples, see Moll's *Hypnotism*, English translation, pp. 177 and 178, where he refers to the observations of other experimenters besides his own.

he went into his sister's house, and found her lying dead in a coffin in the drawing-room. He woke and told a friend with him that his sister was dead. At the same moment he heard "une voix mélodieuse et qui n'avait rien de commun avec nos voix terrestres : 'Ladislas chéri, Ladislas chéri, Ladislas chéri !'" (Ladislas being his Christian name). His sister died at the same time. He knew that she was ill, but the last two letters he had had about her had said that she was convalescent. His only anxiety at the time was about the approaching war with Prussia.

We add a peculiar and interesting case of a dream impression lasting into the waking state: though, as it failed to produce a sensory hallucination, it is not included in our Tables.

(214. 19.)

From Mrs. E. T.

November 3rd, 1889.

"[I was] awaked at night by my own voice, saying, 'Do not let him sleep!' and feeling agonised by seeing my son (who had gone out to British Columbia some weeks previously) lying exhausted on deep snow, a horse also lying near him. [I] found myself walking the room, quite awake, imploring some one I could not see, *not* to let him sleep. [I] ascertained some months later there had been this risk in travelling to a distant ranche. [I had] had much anxiety and grief; [age] about 49. My son (only child) aged about 28, was doing what is described, *i.e.*, lying down exhausted in the snow, but I could not prove that the exact time [corresponded]. My husband was in the same room, but knew nothing of my experience, nor did I say why I called out 'don't let him sleep.'"

Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

December 16th, 1891.

"I have this afternoon seen Mrs. T. She seems quite clear that her experience was not externalised. There was no apparition in the room with her—nor vision that she saw with her eyes.

"It happened perhaps 5 years ago. She was very anxious about her son, who was at the time going through dangers in crossing the Rocky Mountains and dangers in snow. But her vision gave her a quite definite idea of danger from *sleeping* in the snow; and this was not one that had occurred to her apart from the vision, because, as she said, 'it was such an absurd thing to do.' The son had had a very arduous day's journey and was utterly exhausted: but the smell of the interior of the Indian hut to which they came was more than he could stand, and he lay down outside in the snow by his horse, and fell asleep almost instantly. They dragged him into the hut at once, or it might have been fatal. Mrs. T. did not note the date, nor did her son, so the coincidence cannot be made out. She believes, however, that there was one."

Another case where the connection between the dream and the hallucination that followed on waking seems to be clearly made out, is No. 34. 20 (see p. 289).

The explanations above given, however, apply only to a portion of the class which we are now considering,—the hallucinations that occur

when the percipient is in bed. We are inclined, therefore, to think that the mere absence of external distractions which is incident to rest in bed—even when the person resting is in a condition of complete and prolonged wakefulness—is in itself favourable to hallucinations. This supposition seems to be supported by the fact that hallucinations occur more in solitude than in company, as the following Table shows.

VISUAL HALLUCINATIONS.

Analysed according to the condition of the percipient in respect of solitude.

	Percipient alone. ¹	Other persons present.	Unstated.	Totals.
Percipient in bed... ..	318	62	43	423
„ up and indoors	261	147	30	438
„ out of doors ...	103	98	—	201
Unstated	10	1	39	50
Totals ...	692	308	112	1112

From this it appears that 62 per cent. of the visual hallucinations occurred when the percipient was alone or practically alone.

It seems to us possible that the practice of crystal gazing may partly facilitate hallucinations by producing a state of quiescence and abstraction; and that the gazer may even sometimes pass into a semi-hypnotic condition through keeping the eyes fixed on the same spot. Mr. Keulemans describes a condition of this kind as resulting from the concentration of his attention on one spot, during the process of drawing the eye of a bird (see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 517-519); and the experience of one of our percipients, No. 323. 22, —who, when being photographed (and therefore with her eyes fixed) “saw the bust and head of some one appear, who looked like a musician”—is perhaps of the same kind. But, as was said in Chapter V. (p. 109), the 17 cases in our collection of apparitions seen in reflecting surfaces rather suggest that the crystal assists in the formation of hallucinations by providing convenient *points de repère*.

¹ In the first column we have included cases where it seems probable from the circumstances mentioned that the percipient was alone, though he does not explicitly state it, and also cases where any other persons present in the room were asleep.

CHAPTER X.

EXPECTANCY AND SUGGESTION.

In a variety of cases included in our returns, the expectation of a certain sense-perception seems to have caused or facilitated the production of a hallucinatory percept of the kind expected.

Thus there are in the Census 14 cases (13 of which were visual and one auditory), of phantasms of persons for whose arrival the percipient was at the moment looking out. The correspondence in these cases of what was seen or heard with the subject occupying the percipient's thoughts seems so clear that we can hardly avoid the conclusion that there was a causal connection between the state of expectancy and the hallucination.

The following is an instance :—

(690. 1.)

From Mrs. T. E.

(The account of Mrs. E.'s experiences, some others of which are quoted below, pp. 186 and 333, was written by the collector, Mr. D. Fraser Harris, in April, 1890, and signed by Mrs. E.)

“This happened in 1870, when Mrs. E. was aged 40. She was sitting in the drawing-room of a hotel overlooking a park, and was waiting for her husband to take her down to dinner. The drawing-room door was open, and from her seat Mrs. E. had a view of part of the staircase and the intervening hall or passage. He delayed coming, so Mrs. E. ever and anon kept glancing towards the door and out into the hall beyond. At last one time she imagined she saw him turn a bend in the staircase and come slowly along the corridor. Keeping her eyes fixed all the time on what she thought was her husband approaching her with a well-known smile, Mrs. E. rose and crossed the room till she stood, as she thought, opposite her husband, when the spectre vanished from before her eyes. She was in good health at this time. In about half-an-hour afterwards, her husband, detained unavoidably, did veritably come into the room.”

Another kind of expectation, of which we have two instances in the Census, occurs when a prediction is made through some automatic means at a spiritualistic séance that the alleged “controlling” spirit will appear to one of the sitters as a test of identity. One of these cases, in which information unknown to the percipient and afterwards verified was given at the séances, was published in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VI., p. 351, and we give here an abstract of the percipient's account in the other case.

(536. 25.)

From Miss E. K. B.

(Miss B.'s account was written on August 21st, 1889.)

On November 27th, 1887, while staying near Melbourne, Australia, Miss B. made the acquaintance of a lady, Miss L. T., who had the capacity of planchette writing. A communication written through her, and signed by the name of a well-known authoress, "M. N.," stated that "before another year had rolled away, some gift of spiritual power would come to" Miss B. Miss B. afterwards went to Otago, and on the evening of December 31st, 1887, was persuaded by the friends with whom she was staying to try experiments in table-tilting. Miss B., remembering the prediction made through Miss T.'s planchette, wished to enquire further about it, and the tilts indicating that "M. N." was present, she asked when the "gift" would come to her and what form it would take. The tilts replied that "M. N." would be able to make herself visible to Miss B. the same night. This occurred at 10 p.m. Miss B. states that she was not at all impressed by the incident and went to bed and to sleep without thinking about it. In the middle of the night, she woke suddenly and completely, with a curious feeling of what she describes as "inward shivering"; the room was quite dark, and she saw a tall white female figure slowly rising between the wall and her bed with its arms stretching out towards her. She turned away from it and saw it again after turning back; it then seemed to disappear slowly into the floor. After a few minutes, she looked at her watch and found it was 2.25 a.m. In the morning she told her host, who confirms her account.

Six weeks later, Miss B. heard from Miss L. T. that she had been planchette-writing with a friend at Melbourne on the evening of December 31st, 1887. "M. N." had communicated, but at 12.30 had said that she "must go to" Miss B. This time at Melbourne corresponds to about 2.15 a.m. at Otago, the time when Miss B. saw the apparition.

Miss L. T. writes on July 7th, 1889, giving an account of her planchette-writing on the evening in question, and confirming Miss B.'s statements.

Expectancy, of course, cannot account for Miss B.'s seeing the apparition just at the time when the statement that "M. N." would go to her was written by the planchette; but, in any case, it may be regarded as having facilitated the hallucination.

In the following case (received from Brazil) there was a general expectation of seeing something, though there had been no suggestion that it would be seen at any particular time.

(730. 18.)

From Mr. J. K.

March 18th, 1892.

"I saw the form of a man dressed in a cap and blouse like those worn by French workmen. He entered my bedroom with a peculiar gait, more like dancing than walking. I heard him say, 'You wanted to know me. Here I am.' He came right up to the bed, and I could not help uttering a nervous cry. 'If you are afraid,' said the man, 'I will go,' and he immediately disappeared. I am not quite sure of the date, but it must have been in '82 or

thereabouts. It was past midnight. I was lying in bed smoking a cigarette. I am in the habit of smoking when I wake up at night. Health good. I was feeling a little anxiety about the nervous state [into] which my wife had then fallen, and which I attributed to adverse spirit influence. My age in '82 was 33. I had challenged the supposed influence some hours before to come to me, and I believe that it was in answer to this challenge that the form appeared.

“I was once reading aloud at a sitting when I saw a man leaning on the table by my side, who interrupted my reading with the remark, ‘I don’t understand.’ On looking round, I found he had disappeared, nor did any of the others observe a person sitting in the place where I saw him. At another sitting, I was rising from my chair, when a heavy hand was laid upon my shoulder and forced me down again. Yet there was nobody behind me.”

It is possible that habitual attendance at spiritualistic séances may lead in some persons to the seeing of apparitions and hearing of voices. In one case, (No. 383. 1) the percipient, a working-man, reports several hallucinations, both visual and auditory, occurring in the course of a few months, and the collector—himself a spiritualist—suggests that this may be the effect of the séances which he was accustomed to attend at that time.

Suggestions by word or gesture from the other persons present.

An obvious cause of the expectation of a percept is suggestion, in some form, from another person : and the question whether hallucinations can be induced in persons in a normal waking condition by such suggestion is especially important in connection with the evidence for shared or collective hallucinations ; since there are not many cases of collective hallucinations recorded in which it is quite certain that suggestion by word or gesture from one percipient to the other was excluded. But if this suggestion was the sole cause of the sharing of the hallucination in these cases, we should expect to find other cases where one person who is not experiencing a hallucination produces one by verbal suggestion in some one else.

Now it is well known that hallucinations may be produced in this way in hypnotised persons by suggestions given in the hypnotic state : and according to Bernheim (*De la Suggestion*, Chap. V.) they can sometimes be produced in persons “hypnotisable, but in no way hysterical,” even when they are in the normal condition, provided that they have previously been hypnotised. We have heard, moreover, on good authority, of an experimental case in which the effect was brought about in a person not previously hypnotised and in a completely normal state, by verbal suggestion of an insistent and emphatic kind : but we are not aware that any such case has been carefully

observed and recorded. And certainly no case clearly of this kind is included in our Census ; but in the two following, the collective nature of the experience is somewhat doubtful, and it seems, for different reasons, specially likely that the hallucination was caused in the percipient who describes it through verbal suggestion from her companion.

(237. 13.)

From Mrs. S.

January 3rd, 1890.

“I once fancied, or really saw, the shape of a woman by my bed. When about 16 years old, and sleeping with a lady some years older than myself, she awakened me suddenly, asking if I saw anything, and I believed at the time that I saw a tall, grey figure, near the foot of the bed, on the side farthest from me, but it did not make any serious impression on me.”

Here the transition from sleep to waking is, as we have seen, a condition favourable to hallucinations : and though the elder lady must be taken to have seen something, there is no reason to suppose that it was a tall grey figure.

(536. 2.)

From Miss J. S.

August 9th, 1891.

“In the year 1883, I was studying music, and used to practise alone frequently in the evening. Towards the autumn of that year, on one occasion, I felt some one touch me, and on looking round I saw the figure of a gentleman whom I knew. He was dressed in black clothes, with the collar of his coat buttoned closely round his neck, showing no white collar. As I looked he faded away. This occurred on three different occasions. I was in perfect health at the time, and in no trouble or anxiety ; of full age. I had not seen the gentleman himself for about two years before that occurrence, and have no idea what he was doing at the time. The two first occasions were exactly alike. On the last occasion, a young girl was playing a duet with me. She suddenly shuddered and said, ‘I felt some one touch me.’ I also felt as if a hand touched my shoulder, and on looking round saw the same gentleman.”

In this case the other witness, on being applied to for confirmation of her share in the experience, said that she did not remember anything about it. But even if Miss S.’s recollection is accurate, the sudden verbal suggestion, assisted by the traces of the two previous experiences, is probably sufficient to account for the phenomenon on the third occasion.

The possible efficacy of verbal suggestion in cases of collective hallucinations will be considered further when we come to deal with these cases. (See Chapter XV.)

Effect of Noises in Producing Hallucinations.

It appears in some cases that it is possible for a noise to induce visual hallucinations by creating in the hearer a strong expectation of seeing something corresponding to it or that may account for it. Dr. Moll gives a curious instance of a hypnotic subject of his, who when hypnotised was once much alarmed by a hallucination of a mad dog attacking him; Dr. Moll observed that this recurred whenever one of the persons present creaked his boots. (*Hypnotism*: English translation, p. 178.) He gives some further instances of visual hallucinations in hypnotised persons following on some slight stimulus of the other senses; e.g., blowing with a bellows caused a hallucination of a train and railway station (*Op. cit.*, p. 196). But in the hypnotic condition, suggestibility to hallucinations is of course very much greater than in ordinary waking life; and the cases just quoted are perhaps comparable to the instances described by more than one psychologist,¹ of dreams produced experimentally, e.g., by slight tactile stimuli, rather than to sensory hallucinations of persons in a normal waking condition. The following, however, is a transitional case—between dreaming and waking—in which the visual percept seems to be clearly dependent on a real sound heard at the time or just before. It is quoted from *Phantasms of the Living*, (Vol. I., p. 474, foot-note). The percipient writes:—

“Between sleeping and waking this morning, I perceived a dog running about in a field (an ideal white and tan sporting dog), and the next moment I heard a dog barking outside the window. Keeping my closed eyes on the vision, I found that *it came and went with the barking of the dog outside*; getting fainter, however, each time.”

With this may be compared the following case from Dr. G. J. Stoney's paper, *On the Limits of Vision*, another² extract from which is quoted in Chapter VII., p. 141.

“Some years ago, a friend and I rode—he on a bicycle, I on a tricycle—on an unusually dark night in summer from Glendalough to Rathdrum. It was drizzling rain, we had no lamps, and the road was overshadowed by trees on both sides, between which we could just see the sky-line. I was riding slowly and carefully some ten or twenty yards in advance, guiding myself by the sky-line, when my machine chanced to pass over a piece of tin or something else in the road that made a great crash. Presently my companion came up, calling to me in great concern. He had seen through the gloom my machine upset and me flung from it. The crash had excited the thought of the most likely cause for it, and this involved a visual perception in the mind,

¹ See especially Maury, *Le Sommeil et les Rêves*, p. 132, etc.

² See *The Philosophical Magazine*, March 1894.

faint, but sufficient on this occasion to be seen with distinctness when not overpowered by objects seen in the ordinary way through the eyes."

In the following case the form, at least, of the hallucination seems to have been suggested by the barking of the dog, though the coincidence with the death points to the operation at the same time of a supernormal cause.

(562. 3.) From Miss Wharton.

"12, Addison-terrace, Notting Hill, W., *December 4th, 1891.*

"I heard the voice of a friend saying to my brother-in-law, 'Please silence your dog.' Nero, our dog, was, in fact, barking immediately before I heard the words. Place: 15, Royal-crescent, Notting Hill. Date and time: April, 1882, 5 a.m. I was in bed, awakened by the dog barking. Not in any grief or anxiety. Age 40.

"I recognised the voice distinctly as that of a friend who was lying ill of pneumonia in Cambridge-gardens. My brother-in-law called next morning, according to his daily practice, to inquire after the patient, and ascertained that he had died in the early morning—about 3 a.m.¹

"No one else was awake or heard the voice.

"EMMA WHARTON."

In answer to a question put to her by the collector, Mr. E. L. Kearney, Miss Wharton writes:—

"I mentioned my experience to [my sister], Mrs. A., at breakfast, and she has *some* recollection of my telling her what I have recently written down for you on Form B, but her memory of it is not sufficiently vivid to warrant her in formally attesting it. The news of the death did not reach me until Mr. A. returned home in the evening."

Mrs. A. adds:—"The above correctly explains what was told me of the affair."—E. S. A.

The friend's name was given to us in confidence. Miss Wharton says, "He was a very intimate friend of Mr. and Mrs. A. and myself."

From the Register we find that the death took place on April 6th, 1881, not 1882, as stated above.

In an interview with Miss Wharton on January 29th, 1891, Mr. Myers learnt that the experience narrated was the only hallucination she had ever had.

The explanation that the hallucination was produced by a sound seems also to be rightly applied by the percipient in the following case.

(653. 5) From Miss. E. J.

February 17th, 1891.

"The most distinct hallucination that I remember was one which occurred to me one day in January 1891. I heard a friend (whose footstep I

¹ The importance of the coincidence is of course reduced by the percipient's knowledge that her friend was seriously ill.

recognised) coming into this house, cross the hall just outside the room in which I was standing, and go upstairs. *At the same time* that I distinctly heard her going upstairs after having crossed the hall, I saw her in the room where I was. The room opens into the hall. I only saw her for a second or two; and she had not on her hat and jacket as she would naturally have had coming in from a walk, but was dressed as she usually is in the house. The appearance vanished almost at once. I was startled by it, and when my friend came down I told her what I had seen, explaining that it must have been the sound of her step outside which caused the appearance. I had also just come in from a walk, and was talking to other people in the sitting-room. I was not out of health nor in anxiety of any kind. Age 27. I was living in the house with the lady I mentioned. She certainly came into the house at the time at which I heard her, but went straight upstairs and did not come into the sitting-room."

Besides the case just quoted, there are a large number of cases in which a visual hallucination seems to have been preceded by a noise. In most of these cases, however, the noise is regarded as hallucinatory by the percipient, so that they are classed in Table II. as bisensory hallucinations, "visual and auditory (non-vocal)." But in the majority of them, the hallucinatory character of the sounds seems to have been merely inferred from the fact that they were unexplained, or from their association with visual hallucinations. Now, it is obviously difficult—or in many cases impossible—to ascertain of what nature these sounds were; and we think it probable that in many cases they may have been real sounds, due to unexplained physical causes. For we find that when sounds of this kind are heard,—*e.g.*, in houses reputed to be "haunted,"—they are most frequently heard by every one in the house, or in the part of the house that is associated with them. Further, the assumption of their physical reality is not necessarily inconsistent with our systematised experiences of matter. An apparition which disappears in a clear space while being looked at, or passes through a closed door, is inexplicable as a part of the ordinary external world; but it is otherwise with these sounds. They may be unexplained, but they cannot be regarded as strictly inexplicable. Another characteristic of them is that they recur very frequently, to a degree that is extremely rare among hallucinations that can be proved to be such.

These considerations apply with special force to cases where non-vocal sounds alone are heard, no sights, or other more definite impressions, being associated with them. The uncertainty with regard to the nature of the sounds is then so great that we did not include in our statistical enquiry alleged hallucinations of this kind; but the uncertainty remains in some cases when the sounds accompany—and especially when they precede—visual impressions that are undoubtedly hallucinatory. There are 71 cases (see Table I) in our collection where

a non-vocal sound is heard accompanied by a visual hallucination, and in 56 of these the sound precedes the apparition. It seems to us not improbable that in many of these latter cases the sound was real and produced in the hearer a state of expectant attention which led to the visual hallucination. Instances of such cases are No. 68. 25 (see p. 120) and the following.

(623. 9.)

From Mr. H. F.

April, 1892.

“I was, so far as I remember, nine years of age [i.e. in 1874]. I had just gone to bed, and was—at least this was my impression at the time—quite awake. The door of my room was ajar, and there was a light in the passage, which half illumined my room. Suddenly, I became aware of a series of slight taps on the passage outside. These taps were not sufficiently loud for a human footstep: on the other hand, the volume of their sound was greater than that made by a walking stick. I fully remember sitting up in bed and beholding two top boots trot rapidly across the room and vanish into the opposite wall. The illusion was astonishingly vivid and I can recall the details to this day. I have never had a waking dream since, nor have I ever experienced ambulant top boots except on this occasion.”

Another case where it seems especially probable both that the sound heard was a real sound, and that the hearing of it was the occasion of the visual hallucination that followed, is No. 733. 18 (see p. 141), where a previous agitation had clearly predisposed the percipient to that particular hallucination. See also No. 284. 23 (p. 73), where the sound of the “bang” was followed by the sight which the percipient was accustomed to associate with it.

In other cases, a non-vocal noise, such as that of footsteps, leads up to a tactile hallucination (3 cases) or to the hearing of a voice (5 cases).

In considering how far the reality of the sounds may be inferred from their being generally audible to every one within ear-shot of them, we have examined the 56 cases where a non-vocal sound preceded an apparition. We find that other persons were present in 19 cases: that in 5 cases, all those who were present both heard and saw the same; that in 6 cases, the other persons had no share in the impression; but that in the other 8 cases, the sounds were heard by one or more persons who did not share in the visual percept. Instances of this last kind are Mrs. Hall’s case, No. 656. 26 (see chap. XVII.), and the following.

(319. 1.)

From Miss C. E.

July 4th, 1890.

“On January 11th, 1883, between 6 and 7 p.m., I was in the breakfast-room of my home, when I heard my father insert his latch-key in the front door, open the door and knock his stick on the tiles in the hall, but did not

hear him come up the hall. At the same time I saw his dog, a small Scotch terrier, pass the breakfast-room door, as though he had returned with my father. He did not go into the dining-room, but toward the mat at the foot of the stairs. I was standing by the table with my face toward the open door, glancing into a book ; when I heard my father's key, I put down the book and thus saw the dog. Living with my father, I saw both him and the dog constantly. It was his habit to go for a walk about that hour, but on that day both he and the dog were dozing before the dining-room fire. The dining-room door was opposite that of the breakfast-room, but was fast shut. I was alone, but an elder sister and a woman who sewed for her were in the hall and heard my father open the front door. They made no mention of the dog, but were emphatic as to my father having entered the house. I have another sister who remembers my elder sister, the woman, and myself all relating the incident to her the moment it occurred.

“ I ought to mention that directly my elder sister was told that my father had not entered the front door as she supposed, she hurried into the dining-room to convince herself that he was there ; and told him what had occurred. He declared he had not left the room all [the] afternoon, and the dog had been with him.”

Miss. E.'s sister writes :

December 15th, 1890.

“ In corroboration of my sister Miss C. E.'s statement, I remember the sewing woman and both my sisters telling me at the time, that my father had entered at the front door, when at that moment he was asleep in the dining-room.

“ H. G. E.”

Later she adds :—

“ I remember my sister C. telling me at the time she saw the dog cross the hall.”

Mr. Podmore writes :—

March 31st, 1892.

“ I called on Miss C. E. and Miss H. G. E. to day.

“ Miss. C. E. explained that she distinctly heard the ‘ fuss ’ of opening the front door, (*i.e.* key in latchlock, etc.), and then tap of stiek, and tiny patter of dog's nails on tiled floor. Then she saw the dog pass her in the hall—a yellow Scotch terrier—quite unmistakable in the full light of the gas. Miss C. E. then went into the hall, and presently joined her two sisters Miss H. G. E. and Miss E. in the pantry with the workwoman referred to. She there learnt that Miss E. had just had a glass of beer brought to the workwoman in the hall. Mr. E. much disliked anything being drunk in the hall, and probably the infringement of the rule of the house made Miss E. a little apprehensive of her father's return. Anyway, both she and the workwoman said that they heard his key in the latch and had run straightway into the pantry, meeting Miss H. G. E. on the way. Miss H. G. E. gave the fullest corroboration. She remembered to have heard of the incident from both her sisters and from the woman (now dead I gathered). Miss H. G. E. was of opinion that Miss E. saw nothing, and Miss C. E. was inclined to agree with her.

“It should be added that both sisters were of opinion that there was no real sound to start the hallucination, but the house fronted on a public square, and it is clear that it would be very difficult to exclude the possibility of real sounds.

“Miss C. E. was about 23 at the time. She has had no other hallucinations.”

Before leaving this subject, it may be worth while to remark that the spontaneous association of visual images with real sounds which occurs with some persons—such as the “number-forms” described by Mr. Galton and the phenomena of “coloured audition”—sometimes seems to assume a hallucinatory form. The following is an instance which appeared originally in *Nature* of March 6th, 1890. The account there given, which was written in May, 1889, has since been revised, with a few additions, by the percipient, Miss G., whose later account we quote. She writes:—

April 12th, 1891.

“The sound of an oboe brings before me a white pyramid or obelisk, running into a sharp point; the point becoming more acute if the note is acute, blunt if it is grave. The obelisk appears to be sharply defined and solid if the note is loud, and vague and vaporous if it is faint. All the notes of the 'cello, the high notes of the bassoon, trumpet, and trombone, and the low notes of clarinet and viola, make me see a flat undulating ribbon of strong white fibres. The tone of the horn brings before me a succession of white circles of regularly gradated sizes, overlapping one another. The greater the intensity of the sound, the larger and more distinct the circles. These circles and the ribbon float past me horizontally, but the point of the obelisk seems to come at me.

“In an orchestra, when the violins strike up, after the wind band has been prominent for a time, I see often but not always, a shower of bright white dust or sand, very crisp and glittering. I am taking note of the recurrence of this impression, and think it is becoming more frequent, but it is not invariable like the others. [It is much more frequent now, 1891.]

“I have heard a great deal of orchestral music all my life, but I have only noticed these effects for six or seven years. They gained gradually in frequency and clearness, and now the first three are invariable.

“If I know the scoring of a piece well, the various effects *slightly precede* the sound of the instrument they belong to; only the objects are vague and faint till the sound begins. Sometimes, if an oboe passage has an intense and yearning character, the white point comes so near me, and moves so rapidly, that I think it *must wound me*.

“I am very anxious to make it clear that I am not trying to describe a mental state by symbols, but that I *actually see* the point, the fibres, and the circles. Generally they float half-way between me and the orchestra. They give me great pleasure. If only one class of instruments is used, the effect does not extend beyond the opening bars: for instance, in a string quartette I only see the white sand for a moment at the beginning; if, however, wind and stringed instruments are combined, I see the various effects again and again in one piece. Lately (1891), the horn notes affect me so strongly that

instead of seeing a string or necklace of circles the air is full of them, like flakes in a snow-storm, and I have a swimming, giddy sensation.

“I am quite healthy and have always been so. I am 26½.”

Other Slight Impressions leading to Hallucinations.

The seeing of an apparition is sometimes preceded by slight or indefinite impressions, other than sounds, which often produce in the percipient an expectation of seeing something and by this means, perhaps, produce the hallucination. There is the same difficulty of determining whether these impressions are real or hallucinatory that we have found in the case of sounds.¹ The following is an instance where it seems very probable that the sensation described was produced by real movements.

(726. 18.)

From Mr. F. B.

October 31st, 1891.

“When a boy I sometimes saw forms in the dark. In the province of C., of which I am a native, we sleep in hammocks. I felt the hammock quiver, and on looking would see a form standing by or passing under it. I attached no importance to this at the time. This [occurred] in C., one of the Northern Provinces of Brazil. I ceased to see them some 24 or 25 years ago. I was in good health and spirits. I was subject to these visions, to the best of my recollection, between my eighth and fourteenth or fifteenth year.”

In about 14 cases, the seeing of an apparition is preceded by the apparent opening of a door, through which the figure seems to walk into the room. Here again, it is possible that the apparent movement may occasionally be a real one, due to some ordinary cause, and that the sudden expectancy which it produces may lead to the seeing of the apparition. (See Miss E. L. T.’s case, No. 264. 23, Chap. XVI.) An indication of the efficacy of such a cause is to be found in an expression used in an account quoted in Chapter IV. (pp. 76, 77). The percipient, who frequently experienced the hallucinations described, says, “Often when a door is opened, they rush in, like messengers in haste.” It would of course be a proof of the reality of such a movement if the object moved were found finally in a different place from where it was at first—if the opened door remained open. In most cases, however, the door appears to open and shut again, and then the most probable interpretation would generally seem to be that the whole movement is part of the hallucination: though in Miss E. L. T.’s case, just

¹ In the discussion of the “sense of presence” in Chapter IV. (p. 85), it was suggested that some impressions of this kind may be initiated by slight sounds or movements of the air, etc. half consciously or unconsciously perceived; but we have no positive ground for attributing the phenomenon to such a cause in any of the 20 cases in the Census where the “sense of presence” precedes a fully externalised hallucination.

referred to, the fact that the opening and shutting appear to have been seen by two persons renders it probable that the movement was real.

Other comparatively slight impressions leading up to more definite ones are when a touch is felt, preceding a visual hallucination (17 cases), or the hearing of a voice (7 cases). The following is an instance.

(437. 19.)

From Miss L. W.

July 7th, 1891.

“I felt a touch as of a hand laid on my shoulder, and, on looking up, saw a girl whom I had not seen, and of whom I had not heard, for about two years. Place: at my own home. Hour: about 4.30 p.m. [I was] occupied in shading a drawing; was in perfect health, with no grief or anxiety; age 20. [I] was *not* in the habit of seeing the girl [and] do not know what she was doing at the time. Two other persons were in the room, but they did not share the experience.”

In answer to questions, Miss W. adds:—

“The incident occurred about a year ago last March or April. As far as I know, the girl was at that time in Nottingham, but as I do not know her address, I am not able to find out anything about her. The figure only remained about a second after I first saw it, and I do not remember in what way it disappeared. I saw it very clearly.”

It is possible that the feeling of touch in this case was a muscular sensation misinterpreted. See Chap. V., p. 111.

An additional reason for regarding the hallucinatory nature of the initial part of the impression, in the cases discussed above, as doubtful, is that in a large proportion of them (at least 35 out of 124) the percipient is awakened—*e.g.*, by the sound or the touch—and then sees the apparition. This makes it doubtful, on the one hand, whether the sound or touch was not a dream-impression, and, on the other hand, whether it was not real; since there is a special difficulty in distinguishing between true and false impressions at the moment of waking. Several other cases of the visual hallucinations that occur on waking are preceded by more indefinite sensations, described in such terms as the following:—“woke with a disagreeable sensation”; “woke with weight on chest”; “wakened by warm wind”; “woke with feeling that scalding water had been thrown over her”; “woke with uncanny feeling”; “wakened by some one” or “by something.” Here again it is probable that some of these sensations were produced by a physical stimulus of a normal kind.

The Operation of Suggestion in the working out of Hallucinations.

The operation of suggestion may further be traced in the development of a hallucination after it has once started—one percept leading on to the next by the working out of the idea involved. For instance,

this explanation appears to be applicable to the reflection of apparitions in mirrors,—an effect which MM. Binet and Féré were able to reproduce experimentally in visual hallucinations suggested to their hypnotic subjects. In view of these experimental results, we cannot regard this phenomenon as affording evidence that the hallucination is more than purely subjective in such cases as the following :—

(690. 1)

From Mrs. T. E.

(The account was written in April 1890.)

“It was on an evening in June, 1847, when Mrs. E. was 20 years of age, that she had this vision. The house she was living in was one reported to be ‘haunted,’ and Mrs. E. and her husband were only tenants in it for a year. No tenant would remain in it for a longer time. Mrs. E. was in perfectly good health, and on the evening in question was sitting alone upon the piazza of the house off which opened the drawing-room, into which [she] had an uninterrupted view. The house was empty, the servants were away from the back premises, and the nurse had taken the only child out to play ; all the back doors were locked. Mrs. E. was watching a number of children playing some distance off, and was certainly not thinking of anything relating to apparitions, or anything extraordinary, when, quite suddenly, and somewhat towards the left of the seat, a female figure appeared, and strode across the drawing room in an oblique direction, but always keeping its face turned away from Mrs. E.. The outline was very clearly delineated, the dress Mrs. E. remembers yet, it was so distinct ; and so vivid was the appearance, that, on casting her eyes on the mirror on the drawing-room wall a little towards [her] right hand, she saw the side or profile of the figure reflected there. So exceedingly real did this latter circumstance make it, that Mrs. E., being certain there was a woman in her drawing-room, rose and rushed into the room, saying—‘I wonder how *you* got in, indeed !’ only to find nothing out of the common there. Mrs. E. said she had heard no details or descriptions of the alleged ‘haunting,’ and so her mind could not have been pre-adjusted to see any one kind of apparition more than another. She had never let the fact of the house being ‘haunted’ rest with or distress her, and on this evening was not thinking of anything except those children playing in the front of the house.”¹

This is the only case in the Census in which the apparition is seen first and its reflection afterwards ; but there are three cases in which the figure is first seen in a mirror, and afterwards appears to be standing in the room, and the double impression in these cases seems equally explicable as the effect of suggestion,—as whichever appearance is seen first, might naturally lead to the second corresponding percept. The following is one of the three cases referred to.

¹ For another experience of the same percipient, see p. 174.

(208. 7.)

From Mrs. T.

[The account was written down from the lips of the percipient by the collector, in August, 1889.]

“My grandmother was ill in her bed, from which she never afterwards got up, and we were reading the Bible—she explaining it to me, as I was about [ten] at the time—it was about an angel appearing that we were reading. I said to her, ‘Oh, grandmother, I shan’t stay here when you’re gone; I should be afraid.’ My grandmother said, ‘Nonsense, child; I’m sure I shouldn’t do thee any harm.’ When my grandmother died [in February, 1865] I was so frightened of being in the house that I went to a cousin’s. After some time I returned home, and being one day dusting in a room (the room was next to that in which my grandmother died, and I was not thinking about her at the time), as I was dusting the looking glass, I saw my grandmother reflected in it, standing at the door. I turned round and saw her standing in her night-dress, with one foot in the room, and her head turned round to look at me. I made a run past her to go down stairs—but I passed nothing, for she disappeared I never knew where. My mother reproached me for coming down in that way, saying she had never seen such a way of coming down stairs; and I said, ‘I have seen grandmother,’ and my mother said she ‘could not think it.’ I always thought my grandmother had come so, to show me she would do me no harm.”

The collector adds:—

“Mrs. T., who is the wife of a blacksmith, says she never had any other experience, and that this one is as clear to her now as the day she saw it.”

The casting of a shadow by an apparition may similarly be explained by suggestion. This is only recorded in two cases in the Census, which we proceed to give. It will be observed that in the first case the hallucination begins with the perception of the shadow.

(361. 9.)

From Miss A. S.

December 30th, 1889.

“At my grandmother’s house, Albemarle Co., Virginia, U.S.A., at about 11 p.m., my cousin, Miss S., somewhat older than I, and myself, had been conversing in the parlour. She left me. The house door opening into the parlour stood open, the night being warm, and the moonlight streamed in over the floor beside me as I sat, leaning on the sofa-arm, my back to the entrance. The shadow of a human form fell on the moonlit floor. Half turning my head I saw a tall woman dressed in white, her back to me. By the contour and the gleam of the plaits round her head I recognised my cousin, and deemed she had doffed her black dress to try a white one. I addressed an ordinary remark to her. She did not reply and I turned right round upon her. Then she went out of the door down the entrance steps, and as she disappeared I wondered I had heard nothing of a step or the rustle of her dress. I sat and puzzled over this, though without taking fright, for a few minutes. I was unoccupied, ruminating quietly; in robust health; completely awake; untroubled; [age] 16 years about. It was, I felt convinced, though I did not see her face, my cousin. I am short-sighted, but fully believed I saw my cousin.

She had shortly before left the room by the inner door. She lived there. I was familiar with the sight of her. I was alone for about half-an-hour. I then sought my cousin and found her in the other sitting-room with my grandmother. I said, 'I thought you had changed your dress.' She said, 'No, I have not.' I asked, 'Didn't you come to the house door just now?' She said, 'I've been with grandmother the last half-hour,—since I left you.' I then grew frightened and went up to the only other two inmates, at that hour, of the house. These two (females) denied that they had been downstairs during the interval. The negro slaves had all gone to their (outside) quarters for the night."

In the next case, on the other hand, the perception of the shadow follows that of the figure.

(240. 13.)

From Mrs. W.

January 8th, 1890.

"I apparently saw my brother walk down stairs in his house in Newport, Mon., between 2 and 3 o'clock, p.m., one summer day, 25 years ago. My brother had left us with the object of changing dress to take us out for a walk or drive that afternoon. The vision was so distinct that I called my brother by name, but it (the vision) bowed its head as if to avoid observation. I then looked over the banisters and saw the shadow of the figure disappear from the stairs, retired to my room and mentioned the matter to my sister who was with me, when we went to his room and called him, finding him still there and in *déshabille*, and he had not been on the stairs or out of his room.

"The house in which the matter mentioned occurred had the reputation of being haunted, though I was unaware of this at the time and was not told until next day by some one who knew nothing of this particular occurrence. My brother has told me he once saw, as he thought, our mother pass through one of the bedrooms. Our mother was at the time living in [another town]."

We may compare with this another case, No. 180. 15., where the percipient says, "I watched the figure walk right round the room, passing between myself and the candle on the dressing-table, (for a moment [it] hid the light from me), until it reached the hearth-rug, when it disappeared." The feature of appearing to hide the light of a candle is also mentioned in No. 37. 13 (see p. 313).

It is, of course, the usual property of a fully externalised visual hallucination to appear to shut out the view of objects behind it; the effect merely becomes more conspicuous when the object in question is a light. For, in order that a hallucinatory figure may take a definite place among the objects seen by the percipient, and completely simulate the body that it represents—as it ordinarily does when fully externalised—the vision of real things through the retina must obviously be inhibited to a corresponding extent. Sometimes, indeed, as we have before observed (Chap. VI.,

p. 119), the inhibition partially fails: the visible phantasm does not completely obliterate the view of objects behind it. The apparition then gives the impression of *transparency*; and, lacking the quality of opacity, it fails to attain a completely realistic appearance.

A similar inhibition of the vision of real objects occurs in the "negative hallucinations" imposed on hypnotic subjects, when a person or object is made invisible to them by suggestion. But to be able thus not to see a real object to which the attention is directed, in the *absence* of any imaginary obstacle, requires a very high degree of suggestibility; accordingly, we find that, even in hypnosis, some subjects appear to carry out the suggestion by creating for themselves spontaneously a hallucinatory obstacle.¹ Another striking effect of suggestion in the "negative hallucinations" of hypnosis is that the subject sometimes imagines that he can see real objects in front of which a person who has been made invisible to him by suggestion is standing. (See MM. Binet and Féré, *Animal Magnetism*, p. 309). Actual vision of these objects is, of course, prevented, but the subject seems spontaneously to create a hallucination of them, in order to fill up the gap which the invisible object has produced in his field of vision.²

As the vision of real objects is affected by that of hallucinatory objects, so the vision of hallucinatory objects is, in the great majority of cases, affected by the various physical conditions which would affect real vision. Thus a real obstacle placed in front of the eyes generally prevents the sight of an apparition (see case of Prof. Vignoli, p. 141); similarly, on closing the eyes, the apparition usually vanishes, and occasionally is seen again on reopening them, as in Prof. Vignoli's case. See also an experience of Mrs. D.'s (*Appendix D*) and the following.

(364. 5.)

From Miss T. D.

August 20th, 1890.

"I was reading by candle-light in summer [in 1868 or 1869], alone in a large room in the upper storey of a house in a small town, about 11 p.m.; the blinds were not drawn. I looked up and saw close to the panes outside the figure of a man, who was staring at me; the figure was dressed in a

¹ We observed this in the case of one of the Brighton subjects with whom the experiments in thought-transference described in *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 536 *et seq.*, were carried out. When the operator, who had been made invisible to him by suggestion, was standing immediately in front of him, we gathered from his remarks that he saw a vague dark mass or shadow between him and the operator.

² This, however, does not always happen; in our Brighton experiments, the subject was sometimes conscious that he could not see what was actually hidden from him by the invisible person, and was occasionally much puzzled to know what was hiding it.

white linen jacket of the kind German soldiers wear in summer, and appeared down to the waist over the window ledge. I forced myself to shut my eyes, wishing to try whether I should see the figure with eyes shut, but I did not. When I reopened them the figure was still there, but disappeared very soon. I was working rather hard for an examination, and used to sit up till midnight or later. I was nearly 18 years old."

With these cases we may compare further results found by MM. Binet and Féré in experimenting on the hallucinations of hypnotised persons, namely, that the hallucinatory objects were sometimes hidden by real screens placed in front of them and sometimes not. (*Animal Magnetism*, p. 234.) In the cases where the hallucinatory objects continued to be seen in spite of the screen, some subjects appeared to see them in the same place as at first, namely, behind the screen, while others would see them transferred to the front of the screen. Similarly, in experimenting with hallucinatory pictures on blank sheets of paper, it has been observed that some subjects, if another blank sheet is placed over the one on which they first saw the picture, will see it—either at once or after an interval—on the new sheet. Also, in some of M. Binet's experiments (quoted in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 472, foot-note) "after a screen had been interposed between the patient's eyes and the imaginary object, she continued to see, not only that object (say, a mouse) but a *real object* (say, a hat) on which it had been placed."

The difference between hypnotic cases and the apparitions seen by persons in a normal waking state,—which, as we have said, are almost always hidden by anything of the nature of a screen,—seems to be that the mind of the waking percipient is not exclusively concentrated on the apparition, but is aware of his general surroundings, and therefore open to suggestions from them. Whereas, in the hypnotic state, an idea impressed by verbal suggestion takes hold of the mind with greater insistency and exclusiveness than in the normal state; the subject ignores everything else for the moment, and therefore other actions or objects do not suggest to him any modification of his original percept.¹

Another illustration of the similarity of the vision of hallucinatory objects to that of real objects is shown in the fact that an apparition

¹ The cases where a real object that has been made invisible by suggestion appears not to obstruct the view of real objects behind it cannot be explained in exactly the same way. Here a certain amount of unconscious reasoning seems to come into play; the subject, being convinced that there is no obstacle between him and the real objects in question, infers from this that he must be able to see them, and unconsciously conjures up a hallucination of them in order to harmonise his conception of the situation.

does not generally follow the movements of the eyes,¹ but can be looked away from, and back to, like a real object.

Sometimes the seeing of an apparition seems to depend on the presence of light, and this is probably due to suggestion also. (Apparitions seen in the dark, which are rare, are discussed in Chapter IV., see p. 78). Thus, in one case (No. 443. 15) the figure, seen by the light of a lamp, disappeared when the lamp was turned out. In No. 402. 19 (Baron von Driesen's case, see Chapter XVII.) the percipient first heard foot-steps, and did not see the apparition till he had struck a light. Again, in No. 422. 25 (see p. 192) the apparition vanished when the light was put out and was seen again on re-lighting it.

Another instance of the operation of suggestion may be found in the apparent effects on real objects produced by apparitions. The most commonly reported cases are the apparent opening of doors in connection with the entrance or exit of a ghost. We have already spoken of the possibility that the movement in such cases may have been real. Where there is any clear evidence that this was so, we have to consider whether the door was not moved by ordinary means, such as draughts, and whether, in that case, the movement may not have led by expectation to the seeing of the apparition, as suggested above (see p. 184). But in most cases of this kind included in the Census, we have no evidence worth considering in support of the hypothesis that any actual effect was produced on the door; nor does this generally appear to be the view of the percipients: so that there is nothing to prevent us from regarding the apparent movement as merely part of the whole hallucinatory conception,² just as the movement of the apparition itself is.

The following are two cases of a somewhat peculiar character, in which apparitions seemed to produce material effects other than the opening of doors.

(684. 1.)

From Mrs. P.

February 23rd, 1892.

"I saw my eldest child Daisy run down the two lowest steps of the staircase into the drawing-room. I followed, calling her, but obtaining no answer. The figure ran under the table, and the cloth where she passed under shook. I paused for resolution, raised the cloth and saw nothing. Date —, 1865.

¹ Only one case, and that a somewhat dubious one, of an apparition moving with the eyes is reported in the Census. This is quoted in Chapter VII., p. 134.

² There are only three cases of reported movements of real objects seen not in connection with an apparition—two when a door seemed to open and shut (Nos. 114. 6 and 264. 23, see pp. 343-4), and one when the handle of a locked door seemed to be twisted round (No. 285. 14—see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., p. 328). There seems to be no reason for regarding these appearances as other than hallucinatory.

Time, 3 p.m. At the time she was at the top of the house. I had just come in and was standing in the hall by the pantry. I had recently lost my father. Age 28.

“My late husband saw a vision of another daughter in almost identical circumstances a month later.”

(422. 25.)

From Mr. D. Amosof.

May 24th, 1891.

“L'année 1883, à St. Pétersbourg, [j'ai] été témoin de l'apparition dont voici le récit.

“J'étais alors âgé de 19 ans et sur le point d'achever le cours de mes études au premier corps des cadets à St. Pétersbourg. Au mois de Décembre de la même année (la date m'est échappée), je me trouvais dans le logement de ma mère à Pétersbourg. Etant alors en voie de guérison, après une maladie de gorge, et le médecin ayant trouvé l'état de ma santé satisfaisant, je me proposai de quitter le lit le lendemain. Il était près de minuit, et un silence complet régnait dans la maison. J'avais éteint la bougie, placée sur une petite table à côté du lit, au pied duquel se trouvait un tabouret.

“Las de me tourner sans pouvoir m'endormir, j'eus l'idée de fumer, et j'étendis le bras à la faible lueur d'une allumette pour prendre les papiros. En ce moment j'aperçus distinctement sur le tabouret ma défunte grand-mère, Marie Aléxéevna Volohoff (la mère de ma mère), morte depuis cinq ans, c'est-à-dire, en 1878. Assise sur le tabouret, elle s'accoudait à la table et me regardait fixement. Terrifié, je jetai l'allumette, en retombant sur les coussins. M'étant un peu tranquilisé, j'allumai une bougie, et je revis l'apparition, qui était toujours là, comme auparavant, accoudée à la table. Recourant à tout le sang-froid dont j'étais capable, je pris un papiros et en dirigeai la fumée vers l'apparition même. Quel ne fut pas mon étonnement, *en voyant la fumée se partager des deux côtés de l'apparition*, comme heurtant un obstacle. Ensuite l'apparition se leva; j'entendis parfaitement le bruit du tabouret reculé, et vis ma grand-mère, se tenant sur les béquilles (ses pieds furent paralysés quelques années avant sa mort). Elle avait sa robe noire habituelle et une cafetière à la main, dont elle ne s'était presque jamais séparée de son vivant. L'apparition fit quelques pas en arrière; puis, toujours en reculant, sortit dans le corridor par la porte de ma chambre, qui était ouverte. S'étant arrêtée pour me dire les paroles suivantes: ‘Ne m'oublie pas, Daniel, et viens sur ma tombe,’ la figure disparut.

“Je sautai du lit et m'élançai par le corridor dans la chambre à coucher de ma mère, que je réveillai, ainsi que mon beau-père, pour leur raconter le fait. Après cet incident je craignais longtemps de dormir dans une chambre sombre.

“D. AMOSOF.”

The following notes are from Mr. Amosof's mother and stepfather.

“Je me souviens parfaitement, que mon fils Daniel est accouru par une nuit du mois de Décembre, 1883, pour me réveiller et me raconter, qu'il avait vu l'apparition de sa grand-mère (ma mère), ainsi qu'il l'a exposé dans son récit.

“MARIE TÉLÉCHOF.”

“Daniel m'a réveillé la même nuit et m'a fait part de sa vision.

“ATHANASE TÉLÉCHOF.”

For another experience of Mr. Amosof's, see p. 227.

Hallucinations affecting more than one sense.

The operation of suggestion is also to be traced in the hallucinations that affect more than one sense. In almost all cases, the affection of the first sense seems to lead on to that of the other, which follows to complete a familiar conception.¹

We have discussed above the possibility that non-vocal sounds, such as footsteps, which sometimes precede the seeing of an apparition, may occasionally be real noises, which lead by expectation to the sight. But in some cases the apparition is first seen, and then footsteps or some other sounds apparently caused by it are heard, as in the case last quoted: the sound is then to be regarded as part of the hallucination; and this is still more obvious when the apparition is seen and then heard to speak definite words, as in the same case and in many others,—*e.g.* Nos. 620. 4 (see p. 195) and 422. 22 (Mr. Mamtchitch's experiences, Chap. XVII.), where the apparition speaks in answer to a question from the percipient. This latter feature is also recorded in a few other cases. Sometimes the hearing of a voice seems to lead on to the seeing of an apparition, as in No. 464. 15 (Miss Dodson's case, in Chap. XVII.). Sometimes, again, an apparition is first seen and then felt to touch the percipient, as in Nos. 61. 6 (see p. 252), 215. 9 (see p. 224), and 73. 20 (see p. 132). Sometimes the development is of a more complicated kind, as in the following case, where, as will be seen, three senses appear to have been more or less involved, and the hallucinatory vision included an impression of life-like movement.

(470. 1.)

From Miss M. C.

April 1891.

"In 1866 I had a situation as governess in Herefordshire. [My age was then] 39. One Sunday I was suffering greatly from headache, to which I was then very subject. Mrs. M—— placed me on the sofa and said she would take charge of the children, in the hope that perfect quiet would do me good. Shortly after, she came to me and touched me on the shoulder, saying, as I thought, 'Take care of the children.' Knowing she was in delicate health, I immediately followed her out of the room, seeing her until I reached the hall, when I supposed she passed through one of the doors leading out of the hall. I then went to look for the children, and to my surprise found the mother reading to them; she asked why I had disturbed myself; my reply was, 'You called me.' She laughed, and said: 'You have been dreaming.' Though I knew I had not slept, still I should have fancied I had done so, if I had not followed her across the room into the hall. Mrs. M. died in less than a fortnight from that time."

¹ This operation is, we think, traceable in the veridical no less than in the merely subjective cases: only in the former cases the suggestion of which we are speaking, of course, merely supplies a part of the explanation of the phenomenon; it merely determines the form in which the supernormal influence takes effect.

In these "bisensory" or "trisensory" cases, the constructive imagination seems to have reached a higher point than in simple visual or auditory hallucinations, further details being added which make the percept more consistent with ordinary experience, and therefore more like reality. This may be regarded as an example of suggestion and unconscious expectancy. The resemblance of hallucinatory objects to the real objects that we are accustomed to see, *e.g.*, human beings, would generally lead to the expectation that they would, like real objects, be perceptible to other senses besides that of sight. From Table II. it appears that in nearly 14 per cent. (225 out of 1622) of the cases,¹ more than one sense is affected. The expectation that this will occur is not always excited, and, even when it is, the constructive power does not always succeed in creating a hallucination of more than one sense. Thus, in certain cases, the appeal to other senses is definitely observed to fail, *e.g.*, when the percipient seeing an apparition puts out his hand to touch it and can feel nothing, (see account of Dr. H. C., p. 117); or when it is reported that no audible effect is produced when an apparition goes through the motions of speaking² (*e.g.* No. 425. 12. p. 211) or of making sounds (*e.g.* No. 390. 1, p. 150); or again, when, as in the following case, it is observed that the apparition not only walks with noiseless footsteps, but also fails to cast a shadow.

(544. 10)

From Miss C. B.

October 7th, 1891.

"At the top of Heigham Road, Norwich, on New Year's Eve, about the year 1879 or later, at 10 p.m., my elder sister and myself were walking home from a quiet evening spent with an aunt and uncle. To our right a row of houses were divided from a house enclosed in a high wall by a passage. Quietly out of the passage came an old woman about 5 feet in height, wearing dark brown dress, and large black shawl fastened across the chest, the point of it reaching nearly to the bottom of the dress, and a small poke bonnet. She walked before us some yards, exciting my wonder by her noiselessness upon the gravel path, and finally by the fact that she cast no shadow. Putting my hand upon my sister's arm I said, 'What a funny old woman,' but with the movement of my hand she disappeared, we being by the blank wall in which there was neither gate nor opening, with plenty of gas lights, so that she must have been seen crossing the road. I was in perfect health and peace of mind, and I think 17 at the time. The old woman was entirely strange to me, I had not for years seen anyone like her: she simply reminded me in dress of the old-fashioned type of respectable old age. My sister [who] was with me saw nothing."

¹ Excluding the cases where only an auditory hallucination of a non-vocal kind is added to the hallucination of another sense, the proportion is reduced to a little over 9 per cent.—152 out of 1622.

² An interesting intermediate case is that in which an inaudible impression of words is conveyed without any movement of the lips of the apparition (see, for instance, case of Miss G., pp. 88-9).

The frequent extension of a hallucinatory conception to other senses besides the one primarily affected, seems to render it probable that a person experiencing a hallucination has his susceptibility to hallucinatory influences momentarily heightened—as it is heightened in the hypnotic state. This view is supported by a small class of bisensory cases, somewhat different from those just considered, in which the correspondence between the two elements of the double phenomenon is less close and complete. An example of this class is No. 579. 24 (see p. 223) where the percipient sees an apparition of his father and hears an unrecognised voice telling him of his father's death. Here there seems to be no necessary connection between the two hallucinations; but it is as if the telepathic impulse were externalised almost simultaneously in two different ways, in a manner that suggests an exceptional degree of insistent force. We cannot, however, always draw the line between these and the ordinary bisensory cases, where the affection of the two senses seems to give merely two different aspects of what is obviously the same conception, as when an apparition seems itself to speak, in a voice which is recognised as belonging to the person represented by it. Thus we have an intermediate case in No. 728. 16 (see p. 309), where the tactile hallucination was obviously suggested by the sight of the apparition that preceded it, though not definitely connected with this. Another intermediate case is No. 205. 1 (see p. 199) which might be taken as an example of arrested development, so far as the visual part of the percept was concerned, while the auditory part was fully developed and recognised.

Sequent Hallucinations of the same Sense.

Analogous to the bisensory phenomena last considered are cases in which a hallucination is followed by another of the same sense, representing a different object, but so that the connexion of thought is manifest. Thus, in No. 460. 1 (see p. 288) the percipient first sees the figure of her brother dying at the foot of her bed, and then sees a coffin in the same place. This may be compared with the crystal-visions which follow or respond to the course of conscious thought in the mind of the percipient, for instance, No. 406. 25 (p. 106). The following is a peculiar case of this kind, which is also bisensory—verbal suggestion from an apparition producing a second visual hallucination.

(620. 4)

From Mrs. W. E.

[The account is written by the collector, the Rev. H. Kendall, and signed by the percipient.]

July 13th, 1892.

“Mrs. E. was staying in the year 1890 by the seaside for a few days, having left all her children at home. She was feeling rather exhausted and

requiring a change. One night, when quite awake and in full possession of her powers, when she was somewhat anxious about the children she had left behind, her mother came and lay close beside her, and she saw her afterwards as she retired. Her mother spoke to her very sympathetically, as if entering into all her anxiety and depression. She assured her that all was right at home, and in order to satisfy herself that this was so, she should see her youngest child. Accordingly she saw the child up in a corner of the room near the ceiling. Her mother encouraged her to look up where the child was, and assured her it would do her no harm. When this occurred her mother had been dead four years. She was very much beloved by her children. Mrs. E. ascertained that all was right at home just as she had been told. She has never at any other time seen or heard anything that she would deem supernatural. What she saw and heard [then] was too real for her to be able to explain it by mere tension of the nerves."

"The above account is correct.

(Signed) "E. E."

We may compare with this another remarkable case—also slightly bisensory—where the *ceasing* of a hallucination of unique persistence seems to be due to self-suggestion, taking the form of suggestion from the apparition. The further information which the collector gives about the percipient shows that she must have had—at least during some part of her life—an unusual tendency to carry out self-suggestions of various kinds.

(327. 25.)

From Madame R.

April 22nd, 1890.

"En 1882, au mois de Janvier, vers 2 à 3 h. du jour, en passant par un long corridor de notre maison, j'ai senti quelqu'un à côté de moi. En me retournant je vis une personne, dont je ne saurais pas dire le sexe, habillée en une très large robe grise. Elle était très pâle, avec de grands yeux noirs, et de longs cheveux noirs retombant sur les épaules, avec une raie au milieu. Je ne fus nullement effrayée et même pas étonnée. J'allais dans la chambre d'étude pour prendre une leçon. J'étais bien portante, gaie. J'avais l'âge de 14 ans. Cette ombre ou vision ne m'a jamais quittée 2 mois ou 6 semaines de suite. Si je ne la voyais pas, je la sentais à côté de moi, je sentais son souffle sur mon épaule. Si je causais avec quelqu'un, c'est à elle que je m'adressais, car je la voyais derrière la personne à qui je parlais. 'L'ombre' avait une très belle figure, tantôt gaie, tantôt triste. Elle semblait être contente quand je faisais bien, chagrinée quand je faisais mal. J'étais tellement habituée à cette vision que je ne m'en inquiétais pas. C'était la première figure que je voyais en me réveillant, la dernière en m'endormant. Elle ne me disait jamais rien, mais elle me faisait quelquefois des signes de la tête. Elle disparut tout à coup dans le même corridor où je l'ai vue pour la première fois. Elle me regarda, me fit un signe de tête, et je sentis que je ne la reverrai jamais, puis elle disparut, je ne sais comment. Depuis je n'ai jamais ni vu ni rencontré une figure semblable, ni en rêve, ni en réalité. Dans le premier moment personne [n'était avec moi]; depuis je la voyais étant en société,

mais les personnes présentes n'ont jamais rien vu, et lorsque j'en parlais, on se moquait de moi, croyant que j'inventais."

The collector, Mme. de Holstein, writes :—

"Le cas de Mme. R. est intéressant, parcequ' il paraît que c'était le début d'une série de phénomènes très étranges, qui se sont développés plus tard. Deux ans après le cas décrit, Mme. R. avait des accès de sommeil spontané. Elle s'endormait sans aucune raison, à n'importe quelle heure de la journée. Pendant ce sommeil elle avait du délire, elle parlait à différentes personnes, qui paraissaient lui répondre. Très souvent on entendait qu'elle fixait l'heure et le jour d'un rendezvous à ces personnes invisibles, et alors on était sûr qu'elle s'endormira le jour et l'heure fixés. Au réveil elle n'avait aucune conscience de ce qu'elle avait dormi, ni encore moins de ce qu'elle avait vu. Deux ans plus tard ces accès de sommeil disparurent sans laisser de traces, et pour toujours. Mme. R. est actuellement une femme absolument saine au point de vue nerveux."

In the following case of sequent hallucinations, there is an interval of one or two hours between the successive phenomena ; but it can hardly be doubted that the first led to the second.

(485. 13)

From Mr. H. M.

August 9th, 1891.

"In May 1890, about 8 p. m., I looked up from my seat by the fire and saw my wife standing near the door. 'My dear, have you come home? I didn't see you come in,' I said, rising, but ere I reached her she had disappeared. I did look about for her, but contented myself with the conviction that I had made a very strange mistake. Bedtime came a little later, and, as is my habit, I opened the front door to look round, and there, facing me a few feet off in the road, stood my wife's mother, who had been dead ten years. I *was* shocked then. 'In the name of God, what do you come for?' I said. She moved to her left, and I followed till, opposite the window of my next door neighbour, where was a light, she vanished. I was smoking comfortably, in no trouble of mind or body. My age 64. My wife had been for some little time—a few weeks—with an invalid at H—, and when told what I have stated of her visit to me, she said she was not surprised, for she had thought of me very anxiously, because she was staying longer than she had intended. When I went on to tell of her mother's appearance, she was greatly disturbed in mind, as I was myself. We told it to no one but our children and near relatives. Our children are all grown up. My wife is now getting very much like her mother, but at that time there was no mistaking the one for the other. I was alone in the house ; could not sleep that night, but kept my eyes closed lest I should see more than I wished, and in the morning went to see my wife, about whom I was very anxious, and finding her all right, I forbore to trouble her mind with what I had seen till she came home. I've never seen or heard anything I couldn't account for before or since, and I have been used to be out, often in the church and churchyard, at all hours of the night. There was no need to write it down, I couldn't forget, but I think I should only have thought it a mistake if I hadn't seen the second figure."

CHAPTER XI.

ORGANIC EFFECTS ACCOMPANYING HALLUCINATIONS.

In the present chapter we propose to consider certain organic effects reported to us as accompanying hallucinations. It may perhaps be thought that this discussion would have been more fitly placed in Chapter VII., in connexion with the "Physiology of Hallucinations": our reason for placing it here is that, in considering the explanation of these phenomena, it is important to bear in mind the operation of suggestion, illustrated in the preceding chapter.

The first effect to be noticed is the "feeling of cold"—generally described as a "chill" or "cold shudder"—which is sometimes reported as accompanying or immediately preceding hallucinations. This is so common in magazine stories of apparitions that our readers may expect to find it a normal feature in the narratives collected by us: it is, however, on the contrary, quite an exceptional feature, being only reported in seven cases,¹—exclusive of about half-a-dozen cases in which a "feeling of cold breezes" is mentioned. Now it has been maintained (see *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. IV., pp. 296-7) that one distinction between phantasms of the living and those of the dead is that the latter are specially liable to produce this sensation, whereas it hardly ever occurs with the former. This conclusion is not supported by the evidence on the subject furnished by our Census.² Out of the seven cases reported, only one is a phantasm of the dead, namely, No. 422. 22 (Mr. Mamtchitch's case in Chapter XVII). Another is No. 458. 9, (see p. 332), and here the person apparently represented by the hallucination was living at the time. The following are three other cases.

(182. 9.)

From Miss K. M.

(The account was written in 1889.)

"[About 20 years ago] I was about 10 years old, and was staying with friends in Kensington. Between the hour of 8 and 9 p.m., we were all sitting in the drawing-room with the door open, [it] being a very warm evening. Suddenly I experienced a cold shudder, and on looking through the door, opposite which I was sitting, I saw a figure of a little old lady dressed in a long brown cloak with a large brown hat, carrying a basket, glide down the stairs and disappear in the room next the drawing-room. The impression was that of some one I had never seen. I was talking on ordinary subjects, neither ill, in grief, or anxiety. There were several other people in the room, but no one noticed anything but myself. I have never had any experience of the kind before or since."

¹ It is, of course, not improbable that the sensation may have been felt in other cases in which it has not been recorded.

² See also *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 37, foot-note. Of the cases there referred to, three were coincident with a death, and three others with an event occurring to the person represented.

(205. 1.)

From Mrs. F. R.

November 9th, 1889.

“When my father was lying on what proved to be his death-bed, I was obliged to go to the dentist. I was of course anxious about him and in pain. But the physician had told us we need not fear the death of the patient. While waiting in the ante-room, I seemed to feel a shudder and to see a white cloud before me, and heard my father call me by name. I immediately left and found my father insensible and he died a few hours after. This occurred May 5th, 1879, when I was 20.”

(277. 7.)

From Miss I. B.

January, 1890.

“With my bodily eyes I have never yet seen the scene I see so often in mental vision, which, never varying, is always an expanse of bright green lawn of great extent, or large field, with a shady glade or path on the left hand side ending indefinitely. Suddenly the scene falls into shadow, and a horrible chill sensation comes across me. I shudder, and the whole thing is gone. Sometimes this feeling occurs several times in a day, and sometimes not for months. I know for a fact it only lasts a moment, but is so vivid while it lasts that everything else is as nothing, though I see this through the book I am reading or the people I am talking to. It has occurred during every condition of mind and body; and the first occasion is, I think, the first thing I distinctly remember. I was just four years old, and sitting alone in the nursery [in] broad daylight, when I saw this green brightness, and then when it darkened I remember screaming out, and the nurse coming in and telling me I had a new little brother just born, so by this I can fix the date. The curious part is that up to middle age the appearance has never varied one iota.”

In another case (No. 579. 21) the percipient, who was then a girl at school, saw an apparition of herself sitting by her side. This recurred several times, the apparition being always seen on one side of her, and imitating all her movements. It was always accompanied by a sensation of cold and then of extreme weakness. It recurred for two or three months, during a period of serious ill-health, for which reason the hallucination has been excluded from our Tables.

In the last case (No. 736. 18) the percipient felt her dress pulled and a cold shiver run through her at the time of the death of a friend about whose illness she was in anxiety.

Thus of these seven cases, two (Nos 205. 1 and 579. 21) are certainly phantasms of the living, and two more (Nos. 458. 9 and 736. 18) are possibly so. We may add the following somewhat grotesque case of what was perhaps an illusion, which reached us independently of the Census.

From Mrs. S. W.

January 30th, 1892.

“About two years ago I was walking alone along a carriage drive, overlooking an old shrubbery, about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The day was

bright and clear, and below me among the shrubs 80 yards off I saw a tall thing like a long pole overtopping the shrubs, moving through them in a stately manner; some articles seemed to hang from the top of the pole. After moving for a few yards in a straight line it vanished. I felt cold as ice. I did not rush away, but looked at it as long as it was to be seen, then I ran home a quarter of a mile. As soon as I reached home I sent [the coachman] to the shrubby garden, and he returned and assured me he could not see anything; he hunted everywhere and the two gates were quite safe."

It will be observed that in some of these cases the chill is reported as preceding, in others as accompanying or following the hallucination. In the latter cases it would seem to be a natural result, on certain physical temperaments, of the emotional excitement—terror, awe, etc.,—caused by the unusual experience; while in such recurrent cases as No. 277. 7 (p. 199) the regular recurrence of the chill may perhaps be due to association. One of our collectors (Mr. E. L. Kearney) has communicated to us a rather curious case of the association of this sensation with the sight of a real object of a kind which does not excite any strong emotion in ordinary minds. The account is as follows:—

"The sight of a meteor gives me (usually) a chilling sensation from head to foot. On one occasion (about 1877) I was walking with a friend, now dead, and felt the sensation without seeing a meteor. I instantly demanded of my companion if he saw one, and he replied that he did. I have never come across any one who shared this peculiarity with me."

But where the chill precedes the hallucination, it seems clear that the sensation must be regarded as an incident of the whole nervous disturbance of which the hallucination is one effect. In this connexion we may refer to a case quoted by Professor James (*Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II., p. 323), of the apparition of a corpse, seen by a blind man. The experience recurred repeatedly, and was always preceded in the percipient by a feeling of "a cold draught of air suddenly upon his face, with a prickling sensation at the roots of his hair." He afterwards traced the experiences to the strong tea which he was in the habit of taking for lunch; on giving it up, he never saw the corpse or any other apparition again. Here again it seems possible that a link of association may have been established between the feelings of cold and prickling—probably resulting in the first instance from over-stimulation of the nerves—and the apparition: so that the apparitions after the first may have been partly suggested by the recurrence of the sensations.

It will have been observed that in the last case the sensation was described as of "a cold draught of air." As has been already said, we have in our collection about half-a-dozen cases where it is said that the

feeling of cold breezes accompanied the seeing of an apparition. This is mentioned, for instance, in the case that appeared, under the title of a "Record of a Haunted House," in the *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII. (see pp. 320 and 325); on one occasion several members of the household heard footsteps at night walking up and down the landing past them; as the steps passed, they felt a cold wind, though the lighted candles they were holding were not blown about. This would seem to be merely another form of the feeling of chill just discussed.

We pass to a more unusual kind of case, where a sensation is felt resembling that produced by electric shocks; this, too, may perhaps be regarded as merely a variety of the "chill."

(287. 15.)

From Mrs. H. R.

(The account was written in 1890.)

[After describing an experience quoted on p. 170, Mrs. R. continues:—]

"Once I distinctly had the impression of some one bending over me at night, and the contact of this person produced thrills something similar to those produced by a galvanic battery. I *felt* that it was the late Mrs. Laurence Oliphant, and yet I was fully aware that, as she had been dead three years, it was impossible that I should receive any impression from her. I absolutely disbelieve in any reappearance of the dead, I think it most improbable that there is any individual existence after death, and yet all my senses were impressed with the personality of Mrs. Oliphant. Mr. Laurence Oliphant had called upon me about a month before I had this experience, and no doubt this recalled to my mind a photograph I had once seen of his late wife. I don't think I ever see or hear or feel anything of the sort when I am in normal health."

The collector, Mr. C. Schiller, writes:—

"Mrs. R. tells me that her impression of Mrs. Oliphant was not an impression through any of the ordinary senses, but an impression of her presence, including, however, a consciousness of her form and features: quite indescribable in language. But she was made aware by it of details like the colour of Mrs. Oliphant's hair, eyes, &c. She did not know Mrs. Oliphant personally, but could form a general idea of her from her photograph. The experience occurred in May, '88, and was not suggested in any way by Mr. L. Oliphant."

In a few cases the organic accompaniment of a hallucination is somewhat more serious than those which we have been illustrating. Thus in No. 422. 22 (Chapter XVII), Mr. Mamtchitch states that he turns pale and his breathing is affected. Occasionally fainting is produced; this is recorded in six cases in the Census. One is No. 33. 25 (see *Proceedings*, Vol. V., p. 462), where the apparition was unrecognised by the percipient, but was supposed from subsequent enquiries to resemble a man, unknown to her, who had died in the room where it was seen. The other five cases were apparitions of dead persons known to the per-

percipients. In three of these cases, it is very doubtful whether the hallucination was not an effect of the same physical condition that led to the fainting, rather than strictly the cause of the latter. Thus, in No. 152. 1, the percipient, camping out in Australia, had been nearly suffocated by the fumes of some charcoal which he was burning to warm his tent; on going outside to escape them, he saw the figure of his mother standing inside the tent, and then lost consciousness for some time. In No. 681. 9, again, after mentioning that he had fainted on seeing an apparition of his father, the percipient writes:—"a severe nervous illness dates from that evening" [in January, 1884] "which has lasted on and off till within the last year" [1891]. During the six weeks following his first experience, he saw the same apparition twice more, and fainted each time. Another case (No. 733. 18), quoted on p. 141, is an example of a hallucination probably induced by a state of nervous agitation. In the two remaining cases, however, (one of which is No. 728. 16, see p. 309) there is no indication of the hallucination being associated with any morbid condition of the percipient.

Pain.

Only in four cases is pain described as resulting from a hallucinatory touch. In three of these the touch was connected with an apparition; in the fourth case, the impression was merely tactile. In one of the three cases, the apparition represented a dead person; in the other two, which we quote, it was unrecognised. In the first of these latter cases, it is noteworthy that several other hallucinations experienced by the same percipient were followed by more or less marked physical indisposition. It may perhaps be conjectured that this exceptional result indicates a tendency in this percipient to some peculiar recurrent organic disturbance, which in its first stage manifested itself in a hallucination, and which in one case was attended by painful sensations in the left hand, the commencement of which mingled with the hallucination.

(417. 17.)

From Dr. Vladimir Solovioff.

St. Petersburg, *February*, 1891.

"Vers 5 heures du matin le 17-29 Août, 1890, étant arrivé la veille de Moseou chez des amis à la campagne, j'ai eu l'apparition suivante. M'étant éveillé après un sommeil sans rêves, et voyant clairement l'entourage, j'entendis tout-à-coup, que la porte extérieure de ma chambre, qui donnait sur un balcon et qui était fermée à l'intérieur avec un crochet, s'ouvrait doucement, et je vis entrer une forme humaine en costume oriental—une espèce de robe de chambre blanche avec bordure bleue. J'éprouvais une terreur panique et une stupeur complète sans pouvoir bouger ni proférer une parole. L'homme blanc approcha de mon lit, et alors je vis que dans

sa main gauche il tenait un rouleau couvert de caractères inconnus, qui ne ressemblaient ni au sanscrit, ni à l'arabe, ni à l'hébreu, mais plutôt au tibétain. Il se pencha sur moi, et alors je vis distinctement les traits de sa figure. Elle était très pâle et d'un type mongol mitigé, avec une petite barbe d'un roux clair. En tenant toujours son rouleau devant mes yeux, il prit de sa main droite, qui était libre, ma main gauche, et y enfonçant ses ongles, ce qui me causa une douleur aiguë, dit à voix basse quelques paroles (en langue russe) qui n'avaient pas le sens commun. Après un certain temps (dont la durée exacte serait difficile à déterminer—une minute à peu près) il abandonna ma main et disparut au milieu de la chambre. Il ne ressemblait à personne que je connais. Je ne me suis plus rendormi, et pendant plusieurs jours après cette apparition j'éprouvais des douleurs neuralgiques et des contractions dans ma main gauche. J'étais seul dans ma chambre. Des apparitions semblables, mais moins distinctes, me sont déjà arrivées plusieurs fois durant l'été de la même année, 1890, ainsi que dans les années 1884, 1886, et 1889. Dans tous ces cas, les apparitions n'étaient précédées d'aucune maladie ni d'aucun trouble moral particulier, mais elles amenaient à leur suite des indispositions physiques plus au moins marquées. Je suis absolument sûr que ces apparitions n'étaient pas de simples rêves; mais je ne puis pas dire que l'état de la conscience dans lequel je les ai éprouvés fût tout-à-fait normal—c'était un état à part, ne ressemblant ni au sommeil ni à l'état de veille. J'ai actuellement l'âge de 38 ans, célibataire, occupé de travaux intellectuels dans le domaine de la philosophie, de l'histoire religieuse, et de la morale sociale.

“DR. VLADIMIR SOLOVIOFF”

“(Membre honoraire de la Société de Psychologie à Moscou).”

The next case comes from Brazil.

(725. 17.)

From Mr. A. S.

November 5th, 1891.

“On [one] occasion, when asleep in bed, my wife awoke me, saying she heard a noise as of a cane striking on the ceiling. When the candle was out and my wife sleeping, I heard the blows repeated on the framework of the bed itself. I rose, lit the candle, and examined everything in the room, and then visited the other rooms in the house. I could find no explanation for the noise. As soon as I returned to bed and blew out the candle, the raps were repeated. I looked towards the door of the corridor. There stood a child [who] seemed about four years old, of darkish skin, habited in the shirt which is usually worn by children of that age in Brazil. The apparition lasted but a short time. It occurred to me that it might harm my own child, and my first impulse was to throw some object at it to drive it away. On seizing a board that lay near, I felt a smart rap on the back of the hand, that pained me for three days after, though, indeed, there was no sign of contusion on the skin. My efforts to rise when I saw the vision were useless. I could at first only turn my head. This happened in 1888.”

The rarity of pain as an accompaniment of hallucinations—considering the ease with which sensations of pain are produced by

self-suggestion in the hysterical condition, as well as by suggestion in the hypnotic state—tends, we think, to confirm our conclusion that hallucination is not ordinarily a symptom of a morbid condition.

Further Physical Effects.

In one case, the alarm caused by an apparition appears to have produced an organic effect somewhat more permanent than a fainting-fit. This case (No. 285. 14) was published in the "Record of a Haunted House," already referred to on p. 201 (see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 319, 328). The percipient, then a parlour-maid in the house, had twice seen an apparition, which took the form of a dark shadowy figure, and she knew that others in the house had had similar experiences. After this, she was sitting up in her bedroom late one night when she heard a loud noise, and, looking up, saw the handle of her door twisted round, as though some one were trying to come in, the door being locked. She was very much frightened, and next morning on looking in the glass saw that one side of her face was slightly twisted. The effect lasted for some days. The doctor who attended her for it thought that it might have been caused by a draught as well as by a fright, but she was convinced that she had not caught cold, and that it was merely the effect of her terror.

Finally, we have two remarkable cases in which a hallucination is stated to have been accompanied by physical effects on the percipient's organism, resembling those that would have been produced by the pressure of human fingers. The first of these cases is also noteworthy as being one of the very few in our collection in which a collective hallucination of touch is recorded.

(106. 2.)

From Miss M. P.

February 16th, 1890.

"My sister and I slept in the same bedroom at the top of the house—in small beds placed about 3 feet apart. One night about 3 years ago, [our ages at the time being respectively] 20 and 18, I awoke suddenly with the horrible feeling that some one was in the room. For a few minutes I lay still, too much frightened to speak to E. At last I called to her, and she answered in a voice of extreme terror, 'Who is in the room? I have been awake for ages, and dare not speak.' At that moment a cold hand touched my face; in an agony of fright I called to E. once again, but *not* saying what had happened. The next second she shrieked to me 'Some one touched my face.' Overcome with terror, we pulled the bed-clothes over our heads and shouted for help. A few minutes later my brother came, and we told him that some one was in the room. He searched everywhere, but of course found nothing. E. complained that her face was burning, and on lighting the gas we saw that her face on the one side was crimson, with the distinct impress of a hand with outspread fingers.

“Twice afterwards, at intervals of about a month, we were awakened with the same horrible feeling of a strange presence in the room, which for a few minutes paralysed all powers of speech, and once we saw the same thing stand between our beds.

(Signed) “ M. P.
“ E. P.”

(The second signature is that of the sister who shared the experience.)

The collector, Miss Porter, writes :—

February 28th, 1891.

“Miss M. P. has just been here talking about her experience, but was not able to add much to what she originally wrote. On the first occasion she herself did not actually see the figure, but Miss E. P. thinks she did. The room was so dark that it would have been impossible to have noticed any difference in the figures, if they had varied on the different occasions; consequently they decided that it was the same. The impression is that it always took the same course,—was between the two beds and passed from one to the other.

“The experience has had such an effect upon them that, though nothing has been seen or felt since they left the house, they occasionally wake in a great fright—which soon passes off. Miss P. spoke of it as though the being awakened by the figure had got them into the habit of waking very much frightened.”

Mr. Podmore writes :—

February 22nd, 1892.

“I met the Misses P. on the 16th, and they gave me an account of their experiences, which occurred at their former house, about 1886 or 1887. They have no means of fixing the date precisely. The disturbances—four in number—occurred within the space of 2 or 3 weeks. On the first occasion Miss P. saw nothing; on the second occasion both sisters felt a presence in the room, having been awoke from sleep by fright, but saw nothing; on the third occasion Miss P. saw a very vague muffled form or shadow; and, lastly, on another occasion, Miss E. P. again saw a vague form.

“The visual sensations appear to have been extremely vague on all three occasions—certainly nothing approaching a distinct human figure. But the impression of terror produced was very strong. The percipients appear to have been quite unnerved by the fright on the first occasion—which may account for the repetition of the experience. They could not account for the first experience, and had had nothing else of the kind. Their health was good at the time.

“The marks, as of fingers, on Miss E. P.’s face were very distinct. She had not been lying on that side—so there could have been no normal pressure there.

“Their recollection does not seem to be now very clear of the several occasions on which they had the experience. But it seems certain that they had a collective experience of *touching* on the first occasion, at any rate, and solitary visual hallucinations on two subsequent occasions.”

The other case of this kind (No. 134. 5) is given by a lady, Mrs. A. C. S., who has all her life had a very large number of experiences

(from the age of 6 to her present age, 56) of seeing visions—more or less externalised—hearing voices and feeling touches, all of which she regards as due to the agency of spirits. “Among many other experiences of the kind,” she writes, “I have frequently been touched by the finger of my eldest son [after his death], and the indentation of it would be plainly seen on my hand when the touch was felt, and sometimes it has been several times repeated by request for others to see it.” The account is endorsed by Mrs. S.’s husband, but we have been unable to obtain further details.

Some cases have been recorded of similar effects on the organism produced by self-suggestion in the normal state. *e.g.*, a red mark on the ankle from seeing a gate likely to fall against a child,¹ while, by hypnotic suggestion, such effects may be carried much further. Thus Dr. J. Rybalkin² suggested to a hypnotic subject that after waking he would warm himself at the stove (which had not been lighted) and burn a certain place on his arm against it, and that blisters would be produced. The suggestion was duly carried out. Dr. Biggs, of Lima,³ gives an account of three cases in which he had caused a red mark in the shape of a cross to appear on the skin of his hypnotic subjects, the mark persisting in one case for many months. Dr. von Krafft-Ebing⁴ suggested to a hypnotic subject, on whom the experiment of producing blisters by hypnotic suggestion had several times been performed successfully, that a red mark in the shape of a letter K would develop without inflammation or pain, on a selected and protected area between the shoulder-blades. This occurred gradually, the process being completed in rather more than two months. Several similar cases are given in Mr. Myers’ paper on “The Subliminal Consciousness” (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VII., pp. 334-347), from which those just mentioned are taken.

These instances of the influence of ideas on the organism show that it is not necessary to suppose that the effects of the hallucinations on the percipients, in the three cases given above, were due to other than mental causes.

¹ Dr. Hack Tuke, *The Influence of the Mind upon the Body*, Vol. II., p. 35.

² *Revue de l'Hypnotisme*, June 1890, p. 361.

³ See *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VII., p. 339.

⁴ *An Experimental Study in Hypnotism*, by Dr. R. von Krafft-Ebing, translated by C. G. Chattock, M.D., New York, 1889.

CHAPTER XII.

DEATH-COINCIDENCES.

In the preceding chapters we have had occasion to consider, in connection with the facts reported to us, various causes of hallucinations recognised in the ordinary scientific treatment of the subject. We now pass to examine the evidence for the operation of a cause not so recognised, namely, Telepathy. To put it otherwise, we pass from the study of merely subjective hallucinations, in order to concentrate our attention on those which appear to have a veridical character.

By veridical hallucinations we mean those which, either from the ideas involved in them, or from the time at which they occur, or both, can only be accounted for on the hypothesis that impressions or impulses have reached the percipient's mind otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense.

As we have pointed out in Chapter I., a certain number of cases which would *primâ facie* appear to have this character would occur by chance, and merely be "extraordinary coincidences" without significance; accordingly, from the point of view of psychical research, the most important object of a statistical enquiry like the present is to decide whether the number of *primâ facie* veridical cases is more than chance will account for or not. In the present and following chapters, we shall be chiefly engaged in examining this question, in the light of the evidence furnished by our Census.

The hallucinations which have a *primâ facie* claim to be regarded as veridical may be divided into three classes. The first is the class in which the hallucination coincides in time with an external event in such a way as to suggest a causal connection between them,—as when an apparition is seen by B at the time when A, at a distance, is trying telepathically to make him see one, or when the apparition of a dying person is seen at the time of his death. The second is the class in which some information previously unknown to the percipient is conveyed to him through the hallucination. These two classes often overlap, as when a hallucination coinciding in time with a death distinctly conveys the information that the death has occurred (see, for instance, No. 425.12, p. 211; No. 381.4, p. 214; No. 579.24, p. 223), or when an apparition represents some actual characteristics of the dress or appearance of the dying person which was unknown to the percipient (as in No. 571.14, p. 237; No. 147.23, p. 218). The third class consists of "collective" hallucinations; that is, hallucinations occurring simultaneously to two or more persons, which cannot be traced to sensory suggestion from the same ex-

ternal cause, and cannot be explained as transferred from one percipient to the other through suggestion by word or gesture.

In this and the next chapter we shall confine our attention to a selected portion of the first of these classes. This restriction is necessary, since, in order to ascertain whether there are veridical hallucinations which chance will not account for, we have to select a coincidence between two quite definite events, and see how often it would occur by chance, and how often it actually does occur. The coincidence most suited to our requirements occurs among veridical hallucinations of the first class, and is that of a recognised apparition occurring at the time of the death of the person represented by it—a kind of coincidence which has the further advantage of being far the most numerous in our collection.

We have further to define exactly what we mean by “coinciding.” We propose to take the same limits of time as are adopted in *Phantasms of the Living* and to call an apparition “coincidental” when it occurs on the same day as the death—that is, within twelve hours either before or after it.¹ The reason for selecting these particular limits is the convenience of calculation. We shall accordingly speak of a coincidence of this kind as a “death-coincidence.” We propose in this chapter to discuss the death-coincidences reported to us, and in the next to consider whether they can be accounted for by chance.

The number of alleged death-coincidences (in the sense just defined) among the first-hand cases included in our Tables is 80, of which 70 were realistic apparitions, 6 incompletely developed apparitions, and 4 visions.² This does not include cases in which the death was known to the percipient when he saw the apparition (of which there are 7 within the prescribed time limit)—nor does it include a case in which the percipient was in the next room to the dying niece whose apparition she saw at the moment of death, since some sound may possibly have suggested that the death was taking place. Strictly speaking, these eight cases no doubt come within the definition of death-coincidences adopted, but it is obviously better to limit ourselves to cases in which the death was not known, because the knowledge—or rather the emotions attending it—might in some cases be the cause of the hallucination, and in any case would be likely to influence its form.³

¹ The explanation of the inclusion of apparitions seen after death, as a part of the evidence for telepathy, will be given in Chapter XVII.

² For an explanation of these terms, see pp. 50-1.

³ We have also omitted 7 cases which may have been death-coincidences, but in which the percipients seen uncertain as to the closeness of the coincidence; and it should be mentioned that we have counted as one only, a death-coincidence in which two percipients included in the Census shared the experience. Such cases are, as explained at p. 51, foot-note, counted once for each percipient in the general

Further, to avoid complication, we do not intend to use for purposes of calculation cases occurring to percipients who have experienced other hallucinations, some of which were, or may have been, apparitions of living persons, of which they have not reported to us the exact number; nor experiences of children under ten. Of the first of these classes there are 7, and of the second, 8 death coincidences. We do not exclude these cases because we think them unlikely to be telepathically caused. On the contrary, the experiences of percipients who have had frequent hallucinations which they believe to be veridical, like Mrs. McAlpine (No. 458. 9, see pp. 278-282, where one of the excluded experiences will be found), require special consideration in estimating the whole evidence for telepathy. But in this chapter, we are considering a limited class of cases with a view to numerical calculation.

After making these reductions, we have 65 alleged death-coincidences to deal with. Before, however, we examine these coincidences in detail, there is another question to consider:—the question, namely, whether a disproportionate number of alleged death-coincidences has been introduced into our collection by collectors seeking after particular kinds of answers. The precautions taken to guard against this source of error, and its possible effect on the whole collection, have already been discussed (see pp. 57-60). We saw there that either the effect is insignificant, or the cases illegitimately introduced are balanced by those which from reserve or other causes are left out. But though Selection—as we there called it—has thus had little effect on the whole, it does not follow that it has not disproportionately affected death-coincidences. As before observed, it would affect hallucinations regarded as interesting more than others, and death-coincidences are so regarded. This is indicated by their being, as we shall presently show, better recollected than the average of hallucinations; and further evidence is afforded by the comparatively large proportion of such cases stated by our collectors to have been previously known to them,—for, generally speaking, cases thought interesting are those that will be talked of and therefore known. About $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the recognised apparitions of living persons¹ (including visions and incompletely developed hallucinations) in our collection are stated by the collectors to have been previously known to them, and it is a striking fact that not much less than half of these known cases—22 out of 50—are death-coinci-

Tables, but for the present purpose the case in question should, we think, be counted once only, because, however genuinely collective the hallucination may have been, it could not be assumed that it was caused in more than one percipient by the death (see discussion on collective cases, Chapter XV).

¹ The percentage given on p. 68 is here slightly increased by including apparitions other than realistic.

dences. In other words, about 25¹ per cent. of the death-coincidences are stated to have been previously known to the collectors, and only about 8 per cent. of all the other recognised apparitions of living persons.

This disproportion renders it practically certain that errors due to any desire of collectors to obtain affirmative answers will have disproportionately affected death-coincidences. We cannot estimate exactly the amount of error thus introduced: for, on the one hand, our returns as to answers known beforehand are incomplete, and on the other, answers known beforehand are by no means necessarily selected; they would often have been collected whether previously known or not. But we have obtained definite information with regard to a considerable number of cases, and, on the basis of this, we are able to form an approximate estimate of the influence of selection on the remainder.

Of the 65 first-hand death-coincidences with which we are now dealing, 19 were known beforehand to the collector, 26 were not known, and of the remaining 20, we have no adequate means of judging whether they were known or not. Of the 19 which were known beforehand, we have good ground in 5 (including 1 experience of the collector himself) for confidence that the percipients would have been asked the question in any case. In 3, on the other hand, we have evidence that they were specially selected. In the remaining 11, we have no reason to suspect them of having been selected, but we cannot feel sure that they were not.² The possible influence of selection is therefore limited to 34 cases out of the 65: the exact allowance to be made for it we propose to estimate at a later stage.³ Meanwhile the 3 cases known to be selected should, we think, be excluded at once. They are Nos. 61. 6, 301. 6, and 350. 1, and will be found in Chapter XIV. pp. 252-4.

Deducting these, we are left with 62 alleged death-coincidences, which must be considered in detail in order to judge how far their character as death-coincidences is established, and what proportion of them we ought to count. There are two questions to ask about each case. (1) Have we good reason to believe that the apparition really occurred within 12 hours of the death? (2) Have we good reason to believe that it was recognised before the death was known, and not

¹ This number is calculated on all the alleged death-coincidences, including experiences under the age of 10, and those which were experienced by persons who have had unenumerated hallucinations, and also eight second-hand cases; in all 88 cases.

² The information that we possess as to whether any case which we have printed was known to the collector beforehand or not, is given at the end of the case.

³ See p. 243.

merely, having been unrecognised at the time, assumed afterwards to have represented the decedent because of the coincidence?

Exaggeration of the closeness of coincidence may occur in two ways : (a) from a tendency of the memory to simplify the phenomenon by placing both the striking events on one day (*cf. Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 140—142); and (b) from a mistake having from the first been made as to the date of one or other event. We have met with an example of the error occurring in each of these ways in the course of the present collection.¹

Of the second kind of error, by which an unrecognised figure is afterwards remembered as a recognised one, we have no proved instances; nor had Mr. Gurney when *Phantasms of the Living* was written (see that work, Vol. I., p. 137). Still it is an error respecting which we ought to be on our guard.

The best guarantee against both kinds of exaggeration is a written note of the hallucination made before the death was known. Such a note is stated to have been made in only six cases, which we now proceed to quote. In only one of them has the note been preserved, and then only in an ambiguous form, but in three others (Nos. 425. 12, 381.4, and 147.23), there is evidence, independently of the percipient's memory, that the note was made at the time.

The cases are arranged in chronological order—the most recent one first—the dates being reckoned according to the interval between the experience and the time when the percipient answered the Census question. None of these six cases were known to the collector beforehand.

(425. 12.) From Mr. S. Walker-Anderson.²

Tickhill, near Bawtry, Yorks., *June 12th*, 1891.

“An aunt of mine, who died in England last November, 1890 . . . appeared before me in Australia, and I knew before I received the letter of

¹ In the first of the examples here referred to, the case was not an alleged death-coincidence in the sense we are now using the word, since the figure was not recognised. In the later version of the story, written in answer to the Census question and three or four years after the experience, the apparition is said to have occurred within twelve hours of the death (which was that of a stranger lodging in the same house as the percipient), and before the percipient had heard of it. We found, however, that we had in the archives of the Society an account at second-hand, but which we had good reason to regard as correct, of the same incident, written about a month after its occurrence. This account stated that the apparition was seen a week after the death. The other example referred to is No. 656.26, quoted on p. 370. Here the apparition occurred before the news of the death was received, but when the witness was examined, it became clear that the news must have taken considerably longer to travel than the interval between the hallucination and the receipt of the letter, and that the belief in the simultaneity of the two events probably arose from ignorance of this fact.

² For another experience of the same percipient, see p. 382.

her death that she was dead. I took a note of [it] at the time, and found on comparing notes that she appeared to me the day she died—date, November 21st, 1890.”

Mrs. Anderson writes :—

February, 1892.

“I remember perfectly well my husband telling me of the apparition of his aunt ; he also made a note of the date, and when we had news of her death, I remember comparing the two dates.”

Professor Sidgwick, who had two interviews with Mr. Anderson, gives the following accounts, written from notes taken at the time :—

December 19th, 1891.

“Yesterday afternoon I met Mr. S. Walker-Anderson and had some conversation with him about the apparition seen by him in Australia.

“He told me that it occurred on the night of November 17th (not 21st, as given in the paper communicated), 1890. He had gone to bed early, 8.30 or a little later ; and between 9 and 12 he woke up and saw the figure of his aunt, Mrs. P——, standing with her arms down near the foot of the bed at one side, dressed in an ordinary black dress such as he had seen her in many times. She looked older and stouter than when he last saw her three years before. She seemed to speak, *i.e.*, he saw the lips move, though he heard no sound ; and he seemed to catch that she meant ‘good-bye.’ Then the figure gradually vanished. They had a lamp in the room. He is convinced that he was fully awake. He was not anxious about her, having had no letters to say that she was seriously ill, though he knew she was not very well. She used to write to him about once in two months, and he to her somewhat oftener.

“In the early morning he told his wife, ‘I have seen Aunt P——who said “good-bye” ; I am sure she is dead ; we will take a note.’ So he put down on a piece of paper, ‘I believe Aunt P——died on the 17th,’ and put the paper in a drawer.¹ He knows it was before 12 o’clock that he had the vision, because he used to get up at midnight to give the child something. Then in due time an English paper gave the news of his aunt’s death with date, November 17th. Afterwards a letter came from his mother with the same information ; and when he came home he ascertained that his aunt had died about 11 a.m. on that day.

“He remembers distinctly that it was on a *Monday* ; but he and his wife had disagreed about the day of the month. It was, I understood, ascertained to be the 17th, by ascertaining that to be the Monday. [November 17th, 1890, was a Monday.]

“This was the only time that he had had an apparition of this aunt. The figure seemed quite solid and lifelike. It lasted, say, 20 seconds. He sat up in bed and thought for a moment or two that it had been his aunt in the flesh. He did not wake his wife at once, but told her in the early morning.”

March 20th, 1892.

“Yesterday I called on Mr. Anderson, and questioned him about the discrepancy of dates. He said that his mentioning the 21st was due to an

¹ “The paper, he told me, was destroyed when they left Australia.—H. S.”

accidental lapse of memory. Mrs. Anderson, whom I saw and questioned, said that she had always remembered the day as the 17th. She clearly remembered his speaking to her of his vision at breakfast next morning, and saying, 'I am perfectly sure Aunt P——is dead,' and adding, 'I will make a note of it.' She remembers that she made a note of it herself in a diary that she kept, and that after the letter arrived in December announcing his aunt's death, she referred to the diary and found it confirmed their recollection as to the coincidence of the dates.

"H. SIDGWICK."

We have verified the date of Mrs. P——'s death.

Mr. Anderson does not mention in what part of Australia he was then living, but Melbourne time is about 9 hours 40 minutes earlier than Greenwich, so that, if he was in about the same longitude as Melbourne, the death would have preceded the apparition by two or three hours.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

It will be noticed in the above case that the apparent saying of "good-bye" by the figure amounted to an intimation of the death; so that the evidential character of the case depends on more than the mere coincidence.

(442. 17.)

From Miss L. B.

September, 1893.

"At the end of August of the year 1882, my father, mother, and sisters left home for our usual summer holiday. [At] the same time a young man whom we knew quite slightly (although he was our neighbour) started to Texas to learn farming, for which I felt sorry, because I was looking forward to paint well enough by my return to ask him to sit for the principal figure in a picture I was longing to do.

"We went to a cottage in Gloucestershire, where my sister and I shared the same room. About the 14th of September, 1882, my sister and I felt worried and distressed by hearing the 'Death Watch'; it lasted a whole day and night. We got up earlier than usual the next morning, about six o'clock, to finish some birthday presents for our mother. As my sister and I were working and talking together, I looked up, and saw our young acquaintance standing in front of me and looking at us. I turned to my sister, she saw nothing; I looked again to where he stood, he had vanished. We agreed not to tell anyone—and, although I wished to put it down in my diary (which I had not kept for some time), I was afraid to do so; I therefore made marks to remind myself.

"Some time afterwards we heard that our young acquaintance had either committed suicide or had been killed; he was found dead in the woods twenty-four hours after landing.

"On looking back to my diary, I found that my marks corresponded to the date of his death."

(This account was enclosed in a letter dated September 7th, 1893. Miss B——, however, answered the Census question in the middle of 1891, so that the experience is reckoned as having occurred nine years ago.)

Mr. Podmore called on Miss B. and her sister on April 8th, 1893, and gives the following account of his interview.

April 10th, 1893.

“In September, 1882, Miss L. B. and Miss B. occupied the same room. They had got up early to work at a present for their mother’s birthday, October 4th (I saw the cushion actually worked on that occasion in crewels). Miss L. B. saw a momentary vision, near the washstand, of A. L., a young man who had left B—— a few weeks before for Texas. She made a note of it and found later that A. L. had been murdered in Texas the same day.

“A. L. (age about 19) was barely an acquaintance of Miss L. B.’s (she was only about 14). But she, an artist student, had wanted to get him some time to ‘sit’ for her. They had probably not spoken to each other more than once or twice.

“Miss L. B. mentioned the vision at the time to her sister. In Miss B.’s diary for that year appears an entry on September 15th, 1882: ‘Up at 6.30 a.m. working at present.’ Miss L. B.’s diary for 1882 was found; the latter part of the year consists almost entirely of blank pages, with a few cryptogram marks. Under September 14th, 15th, and 16th respectively, appear the marks \triangle , +, \times . The succeeding days are blank in the diary for some time.

“Miss L. B. did not mention the incident to her parents for some years. In conversation with me, Miss B. fully corroborated what Miss L. B. had said.”

Neither Miss L. B. nor her sister could remember the exact date of the death, but they informed us that it had been announced in the *Standard*. From the *Standard* of October 9th, 1882, we afterwards found that the death occurred on September 14th, 1882.

It will be seen that the marks in the diary do not clearly indicate whether the apparition was seen on September 14th, 15th, or 16th. The probability that September 14th was the day, is, however, strongly supported: first, by the recollection of both sisters that they ascertained the coincidence when they first heard the news of the death, and when, no doubt, Miss L. B. would have remembered the exact meaning of all the marks in her diary, which she now forgets; and, secondly, by the expressions used in her account, which seem to imply that the entry relating to the apparition was the *first* one made after some interval.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

Miss B. has had two other experiences which may have been hallucinatory, one auditory and one visual. It is worth noting that her father, mother, and sister have all had hallucinations. An apparently veridical experience of her mother’s is quoted in Chapter XVII., p. 371.

(381. 4.)

From Mrs. J. P. Smith.

Amble, Northumberland, *January 17th, 1891.*

“In June, 1879, I was a teacher in Macclesfield. A friend, Mrs. —, was near her confinement. She told me she was afraid she would die. I went into the county of Durham for a holiday. While there I was roused from sleep by

Mrs. — as I supposed. She was shaking me, and saying, ‘I have passed away, but the baby will live.’ Then the figure left the room by the door. I got out of bed and went to my sister and related the incident. We agreed to make a note of it. Next day I received a letter from a friend in Macclesfield saying that Mrs. — was dead but the baby was alive.

“[I was] in the best of health and about 29 years of age.

“No other persons were present.”

Mrs. Smith, who is the mistress of the Infants’ School at Amble, informs us that this is the only experience of the kind she has ever had, and that to the best of her recollection the apparition was seen about an hour or two after the death.

Unfortunately, neither the note made at the time nor the letter announcing the death has been preserved, but we have received the following letter of corroboration from Mrs. Smith’s sister :—

“203, Elswick-street, Leichhardt, Sydney, Australia, *November 2nd*, 1891.

“I distinctly remember my sister coming into my room and waking me up to tell me of her dream, which was as follows :—

“That she had dreamt that a lady friend of hers some miles away had appeared to her and said she was dead ; but that her baby would live. The dream had evidently impressed my sister very much, as she seemed quite agitated, and we said we would note it down, and to our utter astonishment the next morning my sister received a letter to say that her friend had passed away that same night.

“ANNIE BROWN.”

It will be observed that Mrs. Smith’s experience is here referred to as a dream. That this is not her own view of it appears from the following account given by Professor and Mrs. Sidgwick of an interview which they had with her on September 16th, 1891. The account was written within two hours of their seeing Mrs. Smith, from notes made at the time.

“The figure appeared twice on the same night. The first time was in the breaking dawn of a June morning, before there was any sun. It woke her, and she heard the words she mentions, but she did not get out of bed, and was probably only half awake. The second time the same thing happened, but she is quite sure she was awake. It appeared at the left hand side of her bed, and, after speaking, it moved very quickly round the bed and apparently through the door, which was at the right hand side of the bed parallel to the head and hidden by the curtains, so that she did not see it go out. The figure went as if in a great hurry. It seemed to be dressed in drab ; the face was seen—it seemed exactly as in life. She felt no fear, nor sense of the supernatural—only anxiety to question further—and regarded it as real until, running after the figure downstairs, she became convinced that it was a vision. She felt as she ran as though she would have caught it up, had she not had to open the door. It was about 5 o’clock when she went to her sister, which she did at once after the second vision. Mrs. — had told her she thought she should not live, but Mrs. Smith had thought little of this, and it had quite passed out of her mind. She was in no anxiety. Mrs. — was no special friend of hers. Her children came to Mrs. Smith’s school, and she was interested in them. She did not know why Mrs. — should have told her of her expectation of dying ; but she said at the same time, ‘If I go, you will be very kind to my children.’

“The friend who wrote telling her of the death mentioned it casually—especially as sad because of the young children. She mentioned the time as in the early hours of the morning, and it struck Mrs. Smith when she got the letter that the vision had been coincident with the death, but she did not verify this by ascertaining the exact time of the death.

“Mrs. Smith told us that when she communicated what she had seen to her sister, the latter said it must have been just a very vivid dream, to which she replied, ‘Well, it was a very vivid one, then,’ or words to that effect.”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

This is another case where there is more than a mere coincidence, since information as to the death was given and also as to the survival of the baby. It perhaps adds to the force of the evidence for telepathy here, that the dying mother is likely, from the circumstances of the case, to have had Mrs. Smith specially in her mind at the time of the death.

In the following case also there seems to have been a definite intimation of the death.

(383. 24.) From Mr. James Lloyd.

3, The Grove, Adderley-road, Saltley, Birmingham, *February 10th*, 1891.

“[I] was in India. [I] awoke in the night [and] saw my father in England, standing beside the bed. He was as real as in life, and dressed in a grey suit such as he used to wear when I last saw him about nine years before. The figure said, ‘Good-bye, Jim ; I won’t see you any more,’ or words to that effect. A month after that (the first mail I could have heard by) a letter came, saying he had died that same night, and about that hour—September 14th, 1876. I was a soldier at Mhow, in Bombay Presidency. What hour the vision appeared, [I] did not know. In the morning [I] told a comrade who slept in the next room.

“I wrote it on the wall at the back of my bed at the same time, so as to fix the date.”

Mr. Lloyd was 27 at the time, and was in good health, and in no anxiety about his father.

Mr. Myers called on him on December 18th, 1891, and writes :—

December 19th, 1891.

“I saw Mr. Lloyd yesterday. He seems a straightforward man.

“I saw Mrs. Lloyd separately. The apparition occurred before their marriage, but she said that she had heard her husband tell the story frequently since her first knowledge of him.

“Mr. Lloyd said that he wished to correct the date from September 14th to November 9th, 1876. He was in the 3rd King’s Own Hussars.”

“P.S.—Mr. Lloyd has sent me a funeral card, which shows that James Lloyd died November 9th, 1876 ; interred at Saltley.”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

The following case is classed as a vision.

(362. 21.)

From Mrs. Baldwin.

November 19th, 1890.

“I was my Uncle E. de C.’s favourite niece, and we had made a compact that whichever of us died first should appear to the other. I was about 25 at the time, and he said to me, ‘You won’t be afraid, but, if God permits such a thing, I will come to you.’ This took place at Camareah, in 1860. I was then a widow, living at my uncle’s house. It was in December 1863 (I had married again, and was living at Umritsur), when one morning at about 4 o’clock, as I was sitting up in bed with my baby in my arms, I saw my uncle. He was lying on the sofa in the drawing-room and appeared to be dying. I also saw his bearer and my Aunt’s ayah. They passed each other in going across the room, and looked at me and sighed. I said to my husband, ‘Look, there is my uncle dying,’ and I described the above scene. He thought it so remarkable that he got out of bed and made a note of it. He wrote at once to my cousin C., to inquire after uncle and we heard from him that my uncle had died very suddenly, on the day and at the time I saw him, of heart disease, after an illness of a few days, at his house at Mirzapore.

“G. ADELINÉ BALDWIN.”

Mrs. Baldwin writes further :—

“Camareah is between Allahabad and Benares, about 30 miles from the latter.

“Mr. E. de C. was not failing in health prior to his sudden death, and did not even know he had heart disease.

“I saw the drawing-room distinctly, with my uncle lying on the sofa. The room was at his own house.

“The note that was made at the time, and the letter from my cousin, which my husband received in answer to inquiries, were unfortunately destroyed by white ants. [Mrs. Baldwin informed us in conversation that the white ants had also destroyed documents of greater importance to her.]

“I have quite lost sight of my cousin, and do not even know where he is likely to be found.”

“With regard to the mode of my uncle’s death it happened just as I saw it, inasmuch as he died in the drawing-room on the sofa; the ayah and bearer were present; all this my husband wrote and ascertained. The sofa was placed in a different position to what it had been when I was last in the house.”

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :—

January 3rd, 1891.

“I have just had a long interview with Mrs. and Miss Baldwin. Miss Baldwin tells me that she first heard the account from her father when she was about 16 or 17. He died in 1880. (She was the baby who was in Mrs. Baldwin’s arms at the time of the vision.) Her father was much impressed with it. According to her recollection, the actual position of the sofa where the uncle died was not ascertained, but Mrs. Baldwin is clear on this point. He did die on the sofa, and facing the door, which was not the usual position

of the sofa. The ayah and bearer were the only people with him, as his wife had gone to rest. Mrs. Baldwin says that her uncle seemed to look at her and sigh, and so did the ayah and bearer. They would both have known of her uncle's attachment to her. She saw some details but not others, does not know how her uncle was dressed, but noticed a plate of fruit on a shelf (not, I think, verified). The house was well known to her. She was not at all aware of her uncle's illness.

“She made some notes of the vision of her uncle some years ago, from which she wrote her account, but she is not sure when the notes were made—certainly since her husband's death in 1880.

“The duration of Mrs. Baldwin's vision of her uncle can only be guessed at. She had time to rouse her husband and to say, ‘Look, there's uncle—he's dying,’ for him to say he saw nothing, and for her to describe what she saw.”

In this case also definite information is conveyed, but pictorially, and with more detail than in the cases before quoted. It is also interesting as being one of the three apparitions at the time of death, in connexion with which, as we are told, a compact had been made to appear, if possible.

(147. 23.) From Madame Obalecheff.

(The account is translated from the original Russian by Mr. A. Aksakoff.)

“V. de Tver, le 27 *Mars*, 1891.

“Apparition de mon beau-frère (le mari de ma sœur), Nicolas Nilovitch Zikoff, que je vis dans l'état de veille à Odessa en 1861, le 17 Janvier, à 11 heures du soir—le jour et à l'heure même de sa mort, qui eut lieu à Tver.

“Je ne dormais pas et me sentais tout-à-fait bien portante. Dans la chambre où je me trouvais brûlait une lampe d'image et, en outre, une bougie sur la table près de mon lit. A côté, par terre, dormait ma domestique—une fille ci-devant serve, que j'avais emmenée de Tver, et qui connaissait parfaitement mon beau-frère. Il y avait deux portes dans la chambre : l'une d'elles, conduisant au salon, se trouvait non loin du chevet de mon lit ; quant à l'autre, qui conduisait dans la chambre contigue, je la voyais juste devant moi, étant couchée ou assise dans mon lit. Entendant les pleurs de mon fils, alors âgé d'un mois, je réveillai la domestique et lui ordonnai de me donner l'enfant. Tout à côté de mon lit, près des coussins, était placé un fauteuil, sur le bras duquel je m'accoudai de la main droite, et, prenant l'enfant, je me mis à le nourrir. Mon mari dormait dans la même chambre, et la domestique, après m'avoir passé l'enfant, s'assit par terre, à côté de mon lit, la figure tournée vers le fauteuil, sous lequel elle étendit les pieds. Je ne pensais alors qu'à mon fils, couché dans mes bras. Levant par hasard les yeux sur la porte, que j'avais devant moi, je vis entrer lentement mon beau-frère en pantouffles et en robe de chambre de bayette à carreaux, que je ne lui avais jamais vue (plus tard, ayant pris des informations là-dessus, j'appris qu'elle n'avait été faite qu'une semaine avant sa mort, et qu'il l'avait sur lui en mourant). S'approchant du fauteuil, sur les bras duquel il

s'appuya, il enjambea les pieds de la domestique, qui se trouvait là, et s'assit dans le fauteuil lentement. En ce moment la pendule de la chambre sonna 11 heures. Bien sûre de voir distinctement mon beau-frère, je m'adressai à la domestique avec la question suivante :—'Tu vois, Claudine ?' mais je ne nommai pas mon beau-frère. Là-dessus, la domestique, tremblant de frayeur, me répondit immédiatement :—'Je vois Nicolas Nilovitch' (le nom de mon beau-frère). A ces paroles, mon beau-frère se leva lentement, enjambea de nouveau les pieds étendus de Claudine et, se tournant, disparut derrière la porte, qui conduisait au salon. Cette apparition ne m'effraya nullement, mais je réveillai immédiatement mon mari, en le priant de prendre une bougie et d'aller voir le salon. Mon mari se rendit à ma prière, et après avoir visité la chambre attentivement, il retourna, disant qu'il n'y avait trouvé personne. Alors même, je lui dis, que sûrement mon beau-frère venait de mourir à Tver, et, comme nous nous aimions sincèrement, il sera certainement venu pour prendre congé. En effet, tout cela se confirma par une nouvelle, arrivée de Tver, et annonçant que mon beau-frère y mourut justement le 17 Janvier, 1861, à 11 heures du soir.

“De retour d'Odessa à Tver, il m'arriva un jour de causer de cette apparition avec le prieur de l'église de Notre Dame St. Vladimir, l'archiprêtre Vladislavlew, qui, de mon consentement, publia ce récit dans la gazette du diocèse de Tver.

“AIMÉE TICHONOWNA OBALECHEFF (Veuve de conseiller de collége).”

Attestation de la veuve de Mr. Nicolas Zikoff.

“Je certifie ci-dessous, que quoique la lettre de ma sœur, Aimée Tichonowna Obalecheff, par laquelle elle me communiquait l'apparition de mon mari, qu'elle avait vu dans l'état de veille, soit déjà égarée, je sais pour sûr qu'elle avait expédié cette lettre, avant que je lui eus envoyé la mienne avec la nouvelle de la mort de mon mari, qui coïncida avec le jour et l'heure même de l'apparition. Nous tardions de lui faire part de notre chagrin, en vue de ses couches, craignant de l'effrayer par cette nouvelle. Ce n'est qu'après avoir reçu sa lettre au sujet de l'apparition, que nous nous décidâmes de confirmer sa supposition sur la mort de mon mari. La robe de chambre décrite par ma sœur, et dans laquelle lui était apparu mon mari, était identique à celle qu'il avait en mourant, et qui a été faite peu avant sa mort; de sorte que ma sœur, Obalecheff, ne l'avait jamais vue avant. A son retour à Tver je lui montrai cette robe de chambre, et elle confirma que c'était la même qu'elle avait vue sur le défunt apparu.

“ELISABETH TICHONOWNA ZIKOFF (Veuve de lieutenant).”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

In this case, as in the last, the appearance includes a veridical feature unknown to the percipient, but not one of any interest either to her or to the dying man :—viz: the dressing gown. The unimportance of this detail in itself does not, of course, affect its import-

ance as evidence of the operation of some supernormal faculty. Another point of interest in the case is that the hallucination appears to have been shared by a second person. The special questions raised by this *sharedness* or "collectivity" of hallucinations will be discussed in Chapter XV.

This completes the death-coincidences about which it is stated that a note was made at the time.

The importance and value of contemporary documentary evidence for telepathy was first pointed out in *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. I. pp. 134-147), and has been constantly and emphatically reiterated by those who are working at psychical research, with the result that, in addition to what existed at the time *Phantasms of the Living* was written, the amount of it has since been steadily, though slowly accumulating.¹ Some of the critics of the Society's work have assumed that in a large proportion, probably about one in seven, of the cases where a sensory hallucination is experienced, the percipient would at once write a letter on the subject to some friend, and that letters containing such accounts would, in general, be carefully preserved. They have accordingly maintained that the absence of documentary evidence in the great majority of cases constitutes a *positive* argument against the telepathic explanation. The force of this argument depends, of course, primarily on the frequency with which contemporary notes of possibly telepathic incidents are made. We have therefore endeavoured to obtain information as to the cases in which any notes were taken at the time of the hallucinatory experience. From the information received, it appears that in 49² out of the 1942 cases recorded, that is, in 2·5 per cent, some note was made, or some letter mentioning the hallucination written, within 24 hours of the occurrence, and before knowing whether it was coincidental or not, either by the percipient himself, or by some person who was told of it at the time. We have included in the 49 some cases in which it is not quite certain from the expressions used whether our informant meant that he had made a *written* or a *mental* note of his experience, in order to obtain an outside estimate of the number of cases in which contemporary documentary evidence of any kind ever existed.

¹ A discussion of the state of the evidence on this subject two years ago, with a selection of cases received since the publication of *Phantasms of the Living*, is to be found in an article by Mr. Podmore, "In Defence of Phantasms," in the *National Review* for April, 1892.

² There is also an auditory case not coming within the scope of the Census question, but printed below, No. 105. 1 (see p. 291), in which we have documentary evidence and a few other non-veridical "non-Census" cases were, we are told, noted at the time. These are not included in the following Table.

The following is an analysis of the 49 cases :—

Kind of Hallucinations.	Number of Hallucinations about which Notes were made.			Totals.
	Coinciding with deaths.	Coinciding with other events.	Non-coin- cidental.	
Apparitions of recognised living persons }	6	6	12	24
Apparitions of recognised dead persons }	—	1	3	4
Other visual hallucinations ...	1	—	8	9
Auditory hallucinations ...	1	1	8	10
Tactile hallucinations	—	1	1	2
Totals	8	9	32	49

Where no information is given on the subject, it is generally probable that no written record was made at the time ; and a positive statement to this effect is made in 214 cases.

It will be observed that a large proportion of the noted cases, namely, about one third, are *primâ facie* veridical, which seems to show that veridical cases are, on the whole, more impressive at the time than subjective ones. It is, of course, only the veridical cases in which the documents are of value as evidence for telepathy, but the important point to ascertain, in considering how much documentary evidence could reasonably be expected to be forthcoming, is, in how many cases such documents were written *before* it was known whether there was reason to regard the hallucination as veridical or not. When we consider the very small proportion of adults who keep diaries, and the probably still smaller proportion of people who are in the habit of making any other written notes, otherwise than in letters, about any events in their lives, the small number of notes reported is not surprising. With regard to mention in letters, it happens often that the percipient is living with the persons to whom, if he were living elsewhere, he would most naturally write on the subject, and he therefore speaks of his experience and does not write of it. It has also to be borne in mind that the great majority of educated persons are reasonably afraid of being ridiculed as superstitious if they appear to attach importance to such experiences ; and are therefore much more inclined to communicate them orally to sympathetic auditors, than to narrate them in letters. It follows that corroborative evidence depending on some person's recollections of

a verbal communication, exists much more often than contemporary written evidence. We should further expect that, even if the percipient did mention his experience in a letter, he would be inclined to put off doing so till he had ascertained that there was "something in it." Also in a large proportion of the death-coincidences, the news of the death is said to have followed the experience after so short an interval that any letter telling of the hallucination before the percipient received the news would have had to be written very promptly.

As to the preservation of any notes that are made, it must be remembered that, as a rule, only a very small proportion of letters written on any subject are producible after the lapse of a few years. Diaries also are often destroyed after some time, and all kinds of papers are liable to be disposed of indiscriminately in the course of household removals, and at the death of their owner.

When the percipient makes a note for himself, he is generally simply interested in proving *to himself* that the hallucination has been coincidental. This is done once for all by his comparing it with the time of death, when he hears what this is, and—for him—the note is afterwards almost or quite valueless. In eight cases out of the seventeen, in fact, the percipient tells us that the note was destroyed after the coincidence had been verified. It would probably occur to very few people—unless they had been convinced of the scientific importance of the matter—to keep such a paper for the sake of proving to others afterwards that the event had happened to them just at that time. Either they would not expect that other people would be sufficiently interested to enquire into the matter so minutely, or they would expect these others to be their intimate friends or near relatives, who were not in the habit of demanding from them written evidence of their statements.

We should, however, expect—and this is what we find has actually happened—that in a few cases the percipient who had made a note, would keep it for himself as a memento of an important or striking event in his life; and that a certain proportion of the letters describing the hallucinations would be considered by their recipients sufficiently interesting to be carefully preserved; or that we might be able to trace the answers received by the percipient to these letters, which answers, if dated and sufficiently detailed, have practically the same evidential value as the original letters.

Whether the proportion of documentary evidence that has been preserved in the coincidental cases is, or is not, smaller than would be reasonably expected, we must leave to the judgment of our readers. Since the numbers are so small, it will be convenient to summarise here the amount of the evidence in the two classes of "death-coinci-

dences" and "coincidences with other events" put together, but it will, of course, be obvious, on referring to each case, to which class it belongs. Of the 17 coincidental cases which were noted at the time, the note has been seen by us in two cases (No. 442. 17, see p. 213, and No. 660. 6, see p. 282); in a third case (No. 290. 3, see p. 293) a letter which was written in answer to one from the percipient describing her experience, and which establishes the coincidence, has been seen by us; in a fourth case (No. 34. 20, see p. 289) we have received a copy of a similar letter; and in five other cases (No. 147. 23, see p. 218; No. 381. 4, see p. 214; No. 425. 12, see p. 211; No. 78. 16, see p. 299; No. 458. 9, see p. 279) we have evidence—either from the persons who received the letters, or from those who witnessed the making of the notes—confirmatory of the percipient's statement that the letters or notes were written at the time.

The next best kind of confirmatory evidence is that afforded by the testimony of a second person who has known of the percipient's impression at the time, before the arrival of the news of death, and with him has been aware of the coincidence as soon as it was ascertained. The case then rests on the agreement between the memory of two persons instead of on the memory of one, and granting that each memory by itself may be liable to err, it is unlikely that both would happen to have corresponding illusions;—though it is not impossible that by verbal suggestion, some illusion of memory on the part of the second witness might be induced, *e g.*, to the effect that he had heard of the event at the time, when he had not really heard of it till some time afterwards.¹

The death-coincidences among the 62 with this kind of confirmation are 10 in number, besides 4 of those we have already quoted. We give 9 of them here, in chronological order as before.

(579. 24.)

From Mr. E. A.

(His original account, written in Russian, was translated into French by the collector, Mr. Aksakoff.)

31 Janvier, 1892. St. Petersburg.

"C'était à Milan, le 10 (22) Octobre, 1888. Je demeurais à l'hôtel Ancora. Après le dîner, vers 7 heures, j'étais assis sur le sofa et je lisais une gazette. Ma femme se reposait dans la même chambre sur une couchette, derrière un rideau. La chambre était éclairée par une lampe placée sur la table, auprès de laquelle j'étais assis et lisais. Tout-à-coup je vis sur le fond de la porte, qui

¹ A conspicuous instance of a joint illusion of memory was met with in a story which, in the early days of the S.P.R., was published on the authority of two unimpeachable witnesses, and had afterwards to be withdrawn on the discovery of chronological inconsistencies which made it impossible that the events should have occurred as described. But we believe cases of the kind to be rare.

se trouvait en face de moi, la figure de mon père ; il était, comme toujours, en surtout noir, très pale, eomme mourant. En ce moment j'entendis tout près de mon oreille une voix qui me disait : ' On apportera une dépêche que ton père est mort.' Tout cela ne prit que quelques secondes. Je sautai sur pied et me précipitai vers ma femme, mais pour ne pas l'effrayer je ne lui en dit rien ; pour motiver mon irruption je lui eriai : ' Voilà, tu ne vois pas que la bouilloire à thé débordc.' . . . Le soir du même jour, vers les 11 heures, nous étions à prendre le thé, en eompagnie de plusieurs personnes, parmi lesquelles se trouvaient Mme. Y., sa fille, E. Y., ci-devant artiste des théâtres impériaux, et Mlle. M., demeurant à présent à Florence. Tout-à-coup on frappe à la porte et le coneierge annonce une dépêche. Blême d'émoi, je m'écrie immédiatement : ' Je sais, mon père est mort, j'ai vu.' . . . La dépêche contenait ees mots : ' Papa mort subitement.—Olga.' C'était une dépêche de ma seur vivant à Pétersbourg. J'appris plus tard quemon père s'était suicidé le matin du même jour."

Témoignage de Mme. A.

" J'ai été présente à cela, et je témoigne de l'exactitude du récit.

" W. A."

Mr. Aksakoff writes :—

" Mme. et Mlle. Y. ne se trouvent pas à Pétersbourg, et où sont elles M. A. ne le sait pas. J'ai vu l'original de la dépêche, dont voilà la copie :

" ' Ricevuto il 22,¹ 1888. Milano, Pétersbourg, data 22,¹ ore e minute, 8.40. Papa mort subitement.—Olga.' "

Milan, *i.e.*, Roman, time is about 70 minutes later than St. Petersburg time, so that the apparition occurred about half-an-hour after the despatch of the telegram.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

It is to be observed that this is again a case in which the fact of the death is communicated by the hallucination. The same may practically be said with regard to the following case, in view of the parting words of the friend whose apparition is seen.

(215. 9.)

From Miss J. E. L.

(The account was written in 1889.)

" On June 14th, 1885, while awake, I suddenly saw the figure of a friend at the door. She looked very ill, came to me, and bent down and kissed me. I got out of bed, looked at the hour ; it was between 6 and 7 o'clock. The next day I received news my friend had died at that hour. I was in London at the time. I had left home in May, and on saying good-bye to my friend, she asked me, should she die while I was away, might she come to me in spirit and tell me so ? I said, ' Yes,' hardly realising what was meant. I was in bed, in my usual health, and not in grief or anxiety.

" No [other persons were present at the time]."

Miss L. informs us that she has had no other experiences of the kind.

¹ " Le nom du mois (Octobre) est omis par négligence du bureau télégraphique."

The collector, Miss Finlay, writes, in answer to questions :—“ [Miss L.] did know that her friend was dying. I may add that I was aware of the incident soon after it occurred, and knew about the lady and the circumstances of her death.”

Miss L.'s sister writes :—

“ I remember my sister telling me that her friend had appeared to her in the early morning, and when she was told there was a letter from home she said, ‘ Yes, I know that my friend is dead.’ ” “ E. M.”

Miss L., who is now in a sisterhood, was unwilling to see a member of the Committee on the subject.

The following, as will be seen, is also a case in which the person whose apparition is seen had promised to appear, if possible, to the percipient.

(379. 24.) From the Rev. Matthew Frost.

Bowers Gifford, Essex, *January 30th, 1891.*

“ The first Thursday in April, 1881, while sitting at tea with my back to the window and talking with my wife in the usual way, I plainly heard a rap at the window, and looking round I said to my wife, ‘ Why, there’s my grandmother,’ and went to the door, but could not see anyone; and still feeling sure it was my grandmother, and knowing, though 83 years of age, she was very active and fond of a joke, I went round the house, but could not see anyone. My wife did not hear it. On the following Saturday I had news my grandmother died in Yorkshire about half an hour before the time I heard the rapping. The last time I saw her alive I promised, if well, I would attend her funeral; that [was] some two years before. I was in good health [and] had no trouble, [age] 26 years. I did not know that my grandmother was ill.”

Mrs. Frost writes :—

January 30th, 1891.

“ I beg to certify that I perfectly remember all the circumstances my husband has named, but I heard and saw nothing myself.”

The house (seen by Mrs. Sidgwick) in which Mr. Frost was living when the event occurred, stands some way back from the road in a garden, and the door into the garden opens out of the sitting-room, so that he must have got to the door much too quickly, if he went at once, for anyone to have got away unseen by him.

Professor Sidgwick, who called on Mr. Frost on June 18th, 1892, gives the following account of his interview, written from full notes taken at the time :—

June 22nd, 1892.

“ Mr. Frost had last seen his grandmother in December, 1878. When he said good-bye to her she said that she might never see him again on earth and asked him to come to her if she became ill, or if not, to her funeral. He promised he would come, and said : ‘ They tell me that when people die they can make it known to those they love. If you die and are happy will

you let me know it?' She promised that she would if she could. She had gone through trouble some years before and he had always been very fond of her.

"Mr. Frost was sitting at tea with his back to the window when he heard a distinct knocking. He said, 'What's that?' turned round and saw his grandmother. He saw her face quite clearly—in the bonnet and cape that she used to wear, and saw her hand in the attitude of having just tapped at the window. This was at Bowers Gifford, between Southend and Pitsea, 200 to 300 miles from Knottingley, where she lived. His idea was that she had taken a journey to surprise him. She was an active old lady, and an excursion of the kind did not at the time seem surprising to him. He thought she had come in this way for a joke, and went at once to the door and all round the house, but could find no one. He is quite certain that no one could have got away without being seen. It was about 5 o'clock in April—full daylight. He remembers the time of year by his having just come back from his Easter holidays, and the time of the day by the fact that he was at tea.

"If it had been a real knock and a real person, Mrs. Frost must have heard and seen it. He was surprised at her not hearing and seeing, and she says that she must have done so if a real person had been there, and that she would have seen a person coming up the path. As it was, she could not understand what was the matter.

"Mr. Frost did not at first regard it as supernatural, but when he came back, having found nobody, the explanation that his grandmother was dead occurred to him. Mrs. Frost remembers his saying, 'I should not be surprised if my grandmother is dead.' He had heard of things of the kind, but—in spite of the talk with his grandmother—did not really believe in them. He has never had any experience of the kind before or since (only coincidences of thinking about people just before they appeared, and to this he attached no importance), and would have ridiculed the subject five minutes before. They had not been talking or thinking about her, and did not know she was ill. He certainly would not have gone away for a holiday if he had had any idea of being summoned to her bedside.

"They had news of her death by letter, naming the day and hour. Mrs. Frost remembers the letter coming, and that they noticed the coincidence of time. Mr. Frost went to the funeral, but arrived on the Monday after, his grandmother having been buried on Sunday. He saw the coffin, which was left in the open grave till he came.

"I got the information mainly from Mr. Frost when Mrs. Frost was out of the room, and then obtained her confirmation by questions afterwards."

Mr. Frost could not remember the exact date of the death, but enquired of his brother, who stated that it was April 21st, 1880. We find, however, from the Register, that the true date was April 21st, 1881, and this was, in accordance with Mr. Frost's statement in conversation, the first Thursday after Easter, 1881, though not, of course, the first Thursday in the month.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

The next case is a very peculiar one ; since a hallucination shared by seven persons and (apparently) by a dog also is something unique

in our collection. There seems, however, no reason to doubt that an apparition was seen, by the three persons who sign the account, at a time approximately coinciding with the death of the child.

(422. 25.)

From Mr. D. Amosof.

(The account is translated from the original Russian by the collector, Mr. Aksakoff.)

St. Petersburg, *May 4th*, 1891.

“Voilà le phénomène dont toute notre famille fut témoin. C'était à Pétersbourg, en 1880, lorsque nous demeurions rue Pouchkarska. Par une soirée du mois de Mai, vers les 6 heures, ma mère (aujourd'hui Madame Téléhof) se trouvait au salon avec ses cinq enfants, dont j'étais l'aîné (j'avais alors 16 ans). En ce moment un ancien serviteur de la maison, qu'on traitait en ami (mais qui alors ne servait plus chez nous), était venu nous voir et était engagé dans une conversation avec ma mère. Tout à coup les ébats joyeux des enfants s'arrêtèrent, et l'attention générale se porta vers notre chien 'Moustache,' qui s'était précipité, en aboyant fortement, vers le poêle. Involontairement nous regardâmes tous dans la même direction, et nous vîmes sur la corniche du grand poêle en carreaux de faïence un petit garçon, de 5 ans à peu près, en chemise. Dans ce garçon nous reconnûmes le fils de notre laitière—André, qui venait chez nous souvent avec sa mère pour jouer avec les enfants; ils vivaient tout près de nous. L'apparition se détacha du poêle, passa au-dessus de nous tous, et disparut dans la croisée ouverte. Pendant tout ce temps,—une quinzaine de secondes à peu près—le chien ne cessait d'aboyer de toutes ses forces, et courrait et aboyait en suivant le mouvement de l'apparition. Le même jour, un peu plus tard, notre laitière vint chez nous, et nous fit part que son fils André, après une maladie de quelques jours (nous savions qu'il était malade) venait de mourir; c'était probablement au moment où nous le vîmes apparaître.

“DANIEL AMOSOF.

“MARIE TÉLÉHOF

“ (la mère de M. Amosof en second mariage).

“KOUZEMA PETROF

“ (vivant à présent à Lébiajeyé, près Oranienbaum).”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

For another experience of Mr. Amosof, see p. 192.

The next case presents a marked contrast to the last; since the figure was invisible to all present except the one percipient, although the attention of others was called to it.

(630. 5.)

From Mr. J. H.

March 29th, 1892.

“It occurred at Bury (Lancashire), about fourteen years ago; I was awakened by a rattling noise at the window, and wakened my step-brother, with whom I was sleeping, and asked him if he could hear it. He told me to go to sleep, there was nothing. The rattle came again in a few minutes, and I sat up in bed, and distinctly saw the image of one of my

step-brothers (who at the time was in Blackpool) pass from the window towards the door. Time, 2.30 a.m.

“I was in good health and spirits. Age eighteen.

“I had not seen him for some time. He had not been home for 2 or 3 months. We heard next morning that he had been taken ill and died about 2.30 a.m.

“Three step-brothers and myself slept in the same room. I awakened them, but they could not see anything. My father, hearing the talking, got out of bed, and came into the room. I told him what I had seen, and he got his watch, and said, ‘We will see if we hear anything of him.’”

Mr. H. adds that this is the only hallucinatory experience he has ever had.

The following corroboration from one of the step-brothers was sent by the collector, Mr. Butterworth, of 16, Essex Street, Rochdale, who says: “I regret that I am unable to get more than one signature, as the father is dead, and the other two brothers are abroad.”

“I remember very distinctly my step-brother, J. H., getting up in bed one night in August, 1878, and saying he could see an apparition of my brother in a kneeling position, and my father coming into the bedroom to ask what was the matter. He referred to his watch, and found it was about 2.30 a.m. The following morning we received news of my brother’s death at the time stated.

(Signed) “W. R.”

“Witness: S. R.”

The next case is counted as belonging to a period more than 10 years ago, since it occurred 15 years before the percipient was asked the Census question; but it will be observed that the account was written in 1884, within 10 years of the incident.

(83. 21.) From Miss Ellen M. Greany (now Mrs. Edwards.)

Formerly a servant in the family of Miss Porter, at 16, Russell Square, W.C.

[This case is reprinted from *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 54.]

May 20th, 1884.

“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 anyone 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 very 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 enquiry, Miss Greany adds that this hallucination is the only one she has ever experienced. She was then about 15 years old. 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.”

Mr. Gurney writes :—

“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.”

This case was known to the collector, Miss Porter, beforehand, but the percipient was not included in the Census because of her experience, and the case is one of those referred to on p. 210 as known beforehand, but not selected.

In the next case the interval in time between the apparition and the news of the death is unusually long, and there is a discrepancy as to the day of the week remembered by the percipient; but her recollection that the coincidence of the two events was ascertained when the news came is clearly corroborated by her husband.

(307. 20.)

From Mrs. Murray.

Langholm, Upper Norwood, *June 13th*, 1890.

“Some time in the summer of 1869, awaking suddenly at night, I distinctly saw a man in naval uniform, whose features I recognised, standing in the room, who seemed to walk behind a curtain. I had not seen the person for some years, or thought or spoken of him.

“I was in good health; 21 years old.

“I distinctly saw and recognised the face. Some months after, I heard that the person I had seen had died the same night I thought I had seen him, somewhere at sea.

"I awoke my husband, told him whom I had seen, and he searched the room and house.

"I have never had any other experience, and am not nervous or fanciful."
"FLORENCE MURRAY."

Mr. Podmore called on Mrs. Murray on March 29th, 1892, and wrote an account of his interview the same day as follows:—

"The vision happened in 1869. The figure seen was that of a young man, Mr. —, who had known Mrs. Murray before her marriage. The naval uniform with brass buttons, in which the apparition was dressed, she had never seen. Mr. —, however, as she knew, had left England a few months before the vision, having obtained some appointment on a ship—probably purser on a P. and O. steamer. She showed me a photograph of him—given to her later—in naval uniform, but with gold band and large brass buttons. She told her husband what she had seen, and he got up and searched the room.

"Next day (probably a Saturday) she met the young man's mother at the Crystal Palace, and asked if he were quite well. The news of his death—by an accident at sea—she saw some three weeks or a month later (she thinks), in an evening paper. The vision occurred in the summer of 1869, early in the morning, for the room was partly light.

"No notes were taken of the vision, but she and Mr. Murray talked the matter over when they heard of the death, and came to the conclusion that it occurred on the same day, the date of vision being fixed by the fact of her going to the Palace on the following day."

Mr. Murray's corroboration was given in answer to Mr. Podmore's request.

April 3rd, 1892.

"Mrs. Murray has advised me of your visit and the purport thereof.

"I recollect the circumstance very distinctly, but saw nothing myself.

"I however ascertained that —'s death did occur at that time, as nearly as difference of [longitude] will allow.

"M. MURRAY."

Mr. Podmore wrote to Mr. —'s brother asking for the date of his death, and was informed that he died on August 24th, 1869, on one of the Royal Mail Company's steamers, and was buried at sea. August 24th, 1869, was a Tuesday; so that Mrs. Murray's present impression as to the day of her visit to the Crystal Palace is probably at fault.

The following is again a case of shared or collective hallucination:—

(418. 4.)

From Mr. H. Sims.

64, Geach-street, Birmingham, *May 20th, 1891.*

"Sixteen years ago, I had just got into bed, but had not lowered the gas, which was brightly burning. My wife and I both saw her aunt walk across the room and disappear. The figure was as plain as in life. She lived one and a-half miles away, and was ill at the time. Next day we heard she had died about that hour.

"My age was 26.

"HENRY SIMS."

Mrs. Sims adds a note to the narrative :—

“I certify the above to be correct.

“ELIZA SIMS.”

Mr. Sims, who is an engineer in a factory at Birmingham, says that he has had no other hallucination, except a non-voeal auditory one, and that he was not out of health or in anxiety on either occasion.

Mr. Myers writes :—

December 19th, 1891.

“I saw Mr. and Mrs. Sims yesterday evening. They seem both of them sensible persons. They are quite sure that they saw the figure *independently*. They both saw it move in the same direction. The date was more remote than Mr. Sims had at first supposed, viz., January, 1869.”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

In the next case the experience is very remote ; but the recollection both of the percipient and of his wife appears to be quite firm and clear.

(523. 12.)

From Mr. John Cass.

Castleford, Yorkshire, *December 18th, 1891.*

“[In] May, 1845, in Castleford, Yorks, about 10 p.m., I saw the figure of my sister Isabella pass through the bedroom. [I had] just retired to rest—light still burning in bedroom ; [I was] in good health ; age 29 years. My sister and I were in great sympathy of spirit. I learned next day that she had died at the same hour of above experience, at Barnsley, 17 miles off.

“My wife was present at above time, to whom I remarked, ‘My sister Isabella is dead, I have just seen her pass through the room.’ My wife did not share the experience. [I have had] no other experience so distinct as [the] above.

“JOHN CASS.”

Professor Sidgwick writes :—

March 18th, 1892.

“I called on Mr. John Cass this morning, and also saw his wife. She said that she remembered the incident as clearly as possible. She remembered that her husband said, ‘My sister Isabella is dead,’ that she answered, ‘How do you know?’ and that he replied, ‘She has just passed through the room.’ I asked about the coincidence of time. She said, they generally went to bed about 10, and as she was not yet in bed when the apparition was seen by her husband, the time of it was thus approximately fixed. It happened on Sunday. They learnt that it coincided with the time of the death by a letter that arrived on Tuesday from another sister. Mrs. Cass said that she remembered her husband remarking, when the letter had been read, ‘that it would be about the same time.’ The letter was long since burnt. The sister died of consumption, aged 24, near Barnsley, 17 miles off. They knew that she was very ill, but had no expectation of her death as imminent at the time when Mr. Cass saw the apparition. Mr. Cass was not inclined to give details about the figure, beyond saying that it passed through the room, that he knew it was spiritual, but felt no alarm. Mrs. Cass thought that she must have seen it if it had been a real human being. He was also reluctant to give details of his other experiences, but

he said unhesitatingly that this was the only time he saw the apparition of a relative or friend. He thinks that he can make others think of him, and know clairvoyantly what they are doing. He mentioned, and Mrs. Cass confirmed, that a daughter living 13 miles off had come to see him, with her husband, meaning to take him by surprise, and found dinner specially prepared for her and her husband."

The 10th case in which we have testimony from more than one person who knew of the experience before the news of the death was received—viz., No. 118.20—will be found in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II. p. 462, where it is numbered 500. We do not reprint it here, as there is some doubt whether the hallucination preceded the death by four to six hours, or followed it by some 18 or 20 hours. In the latter case, it would not of course have been a "death-coincidence" according to our definition. In this instance the death happened at a distance, and was not heard of till some weeks later, as in Mrs. Murray's experience above. Under these circumstances, there is naturally more doubt about the coincidence when no note is made, since the evidence depends on the percipient's remembering the date of the hallucination accurately when the news comes. If the death is heard of by telegram or otherwise on the day it occurs, a mistake at the time as to whether there was a coincidence or not is almost impossible. The following 9 cases are instances of this.

(61. 22.)

From Miss C. L. P.

(The account was written in May or June, 1889.)

"I saw my father. Date, Wednesday, April 6th, 1887. Hour, between 8 and 8.30 a.m. Place, B—.

"[I was] walking [alone] to school. He was then dying (or dead) at P—, and I was the last person mentioned by him. We were in absolute ignorance of his illness. Two telegrams were brought to me at school from my lodgings—one saying that he was ill, the second that he was dead.

"On Sunday, April 3rd, a presentiment of coming trouble took such hold of me that I went down to a friend, telling her I really could not stay alone, as I expected to hear every second that somebody belonging to me was dead or dying. Sleep was advised as a cure for nervousness, and the presentiment wore away completely."

Miss P., who was at the time a mistress in a High School, writes further that she has never had any other experience of the kind. Her going abroad has prevented our obtaining further evidence in the case, but we have ascertained from a local paper of April 14th, 1887, that her father's death occurred, as she states, on April 6th, 1887.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

In the following case there is more than a mere coincidence; since the fact of the death and the position of the dead person were communicated to the percipient.

(730. 24.)

From Mrs. B. de A.

Rio de Janeiro, *March 14th*, 1892.

“I saw the form of a lady friend lying on a sofa as if dead. I exclaimed, ‘Retinha is lying there dead, mother.’ We were living at the time at Rio de Janeiro. It was past midnight on the 21st of June, 1886.

“I was doing needlework. Health and spirits good. Age at time, 56.

“[It was] Donna R. N., my cousin. She had promised to dine with me that very day, but afterwards sent word that she would dine at T. She died of congestion of the brain at the house of the people she had gone to visit, shortly after midnight, and was laid out on the sofa. I saw her next day exactly in the same position in which I had seen her at home.

“My mother and a servant [were present]. They did not share the experience.”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

In the next case—as in the first of this group (Miss P.’s)—the probability of thought-transference appears to be increased by the statement that the dying person’s thoughts were directed to the percipient.

(645. 11.)

From Mr. C. H. Beer.

Cheltenham, *May 29th*, 1893.

“My first impression was at a concert at Richmond, Surrey, on December 12th, 1881, when my father appeared to me on the platform at frequent intervals the whole time the concert was going on. My father was lying ill in Devonshire at the time. He was dressed in his ordinary clothes. I was told afterwards that my father had been asking for me at this time.

“I was in much anxiety about my father, who was very ill at the time, but I did not know he was any worse in December than he had been for some weeks previously. My age was 27.

“I again saw my father in the early hours of the morning of the 13th December, and was so disturbed that I got up and told a footman of it in an adjoining room. On returning to my own room I again saw the figure of my father, leaning over me as I lay in bed, and he remained on and off through the night. I had seen my father the previous July. He died at 7.30 on the morning of the 13th December, within a short time of his appearing to me. I did not know of his death till mid-day on December 13th.

“I have had one hallucination subsequently, of a man whom I did not recognise.

“CHARLES H. BEER.”

Mr. Beer is a butler, in the service of the Rev. Hugh Pearson, at whose house Dr. Myers saw him on May 30th, 1893.

Dr. Myers writes, on the same day :—

“[Mr. Beer] seemed to me a very good witness—clear and intelligent, and not inclined to exaggerate. His master told me he had always heard the same story from him. He knew his father was seriously ill (consump-

tion) at the time of his hallucination, December 12th and 13th, but was expecting him to live over Christmas, when he hoped to go and see him.

“He says he told a footman at the time about his hallucination before he knew of his father’s death (and this footman is now at an unknown address in Australia), and also a nurse, who is now dead. I see no hope of getting contemporary evidence. He says he wrote down nothing.”

We have verified the date of death independently.

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

The frequent recurrence of the apparition, which we find in Mr. Beer’s case, is a very unusual feature. (See Chapter VIII., pp. 164-5.) The duration of the experience in the next case is no less unusual.

(450. 18.)

From Miss S. R. R.

August 22nd, 1891.

“When my sister died in 1877, she died in Dublin. I was at home; we knew she was very ill, and my father, who was in Dublin, said he would telegraph if she grew worse. But that night I saw my sister lying dead beside me, and I knew, before we sent for the telegram, the contents of it. It came by post next morning.”

In answer to our enquiries, Miss R. sent the following more detailed account of her experience:—

September 5th, 1891.

“At the time of my sister’s death, I was sleeping in my mother’s room, and my thoughts were very much with my sister, who was dangerously ill in Dublin, and just as I lay down, I plainly saw her lying dead beside me, with her arm outside the clothes, just as she had died a few hours ago. I scarcely slept at all that night, and there my sister lay beside me, and I was glad to have her, knowing too well what the contents of the telegram would be next morning. I said nothing of it to anyone, till I was sending the groom to the post office for it, and then I said to him, ‘I know the contents of it, Mrs. R. is dead.’ I do not think it would be any use asking him any questions—he left my father’s service shortly after, and I am sure could not recall events so long past.”

Some years after this incident, Miss R. saw repeatedly apparitions of her mother, which she describes as follows:—

August 22nd, 1891.

“My mother died in February, 1882, and for three months after her death she used to come to me almost nightly, after I had retired to my bed-room. Sometimes she would come up to the bed and bend over me; at other times she would stand at the door and beckon to me.”

Professor Sidgwick writes:—

March 23rd, 1892.

“I saw Miss R. to-day, and she described to me her experiences. The apparition of her sister was the first hallucination she ever had. It occurred about six hours after her death; she died at four o’clock in the afternoon, and Miss R. went to bed about 10, and had the vision soon after. She knew her sister was very ill, but did not think there was immediate danger;

her father had gone to Dublin to the sister, and had promised to write or telegraph if there was such danger ; but in fact the alarming symptoms only manifested themselves half-an-hour before she died.

“What she saw was first ‘something white’ on a long cedar chest beside her bed; then looking closer it seemed to be her sister in bed; the chest was plain bare wood, but it seemed just like a bed. She saw the face distinctly; she had put out the candle, but there was a fire in her room; she is quite sure that she was awake. She saw it all night whenever she turned to it, just as if it was a real form. She was clearly anxious to give her recollection exactly.

“The apparitions of her mother were always completely externalised; she appeared just as in life. The first time she appeared standing in the doorway, with a gesture as if beckoning to follow, and this was the more usual appearance; but sometimes she came when Miss R. was in bed, and seemed to stoop over the bed.”

The next case is one to which we have referred in Chapter VI., p. 117, as an instance of gradual development of the apparition.

(328. 5.)

From Dr. A. T.

His original Russian account has been translated into French by the collector, Madame de Holstein. It is undated, but was written not later than the early part of 1890.

“C’était en 1874, au commencement du mois de Mars, à Kieff. Entre 7 et 8 h. du soir j’étais assis seul dans ma chambre et je pensais à mon père. J’étais sous l’influence de très tristes pensées; voici pourquoi: deux jours avant, j’avais lu dans un livre que la maladie qui avait entre autres été reconnue chez mon père avait assez souvent pour issue une mort subite. Comme j’aimai beaucoup mon père, ce que j’ai lu ne laissait pas de me rendre inquiet. J’étais surtout oppressé le soir dont je parle. Tout à coup je commençai à distinguer à l’autre bout de la chambre une figure qui, au commencement, semblait être recouverte d’un brouillard; en suite la figure de mon père s’est nettement dessinée. Je la voyais nettement, elle me fixait et l’expression du visage était très triste. Au bout de trois minutes environ le fantôme (vision) disparut. Le même jour à 11 h. du soir j’ai reçu de Krémentchouk, où habitait mon père, un télégramme m’annonçant qu’il était sérieusement malade. Je vins 3 jours après à Krémentchouk juste pour son enterrement. Il mourut le jour où j’ai reçu le télégramme, près de 6 h. du soir. J’avais alors 21 ans.

“Je n’ai jamais rien éprouvé de semblable après.”

The following letter from Dr. T. to Madame de Holstein gives fuller details of the incident:—

“En réponse à vos questions je m’empresse de vous dire que la tristesse que j’éprouvai le soir dont il s’agit avait certainement pour cause la lecture de laquelle j’ai parlé.

“Au moment où j’ai vu l’apparition je n’ai rien fixé, je n’avais pas de point de repère. J’ai regardé par hasard du côté de la porte.

“Je n’ai rien ressenti d’extraordinaire avant l’apparition, aucun choc ; je n’avais pas un sentiment d’attente ; l’idée de voir mon père n’a pas traversé mon esprit un seul instant. J’ai commencé par voir une grande tache qui n’était pas lumineuse, c’était comme un nuage, comme des vapeurs. En regardant bien, j’ai tout d’abord distingué le visage, qui était pâle, exténué, avait une expression de douleur, et était tel que je l’ai vu après les accès d’angine de poitrine, dont mon père était atteint. Après le visage j’ai distingué toute la figure de mon père, de grandeur naturelle. Il était habillé en noir, comme je l’ai vu pour la dernière fois, étant allé passer à la maison paternelle les vacances de Noël.

“Je n’ai pas remarqué sur le visage de mon père des changements dont je n’avais pas connaissance auparavant.

“La chambre où je l’ai vu n’était pas bien éclairée, la lampe n’était pas encore allumée, c’était dans le pénombre d’une soirée de printemps.

“Je n’ai pas ressenti de peur, j’étais étonné, stupéfait, et plutôt enclin à croire à la présence réelle de mon père qu’à une ‘apparition.’ Quand l’apparition disparut, j’ai éprouvé une angoisse excessive, un pressentiment, la conviction qu’il devait arriver quelque chose à mon père.

“Jusqu’au moment de l’arrivée du télégramme j’étais sous le coup de cette apparition, j’ai même conçu l’idée de partir tout de suite à Krémentchouk. Lorsque j’ai reçu le télégramme je ne l’ai pas ouvert de suite ; je ne savais pas d’où il venait, mais j’étais convaincu qu’il s’agissait d’un malheur arrivé à mon père.

“Mon père n’a jamais habité ni fréquenté la maison où je l’ai vu. J’habitai alors une chambre garnie. Je ne suis ni hystérique, ni neurasténique, et je l’étais encore moins en 1874.

(Signed) A. T., Docteur en Médecine.”

Madame de Holstein’s comments on this case, contained in a letter, part of which is printed below, express what seems to us a just view as to how far it is reasonable to regard anxiety as the cause of this hallucination.

29, Avenue de Wagram, Paris, August 26th, 1890.

“J’ai demandé M. T. s’il a parlé à quelqu’un de sa vision ; il n’avait répondu que *non*.

“Quant aux causes réelles de l’apparition, elles resteront douteuses dans le cas en question, comme du reste dans beaucoup d’autres cas. Pour moi, le cas du Dr. T. est surtout intéressant parcequ’il vient d’une personne parfaitement saine d’esprit et de nerfs, instruite, sceptique, sans idées préconçues. Il me semble aussi qu’il est très difficile de chercher l’explication de cette vision dans l’inquiétude que M. T. éprouvait. Il n’est pas arrivé à l’âge de 40 ans sans être plusieurs fois inquiet pour ceux qui lui étaient chers ; pourquoi n’avait il pas d’autres visions ?

“Mais tout ceci constitue une série de preuves morales, subjectives si vous voulez, et vous avez mille fois raison de faire une réserve.”

The evidential value of the next case depends on the great exactness of the coincidence—it will be seen that the evidence of its exactness is strong.

(725. 6.)

From Dr. B. G.

Rio de Janeiro, *September 1st, 1891.*

“I saw very distinctly the apparition of a friend passing in front of a looking glass. I was then in bed. I lived at the time in Rio de Janeiro. It was, I believe, about 3 a.m. I told my wife at the time to look at the watch. This occurred November 21st, 1873.

“I was lying awake in bed. My health was good at the time. We had taken it in turns to sit up with the sick man whose phantasm appeared, but I had rested from my watching. I was 57 years old.

“The appearance coincided, as nearly as we could make out, with the moment of death. It was that of a friend, Sn. A., whom I had visited the night before. I had sat up with him on previous nights, and therefore knew that he was seriously ill.

“My wife was present, but sleeping. I woke her, told her what I had seen and asked her to look at the watch. My son, who had been watching by the decedent, and who had witnessed the death, returned at 6 a.m. I told him, much to his surprise, that I knew Sn. A. had expired at 3 a.m. He confirmed it.”

This case was known to the collector beforehand.

The next is again a case in which there was a veridical element besides the coincidence,—viz., the dress of the apparition, which, unknown to the percipient, resembled that of the decedent.

(571. 14.)

From Mrs. Belcher.

Apsley House, Gloucester, *September 26th, 1891.*

“When I was about 19 years old, an old friend of my mother’s, Mr. Wilson,¹ came to live near us. He had just lost his wife and was himself in consumption, with no chance of permanent recovery. He was in the habit of coming to our house in a bath-chair every morning, when he was well enough, and having a rest and a little luncheon. One day he came as usual, but looking much better and in particularly good spirits. On the evening of that day, about 9 o’clock (it was quite dusk), I was sitting at supper with my mother and aunt in the dining-room, with my back to the window, and facing an old-fashioned sideboard. I distinctly saw Mr. Wilson standing, resting his elbow on the sideboard and his face on his hand; he had *no coat* on, and I was *particularly* struck by noticing that the back of his waistcoat was made of a *very shiny* material. I felt as though I could not take my eyes off him, and my aunt, noticing that I looked terrified, asked me what was the matter. He then disappeared. Within an hour a messenger came to fetch my mother, telling her that Mr. W. had broken a blood vessel and was dying. We went round just in time to see him alive, and he was lying on the bed, on his side, *without a coat*, and wearing a waistcoat with a *particularly shiny* back.

“This vision so unnerved me that for months I was unable to go about the house alone, even in the daytime. This is perfectly correct, not in any way exaggerated.

“ADA BELCHER.”

¹ This is an assumed name. The real name of the gentleman was given us in confidence.

Mr. Myers writes :—

December 22nd, 1891.

“I have to-day seen Mrs. Belcher, an excellent witness. Her mother had been very kind to the invalid, and he left souvenirs to mother and daughter—some cabinets, which I saw, to the daughter. The date must have been 20 or 25 years ago.

“The figure looked quite solid ; it gazed into the room, but not *at* Mrs. Belcher. The back of the waistcoat was clearly seen, a black shining material. Mrs. Belcher had never seen the decedent without his coat.

“She has had one other slight experience—perhaps a mere illusion. Her nerves were much shaken by the apparition of Mr. Wilson, and one day, soon afterwards, while looking in the glass, she thought she saw in the glass her mother looking over her shoulder—in the dress which she was wearing at the time. Mrs. Belcher does not regard this as a full-blown hallucination.”

In the next case the percipient knew of the illness of the brother whose figure appeared to him ; but we see no reason to doubt his assertion that the knowledge was not attended by serious anxiety.

(452. 10.) From Mr. Alexander Sherar.

5, Wellwood-street, Amble, Northumberland, *September 15th, 1891.*

“About 27 years ago, when about 11 years of age, one morning at about 11 o'clock, going downstairs on my way to work I met a figure which I instantly recognised as that of my brother, who had fallen into the water a few days previously, and was lying ill at his house about 200 yards off. I was accustomed to see [him] daily. He seemed to have just come out of the water, as the water was running from him. I was startled and ran into the house and told my mother, who, knowing my brother was confined to bed, ran to his house, and found that he had died about the time I saw him.

“I was in good health, and in no grief or anxiety. No one [was] with me at the time. My present age is 38.

“ALEXANDER SHERAR.”

Mr. Sherar has had one other veridical hallucination, which we have classed as a “vision.” It is included in the 62 death-coincidences, and is interesting as being of the nature of a crystal-vision, and also in connexion with his former experience. It is therefore printed here, to keep the two together, but the coincidence is not so certain as in the first case, since the news of death may not have been received till some time later. He describes it thus :—

“When about 20 years of age, on board ship in the North Sea (about July, 1873 ?), about 6 to 8 p.m., while I was at the wheel I was startled by seeing reflected in the face of the compass the face of a young lady to whom I was to be married on my return home. On arrival at Berwick next day I learnt that the lady had died about the time I saw her. I was not at [the] time of seeing [the] face aware she was ill.”

The following account of an interview with Mr. Sherar, on September 16th, 1891, is given by Professor and Mrs. Sidgwick, from notes taken at the time :—

“Mr. Sherar is a sailor. He struck us as having a very vivid recollection of his experiences. He was starting to go down the stairs when he saw the figure of his brother coming up. They met on the landing, where the stairs turned. The figure stopped, and Mr. Sherar, knowing it could not really be his brother, turned at once and ran back to tell his mother. He did not look round again, and did not see the figure after he turned. He did not see his brother drawn out of the water: indeed, he had not seen him at all since he fell in and became ill. He did not think him so seriously ill that there was any need to go. His mother and all his family are dead, so that no corroboration can be obtained.

“At the time of his second experience he lived at Shields, and so did the young lady. He heard of her death by letter from a friend, who wrote to him at once. The letter came after he landed at Berwick. He believes the writer of the letter to be dead, and the crew, to whom he probably mentioned the vision, are scattered. No corroboration can be obtained. When the letter came he believes he made out the coincidence of time. He was not anxious and was not specially thinking of her when he saw the face. The illness was short and he knew nothing of it. After seeing the face he foreboded evil. It was getting dusk when he saw it. He has had no other experiences of the kind except these two.”

These cases were not known to the collector beforehand.

The next case is very like Dr. B. G.'s, given on p. 237; and in the same way depends for its evidential value on the exactness of the coincidence.

(385. 20.)

From Mrs. C. S.

January 1st, 1891.

“At 5 a.m., September 23rd, 1855, I saw my grandfather stand by me. Three hours and-a-half afterwards I learnt that he died at that exact time.

“I was sitting up through the night. I was nearly twenty-one.

“I had a friend sharing my watch and pressed her arm and whispered the fact and hour to her as a witness to the truth of it.

“[I have] never [had any other hallucinations].”

In answer to further enquiries, Mrs. S. writes:—

“I knew my grandfather was ill. He had been sat up with for a week. I did not specially expect his death that night. My youngest sister was also ill, in another house, and a friend and I were sitting up with her.

“The house we lived in was across a small park from my grandfather's; it would take from five to ten minutes to go from one to the other.

“[I am] certain [of the coincidence] because a clock struck five within a minute or so of my grandfather's being with me, and I whispered the hour to my friend, bidding her remember it.

“The death caused a great change in our family, and is, therefore, well remembered, though so long ago.

“I mentioned the matter to my parents, as my father spoke on entering the room to acquaint my mother with my grandfather's death, but till then my friend and I had sat silent and alone of waking inmates of that room.”

Since giving this account, Mrs. S. has been abroad, so that we have been unable to make her personal acquaintance.

The case was not known beforehand to the collector.

The last case we shall include in this group is remote, and the percipient was young at the time; but Mr. McKechnie is a careful witness, and if his recollection is substantially accurate, the evidence both of the hallucinatory and of the coincidental nature of the experience appears quite unmistakable.

(191. 3.)

From the Rev. C. C. McKechnie.

43, Stanhope-road, Darlington, *September 24th*, 1889.

“I was about 10 years of age at the time, and had for several years been living with my grandfather, who was an elder in the Kirk of Scotland, and in good circumstances. He was very much attached to me, and often expressed his intention of having me educated for the ministry in the Kirk. Suddenly, however, he was seized with an illness, which in a couple of days proved mortal. At the time of his death, and without my having any apprehension of it, I happened to be at my father’s house, about a mile off. I was leaning in a listless sort of way against the kitchen table, looking upwards at the ceiling, and thinking of nothing in particular, when my grandfather’s face appeared to grow out of the ceiling, at first dim and indistinct, but becoming more and more complete until it seemed in every respect as full and perfect as I had ever seen it. It looked down upon me, as I thought, with a wonderful expression of tenderness and affection. Then it disappeared, not suddenly, but gradually; its features fading and becoming dim and indistinct, until I saw nothing but the bare ceiling. I spoke at the time of what I saw to my mother, but she made no account of it, thinking probably it was nothing more than a boyish vagary. In about 15 or 20 minutes after seeing the vision, a boy came running breathless to my father’s with the news that my grandfather had just died.

“I have never been able to persuade myself that the vision was purely subjective. I have rather been inclined to think that the explanation is to be sought in my grandfather’s exceptionally strong love for me, impelling and enabling him to bring himself into connection with me, at the moment of his death, in the way I have stated. It was at Paisley where the above occurred.

“To the best of my recollection this is a correct statement.

“COLIN CAMPBELL McKECHNIE.”

On being asked for an approximate date, Mr. McKechnie writes:—

“To the best of my recollection the boyish vision—if I may so call it—occurred in 1830 or 1831. The Register of Deaths kept in the Gaelic Chapel of Paisley, if consulted, would enable one to fix the date. Grandfather lived in Sneddon-street, and his name was John McKechnie.

“COLIN C. McKECHNIE.”

Professor Sidgwick called on Mr. McKechnie on September 23rd, 1891, and writes on the same day:—

“Mr. McKechnie has had no other experience of the kind, except that of hearing a voice, which was ‘between sleeping and waking.’ In the case of his vision of his grandfather’s face he was certainly awake.

“He believes that he was in no anxiety about his grandfather’s illness, though he was aware of it.

“He has often told the story, but no corroboration is now possible, all those who could have corroborated being no longer living.

“I saw an account written by Mr. Kendall (the collector), on November 2nd, 1870, from memory, a day or two after hearing it from Mr. McKechnie. This is briefer, but corresponds in all essential respects with the narrative given above, except that the news of the death is said to have come ten minutes after.”

We add one more case in which the action taken in consequence of the apparition shows it to have been at the time of an impressive character, and makes it improbable that any mistake could have been made as to the coincidence when the death was heard of. No corroboration is now obtainable.

(579. 25.)

From Mrs. A.

Mrs. A. is the wife of the percipient in the case numbered (579. 24.).
(The account was written in 1892.)

“En 1867 je vivais à Toula (ville de gouvernement). Le 24 du mois d’Octobre, je me rendis au village Lanky, à 100 verstes de Toula ; vers 10 heures du soir je me mis au lit, tout en continuant la conversation avec la mère de l’intendant de ce bien, qui se faisait un lit dans la même chambre. Pendant que cette femme me tournait le dos, en arrangeant les coussins de son lit, et continuait de me parler (je me rappelle très bien de ce moment), je vis tout à coup au dessus de moi, tout au devant de mes yeux, une main, la paume tournée vers moi, passer lentement devant mes yeux et disparaître. La chambre était encore éclairée, de façon que je pus très bien reconnaître dans cette main la main de mon père, vivant alors à Moscou, dans sa propre maison. Depuis plusieurs années il était malade de phthisie, mais son état n’inspirait rien d’alarmant, et je l’avais vu deux mois avant cet accident. Je fis part immédiatement à la mère de l’intendant de ce que je venais de voir, et l’impression qu’un malheur m’attendait était si forte que, quoiqu’à peine arrivée à la campagne, le lendemain, de grand matin, je me mis en route pour revenir en ville. Arrivée à Toula, où j’occupai un appartement, je trouvai une dépêche de ma mère, par laquelle elle m’informait que mon père venait de mourir le 24 Octobre, à 11 heures du matin.”

This case was not known to the collector beforehand.

If the reader has perused all the cases we have presented to him in this chapter, he has had before him 26 of the 62 death-coincidences (not including the second case of No. 452.10). For another (No. 118. 20) we have referred him to *Phantasms of the Living*; and three more, viz., Nos. 407. 3, 460. 1, and 692. 2, are printed in other chapters to illustrate different points (see pp. 129, 288 and 115). We have not

thought it worth while to print more specimens of this class, though we keep the rest for reference.

The 26 given in this chapter seem to us, on the whole, the best evidentially. It is, of course, difficult to draw the line, and probably some of those omitted might be thought by others more impressive than some which we have included; but the evidential value of many of the unprinted cases is not very great. When, however, it is remembered that the 62 cases are simply all the cases which, in the answers to our circular of enquiry, have been reported to us as death-coincidences among the recognised visual phantasms, leaving out those only which belong to the classes specified on pp. 209-10, it will be obvious that their value as evidence must vary considerably. Some of the cases are very remote; others are vaguely and inadequately described; many are without corroboration or confirmation of any kind, the persons who could have given corroboration in many cases being dead, or having been lost sight of. That in some among so many the closeness of coincidence is exaggerated, we might safely assume *à priori*. But we have now to show that indirect evidence of such exaggeration is afforded by the distribution of the cases in time, since there is good reason for believing the remoter cases to be too numerous in proportion to the recent ones.

If the 62 death-coincidences are divided into those that occurred within 10 years of the answering of the Census question and those that occurred earlier, it will be found that the number in the recent period is 11, and in the remoter period 51. Now the average age of the percipients at the time of answering the question was 46 years,¹ and as we have not included experiences occurring at ages under 10, this gives an average period of 36 years over which the 62 death-coincidences are distributed. If we assume that death-coincidences are equally likely to occur at all ages from 10 years old upwards, and—unlike the average hallucination—equally likely to be remembered, however remote, then 62 divided by 3·6, or about 17, is the number which should have occurred, out of the 62, in the most recent ten years (a period which, as our percipients are all over 20 years of age, is common to them all), leaving 45 for the remote period. This is a very different proportion from the actual one. We cannot, of course, expect the proportion to conform so exactly to the average as we should were we dealing with a larger number of percipients, but 51 remote experiences should on an average imply 19 or 20 recent ones instead of 11, and that the recent experiences should by chance alone be not much over half the most probable number in proportion to the remote ones

¹ It is thus higher than the average age of our informants generally, which is only 40 years. (See p. 53.)

seems unlikely. If we look at it the other way, we should infer from the 11 recent cases that there were really about 29 remote ones; and that some 22 of those reported were not death-coincidences at all. Our numbers are, however, too small to justify us in drawing this inference with any confidence; especially as, if we included second-hand cases, we should add 3 to the period within ten years, and only 2 to the remoter period. Moreover, we ought not to lose sight of the fact that there are probably special causes tending to reduce the number of recent cases that come to our knowledge. It is not improbable that some may have been withheld from us, owing to a natural reluctance to make public experiences which have strongly affected the emotions, especially recently.¹ Still we have also to take into account the possibility that one or two of the recent cases given were not really death-coincidences.²

On the whole, in view of the evidential defects of many of the cases, we are disposed, in order to be on the safe side, to accept a reduction to the extent above suggested, and to estimate the whole number of death-coincidences at 40, instead of 62. From this number we propose, for the purpose of calculating the probability of chance coincidence, to make a further reduction of 8, as a very ample allowance for the selection which, we must assume, may have occurred in some cases.³

Before concluding this chapter, we must explain to what extent we have made the personal acquaintance of the percipients, and talked over their experiences with them, which it has been our wish to do as far as possible in veridical cases. Out of the 62 percipients in the death-coincidences we are now considering, we have interviewed 21,

¹ From one of our informants who answered "Yes," no further particulars could be obtained, because the experience was connected with the recent death of her brother. This may have been a death-coincidence not reported. One alleged death-coincidence was withheld, though related verbally to the collector, because, not having mentioned it to her friends at the time, the percipient was unwilling to make it public now.

² One of those cut out as a suspicious case, see next Chapter, pp. 246-7, is a recent case in which the coincidence is not clearly made out.

³ We arrive at this number thus: out of 65 cases, as stated on p. 210, 19 were known beforehand to the collector, 26 unknown, and of 20 we cannot say whether they were known or not. Assuming these 20 to be divided between known and unknown cases in the same proportion as the 45 of which we have information, we may take 9 as known beforehand. We have therefore 28 known beforehand. Of these, as we saw, 5 were certainly not selected and 3 certainly selected, leaving 20 which must be regarded as doubtful. As express instructions were given not to select, it will be an outside estimate to assume that half of these were selected, *i.e.*, less than 10 out of 62 (besides the 3 known to have been selected, which we excluded at the outset). As the 62 are now reduced—by an allowance for exaggeration—to 40, and as there is no reason to suppose selection to have operated more in unexaggerated than in exaggerated cases, we think that the diminution of these by 8 will be a more than adequate allowance for selection.

and 3 others had been similarly questioned by Mr. Gurney.¹ Of the others, 22 were practically inaccessible to us on account of residence abroad, 5 on various grounds refused to see us, 2 have apparently changed their address and cannot be got at; in 6 cases out of the remaining 9, it has not on the whole appeared to us worth making a troublesome journey to see the percipients, either because of the length of time since the incident, or because it was vaguely remembered, or for unavoidable reasons badly evidenced; finally, (in 3 cases) we have thought the collectors' investigations sufficient.

The general result of the interviews we have had in these and other cases has been decidedly satisfactory, leading, in almost all cases, to a favourable view of the carefulness and desire for accuracy of the witnesses. In 2 cases, a flaw in the evidence, which had not been observed by the witness, was detected, one being No. 656. 26 (see p. 370), already referred to, reported as a death-coincidence, but proving to be an apparition after death, but before the death was known; and the other, No. 460. 1 (see p. 288), which we have still counted as a death-coincidence, but where there is a discrepancy as to the day of the week. But, in most cases, the interview decidedly adds to the evidential value of the story, at least in the interviewer's own mind.

¹ In 15 out of the 26 cases in this Chapter, the percipients have been thus questioned.

CHAPTER XIII.

CHANCE COINCIDENCE.

We are now in a position to estimate the improbability that the death-coincidences are due to chance.

The fact that each of us only dies once, enables us to calculate definitely the probability that that death will coincide with any other given event, such as the recognised apparition of the dying person. Taking as a basis for calculation the average annual death-rate for England and Wales for the ten years 1881 to 1890, as given in the Registrar General's Report for 1890, namely, 19·15 per thousand, we get as the probability that any one person taken at random would die on a given day, 19·15 in 365,000, or about 1 in 19,000. This, then, may be taken as the general probability that he will die on the day on which his apparition is seen and recognised, supposing that there is no causal connection between the apparition and the death. We ought therefore to find that out of 19,000 apparitions of living persons, or persons not more than 12 hours dead, one is a death-coincidence,—occurs, that is, on the day of the death of the person seen, and within 12 hours of the death on either side.

The number of apparitions of living persons (including persons not more than 12 hours dead, if they are not known to the percipient to be dead) in the present collection is 381; viz., 352 realistic apparitions, (see Table IV.), 20 cases, classed as incompletely developed, where the figure or portion of a human figure seen is recognised as representing a living acquaintance, and 9 visions¹ in which a living acquaintance appears. But among the percipients in these cases there are some who have experienced more than one hallucination. When these are all specified and enumerated, no confusion in our numbers can, of course, arise, because each apparition of a recognised human being is counted among the 381. But the cases where our informants have experienced several or many *unenumerated* hallucinations, some or all of which were—or at least may have been—apparitions of living persons, introduce an element of uncertainty into the numbers which would complicate the calculation of the proportion of coincidental to non-coincidental cases. For the purpose of the present discussion, therefore, it seemed best to omit them altogether.

There are 28 percipients who have had such unenumerated experiences among those whose experiences are included in the 381, and the

¹ For the use of this term see the explanation of the Tables at the end of Chapter II.; also Chapter IV., p. 83.

number of cases to be cut out on their account is 31,¹ of which 7 are death-coincidences, and were, as it will be remembered, omitted in estimating the death-coincidences in the last chapter. Omitting these 31 cases, our number becomes 350.

We now come to the most important correction we have to make—that for lapse of memory. It was shown in Chapter III. that the proportion of hallucinations (including perhaps doubtful hallucinations) which is forgotten or ignored is probably very large. If oblivion affected death-coincidences to the same extent that it affects the average of visual hallucinations, it would be unnecessary for us to take it into account—since the ratio of the two would not be altered by it. But this is not the case,—as is proved by the distribution in time of the alleged death-coincidences reported (see last chapter, p. 242), and as might be assumed from the fact that the coincidence would itself impress the hallucination on the memory. Indeed, it is clear that the evidence before us does not entitle us to assume that any death-coincidences at all are forgotten. They may be, and the absence of any indication of it may be due to the withholding of recent cases, but we have no sufficient grounds for assuming this. The whole correction required for oblivion ought, therefore, to be applied to the 350 recognised apparitions of living persons with which the death-coincidences are to be compared. What this correction should be, is not quite a simple question, as the discussion in Chapter III. (pp. 63-6) showed. The conclusion there arrived at was that in order to form a fair estimate of the whole number of visual hallucinations occurring to persons over 10 years of age, we should multiply the number reported by $6\frac{1}{2}$, if we included what we there called “suspicious cases,” that is, experiences which must be regarded as doubtfully hallucinatory on certain specified grounds, but that the multiplier would be 4 if we excluded these suspicious cases from consideration. Now it is to be observed that such suspicious cases are particularly prevalent among the reported apparitions of living persons, so that, if we estimate the whole number of these by multiplying the reported number by $6\frac{1}{2}$, the proportion of trivial and doubtfully hallucinatory experiences will be even larger than with the visual hallucinations in general; whereas among the 62 death-coincidences discussed in the last chapter, there are only two cases of which the hallucinatory character is doubtful² on the

¹ Of these, 5 occurred within one year from the time of answering the Census question, 13 others within ten years, 8 are more remote, and 5 are undated. Of the death-coincidences thus cut out, 2 occurred within the last ten years, 4 were more remote and 1 is undated.

² Taking the three specified grounds of suspicion named at p. 64, viz., (a) the figure seen at some distance either out of doors or in a public room; (b) the figure seen passing outside the door of the room in which the percipient was, or seen inside the room when the percipient passed outside it; and (c) seen in a bad light and under

grounds specified. This being so, it is more correct to compare the death-coincidences with the estimated number of recognised hallucinations, omitting the suspicious cases on both sides; and this latter number we obtain, for the reasons given in Chapter III., pp. 63-5, by subtracting from the reported number 8 per cent. for experiences occurring under the age of ten,¹ and multiplying the remainder by 4. The number of recognised apparitions thus obtained is 1,288, or, let us say, 1,300.

We concluded in the last chapter that, after making ample allowance for possible exaggeration and selection, it would be safe to reckon 32 death-coincidences. To be on the safe side, let us assume—what is very improbable—that the two suspicious cases are both among these 32 and exclude them. We have then 30 death-coincidences in 1,300 cases, or about 1 in 43. But chance would, as we have seen, produce death-coincidences at the rate of 1 in 19,000 apparitions of recognised living persons, and 1 in 43 is equivalent to about 440 in 19,000, or 440 times the most probable number. Or, looking at the matter in a different way, we should expect that if death-coincidences only occur by chance, it will require 30 times 19,000, or 570,000 apparitions of living persons, to produce 30 such coincidences, and of these we may assume that about a quarter, or 142,500 would be remembered. We should therefore expect to have to collect 142,500 cases instead of 350, in order to obtain by chance 30 death-coincidences.

If we include the suspicious cases, and accordingly multiply the reported number of cases by $6\frac{1}{2}$, we get about 1 death-coincidence in 65, *i.e.*, about 292 times the most probable number.

This is the case if we take, as we have done, death-coincidences to mean an apparition occurring on the same day as the death of the person seen; that is within 12 hours of the death. But as a matter of fact, the great majority of the coincidences are believed by the percipients to be closer than this, as may be seen by examining the 62 cases (or the 31 printed ones) discussed in the last chapter. The improbability of the apparition occurring by chance within an hour of the death, is, of course, twelve times as great as that of its occurring within 12 hours of it.

We conclude then that the number of death-coincidences in our

circumstances not otherwise such as to exclude the possibility of mistake, we find in the first place that out of the 62, only 4 occurred out of-doors at all (or 5 if we include No. 379.24, p. 225, when the figure appeared out-of-doors, being seen through a window), and of these only one comes under the category of "seen at some distance." Under head (b) there are none among the 62, and under head (c) we ought possibly to put one case, but not more.

¹ The reasons for excluding these before estimating the correction required for oblivion are given in Chapter III., p. 65. They are also, it will be remembered, (see p. 209), excluded from the number of death-coincidences with which we are about to compare the whole number of recognised apparitions.

collection, if our estimate of them is accepted as fair, is not due to chance. This will not be maintained by anyone with the most elementary acquaintance with the doctrine of chances. The opponent of a telepathic or other supernormal explanation must take one of three other lines of argument. He must either (1) maintain that the alleged coincidences are misrepresented as such to a much larger extent than we have allowed for, or (2) that they have been sought after by the collectors, and illegitimately introduced into the collection to a much larger extent in proportion to non-coincidental cases than we have allowed for; or (3) admitting that the coincidences really exist in a proportion sufficient to prove a causal connection between the apparition and the death of the person seen, he may maintain that this connection is not telepathic, but consists in a condition favourable to hallucination being produced in the percipient in some normal way by the circumstances of the case.

The first of these lines of argument can only be met by reference to the evidence on which each case rests. This in 26—or in fact 31—cases is before the reader, and he must form his own estimate. We need only point out here that the evidence must break down in a wholesale way in order to destroy our argument. For the margin on the side against chance is very large, even one death-coincidence being more than we should be justified in expecting chance to produce in a collection ten times the size of ours.

As to the second line of argument, we have only to remind the reader that in 26 of the death-coincidences, of which 16 are printed in the last chapter, our collectors report that they had no previous knowledge of the percipient's experience. We may add that in 11 of these cases—of which 8, viz., Nos. 425. 12, 442. 17, 381. 4, 383. 24, 379. 24, 61. 22, 452. 10 (two cases), are among the 27 printed in the last chapter—we have—besides the marking of the returns in accordance with our instructions—the positive statement of the collector, confirmed in most cases by circumstances mentioned by him when questioned, that he did not know of the experience when the question was put to the percipient. The number of these cases is alone sufficient to destroy the argument for chance coincidence, and as stated on p. 210, we have strong ground for believing that in some of the cases in which it is known that the collector was aware of the experience, this knowledge had no influence on his selection of the informant.

The third line of argument—that death-coincidences really exist and are not due to chance, but that the causal connection between hallucination and death is not telepathic,—requires careful examination.

We saw in Chapter IX., that certain mental and physical states of the percipient are to some extent favourable to hallucinations, and

there can be no doubt that the form of any hallucination that may occur is likely to be determined by the subject with which the mind of the percipient is occupied. If, therefore, any mental tension—whether it be anxiety, grief, awe, anxious alertness to act rightly in an emergency, or any other such psychological condition—, or any overwrought state of nerves be produced in the percipient by the dying person's state, it is proper to regard it as a possible cause of the hallucination and examine it accordingly. But the case can obviously only arise if the percipient is aware of the dying person's condition, and, whatever be the effect of emotion, telepathy will still have to be called in to explain the existence of at least 19 cases among the 62 death-coincidences of which 10 are included in the last chapter,¹ in which it is positively stated, or clearly implied, that the illness had not been heard of at all by the percipient at the time of the apparition. To these we may reasonably add those cases where though there was (or, at least, so far as we know, may have been) knowledge of illness, there was none of danger, and where it is expressly stated, or clearly implied, that there was no anxiety. Such are cases where the percipient either believes the illness to be trifling, or where it is a long chronic illness not known to be approaching a crisis, and where he cannot therefore be supposed to be emotionally affected. These are 18 in number, of which 6 are included in the last chapter.² With them we may reckon No. 579. 24 (see p. 223), where the death was due to suicide, but where we cannot be sure that it was not preceded by illness, and No. 307.20 (see p. 229), where there is no reason to suppose that there was more anxiety than is usual when our friends are on a voyage.

There remain 20 cases, of which 8 are included in the last chapter,³ in which the illness was known to be dangerous, or in which we cannot assume that this was not known, and 3⁴ in which the percipient was otherwise more or less anxious or troubled about the decedent. The extent to which the anxiety or trouble really occupied the percipient's mind in these 23 cases varies considerably and is sometimes difficult to estimate. In some cases (*e.g.*, Nos. 450.18 and 328.5), the anxiety was clearly great. In others (*e.g.*, No. 422.25), the knowledge of the serious illness does not seem to have produced emotional anxiety in

¹ Nos. 442.17 (p. 213), 383.24 (p. 216), 362.21 (p. 217), 147.23 (p. 218), 379.24 (p. 225), 630.5 (p. 227), 83.21 (p. 228), 61.22 (p. 232), 730.24 (p. 233), 452.10 (second case, p. 238). These cases are none of them under suspicion of having been selected by the collector. In 7 of them we have positive evidence to the contrary.

² Nos. 425.12 (p. 211), 215.9 (p. 224), 418.4 (p. 230), 571.14 (p. 237), 452.10 (first case, p. 238), 579.25 (p. 241).

³ Nos. 422.25 (p. 227), 523.12 (p. 231), 645.11 (p. 233), 450.18 (p. 234), 328.5 (p. 235), 725.6 (p. 237), 385.20 (p. 239), 191.3 (p. 240).

⁴ Nos. 381.4 (p. 214), and 460.1 (p. 288), are two of them.

the percipient at all, on account of the absence of emotional relation between the percipient and the decedent; but though this makes the anxiety—if it can be called so—less important, it also makes a telepathic explanation less plausible, so that we had better consider together all the cases where there was knowledge of serious illness, whether this knowledge produced emotional anxiety or not, or where there is reason to think that the percipient's mind was specially occupied with the decedent.

The question before us is: granting that anxiety and other emotions, or concentration of the mind on particular persons, are causes of hallucinations representing the person exciting the state of mind, ought we to assume that where such a state,—let us say anxiety,—is present, it sufficiently accounts for a death-coincidence? It is clear that the answer must largely depend on the duration of the anxiety as compared with the interval between the hallucination and the death. If the anxiety remains much the same for several days, the hallucination will not occur on the day of the death, and at no other time during that period, without some reason other than the anxiety, and, similarly, if the anxiety is unchanged for several hours and the hallucination occurs within a few minutes of the death, the coincidence, if frequent, needs accounting for. There may, no doubt, be cases where a period of culmination of emotion or fatigue occurs at the time of death comparable in duration to the interval between death and hallucination, and when this is so, the subjective causation of the hallucination may be regarded as equally probable with the telepathic. But this does not happen to be the case in any of the death-coincidences with which we are now concerned, and in our opinion, therefore, anxiety will not account for even those in our collection in which it was acute.¹

It must be regarded as confirmatory of this view that, out of the 50 apparitions in the whole collection that occurred to our informants during anxiety (or presumable anxiety) of the percipient about the person whose figure was seen, 31² are reported to have coincided with the latter's death—a proportion which must be greatly in excess of

¹ The strongest instance of anxiety, is perhaps No. 407. 2. The death had been hourly expected since the morning. From noon till evening, the percipient had watched by her dying cousin, and then had to return to her own house next door to rest, in preparation for her work next day as a teacher. Some time after she was in bed, she saw the figure of her cousin, at once got up and dressed, and, as she left the room, met the news that all was over.

² This includes 8 cases not reckoned in the 62 death-coincidences, because in 2 of them the percipient was, or may have been, aware that the death was actually at that moment taking place; in 3 the percipient either was under 10 years of age or had had unenumerated experiences: and the other 3 are the ones in which we have evidence pointing to special selection by the collectors.

the frequency with which anxiety is terminated by the death, and not by the recovery, of the person inspiring it. It is further significant that, of the remaining 19 cases, 11 occurred when the person seen proved to be on his death-bed, though he did not die within the 12 hours which we have taken as the limit for death-coincidences.¹

The reader should bear in mind that when we affirm telepathy to have operated in any particular case, we do not intend thereby to exclude the action of other causes and conditions,—such as those examined in Chapters IX. and X. Indeed, the operation of other causes besides telepathy is sometimes obviously required to explain the bizarre form occasionally taken by seemingly telepathic communications. It is therefore quite likely that anxiety,—with other things which direct the thoughts of the percipient to the agent,—may facilitate telepathic communication; but except in very special cases, of which we have none in the present collection, it will not by itself account for the coincidence of the hallucination with the death.

¹ It is worth analysing the remaining 8 cases. Three of them occurred during illness of the person seen, but we have no information as to whether the illness ended fatally or not. One (No. 69.14, see p. 105) coincided with a serious danger to the person seen, suggesting a possible telepathic explanation. Two are cases where the percipient was awaiting the arrival of the person seen. (One of these is No. 317.14, see p. 308.) The anxiety was by no means acute in either case, and there was in both a slight element of coincidence, which makes the interpretation doubtful. In another, the percipient saw a friend, and states that he was anxious, but does not say on what subject. In the remaining case, (No. 426.13, see p. 167) the person whose phantasm was seen appears to have been in no exceptional condition at the time.

CHAPTER XIV.

VERIDICAL HALLUCINATIONS CONTINUED : FURTHER
COINCIDENTAL CASES.

In the last two chapters we limited ourselves to a special class of coincidences, namely, recognised apparitions of a dying person seen within 12 hours of the death, in order to base a calculation upon them. The evidence for telepathy—or some other supernormal cause—afforded by the Census docs not, however, rest on these cases alone; and in the present chapter we shall give selected instances of hallucinations which do not fall within the class above defined, but which yet either coincide with some external event in such a manner as to suggest a causal connection between them, or else convey some information previously unknown to the percipient.

But before leaving the subject of recognised visual death-coincidences, we may conveniently lay before the reader the three cases which we excluded from the last two chapters (see p. 210) because there was some reason to believe that the percipients were asked the Census question owing to their having had an experience. In all of them the coincidence was well made out, and appears to have been very close. They are the following:—

(61. 6.)

From Mrs. G.

“I saw my mother, exactly as she was some few months before (when she lived with me), standing at my bedside. She touched me, but when I spoke to her and tried to touch her, she immediately vanished. This took place in January, 1883. Place, my own bedroom, in —

“I was in bed at the time, but wide awake; was suffering from rheumatism.

“I had not seen my mother for some months; previous to that time she had lived with me. I was not aware of what she was doing at the time. My mother died at the exact time I saw her at my bedside, as I found next morning.

“No other person was in the room at the moment I felt the touch of her hand; but one of my daughters, coming in just afterwards, saw nothing; took note of exact time, which was 9.10 p.m.

“I have never since had a similar experience.”

The lady through whom this case was obtained informed us that she had first heard the account from the daughter referred to, who told her that on going into her mother's room she had found her talking, apparently to someone at the foot of her bed. Her mother asked her if she could see anyone, but she saw nothing. They had a telegram next morning saying that Mrs. G.'s mother had died at the time the apparition was seen. Miss G. was then about 16. Mrs. G. had some ground for serious anxiety with regard to her mother's health, but the death was quite unexpected.

The account was written in May or June, 1889. It is in the handwriting of the daughter, and is signed by Mrs. G. herself.

Mrs. G., who is now an invalid, was unwilling to see any member of the Committee on the subject.

(301. 6.)

From Mrs. Wilde.

10, Golborne-street, Warrington, *May 1st*, 1890.

“On November 7th, 1883, I was sitting in the evening nursing my baby, when my brother-in-law, who I knew was at the time very ill, suddenly appeared, raised his arm, and then vanished. He was without his coat, as I had often seen him at his own home. I went at once to his house, and was told that he had just died. He was very fond of me, and during his illness had often said that he wished he could come and see me.

“I was quite well, very anxious about my brother, but not thinking about him at the time. I was 30 years old. I had only my baby with me at the time.

“That was the only time I had such an experience.

“CATHERINE MARY WILDE.”

Mr. Wilde corroborates as follows :—

“I beg to certify that I remember my wife relating to me shortly after my brother-in-law’s death the circumstance already given relating to the same.

“THOMAS WILDE.”

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :—

December 18th, 1891.

“I have to-day seen Mrs. Wilde and questioned her as to her experience. She seems a good witness. Her brother-in-law, whose name was Thomas Hatch, died of bronchitis (added to some degree of consumption), and was delirious during the last few days of his life. He was attended by a professional nurse, but Mrs. Wilde saw him frequently, and he seemed to recognise her when she came into the room. On one occasion he got up in bed and said he was coming round to have a cup of tea with her. She believes she had seen him on the day he died more than once. She knew he was expected to die, but did not realise it as likely to be immediate nor had she any idea that she had seen him for the last time. The kitchen in which she sat had a doorway into the lobby with no door. She looked up and saw him in the doorway quite distinctly (‘not like a shadow’) just as she was accustomed to see him before he was ill, in his shirt sleeves. She saw him raise his arm (as though to beckon, I think she said). At the first moment she really thought it was he; then she was frightened and looked away and saw him no more. She was so startled by the incident that she went round instantly to her sister’s house, not three minutes off, for the sake of company, not with any idea of finding her brother-in-law dead. She asked how he was and was told he had just died. No one was with her when she had the experience, but she told her husband soon after.”

We have verified the date of death through the *Warrington Advertiser* of November 10th, 1883, which gives, under *Deaths*, “November 7th, aged 29 years, Mr. T. L. Hatch, Golborne-street, Warrington.”

After the above account was given, Mrs. Wilde had another possibly veridical experience—of an auditory hallucination—which she thus describes :—

April 7th, 1892.

“Just before I got up, on the morning of the 28th January, 1892, I heard my name called distinctly (Kate). I thought it was my husband’s voice, and throwing something on went quickly down. I noticed the time by the large clock in Sankey-street, which is plainly visible from our door ; it was then a quarter to eight. Mr. Wilde was not in the house, and did not come in for nearly an hour. About eleven o’clock that morning news was brought of the death of Mrs. L., the lady whose business I was managing. She died at a quarter to eight, the time I heard the voice calling me.

“C. M. WILDE.”

A mourning card, giving the date of death, was sent with this account.

(350. 1.)

From Mr. T. J. Hay.

Tower House, Millbrook, Southampton, *June 24th, 1890.*

“It is long ago—I think in 1845. One evening I took a candle and went downstairs, when I thought I met my great-aunt, who I was aware was seriously ill. I talked of this at the time with my mother and brother, and probably also my sister. Early the next morning the footman brought word that the poor old lady died the previous evening, about the hour when I fancied I saw her. [I was] in good health, [age] 19 years.

“THOMAS J. HAY.”

Mr. Hay informed us further that this is the only hallucinatory experience he has ever had, and that his brother was present, but did not share in the experience. His brother, through whom the collector first heard of the case, writes :—

“I was present with my brother when the so-called vision took place, but I did not see it.

“H. W. HAY.”

Professor Sidgwick gives the following account, written from notes taken at the time, of an interview which he had with the percipient :—

March 23rd, 1892.

“I called yesterday morning on Mr. T. J. Hay at the Tower House. He told me he only regarded the matter as a strange coincidence.

“It happened thus. He had been sitting in the evening with his mother and sister, but had left them for a brief interval, and it was during this interval that he saw the figure of his aunt. He was well aware that she was dangerously ill, but was not in emotional anxiety. The appearance was quite clear and definite, just as though she were there in the body : but knowing this to be impossible, he had a ‘creepy’ feeling, though not a nervous man. It lasted about half a minute, and then vanished. He went back into the sitting-room, and told his mother and sister, saying, ‘I fear something has happened to Aunt Fanny.’ At the same time he regarded the experience as a mere hallucination. He has never had any other hallucination, nor, so far

as he knows, has any member of his family. When the butler came the next morning with the news of his aunt's death, he asked the time of it, and found it about the same as the time of the appearance."

Recognised Auditory and Tactile Death-Coincidences.

The next group of cases are auditory hallucinations, in which a voice is heard at the time of a death, and either recognised as that of the dying person, or distinctly associated with him. There are 15 of these in our collection, not counting those in which a recognised apparition is accompanied by a voice. In 10 of them, what is heard is the percipient's name only, and in the remainder, other words. One of the 15 cases (No. 83. 3) was published in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 564, where it is numbered 616; another has been already printed in Chapter X., p. 179; the following are, we think, the three best cases among the others.

(131. 11.)

From Mrs. Smith.

38, Gillingham-street, Pinlico, S.W., *September 9th*, 1890.

"[I heard] a voice calling my name three times on board the *Runnymede*, homeward bound from Australia. 10 p.m., 1874, March 9th. [I was] lying in the bunk, but wide awake, only just laid down; in good health and spirits.

"It was my mother's [voice. She was] in England. My husband [was present] but he heard nothing.

"When I returned to England I found my mother had died that same night. She pined and lost her health after I left. She was particularly anxious to see me before she was taken, and thought I had returned.

"E. S. SMITH."

Mrs. Smith writes further to the collector, Miss H. Wilson :—

"*February 28th*, 1891.

"I can only tell you that my mother was not attended by any of those belonging to the family, as she died in Bethnal Green Asylum, March 9th, 1874; and her name was Ann Youens, and I cannot ask anyone, as I am the only one living of all the family, but my husband has signed his name, as he knows quite well I told him on the 9th of March, the same night the fire broke out on board the *Runnymede*, the ship we came home in, and got in the West India Docks the 8th of June, 1874, on Sunday morning. The captain's name was Hay. I am sorry that I have no one left to tell you more."

Mrs. Smith enclosed the following statement from her husband :—

38, Gillingham-street.

"When on board ship my wife told me that she distinctly heard her mother's voice calling her name.

"JOSEPH S. SMITH."

Mrs. Smith is a lodging-house keeper. She states that she has had no

other hallucinatory experiences. Mr. Podmore called on her, and gives the following account of his interview :—

February 4th, 1891.

“I heard the story from Mrs. Smith and her husband yesterday. Both are good witnesses, and intelligent. I enclose newspaper extract about the fire. The *Runnymede* was a barque sailing from Brisbane, and belonged (Mrs. Smith thinks, but is not sure) to the Shaw and Savile line. It was a wool-ship, and the fire broke out in the wool. The fire broke out, they agreed, about half an hour after the voice. The voice was distinctly recognised as that of Mrs. Smith’s mother. The name called was ‘Lizzie.’ The agent’s name was Ann Youens. I saw a printed memorial card giving the date of her death, March 9th, 1874.”

The newspaper cutting referred to gives under the head of “Shipping Intelligence” :—

“(FROM LLOYD’S, APRIL 15.) WRECKS AND CASUALTIES.

“PERNAMBUCO (per telegraph, Lisbon, April 14). A fire broke out on board the *Runnymede*, from Brisbane to London, loading wool, and tin ore, but was extinguished with little damage to vessel; extent of damage to cargo not yet ascertained. She has been surveyed, and has discharged part of her cargo; cause of fire unknown.”

The fact that the voice and the fire occurred on the same night is likely to have fixed the date in the mind of the percipient; and this diminishes in the present case the evidential weakness which—if no note is taken at the time—usually attaches to cases where a considerable interval elapses between the hallucination and the receipt of the news of the death. In the next case there can have been no mistake as to coincidence, since the news was received by telegram at once.

(23. 11.)

From Mr. Eggie.

Walbottle, *May, 1889.*

“On October 5th, 1863, I awoke at 5 a.m. I was in Minto House Normal School, Edinburgh. I heard distinctly the well-known and characteristic voice of a dear friend, repeating the words of a well-known hymn. Nothing [was] visible. [I was] lying quite awake in bed—in good health, and free from any special anxiety. There would be two others in the room, but sound asleep.

“I have always thought it remarkable that at the very same time, almost to a minute, my friend was seized suddenly with mortal illness. He died same day, and a telegram reached me that evening announcing that fact. He had previously been in his usual good health.

“JNO. EGGIE.”

Mr. Eggie is a certificated schoolmaster at Walbottle. In answer to our further inquiries he writes :—

Walbottle, *May 24th, 1889.*

“I cannot produce any independent testimony of any kind regarding the incident. It rests entirely on my own word, which, of course, in a scientific investigation, is worth nothing. My replies would be as follows :—

“ I mentioned it to no one before the death.

“ The friend was my father. He died on October 5th, 1863. The cause of death was, I believe, certified as the bursting of a blood-vessel.

“ The sudden death was mentioned at the time in the Dundee newspapers, but I have no copy of one of them.

“ The words had something peculiarly appropriate about them, but, so far as I know, there was no special association.

“ You will see that most probably my father would at least be thinking a good deal about me that day. He did not speak, I believe, after the seizure.”

Professor Sidgwick writes :—

September 23rd, 1891.

“ Yesterday, at 5.45 p.m., I had an interview with Mr. Eggie. He read over his paper, and suggested modifications of one or two phrases, which he thought perhaps needed slightly qualifying.

“ Thus, with regard to ‘no anxiety,’ Mr. Eggie thought he ought to mention that his father had been ill at the previous Christmas-time—had burst a blood-vessel; but he had recovered from this, and was believed to be in normal health. Mr. Eggie had had a letter from him a day or two before, which gave not the slightest ground for anxiety. Still, though he had no ground for special anxiety, there might have been a faint general anxiety on account of the previous illness.

“ Again, in his statement of the exactness of the coincidence, he thought ‘almost’ should be inserted before ‘to a minute.’ But he felt sure of the closeness of the coincidence, for the following reasons:—

“ (1.) He knew the time of the voice from hearing the chimes of St. Giles’s Church very shortly after. (2.) The time of the seizure he learnt when he went home for the funeral; and it was fixed in his mind by the following circumstances. The father was engaged in farming, and the day of the fatal illness was market day; he consequently rose earlier than usual, and was making himself some breakfast when the seizure occurred; he never became conscious again, and he died at 2 p.m. on the same day.

“ The voice repeated two complete stanzas of the hymn.

“ An entry by which Mr. Eggie knows the date was in the fly-leaf of a Bible; it must have been made very shortly after the death. He heard of the death by telegraph on the same day; a letter followed; but neither mentioned the *exact* time of the death. He has had no similar experience, either before or after.”

This case is a death-coincidence, as the hallucination occurred within seven hours of the death; but the almost exact agreement in time between the hallucination and the seizure suggests that it was the crisis of the seizure rather than of the death which caused the telepathic impulse.

In the following case, again, the receipt of the news followed the hallucination so closely that there can have been no mistake as to the coincidence.

(55. 18.)

From the Rev. J. Maskell.

(The account was written in 1889).

Emanuel Hospital, Westminster.

“On 30th October, 1857, while Curate of Gain’s Colne, Essex, I was sitting in my room, in lodgings, in a lonely half-occupied farmhouse, about 7 p.m., when I heard the voice of a parishioner, whom I well knew, calling me from the outside, under my window, ‘Mr. Maskell, I want you; come.’ I went out, but saw no one, and thought no more of it, till about 9 p.m. I was sent for by the man’s wife, distant nearly a mile, and then learned that the man J. B. had been found dead in the roadway from Chapple Station to the village—a long distance from my abode, perhaps a mile or more.

“[I was] reading, and in good health.

“J. B. was a cattle dealer, and I saw him frequently, both in his place in church, and out of it. I had no knowledge of his occupation at 7 p.m. on Saturday, October 30th, 1857.

“A lad who was my pupil [was present]; he had no share in the experience.

“I took no notes. The man J. B. was supposed to have been murdered, and at the inquest the verdict was ‘Wilful murder against some person or persons unknown.’ The motive for the murder was robbery, as he had sold much cattle, and was returning with money from Colchester Market.

“J. MASKELL.”

We have verified the fact that October 30th, 1857, was a Saturday.

Mr. Maskell is now no longer living, but through the kindness of Miss Maskell we have been able to obtain a copy of the inscription on the murdered man’s tomb in the churchyard of Colne Engaine, Halstead, Essex, which gives the date of his death as October 31st, 1857. The circumstances of the death seem to make it certain that it was on Saturday night, and not on Sunday, that the man was killed, so that we must suppose the day of the month on the tombstone to be wrong.

Miss Maskell says:—

“[My father] was, I know, much impressed with the occurrence, and seldom spoke of it; but, if necessary, I could have given you data, &c.”

The following case is the nearest approach among our cases to a recognised tactile hallucination coinciding with a death, but, as will be seen, it was not the touch that was connected with the dying person, but an accompanying mental impulse, much more impressive than the touch and of which the touch seemed to be a subsidiary part.

(338. 26.)

From Miss L. D.

September 4th, 1890.

“On September 3rd, 1858, I was in a wild part of the West Highlands, where our home was, close to the sea. A party of cousins were with us, on a visit. I and a sister and one of our guests, a girl of 16, went out on the hills, to a point where we could look over the Sound of Mull. We sat on the turf looking at the view. I and my cousin made an outline sketch. [Then] she rose and walked a little further to join my sister. I was left

alone, and an impulse came over me to *pray* for a brother, a sailor—he was in the West Indies at the time. I heard no sound, but I felt a sensation as if something touched me. I obeyed and prayed for his safe keeping (his ship was on its way home). I said nothing to the others, but I did look at my watch : it was 3.30 p.m.

“On September 7th a letter from this brother came. He hoped to be with us in a few weeks, but they had been coaling at St. Thomas, and yellow fever was raging there ; several cases on board his own ship, though none were very severe. His letter was dated on a late day in August (25th, I think). On September 21st, our guests having all left us, a letter came from the authorities at Portsmouth, stating that on September 3rd he had died of yellow fever on his voyage home, and his body had been committed to the deep on the same day. He had been taken ill just after writing his last letter, and as he was a young fellow of 19, the surgeon thought his best chance was to be sent off at once, so he was carried on board and died on the second day at sea, September 3rd. The exact hour was not known, for the boy was left asleep in his berth, and found dead by one of his fellow-officers.

“The shock was great to my mother—we could not talk much to her. Just after Christmas my mother and I went to stay with old friends and connections at a beautiful place close to Dunbar. Of course the sad event was talked over by my mother and our hostess. I was sitting by the first time they spoke, and heard my mother say, that about 3 o'clock on September 3rd she was sitting talking to her friend (the mother of the girl who walked out with me). Each had a sailor-boy, and they were talking of those two absent ones. Then they agreed to go out and walk, and my mother had got on her things, and was leaving her room to join her friend, when (I quote her words) ‘a hand seemed to force me to turn back, and I went and knelt down and prayed for my boy. I did not know why, but I just prayed he might be safe.’ When I got her alone, I told her about our walk and my own experience. I had never done so till then, she had been so ill and upset. Neither of us had a doubt but that this ‘message’ was sent to us just as the young spirit passed alone into the Unseen World. We heard no voice and saw nothing, but we were aware of an unusual sensation, which could not be resisted. I can only call it ‘an uncontrollable impulse.’

“My mother died last year, and all the persons except one, who were with us on that day, are dead too. The exception is that young cousin, but I do not think I ever told her. I was 24 years old.”

It is an interesting feature in this case that the experience apparently occurred to two percipients in different places simultaneously, but the second percipient being dead, it has, of course, been impossible to obtain her evidence at first-hand.

Apparitions, not of the Dying Person, Coinciding with Death.

In the next group of cases, an apparition coinciding with the death represents, not the dying person herself, but a near relative of hers. There are four cases of this type in the Census ; of these, one was

published in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 357 (No. 124), and two others are given below.

Such cases need present no difficulty on the telepathic theory. Indeed it may be rather said that the absence of any cases of the kind would render the theory improbable. They raise the question, however, who the "agent"—the person, that is, from whom the telepathic communication comes—is, in hallucinations coinciding with a death. Usually it seems natural to assume that it is the dying person, and in some cases—as we have seen in Chapter XII—this view is supported by evidence that the dying person's thoughts were specially directed to the percipient. The mere fact, however, that the apparition represents a particular person does not prove that that person was the agent. It is possible for an agent to transfer to a percipient an image of some third person, and it is possible for a percipient to embody an impression telepathically received in a form suggested by his own mind and not by the agent's. As an instance where it seems improbable that the person whose figure was seen was the agent, see Mrs. McAlpine's vision of her baby nephew at the time of its death (printed at p. 281 after another experience of the same percipient.) It seems more likely in this case that the agent was some one with the child, than the child itself, aged six months. In one of the death coincidences quoted in Chapter XII., (No. 579. 24, p. 223), there is some reason for thinking that the agent was the sister who telegraphed the news rather than the deedcent; because (1) the hallucination nearly coincided in time with the despatch of the telegram, while it occurred some hours after the death, and (2) it foretold the arrival of the telegram. These cases, of course, differ from those we are about to quote, in that the apparition is of the dying person, but they should be kept in view in interpreting them.

(341. 21.)

From Miss W.

October 11th, 1891.

"It was one Sunday morning at church, during morning service. I looked up from my Prayer-book and saw the figure of a man standing in what had been an empty seat opposite me. He turned half round and looked at me with a fixed, agonised gaze. I felt perturbed and very annoyed at his behaviour, when he bowed his head as though something were passing over him, and, to my utter astonishment, vanished. This was on Sunday, _____, 1885. I was singing the Psalms, with my brother sharing the same book. I was in good health, and quite free from grief or anxiety. My age was 22.

"The appearance was that of an acquaintance of mine, who from his seat in church was much given to staring at me during service. I heard afterwards that at that exact time he was at the deathbed of his mother.

"This was the only occasion [on which I have had such an experience].

Miss W., in answer to further questions, informed us that she did not know that Mr. ——'s mother was ill. She had been delicate for years, but she had not heard that she was at all less strong than usual.

Mrs. Sidgwick called on Miss W. on December 5th, 1891, and gives the following account, written at once, of what she heard from her :—

“Miss W. was at the west end of the church. The figure appeared in the choir at the opposite side, so that she had a three-quarters view of it, as it were. It was the gentleman's usual seat. She had the impulse to say to her brother : ‘How could Mr. —— have got there without our seeing him going across?’ but restrained herself because of the way he was looking at her, which made her angry. She thinks the appearance may have lasted through half a Psalm, but is not sure. I think she most likely did not keep her eyes on it, and when she looked again it was gone. Anyhow, she cannot give any account of its vanishing ; it was just not there. Only then did she realise that what she had seen was not real, and it gave her a shock. She had a difficulty in standing through the remainder of the Psalms, her knees shook so much ; but looking over the same book with her brother, she would not give way. She had no unusual feelings before the figure vanished. Her sight is good and she would see a real person quite clearly at that distance.

“She heard, when she got home, that Mrs. —— had died that morning, at the time she saw her son, as she believes.

“She has never told anyone of this experience, so that no further evidence can be obtained.”

We have verified the date of Mrs. ——'s death independently through a local paper.

In this case the coincidence appear to have been very close. In the absence of evidence either from Mr. —— or his mother, it is not possible for us to feel sure which was the agent. The fact that Mrs. —— was more clearly passing through a crisis is an argument for supposing that the telepathic impression came from her, but on the other hand there is reason to think that Mr. —— and the percipient were more interested in each other than the dying lady and the percipient were, and his thoughts may well have turned to her at the moment of his mother's death.

In the next case the fact that the person whose figure was seen can hardly by any normal means have known of his mother's death at the time of the hallucination makes it difficult to suppose that he was the agent, without a telepathic hypothesis so complicated as to be extremely improbable.

(338. 20.) From Miss C. L. Hawkins-Dempster.

(The account was written in 1890).

24, Portman-square, W.

“I ran downstairs and entered the drawing-room at 7.30 p.m., believing I had kept my two sisters waiting for dinner. They had gone to dinner, the

room was empty. Behind a long sofa I saw Mr. H. standing. He moved 3 steps nearer. I heard nothing. I was not at all afraid or surprised, only felt concern as [to] what he wanted, as he was in South America. I learnt next morning that at that moment his mother was breathing her last. I went and arranged her for burial, my picture still hanging above the bed, between the portraits of her two absent sons.

“I was in the habit of hearing often from [Mr. H.], and was not at that moment anxious about Mrs. H.’s health, though she was aged.

“I had had 25 days before the grief of losing an only brother. No [other persons were present at the time].

“C. L. H. DEMPSTER.”

In answer to further inquiries, we learnt from Miss Hawkins-Dempster that the above incident occurred on New Year’s Eve, 1876-77; the room was lighted by “one bright lamp and a fire,” and the figure did not seem to go away, she merely “ceased to see it.” She used to see Mrs. H. often, and was in no anxiety as to her health at the time. Mrs. H. was very old, but not definitely ill. Miss Hawkins-Dempster corrected her first statement as to the exactness of the coincidence by informing us that Mrs. H. died in the morning of the same day on which the apparition was seen.

Miss Hawkins-Dempster mentioned what she had seen to her sister, who thus corroborates:—

July 15th, 1892.

“I heard of my sister Miss C. L. Hawkins-Dempster’s vision of Mr. H. in the drawing-room at 7.30 p.m. on New Year’s Eve, 1876-7, immediately after it happened, and before hearing that Mrs. H. died the same day, the news of which reached us later that evening.

“H. H. DEMPSTER.”

We have verified the date of death at Somerset House.

Miss Hawkins-Dempster has had one other experience. While sitting at luncheon with her sister and their governess, they all saw their hostess, who was, in fact, writing in her own room, and probably conscious that she was late for luncheon, enter the room. She actually came in about ten minutes later. This occurred in 1848 or 1849.

Mr. Myers had an interview with the Misses Hawkins-Dempster on July 16th, 1892, and writes as follows the next day:—

“Miss C. Hawkins-Dempster’s veridical experience is well remembered by both sisters. The decedent was a very old lady, who was on very intimate terms with them, and had special reasons for thinking of Miss C. Hawkins-Dempster in connection with the son whose figure appeared. He was at the other side of the world, and almost certainly had not heard of his mother’s death at the time.

“The figure was absolutely life-like. Miss Hawkins-Dempster noticed the slight cast of the eye and the delicate hands. The figure rested one hand on the back of a chair and held the other out. Miss Hawkins-Dempster called out, ‘What can I do for you?’ forgetting for the moment the impossibility that it could be the real man. Then she simply ceased to see the figure.

“ She was in good health at the time, and her thoughts were occupied with business matters.”

Here the apparition followed the death by some hours ; so that, if Mrs. H. was the agent, the telepathic impression must either have remained latent for some time, or have been produced by the agent after death. In this the case resembles other death-coincidences in which the apparition followed the death. This class of experiences will be further discussed in Chapter XVII.

Unrecognised Hallucinations coinciding with Death.

We come next to cases in which the hallucinatory figure or voice which coincides with a death is unrecognised, or in which the coinciding (visual) hallucination does not amount to a human figure at all.

We have in our present collection two cases where a human figure seen at the time of death is not recognised as representing any known person. In the first of these, the dying person was one whom the percipient had never even heard of, and therefore could not be expected to recognise.

(317. 6.)

From Miss S. Money.

(The account was written in 1890).

47, Upper Baker-street, Regent's Park, N.W.

“ At Redhill, on Thanksgiving Day, between 8 and 9 in the evening, when I was taking charge of the little daughter of a friend, during [my] friend's absence for that evening, I left the child sleeping in the bedroom, and went to drop the blinds in two neighbouring rooms, being absent about three minutes. On returning to the child's room, in the full light of the gas-burner from above I distinctly saw, coming from the child's cot, a white figure, which figure turned, looked me full in the face, and passed down the staircase. I instantly followed, leaned over the banisters in astonishment, and saw the glistening of the white drapery as the figure passed down the staircase, through the lighted hall, and silently through the hall door itself, which was barred, chained, and locked. I felt for the moment perfectly staggered, went back to the bedroom, and found the child peacefully sleeping. I related the circumstance to the mother immediately on her return late that night. She was incredulous, but said that my description of the figure answered to that of an invalid aunt of the child's. The next morning came a telegram to say that this relative, who had greatly wished to see her niece, had died between 8 and 9 the previous evening.

“ I had just put down the *Pickwick Papers* with which I had been whiling the time, was free from trouble, and in good health.

“ No one was in the house but myself, the child, and one servant, who, at the time, was in the kitchen, dressed in black.

“This is the only experience of this nature I have ever had.

“P.S.—The writer cannot give the date in figures without reference to an almanack of that year, but is certain that this occurred on the evening of Thanksgiving Day for the recovery of the Prince of Wales [*i.e.*, February 27th, 1872.]

“S. MONEY.”

In answer to our inquiries, the collector, Miss B. Garnett writes:—

Highlands, Clarendon-road, Lewisham, S.E., *December 20th*, 1890.

“I obtained lately an interview with Miss Money, and wrote down her replies to the four questions enclosed. This was all the information she was able to give. I should state that Miss Money’s rather interesting experience was told me long before I was asked to collect answers for the Society, and then merely was told by her in the course of conversation, when I had been expressing my scepticism about all so-called *spiritual* manifestations. She then said she had been utterly sceptical until she herself met with this experience.”

The replies enclosed were:—

“1. The child’s mother died about 10 or 11 years ago.

“2. Miss Money did not even know of the existence of the aunt at the time of [her] experience.

“3. Miss Money has scruples about giving the name without permission. She states that the aunt was a single woman, and a step-sister of the father of the child, and that the aunt was not living near.

“4. As the lady (the aunt) was no acquaintance of Miss Money’s, and as she heard no further details, she knows of no further way of proving the fact. Miss Money lost sight of the parents, having been abroad herself for many years afterwards.”

Miss Garnett says further, in speaking of the original account, which was first given to her verbally by Miss Money, “It was clearly and repeatedly given, amid many critical suggestions on my part. I may add that Miss Money’s testimony on any subject is one that I have always found reliable. I merely add this because there are so many people who seem scarcely able to help exaggerating in the direction of the particular bias of their minds.”

Mr. Podmore called on Miss Money on February 2nd, 1892, and heard full particulars of the incident from her. He further ascertained that no corroboration is now obtainable, and that Miss Money has failed to obtain permission to give the name of the lady who died. We have therefore been unable to verify the date of the death.

In this case, it is said that the percipient’s “description of the figure answered to that of” the decedent. We cannot lay much stress on such a supposed correspondence, but if there really was any material resemblance, it may be compared to cases where some veridical detail not previously known to the percipient is introduced into a coincidental apparition, as the “waistcoat with the shiny back” in No. 571. 14 (see p. 237), the dressing-gown in No. 147. 23 (see p. 218),

and the details of the scene in No. 362. 21 (see p. 217). Where the appearance of the phantasm presents no details that could not have been evolved from the percipient's own mind, all that we have to suppose transferred from the one mind to the other is—to use Mr. Gurney's phrase (*Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 537)—a dim and shadowy idea; the particular form of the hallucination depending on the mental processes of the percipient, who alone may supply the embodiment of the idea. But in certain cases, such as those above referred to, the hallucination includes features which could not be supplied by the percipient's mind, and seem in some way to be derived from the agent's; it seems (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 555) “that a ready-made concrete image, and not a mere idea, has been transferred from one to the other.” There is another peculiar feature in the case now before us; viz., that there seems to be no reason why the apparition should have been seen at all by this particular person. A few instances of the same kind are recorded in *Phantasms of the Living* (see Vol. I., p. 524, and Vol. II., p. 61) and another will be found later in this chapter (No. 402. S., p. 284). It is difficult to decide, in the present state of our knowledge, as to the right explanation of such cases; but it may be suggested that they are quasi-collective in character,¹ the telepathic impulse reaching the percipient through the other person present—the child in this case,—who may have acted as a link between agent and percipient, because the minds of both were much occupied with her.

In the second case of an unrecognised coincidental phantasm, the non-recognition is of a different type, the figure seen appearing indistinct.

(459. 2.)

From Dr. W. A. Jamieson.

35, Charlotte-square, Edinburgh, *June 19th*, 1891.

“I am an early riser; the awakening bell rings usually at seven o'clock a.m. On the morning of December 24th, 1887, it rang a little later, about twenty minutes past seven. I was aroused by it, but did not immediately rise, though fully awake. The dawning light came in somewhat obscurely, as the shutters were partially closed. When just on the point of rising, I became conscious that a dark form, distinctly that of a female of medium height, was passing round the foot of my bed, and glided up to my side. When it reached me I raised myself in bed and felt with my hand, but it passed through the shadow. I felt nothing, and on looking closely found the apparition was gone. I at once pulled my watch from under the pillow; it was exactly half-past seven.

“This occurred at 26, Rutland-street, Edinburgh. I was just on the

¹ A discussion of collective percipience will be found in the next Chapter. Compare with this case one given in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 256.

point of rising, was in good health, had had no worry or anxiety, and was then forty-eight years of age.

“The form closely resembled that of a patient of mine whom I had seen the evening before. She was very ill, though quite conscious, and I had told her husband that I did not think she would live over the night. She was aged sixty-six, was not an interesting person; had caused her friends much distress from her habits. She died as nearly as could be ascertained at 7.30 a.m., December 24th, 1887.

“My wife was in bed, but asleep. I wakened her and told her my experience, impressing on her the fact that I had mentioned the circumstance, though I could not explain its import, as I was not thinking of the lady who died at the time. She had seen nothing.

“[I have] never before or since [had such an experience.]

“W. ALLAN JAMIESON, M.D.”

Professor Sidgwick, who called on Dr. Jamieson on September 21st, 1891, writes on the same day from pencil-notes taken during the interview:—

“At the time Dr. Jamieson saw the female figure described in his statement he was in the act of getting up, and undoubtedly quite awake. Though the time was 7.30 on December 24th, still, as the house looked south and east, and the central part of both shutters was open, enough light came in to enable him to see the form distinctly. He felt no ‘chill’ or shudder, nor nervous feeling of any kind. He put out his hands to feel it, in order to find out what it was, having no definite idea what it would turn out to be. When he put out his hands the form had passed out of the light of the window, moving by his bedside, so that he did not see it disappear, but only felt that there was nothing there.

“He first looked at his watch, ascertained the time to be 7.30, then woke his wife and told her what he had seen; but the resemblance of the form to his patient did not occur to him at the time, so that he did not mention it to his wife: it only occurred to him after the news of her death had reached him. He immediately went to see the husband, who told him that she had died ‘as near as I can say’ at 7.30.

“Though he knew the woman to be dying, his mind was not occupied about her. When he went away after seeing her he dismissed her from his mind.

“It could not possibly be a real human being, nor a reflection from anything.”

Dr. Jamieson writes later:—

35, Charlotte-square, Edinburgh, *October 2nd, 1891.*

“DEAR SIR,—I now have much pleasure in sending the statements you wished me to obtain in connection with the experience I had on December 24th, 1887. I send the letter I received to-day from the lady’s daughter. I have inquired at the Registrar’s office and find that the husband of the lady registered the death as having occurred at 7.55 a.m. on December 24th, 1887. This is certainly twenty-five minutes later than the time at which I saw the dark appearance enter my room. I can only say that when I called at the house that morning the lady’s husband told me that his wife died at

half-past seven before I mentioned anything to him, but he must have found that it really was later ; at least he has registered it as mentioned above.

“ W. ALLAN JAMIESON.”

The statements enclosed are as follows :—

(1) From Mrs. Jamieson.

35, Charlotte-square, Edinburgh, *September 28th*, 1891.

“ My husband has asked me to relate what I remember of an occurrence on the morning of December 24th, 1887. I was asleep and had not risen from my bed when he woke me to tell me the following :—

“ That he had seen a dark figure come from the door on the side of the room furthest from him. It walked round the foot of the bed and came and stood at his side ; he put out his hand to feel, but encountered no one. He then woke me and asked if I had come to the side of his bed, but I told him I had not been up. On looking at his watch my husband found the hour to be half-past seven.

“ C. A. JAMIESON.”

(2) From Mrs. —'s daughter.

October 2nd, 1891.

“ DEAR DR. JAMIESON, —I just got your note last night on my return to town. As far as I can remember it was just about eight o'clock or a few minutes after that my mother died, December, 1887.”

The non-recognition in this case appeared at the time to be due to the bad light, which prevented the apparition from being seen distinctly : but an effect of this kind may be put down to the influence of self-suggestion. The case is analogous to those where an apparition becomes invisible as soon as a light is put out and reappears on the relighting of it (see, for instance, No. 422. 25, p. 192). It would seem that the telepathic impulse was prevented from reaching the consciousness of the percipient in the form of a completely developed hallucination by his subconscious idea of the difficulty of seeing it. It is, however, quite possible to suppose that the telepathic impression was altogether vague, so that there was no definite idea to be translated into a hallucination. As Mr. Gurney expresses it (*Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 538, footnote), such an undistinctive idea may be “ hurried on into hallucination, without having first declared itself as an idea ; it assumes the definiteness of visible shape, while yet its content or message remains indefinite.” The case would thus be analogous to the cloud-like stages of some hallucinations, telepathic and other (see Chapter VI., p. 116), and to the shrouded forms classed with undeveloped hallucinations (see Chapter VI., p. 119).

In the next case, we have an unrecognised apparition which has a certain interest on account of its exceptionally rudimentary character. It is just one step beyond the “ sense of presence,” before mentioned, which we have regarded as not amounting to a sensory hallucination.

(554. 13.)

From Miss Egerton.

Whitwell Hall, York, April 10th, 1891.

“[At] Seville, April, 1882, I was leaving my bedroom hurriedly (probably to join my companions) when, as I opened my door, somebody appeared to enter, and I started hastily back; the impression disappeared instantaneously; there was no one. [I was] in good health, and in no grief; [age] 36.

“The impression was absolutely vague, as to the individuality of the appearance. No one [else was present]. A week after the occurrence I heard of the death of a favourite cousin, which happened in Java, on the same day.

“MARY L. EGERTON.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Egerton writes further:—

“I did not mention it to anyone at the time. I saw the figure vaguely, more as an obstructive object or body, as I opened the door of my bedroom to go into a somewhat dark passage. The impression was sufficiently strong to make me start hurriedly back for fear of running ‘amuck’ into the stranger, as I thought it was. The impression was gone instantaneously, and I saw there was no one. The moment I heard of my cousin’s death, I remembered the impression, and made out then that it must have been within a few hours of his death.”

Professor Sidgwick called on Miss Egerton in March, 1892, and writes from notes taken at the time:—

March 22nd, 1892.

“Miss Egerton said that when she opened her door to go out into the passage she had momentarily no doubt that she met, face to face, another human being coming in. Her impression was that it was a man, but the whole thing was so startling and transient that she could not be sure of this. She started back just as she would do to avoid a sudden collision with a real person. It seemed to be within a few inches of her.

“The passage was perfectly bare; with nothing in it to produce illusion. It was lighted from a courtyard. (The event occurred in the Hotel de Paris, at Seville.) When it was over, and she found there was no person there, she regarded it as a momentary hallucination.

“When the news of the cousin’s death in Java came, she convinced herself that the coincidence in time between her experience and the death was *within an hour*, allowing for difference of longitude. (The exact hour of the cousin’s death was communicated.) The relation between the two was more intimate than ordinary cousinship, as they had been much with each other from childhood; he was more like a younger brother.

“The hallucination was only of the sense of sight. It was a quite unique experience.”

In cases such as this and Dr. Jamieson’s, the closeness of the coincidence and the uniqueness of the experience are specially important considerations in estimating the probability that the hallucination and the death were causally connected.

Out of 17 cases of hallucinatory lights in our Census, 7, as already said (p. 125), were seen at or about the time of a death; two of these, No. 191. 2 (see p. 124), and No. 305. 4 (see p. 126), have been given already, but as evidence of a *telepathic* connection between death and hallucination we cannot lay much stress on them, since they are open to another interpretation. This, for various reasons, is true also, we think, of the remaining cases, which we do not therefore quote here.

Of unrecognised auditory hallucinations coinciding with a death, we have 8 cases. The following is one of them:—

(561. 24.) From Mrs. E. L. Kearney.

2, Wharton-road, West Kensington, W., *November 30th, 1891.*

“I felt my bed shaken under me, and heard a gurgling noise, and a distinct cry for help. Time and date, about 1 p.m., New Year’s Day, 1875. Place, Westbourne, Hermitage-road, Geelong, Victoria, Australia.

“I was fully awake, lying in bed convalescent from an attack of scarlet rash. During this illness the rash only remained a few hours, and I had no symptoms of fever, neither thirst, nor high temperature, nor derangement of consciousness. I was not in any grief or anxiety. Age 18. The sun was very bright, and it was very hot at the time.

“I was very much affected by the sound and cry, but did not at the time associate it with any particular person.

“No one was with me, and none shared the experience. I rang my bell, and on my mother coming to me, told her what had occurred. At about 3 o’clock the same day, a telegram was brought announcing that my cousin, Charles Griffith (aged 13), had been drowned in a lagoon at 1 o’clock. He was out shooting, and went in after a wild duck. He was an expert swimmer.

“My mother noted the day and hour at the time I called her, but I do not think any permanent record was made.

“GERTRUDE E. KEARNEY.”

In answer to our request for further information and corroboration, Mrs. Kearney wrote:—

January 17th, 1892.

“What occurred is perfectly fresh in my memory, although it is some years since it happened. I should like to add that two days previous to my cousin Charlie Griffith’s going up the country he came to say good-bye to myself and my family, but as his people were afraid I might have something infectious, he remained at the garden gate, and called out to my mother, who was standing on the balcony, to say good-bye to me, as he could not come in. Two days later he was drowned.”

Mrs. Kearney enclosed the following note from her father. Her mother, being ill, could not be pressed to write any statement of her recollections.

“With regard to the Charley Griffith episode, neither your mother nor I can call to mind any exact particulars. I do remember your returning about Christmas time from a visit to the Timms’, and having what was supposed might be an attack of scarlet fever. I remember the news coming in the

afternoon of 1st January (year I know not)—the news of the poor boy's being drowned in a pool at Edmondson's station. Your mother remembers your calling her into your bedroom to tell her you had heard 'a cry,' or something of that sort ; no more."

Mrs. Kearney has had another experience mentioned in Chapter VIII., p. 156.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Kearney are known to Mr. Myers.

Though the hallucination in this case was unrecognised and did not indicate the person who was dying, it gave some indication of the nature of the death, and the evidence, therefore, for a telepathic origin is something more than the mere coincidence of the two events in time.

An unrecognised auditory death-coincidence, in which the hallucination consisted merely in the hearing of the name of one of the percipients, will be found in Chapter XV., p. 316 (No. 138. 18).

The hallucinations in the present collection affecting the sense of touch only, which are believed to have coincided with the death of a friend or relative, need not detain us. There are seven of these, besides the one quoted at p. 258.

Hallucinations Experimentally Produced.

We turn now to cases where some event other than the death of the supposed agent coincides with the hallucination in such a way as to suggest a causal connection between them.

The special importance of one class among these, viz., hallucinations experimentally caused, (B experiencing a hallucination when A is, unknown to B, endeavouring by mental suggestion to induce one in him), was dwelt on in Chapter I. This class is not very strongly represented in the present collection, probably because the experiment is only rarely attempted. We have four cases which belong to it more or less, two of them visual, one auditory, and one tactile.

It is to be observed that the agent in the first of these cases—Mr. Kirk—seems to possess an unusual capacity for impressing other minds telepathically, as shown by his experiments in thought-transference, a few of which have been already printed in the *Journal*, and some more of which we hope to publish in a future Part of the *Proceedings*.

(The following case is not included in our Tables, because it occurred after the percipient—Miss G.—had filled up the Census form).

(284. 19.)

From Mr. Kirk.

2, Ripon-villas, Upper Ripon-road, Plumstead, *July 7th*, 1890.

"I have to inform you that from the 10th to 20th June I tried a telepathic experiment each night upon Miss G. I did so, as suggested by you in your letter of June 3rd, without her knowledge, as a preliminary to entering upon

experiments with her under conditions of expectancy and the recording of dates and hours. Each trial had for its object the rendering myself visible to her—simply visible. With the exception of one—which was made one afternoon from my office in the Arsenal—each trial took place at my house between the hours of 11 p.m. and 1 a.m.

“Up to June 23rd I heard nothing *direct* from my ‘subject.’ Indirectly, however, I learnt that my influence was acting rather strongly. Each time Miss G. came to my house, while the experiments were in progress, she complained of being kept sleepless and restless from an uneasy feeling which she was unable to describe or account for. On one night, so strong was this uneasy feeling, she was compelled to get up, dress herself, and take to some needlework, and was unable to throw off the sensation and return to bed until 2 o’clock. I made no comments on these complaints—never dropped a hint, even, as to what I was doing. Under these circumstances it seemed probable to me that, although my influence was telling upon her, to her discomfort, I had not succeeded in the object of my experiments. Supposing this to be the case, and that I was only depriving her of rest, I thought it best to discontinue the trials for a time.

“I felt disappointed at this apparently barren result. But, on June 23rd, an agreeable surprise was sprung upon me, in that I learnt I had most effectually succeeded on one occasion—the very occasion on which I had considered success as being highly improbable—in presenting myself to Miss G. As you will find in her statement, herewith enclosed, the vision was most complete and realistic. The trial which had this fortunate result was that I had made from my office and on the spur of the moment. I had been rather closely engaged on some auditing work, which had tired me, and as near as I can remember the time was between 3.30 and 4 p.m., that I laid down my pencil, stretched myself, and in the act of doing the latter I was seized with the impulse to make a trial on Miss G. I did not, of course, know where she was at the moment, but, with a flash, as it were, I transferred myself to her bedroom. I cannot say why I thought of that spot, unless it was that I did so because my first experiment had been made there.¹ As it happened, it was what I must call a ‘lucky shot,’ for I caught her at the moment she was lightly sleeping in her chair—a condition which seems to be peculiarly favourable to receiving and externalising telepathic messages.

“The figure seen by Miss G. was clothed in a suit I was at the moment wearing, and was *bareheaded*, the latter as would be the case, of course, in an office. This suit is of a dark reddish-brown *check* stuff, and it was an unusual circumstance for me to have had on the *coat* at the time, as I wear, as a rule, an office coat of *light* material. But this office coat I had, a day or so before, sent to a tailor to be repaired, and I had, therefore, to keep on that belonging to the dark suit.

¹ The first experiment of this series was on the night of the 10th, the successful experiment on the afternoon of June 11th (Wednesday). Mr. Kirk tells us that he made a note at the time on his blotting paper, of day and hour. Mr. Kirk had on four occasions during the previous four years tried from a distance to produce an impression of presence on Miss G. with considerable success, but had not tried to appear to her. These experiments and others are described in the *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. V., pp. 21–30.

“I tested the reality of the vision by this dark suit. I asked, ‘How was I dressed?’ (not at all a leading question). The reply of Miss G. was, touching the sleeve of the coat I was then wearing (of a *light* suit), ‘Not this coat, but that dark suit you wear sometimes. I even saw clearly the *small check* pattern of it; and I saw your features as plainly as though you had been bodily present. I *could not* have seen you more distinctly.’”

Miss G.’s account is :—

June 28th, 1890.

“A peculiar occurrence happened to me on the Wednesday of the week before last. In the afternoon (being tired by a morning walk), while sitting in an easy-chair near the window of my own room, I fell asleep. At any time I happen to sleep during the day (which is but seldom) I invariably awake with tired uncomfortable sensations, which take some little time to pass off; but that afternoon, on the contrary, I was suddenly quite wide awake, seeing Mr. Kirk standing near my chair, dressed in a dark brown coat, which I had frequently seen him wear. His back was towards the window, his right hand towards me; he passed across the room towards the door, which is opposite the window, the space between being 15ft., the furniture so arranged as to leave just that centre clear; but when he got about 4ft. from the door, which was closed, he disappeared.

“My first thought was, ‘had this happened a few hours later I should have believed it telepathic,’ for I knew Mr. Kirk had tried experimenting at different times, but had no idea he was doing so recently. Although I have been much interested by his conversation about psychical phenomena at various times during the past year, I must confess the element of doubt *would* very forcibly present itself as to whether telepathic communication could be really a fact; and I then thought, knowing he must be at the office at the time I saw him (which was quite as distinctly as if he had been really in the room), that in this instance, at least, it must be purely imaginary, and feeling so sure it was only fancy, resolved not to mention it, and did not do so until this week, when, almost involuntarily, I told him all about it. Much to my astonishment, Mr. Kirk was very pleased with the account, and asked me to write it, telling me that on that afternoon, feeling rather tired, he put down his pen for a few moments, and, to use his own words, ‘threw himself into this room.’ He also told me he had purposely avoided this subject in my presence lately, that he might not influence me, but was anxiously hoping I would introduce it.

“I feel sure I had not been dreaming of him, and cannot remember that anything had happened to cause me even to think of him that afternoon before falling asleep.”

Mr. Kirk writes later :—

“I have only succeeded once in making myself visible to Miss G. since the occasion I have already reported, and that had the singularity of being only my features—my face in *miniature*, that is, about *three inches* in diameter.”

In a letter dated January 19th, 1891, Mr. Kirk says as to this last appearance :—

“Miss G. did not record this at the time, as she attached no importance to it, but I noted the date (July 23rd) on my office blotting-pad, as it was at the office I was thinking of her. I say ‘thinking,’ because I was doing so

in connection with another subject, and with no purpose of making an experiment. I had a headache, and was resting my head on my left hand. Suddenly it occurred to me that my thinking about her might probably influence her in some way, and I made the note I have mentioned."¹

Mrs. Sidgwick had a talk with Mr. Kirk and with Miss G. on April 8th, 1892, about the above incidents and other experiments in thought-transference between them, and writes:—

“Mr. Kirk’s appearance to Miss G. evidently impressed her very much. It was extremely realistic. She is quite sure she was awake. It was as if she had waked up to see it, but she had not been dreaming of Mr. Kirk. The figure did not look towards her or appear to take any interest in her. The other time she saw his face it was like a miniature. She did not think so much of that experience.”

The experiment in the following case succeeded on the first trial.

(98. 13.) From Miss Edith Maughan (now Mrs. G. Rayleigh Vicars).

September, 1890.

“One night in September, 1888, I was lying awake in bed reading. I forget what the book was, but I had recently been studying with interest various cases of astral projection in *Phantasms of the Living*, and I distinctly remember making up my mind that night to try whether I could manage to accomplish a projection of myself by force of will-concentration.

“The room next to mine was occupied by a friend of mine [Miss Ethel Thompson], who was an old acquaintance, and not at all of an excitable turn of mind. This room had formerly been used as a dressing-room, and there was a door connecting it with mine. For some years, however, it had been absolutely separated by the locked door, on my side of which stood a very heavy wardrobe, which would require two strong men to move it away. The only available exit from my room was the other door which opened on to the landing, as was also the case with the dressing-room. That night I perfectly recall lying back on my pillow with a resolute but half doubtful and amused determination to make Miss Thompson see me. The candle was burning on a chair at the side of my bed, and I heard only the ticking of the clock in my room as I ‘willed’ with all my might to appear to her. After a few minutes I felt dizzy and only half conscious.

“I don’t know how long this state may have lasted, but I do remember emerging into a conscious state and thinking I had better leave off, as the strain had exhausted me.

“I gave up, and changing into an easy position I thought I had failed and needlessly fatigued myself for an impossible fancy. I blew out my candle; at the instant I was startled by hearing an indistinct sound from the next room. It was Miss Thompson’s voice raised slightly, but I could not distinguish more than the actual sound, which was repeated, and then there was silence. I wondered whether she had had a bad dream, and listened a short time, but did not seriously imagine that it was more than an accidental coincidence. Soon after my clock struck 2 (a.m.) and I fell asleep.

¹ Mr. Kirk enclosed the piece of blotting-paper with the note.

“Next morning I noticed that Miss Thompson looked rather tired at breakfast, but I asked no questions. Presently she said, ‘Had I gone into her room to frighten her during the night?’ I said I had not left my room. She declared that I seemed to her to come in and bend over her. From what she said I concluded it must have been between 1 and 2 a.m. Her own account is in the possession of the Psychological Society. All I have to add is, that I was in my ordinary state of health, and not at all excited, but merely bent on trying an experiment.”

In a letter accompanying this, Miss Maughan says:—

“I can’t find the fact noticed in my diary for 1888. I only keep a very tiny one, just for the sake of entering letters, &c., and have no allusions to what happens as a rule. I fancy, though, that it was on the night of September 10th. Does Miss Thompson give any exact date? for if it approximates to that, it would be the correct one. I know it was just at that time, because it was during her last visit at this house.”

Miss Thompson writes:—

The Chimes, Grove Park, Chiswick, *December 30th, 1889.*

“During the summer of 1888 (end of August) I was staying with the Miss Maughans in Lincolnshire. We were interested in Theosophy, and had been discussing the phenomena of people leaving their bodies and appearing in their astral forms. I am not a good sleeper, but not at all of a nervous temperament. I stayed awake one night until two or three. I was perfectly wide awake, when suddenly I saw Miss Edith Maughan standing by my bedside in her ordinary dark dressing-gown. The moonlight came in at the window sufficiently for me to distinguish her face clearly, and her figure partially. I sat up in bed, and said, rather crossly, ‘What do you want here, Edith?’ I thought she had come for some joke. As she didn’t answer, I *immediately* struck a light, but she was gone. It is a mistake that I screamed out. I may have spoken sufficiently loudly to be heard in the next room. I thought she had got out of the room with astonishing rapidity, but I didn’t trouble much about it. The next morning I asked why she came into my room. She denied having done so, but said she had thought of coming, but that as it might disturb me she decided not. She said she sat up in bed, and for the sake of something to do was willing herself to go out of her body and come to me, and mentioned about the time I saw her. Although it is more than a year ago, I remember the incident clearly, as it made a distinct impression upon me.

“ETHEL THOMPSON.”

Mrs. Sidgwick has talked over this experience with Miss Maughan and Miss Thompson separately, and questioned them specially as to the possibility that Miss Maughan had really gone into Miss Thompson’s room unconsciously. They were both quite certain that she had not done so, Miss Thompson dwelling on the impossible rapidity of the disappearance, and Miss Maughan on the fact that, when she roused herself, she was lying in the same position as before—hands clasped and feet crossed in a special manner, which, she had been told, is adopted by Eastern people wishing to concentrate themselves on anything, and which she adopted deliberately on this account.

It is interesting that Miss Maughan has appeared, but unintentionally, on other occasions to other percipients, while one of her sisters was the agent in No. 105. 1 (see p. 291). The following is an account of another of Miss Maughan's appearances.

[Extract from letter received by Miss Maughan on March 12th from Miss Gatty. The original letter is in our possession.]

Holbein House, Sloane-square, S.W., *Wednesday, March 11th, 1891.*

“I wonder whether you have been experimenting psychically, or if it be a mere curious coincidence that I should have had a distinct vision of you last night.

“The facts are these. Being very seedy yesterday—writing to you probably tired me a good deal, and feeling very helpless where you were concerned distressed me more than a little—I went off to [bed] at about 8 o'clock. I read for an hour or thereabouts, and then fell asleep. I woke again when mother passed through to go to her own room, and several times in the night after dreaming in an unexciting fashion. Then I lay awake for some time, and thought about a Roman Catholic I know, etc.

“A little while after, I don't know what it was that made me turn my head towards one special corner of the room, where I saw you standing (in a nightdress trimmed with Swiss embroidery), in a most ill-balanced posture. So much did this strike me that I got out of bed (the cold of the floor was excessive), and went to catch you, so that you might not fall over on your face. You remained there until I had made the motion of touching, when I found nothing there any longer. This is all, except that you looked as if you had candlelight or some faintly perceptible yellowishness behind you. I went back to bed, and, not liking to disturb mother by asking her the time, I listened for the chimes, and shortly after heard four strike. Of course I didn't go to sleep again, but lighted my candle and read until day dawned. At breakfast I told mother, who accounts for everything by the word ‘sommambulism,’ but says she heard me moving about. I am perfectly convinced of my wakefulness, but in any case, as I am unused to sleep-walking, that would be strange enough in itself to make me wonder if there should be any cause for it beyond my subjective reason of anxiety about you. The time is the most curious part, is it not? “E. K. G.”

Miss Maughan writes:—

East Kirkby Vicarage, Spilsby, Lincolnshire, *May 21st, 1891.*

“I left W——, in Derbyshire, on March 10th, and arrived at Collingham, in Nottinghamshire, about 3 p.m. I was not alone, or able in any way to give my attention to any one subject until nearly midnight, when I went to bed. During the whole evening, though I had been busy hearing and giving news of mutual interest, I had experienced a sort of ‘undertone’ of thought about my friend E. G. [Miss Gatty]. I had only once spoken of her incidentally during the evening, but I felt my mind revert to her in a general way for a few moments several times. When I got to bed I lay awake and thought of her again. Why, I did not really know. I had heard from her the day before, saying she was not well, but that was not specially in my

mind, as I did not suppose she was more than temporarily indisposed. I remember wondering at the time why she was so present to my mind, as I had a great many things to think of that day totally apart from any connection with her.

“I fell asleep at last, to wake up suddenly. It must have been after 3 a.m., as the fire had burnt very low—almost out.

“During the short time I lay awake I remember clearly that the thought of E. G. returned strongly to my mind. I felt an instinctive turning towards her for the mental sympathy certain circumstances might render me in need of, and I felt with a sort of flash that she would be better able to understand what I wanted than any friend I had. I know I dwelt on this with strengthening confidence until I fell asleep.

“I had not been dreaming consciously of anything: I merely woke up, thought of E. G., and mentally claimed her sympathy, but *with no intention whatever* of trying to influence her in any possible way. The whole attitude of my mind was unconscious and involuntary, and, but for the letter I received from her on the 12th, I should have attached no importance to the matter.

“EDITH MAUGHAN.”

On another occasion, in 1886 or 1887, Miss Maughan was staying in the house of Mr. T. [assumed initial], and Mrs. T. one evening thought she saw her for a moment standing in the doorway when she was really in another room. Mr. and Mrs. T. together also saw her later on the same day going downstairs into a room. They followed, and found the room empty, Miss Maughan having gone to bed.

Miss Maughan herself says of this case:—

“The being seen by Mr. T. is not so positive to my mind. I was very ill at the time, and any mistaken impression must rest upon his shoulders. I have argued the possibility of my being seen in *reality*, but he and his wife appear convinced. I can't be sure about it myself.”

Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

June 26th, 1891.

“I saw Miss Edith Maughan, and also Mrs. T., with whom she is staying, this afternoon. In the case where Mr. and Mrs. T. were the percipients, Miss Maughan was simply sitting in the drawing-room, wishing that Mr. T. would consent to her going home, because she felt so ill. Mr. and Mrs. T. were in the passage talking. Mr. T. said he had forgotten to say good-night to Miss Maughan. Mrs. T. said, ‘I think she has gone upstairs.’ He replied, ‘No, I saw her go into the study.’ Mrs. T. said, ‘Oh, I think I did too’; and they went to look, and she was not there. I did not gather that the figure was very clearly seen in this case. It was more distinct on the other occasion, which occurred on the same afternoon, when Mrs. T. saw Miss Maughan looking over the shoulder of a man to whom she (Mrs. T.) was talking in the dining-room.

“As to the appearance to Miss Gatty, Miss Maughan is quite sure that she did think of her in a special way, as the person who would be able to help her in an anticipated difficulty. This suddenly occurred to her in the middle of the night. It appears that Miss Gatty was troubled about Miss Maughan, wishing she could help her in her difficulty. Miss Maughan told

me that she had written to Miss Gatty about this difficulty, and begged her to write to her often while it lasted. Miss Maughan is not sure whether the embroidery seen on the apparition by Miss Gatty was of the kind that she was wearing then."

The tactile experience referred to on p. 270 occurred in an experiment which—as the percipient, Miss C. M. Campbell, says—cannot be called a success. Her friend, Miss Despard, had agreed to try to appear to her, without fixing the days beforehand; and it is remarkable that a sense of presence, and in one case a soft touch as if some one were stroking her hair, were felt by Miss Campbell on the only two nights on which Miss Despard made the attempt; but that was all that occurred. The letters and notes relating to the experiments have been submitted to us.

A seemingly telepathic visual experience of Miss Campbell's has been printed in Chapter IV., p. 85. (See also *Proceedings S. P. R.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 314 and 324). She has also carried out some other successful experiments in thought-transference with Miss Despard, an account of which was printed in the *Journal S. P. R.*, January, 1893.

The experiment in which the auditory hallucination occurred was of an entirely different kind. It is as follows:—

(78. 14.)

From Mrs. Raines.

(The account was written in 1889.)

46, Sussex-gardens, Hyde Park, W.

"At 20 minutes to 11 on the night when Mr. Irving Bishop took up Mr. Labouchere's challenge to read the number of a note enclosed in an envelope, I heard my husband's voice say, quite loud and distinctly, 'He has read the number of the note.' It was so distinct that for a moment I could not believe he was not in the room. My next thought was to ascertain the exact time. I was in our own dining-room.

"I was working, and expecting my husband's return, he having gone to the séance. I had asked him to try and will me to know if the note was read, and he said the trial would take place from about 9.30 to 10 o'clock. So at that hour I fixed my mind intently on the subject, but as there was no result I gave up trying, and was not thinking of the note when I heard the voice. When he did return his first words were, 'Well, he read the number of the note, and it was exactly 20 minutes to 11 when he read it.' He afterwards told me he was one of the committee chosen to sit on the platform, and see fair play.

"It was my husband's voice, and I believed him to be on his way home at the time I heard it.

"I was quite alone.

"I did not make any notes, as the experiment was only attempted out of curiosity, and the intimation reaching me so much later than I expected, made me believe at the time that it had failed.

"KATE RAINES."

General Raines writes:—

46, Sussex-gardens, Hyde Park, November 4th, 1889.

“DEAR SIR,—Mrs. Raines has handed to me your letter of the 15th October, in which you ask if I can at all contribute to the account she wrote you of the night of the thought-reading by Mr. Bishop of the bank-note.

“Yes, I quite remember being one of the chosen from the audience to form the committee on the stage at St. James’s Hall, to see fair play. Mrs. Raines had asked me to try and will that she at home should know the result before I returned, and I said the note will probably be read about 10 o’clock, but owing to many things that took place on the stage the actual time was 20 minutes to 11 o’clock. I quite remember coming home at about a quarter to 12, and on my entering the dining-room she at once said, ‘Mr. Bishop has read the note,’ and narrated how she had heard my voice telling her that Mr. B. had done so.

“JULIUS RAINES.”

Mr. Podmore writes:—

November 25th, 1891.

“I called on General and Mrs. Raines to-day. They could add nothing further to the story; except that Mrs. Raines told me that, in the Irving Bishop case, she went out into the hall, after hearing the voice, in order to note the time by the clock there. The voice sounded quite real and lifelike. The incident occurred about 6 or 7 years ago, they think. Mrs. Raines added accounts of two prophetic dreams, fulfilled; both of which accounts General Raines, to whom the dreams were told before fulfilment, corroborated.”

The arrangement made beforehand in this case may have had some influence in inducing the hallucination, which, it will be observed, however, conveyed the correct one of the two possible alternatives, and gave this information at the right time, and after the percipient had given up expecting it.

Hallucinations Coinciding with Illness and Accidents.

In the next set of cases to be considered, the hallucination occurs during a sudden or serious illness of the supposed agent, which was unknown to the percipient. There are eleven cases of recognised apparitions under these circumstances, and three of recognised voices, also three cases in which the voice was not recognised.¹ The following four cases,—together with one already published in *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. II., p. 526, No. 572),—are, we think, those in which the evidence for a telepathic origin is the best. Mrs. McAlpine, the percipient in the first case, belongs to a small but interesting class of percipients who have had several experiences, all of which they believe to have been veridical. Only three of hers have, however, been

¹ In 9 out of these 17 cases, the illness ended fatally; in 4 cases the patient recovered, and in the remaining 4 cases it is not stated whether he did so or not.

communicated to us; the remainder being, we understand, of too intimate a nature to be communicated to strangers.

(458. 9.)

From Mrs. McAlpine.

(The following account was enclosed in a letter, dated April 12th, 1892. We had previously received a somewhat briefer account, dated May 7th, 1891, which agrees in all essential particulars with the one printed below.)

Garscadden, Bearsden, Glasgow.

“On the 25th March, 1891, my husband and I were staying at Furness Abbey Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness, with a friend of ours, the late Mr. A. D. Bryce Douglas, of Seafield Tower, Ardrossan. He was managing director of the ‘Naval Construction and Armaments Company,’ and had resided at Furness Abbey Hotel for some eighteen months or more. He had invited us, along with a number of other friends, to the launch of the *Empress of China*. We breakfasted with Mr. Bryce Douglas on the day of the launch, the 25th, and afterwards saw the launch, had luncheon at the shipyard, and returned to the hotel. He appeared to be in his usual health and spirits (he was a powerfully-built man, and justly proud of his fine constitution). The following day (Thursday) he left with a party of gentlemen, to sail from Liverpool to Ardrossan, on the trial trip of the *Empress of Japan* (another large steamer which had been built at his yard).

“We remained on at the hotel for some days with our son Bob, aged 23, who was staying there, superintending work which Mr. McAlpine was carrying on at Barrow.

“On the Monday night, the 30th, I went upstairs after dinner. On my way down again I saw Mr. Bryce Douglas, standing in the doorway of his sitting-room. I saw him quite distinctly. He looked at me with a sad expression. He was wearing a cap which I had never seen him wear. I walked on and left him standing there. It was then about ten minutes to eight. I told my husband and Bob. We all felt alarmed, and we immediately sent the following telegram, ‘How is Mr. Bryce Douglas?’ to Miss Caldwell, his sister-in-law, who kept house for him at Seafield. It was too late for a reply that night. On Tuesday morning we received a wire from her; it ran thus: ‘Mr. Bryce Douglas dangerously ill.’ That telegram was the first intimation of his illness which reached Barrow. As will be seen in the account of his illness and death in the *Barrow News*, he died on the following Sunday, and we afterwards ascertained from Miss Caldwell that he was unconscious on Monday evening, at the time I saw him.

“My husband and [step] son can corroborate this, and I have also letters which bear out my statements.”

In her earlier account Mrs. McAlpine states that she “was in good health, and in no grief or anxiety whatever.” Her age was 26.

Mrs. McAlpine enclosed a copy of the *Barrow News* for April 11th, 1891, containing a memoir of Mr. Bryce Douglas, and a full account of his last illness and death. It appears from this account that he left Barrow on Thursday, March 26th, to join the steamer *Empress of Japan*. He was noticed by his friends to be far from well on Wednesday, the previous day, on the occasion of the launch of the *Empress of China*, and was advised to go home. He did not do so, however, until the Sunday, when he was put

ashore at Ardrossan, and walked home to Seafield—a distance of nearly two miles. His medical man was sent for the same day, and the case was considered serious from the first, and on the following Thursday the doctors pronounced it hopeless. He died on April 5th, at about 5 a.m.

From the evidence which follows it seems clear that if any anxiety as to his health was felt before he left Barrow, as suggested in the newspaper report, Mrs. McAlpine knew nothing of it.

Mr. Myers writes:—

“I discussed the incident connected with the death of Mr. Bryce Douglas with Mr. and Mrs. McAlpine and Mr. McAlpine, jun., on February 24th, 1892. I believe that their evidence has been very carefully given. Mr. McAlpine knew Mr. Bryce Douglas intimately. Mr. Bryce Douglas was a robust and vigorous man, and disliked ever to be supposed to be ill. Mr. McAlpine therefore felt great unwillingness to telegraph to him about his health, but from his previous knowledge of phenomena occurring to Mrs. McAlpine, he felt sure that her vision must be in some sense veridical.”

Mrs. McAlpine's husband and his son corroborate as follows:—

April, 1892.

“I was at Barrow on the 25th of March of last year (1891), and distinctly remember the incident of the following Monday night. I can bear testimony to the statements made by my wife and son.

“ROBERT MCALPINE.”

Garseadden House, April 4th, 1892.

“I was living for several months in the Furness Abbey Hotel, at Barrow-in-Furness, and I remember father and mother coming for a few days in order to see the launch of the *Empress of China* on the 25th of March, 1891, and on the following day (Thursday) Mr. Bryce Douglas (who was then in his usual health) left with a party of friends on the trial trip of the *Empress of Japan*. I also distinctly remember that the following Monday night (30th) my father and I were sitting at the drawing-room fire after dinner, and mother came in looking very pale and startled, and said she had been upstairs and had seen Mr. Bryce Douglas standing at the door of his sitting-room (he had used this sitting-room for nearly two years). Both my father and I felt anxious, and after some discussion we sent a telegram to Mr. Bryce Douglas's residence at Ardrossan asking how he was, and the following morning had the reply, ‘Keeping better, but not out of danger,’ or words to that effect. I can assert positively that no one in Barrow knew of his illness until after the receipt of that telegram.

“ROBERT MCALPINE, JUN.”

Mrs. McAlpine wrote to some of the persons who knew of the circumstances at the time, asking for their recollections of them, and the letters that follow were sent by her to us in their original envelopes.

1. From Miss Caldwell, sister-in-law of Mr. Bryce-Douglas:—

[Post-mark, *February 8th, 1892.*]

“ . . . I can remember perfectly well the [telegram] you sent on Monday, the 30th of March, the day after [Mr. Bryce Douglas] arrived

home, and I was very much surprised at receiving it, as I did not think anyone knew he was so ill; but I remembered afterwards that you and Mr. McAlpine were at the launch of the *Empress of China*, and Mr. Bryce Douglas was rather complaining at that time, so I thought you would want to know if he was better. The contents of the telegram were—as far as I can remember—‘Kindly let us know if Mr. Bryce is better.’”

2. From Miss Charlton, daughter of Mr. Charlton, of Barrow-in-Furness. (Mr. and Mrs. McAlpine and their son had spent the Sunday, March 29th, at the house of Mr. Charlton, who was also a personal friend of Mr. Bryce Douglas).

February 15th, 1892.

“ . . . [My father] says I am to tell you that he can quite bear out all you have said—indeed, we all can, for on the Sunday you were here, we were all quite unconscious of the fact that Mr. Douglas was ill. Indeed, it was not until the Tuesday after (Easter Tuesday) that father heard by telegram—his first intimation—which ran as follows:—‘I have been very ill,’ &c. We also did hear of what you saw at the hotel . . . and we thought it a very singular coincidence at the time.”

Mrs. Scarlett, the wife of the proprietor of the Furness Abbey Hotel, also confirms the sending of the telegram.

Of the other two experiences communicated to us by Mrs. McAlpine, one is the following death-coincidence, which, however, we have not counted in Chapter XII., because of her unenumerated experiences, all of which, as has been said, she believes to have been telepathic.

April 30th, 1892.

“I remember my brother, who lived some six miles from us, writing a postcard to mamma, saying, ‘Come up to see us to-day, the children have colds,’ or some such words, not indicating anything serious, or any particular child. We were not alarmed, but mamma drove to see them about 1 o’clock in the day. At 6 o’clock I was crossing the hall and saw, as in a cloud, the baby (aged about 6 months) lying dead. I looked at the clock and told a servant, who was the only other person in the house, that the child was dead. She was shocked, and asked if I had had a telegram. I told her what I had seen. Next morning I had a letter from mamma telling me that the baby had died at 6 o’clock the previous evening. She remembers the occurrence, and can give the exact date, which I have forgotten.”

The letter printed below, to Mrs. McAlpine from her mother, corroborates both the incidents already described:—

February 8th, 1892.

“I remember perfectly that you wrote me from Barrow—from the Furness Abbey Hotel—saying you had had a bad shock, that you were passing along a corridor and you saw Mr. Bryce Douglas in his room, standing and looking at you—knowing that he had left early in the day (it was then evening) you were alarmed and got your husband to wire an inquiry about his friend—that the reply was ‘He is very ill.’ You wrote that letter the morning after the appearance.

“I also remember very clearly about your brother Ben’s little child. You and I only were at home here. I got a note asking me to go to his

house, as the little ones had colds and their mother was anxious, but there was nothing to cause you to expect bad news. I went, and the poor baby was dying when I arrived, and at 6 o'clock was dead. At that exact time you told the maid that the doctor's baby was dead. She knew the hour, she told me long afterwards, because you told her to look at the clock. When I got home, in a few days, I asked you, 'Were you shocked when the messenger came saying the poor little baby was dead?' You replied, 'Oh, no; I knew at the time it died.' And either then or soon after you said, 'I saw it.'

With regard to the exact date of the baby's death, Mrs. McAlpine wrote again later to her mother, and received the following reply:—

October, 1893.

“[The baby] died on Saturday, April 6th, 1888. . . I have never forgotten the very strange circumstance of how you told me when I got home that you saw the poor little child, the time being exactly when she died. You did not know previously that she was seriously ill.”

For another of Mrs. McAlpine's experiences, see p. 332.

The following has already been referred to as one of the rare cases in which a note of the phenomenon was not only taken at the time but preserved. Here, as will be seen, the apparition occurs within the last 32 hours of a brief fatal illness of which the percipient had no knowledge.

(660. 6.)

From Miss Hervey,
9, Tavistock Crescent, W., *April 28th, 1892.*

“I saw the figure of my cousin (a nurse in Dublin) coming upstairs, dressed in grey. I was in Tasmania, and the time that I saw her was between 6 and 7 p.m. on April 21st, 1888.

“I had just come in from a ride and was in the best of health and spirits. I was between 31 and 32 years of age.

“I had lived with my cousin, and we were the greatest of friends, but my going to Tasmania in 1887 had, of course, separated us. She was a nurse, and at the time I saw her in April, 1888, she was dying of typhus fever, a fact unknown to me till 6 weeks after her death. Her illness lasted only 5 days, and I heard of her death at the same time as of her illness.

“There was no one present with me at the time, but I narrated what I had seen to the friend with whom I was living, and asked why my cousin, Ethel B., should have been dressed in grey. My friend said that was the dress of the nurses in that particular hospital; a fact unknown to me.

“The impression of seeing my cousin was so vivid that I wrote a long letter to her that night, saying I had had this vision. The letter, arriving after she was dead, was returned to me and I destroyed it.”

“ROSE B. E. I. HERVEY.”

Mr. Podmore writes:—

July 21st, 1892.

“I called on Miss Hervey to-day. She was staying at the time of her experience with Lady H. Miss Hervey and Lady H. had just returned

from a drive, and Miss Hervey was leaving her room to cross the upper landing to Lady H.'s room to have tea. On passing the stairs she saw the figure coming up. She recognised it at once and ran away to Lady H., without waiting to see the figure disappear, and told her what she had seen. Lady H. laughed at her, but told her to note it in her diary. This Miss Hervey did. I saw the entry :—'Saturday, April 21st, 1888, 6 p.m. Vision of [nickname given] on landing in grey dress.' The news of death did not arrive till June. Date of death, April 22nd, 1888, at 4.30 p.m."

We have seen a copy, retained by Miss Hervey, of a letter giving an account of Miss Ethel B.'s death. It was written on the evening of Sunday, April 22nd, 1888. The letter speaks of Miss B. having been "so heavy with fever all through." The crisis of the illness began at 4 a.m. on the 22nd. About 10 she got a change decidedly for the worse, and lingered on till half past four, when she died. Miss B.'s relations were unable to be with her.

The difference of time between Tasmania and Dublin is about 10 hours, so that the apparition preceded the death by about thirty-two hours.

We have examined a pattern of the material used for the nurses' dress at the hospital where Miss B. was. It is of cotton, with a sort of check pattern of white and dark navy blue and a little red: it has a greyish tone at a little distance, but the coincidence in respect of colour is not marked enough to be of any value.

We wrote to Lady H. asking for her recollections of the matter, and received the following reply.

July 30th, 1893.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter dated April 6th has followed me back to England, and I should have answered it a week or two sooner, but I thought my son from Tasmania might be able to throw some light on your search for a definite corroboration of Miss Hervey's account of an apparition which she tells you she saw when in Tasmania with us in 1888. He, however, can do little more than I can for its confirmation. He recollects that Miss Hervey made such a statement at the time, and I seem to remember something about it, but nothing really definite."

Miss Hervey has had one other apparently veridical vision. As a girl of 14 at school, she saw an angel (like the angel in the picture called "The Reaper and the Flowers," with which she was familiar) carrying one of her schoolfellows in his arms. The vision is believed to have coincided with the death, but the child was known to be dying, and no corroboration is now obtainable. Miss Hervey has had no other visual hallucinations, but several auditory ones, two of which were *primâ facie* veridical. She does not, however, attach much importance to these.

In the next case the apparition preceded the death by two days; but it will be observed that the final stage of the decedent's illness had lasted more than three months. The case is curious in more ways than one. It has already been referred to in Chapter VI., p. 128, as an instance of deferred recognition, and in the present Chapter, p. 265, as a case of a telepathic impulse seeming, so to speak, to have missed its mark and affected the wrong person; and we shall have to

refer to it again (see Chapter XVII.) as an instance of a compact to appear after death if possible.

(402. 8.) From Countess Eugénie Kapnist.

June 24th, 1891.

“ A Talta, en Février, 1889, nous fimes la conaissance de M. P. et de sa femme, passant la soirée chez des amis communs qui avaient tenu à nous réunir. A cette époque, M. P. souffrait déjà d'une phthisie assez avancée ; il venait de perdre, à Pétersbourg, son frère, atteint de la même maladie. On pria ma sœur de faire un peu de musique, et elle choisit au hasard le Prélude de Mendelssohn. A mon étonnement je vis M. P., que nous ne conaissions que de ce soir, aller, très émotonné, prendre place auprès du piano, et suivre avec une espèce d'anxiété le jeu de ma sœur. Lorsqu'elle eut fini, il dit que pour quelques instants elle venait de faire ressusciter son frère, exécutant absolument de la même manière ce morceau, qu'il jouait fréquemment. Depuis, en voyant ma sœur, il aimait particulièrement à causer avec elle. Je puis certifier ainsi qu'elle eut une conversation que nous eûmes à une soirée, au mois de Mars. Nous parlions de la mort, chose fréquente à Talta, toujours peuplée de malades :—' Savez-vous,' disait-il à ma sœur, ' il me semble toujours que mon esprit est très proche du vôtre ; j'ai la certitude de vous avoir déjà connue ; nous avons dans la réalité une preuve que ce n'est pas en ce monde—ce sera que je vous aurais vue durant quelqu'autre vie précédente' (il était un peu spirite). ' Ainsi donc, si je meurs avant vous, ce qui est bien probable, vu ma maladie, je reviendrai vers vous, si cela m'est possible, et je vous apparaîtrai de façon à ne pas vous effrayer désagréablement.' Ma sœur lui répondit, prenant la chose très au sérieux, qu'elle lui rendrait la pareille si elle mourait la première, et j'étais témoin de cette promesse mutuelle.

“ Néanmoins nous fimes à peine conaissance de maison ; nous nous rencontrions parfois chez des amis communs, et nous le voyions souvent se promener sur le quai dans un paletot couleur noisette qui excitait notre hilarité et qui nous resta dans la mémoire je ne sais plus pourquoi. Au mois de Mai, nous partions de Talta, et depuis nous eûmes tant d'impressions diverses, nous vîmes tant de monde, que jusqu'à l'hiver suivant nous oubliâmes complètement M. P. et sa femme, qui représentaient pour nous des conaissances comme on en a par centaines dans la vie.

“ Nous étions à Pétersbourg. Le 11 Mars, e'était un lundi de Carême en 1890, nous allâmes au théâtre voir une représentation de la troupe des Meiningner. Je crois qu'on donnait *Le Marchand de Venise*. Mlle. B. était avec nous, venue de Tsarskoé à cette occasion. La pièce terminée, nous n'eûmes que le temps de rentrer à la maison changer de toilette, après quoi nous accompagnâmes Mlle. B. à la gare. Elle partait avec le dernier train, qui quitte pour Tsarskoé Sélo à 1 heure de la nuit. Nous l'installâmes en wagon, et ne l'y laissâmes qu'après la seconde cloche de départ.

“ Notre domestique allait bien en avant de nous, afin de retrouver notre voiture, de manière que, gagnant le perron, nous la trouvâmes avancée qui nous attendait. Ma sœur s'assit la première ; moi je la fis attendre, descendant plus doucement les marches de l'escalier ; le domestique tenait la portière du landau ouverte. Je montai à demi, sur le marche-pied, et

soudain je m'arrêtai dans cette pose, tellement surprise que je ne compris plus ce qui m'arrivait. Il faisait sombre dans la voiture, et pourtant en face de ma sœur, la regardant, je vis dans un petit jour gris qu'on eut dit factice, s'éclaircissant vers le point qui attachait le plus mes yeux, une figure à la silhouette émoussée, diaphane, plutôt qu'indécise. Cette vision dura un instant, pendant lequel, pourtant, mes yeux prirent connaissance des moindres détails de ce visage, qui me sembla connu : des traits assez pointus, une raie un peu de côté, un nez prononcé, un menton très maigre à barbe rare et d'un blond foncé. Ce qui me frappe, lorsque j'y pense à présent, c'est d'avoir vu les différentes couleurs, malgré que la hueur grisâtre, qui éclairait à peine l'inconnu, eut été insuffisante pour les distinguer dans un cas normal. Il était sans chapeau, et en même temps dans un paletot comme on en porte au sud—de couleur plutôt claire—noisette. Toute sa personne avait un cachet de grande fatigue et de maigreur.

“ Le domestique, très étonné de ne pas me voir monter, arrêtée ainsi sur le marchepied, crut que j'avais marché dans ma robe et m'aida à m'asseoir, pendant que je demandais à ma sœur, en prenant place à côté d'elle, si c'était bien notre voiture ? A tel point j'avais perdu la tête, ayant senti un vrai engourdissement de cerveau en voyant cet étranger installé en face d'elle, je ne m'étais pas rendu compte que, dans le cas d'une présence réelle d'un semblable vis-à-vis, ni ma sœur, ni le valet de pied ne resteraient si calmement à l'envisager. Lorsque je fus assise, je ne vis plus rien, et je demandais à ma sœur :—‘ N'as-tu rien vu en face de toi ? ’ ‘ Rien du tout, et quelle idée as-tu eue de demander, en entrant dans la voiture, si c'était bien la nôtre ? ’ répondit-elle en riant. Alors, je lui racontais tout ce qui précède, décrivant minutieusement ma vision. ‘ Quelle figure connue, ’ disait-elle, ‘ et à paletot noisesette, cette raie de côté, où donc l'avons nous vue ? Pourtant nul ne ressemble ici à ta description ; ’ et nous nous creusions la tête sans rien trouver. Rentrées à la maison, nous racontâmes ce fait à notre mère ; ma description la fit aussi souvenir vaguement d'un visage analogue. Le lendemain soir (12 Mars) un jeune homme de notre connaissance, M. M. S., vint nous voir. Je lui répétais aussi l'incident qui nous était arrivé. Nous en parlâmes beaucoup, mais inutilement ; je ne pouvais toujours pas appliquer le nom voulu à la personnalité de ma vision, tout en me souvenant fort bien avoir vu un visage tout pareil parmi mes nombreuses connaissances ; mais où et à quelle époque ? Je ne me souvenais de rien, avec ma mauvaise mémoire qui me fait souvent défaut, à ce sujet. Quelques jours plus tard, nous étions chez la grandmère de M. M. S. :—‘ Savez vous, ’ nous dit-elle, ‘ quelle triste nouvelle je viens de recevoir de Talta ? M. P. vient de mourir, mais on ne me donne pas de détails. ’ Ma sœur et moi, nous nous regardâmes. A ce nom, la figure pointue et le paletot noisesette retrouvèrent leur possesseur. Ma sœur reconnut en même temps que moi, grâce à ma description précise. Lorsque M. M. S. entra, je le priai de chercher dans les vieux journaux la date exacte de cette mort. Le décès était marqué au 14 du mois de Mars, donc, deux jours *après* la vision que j'avais eue. J'écrivis à Talta pour avoir des renseignements. On me répondit qu'il gardait le lit depuis le 24 Novembre et qu'il avait été depuis dans un état de faiblesse extrême, mais le sommeil ne l'avait point quitté ; il dormait si longtemps et si profondément, même durant les dernières nuits de son existence, que cela faisait espérer une

amélioration. Nous nous étonnions de ce que j'aie vu M. P., malgré sa promesse de se montrer à ma sœur. Mais je dois ajouter ici qu'avant le fait décrit ci-dessus, j'avais été voyante un certain nombre de fois, mais cette vision est bien celle que j'ai distinguée le plus nettement, avec des détails minutieux, et avec les teintes diverses du visage humain, et même du vêtement.

“ COMTESSE EUGÉNIE KAPNIST.

“ COMTESSE INA KAPNIST.”

The second signature is that of the sister who was present at the time.

Mr. Michael Petrovo-Solovovo, the collector, writes :—

“ I have much pleasure in certifying that the fact of Countess Kapnist's vision was mentioned, among others, to myself before the news of Mr. P.'s death came to Petersburg. I well remember seeing an announcement of his demise in the papers.”

In the following case the hallucination occurred within 36 hours of the death. The percipient withholds her name from publication for reasons which seem to us adequate.

(555. 5.)

From Miss A. O.

January 21st, 1892.

“ In the autumn of 1880 I was living in a farm house among the Cheviot hills, having gone there with some younger members of the family, quietness being desirable at home, owing to the illness of a near relative. The house being a small one, I occupied a bedroom which communicated with a sitting room on the upper storey, and, being some way from the other sleeping rooms, it was my habit to keep a lamp burning during the entire night. On the 29th of September I retired as usual in the best possible health and spirits, quite unaware of the then critical state of my relative, and had just got into bed, with face turned towards the wall, when I became aware of another presence in the room.

“ Turning towards the door of communication, I there saw, as I imagined, my relative who was ill, standing looking at me and smiling. He was dressed as I had been accustomed to see him ; the light was bright, and I observed every detail. I lay for a few seconds and then spoke, but getting no answer, jumped out of bed with hands outstretched towards the figure, which, on my approach, retreated to the outer room still smiling with peculiar sweetness. I followed it, and watched it vanish through the outer door, which was closed. After a moment's pause I opened the door and looked out, but saw nothing but a bare passage and narrow staircase, dimly lit from the room in which I stood. I was not afraid, only wondering, for though we had been in the habit of telling 'ghost' stories, it did not strike me at the time to associate this with anything of the kind.

“ On the following morning I told the other members of the family of my experience, and somebody suggested that it was just possible that the bright light at that hour might have alarmed the man who had care of the house, an old servant, and that he might have come upstairs to see that all was safe.

Though personally quite sure of the identity of the apparition, I made inquiries, and found that there was no foundation for the suggestion.

“My relative died the following night.

“On relating this experience some years later to a cousin, she owned to having seen the same apparition on the same night as it appeared to me. She herself was then recovering from a long indisposition, but her intellect was clear and her nerves steady. Her husband distinctly recollects being told by her at the time of what she had seen. She was not afraid, her feeling was one of gratitude. I may add that the above is her only experience of the kind.”

In answer to our enquiries, Miss O. wrote :—

January 28th [1892].

“My cousin was not in the same house as myself at the time. I am not sure of her address, but know for certain that she was not within 50 miles of it. The apparition appeared to her, I imagine, at a later hour than it did to me. We were young [Miss O. was 15 at the time], and went early to bed ; I should think, a good deal earlier than was her habit ; also, if I recollect rightly, she had been asleep previously. I do not correspond with her. . . . [I] will try to obtain her written testimony, but have little hope of succeeding. I made no note of the occurrence, but know for certain that my relative’s illness terminated fatally on the 30th of September, 1880. It is, however, possible that his death may have occurred in the early morning hours of the 30th, which would cause my experience to have been on the 28th—not 29th, as previously stated. I am quite sure of the date of the death, and have consulted the county papers which contained obituary notices. The relative was my father.”

The following corroborative note was received from Miss O’s sister :—

January 28th, 1892.

“I distinctly recollect on the morning of September 30th (or 29th), 1880, being told by my sister of her experience of the previous night,—before the termination of our relative’s illness.

“K.O.”

It will be noticed that in the three cases of apparitions coinciding with illness first quoted, and very possibly in the last, the agent was in a comatose state. In this respect, these cases contrast strongly with some other cases of coincidence with illness in our collection,—notably with No. 34. 20, quoted below, in which the agent is at the moment in a state of very active consciousness, in acute pain and feeling a vivid desire for the help of the percipient.

Parenthetically we may remark here that, if we are right in believing that a certain number of the hallucinations described as occurring within 12 hours of death were not really so closely coincidental, some of them may still have been coincident with fatal illness—like those we have just been describing,—or may have occurred after death, the death being unknown (see Chapter XVII.). For instance, the following case is counted as a death-coincidence, because the percipient

believed—perhaps rightly—that it was so; but she also believes that it occurred on a Sunday, because she remembers going to church on the same day, and that the death took place on the 8th of the month, which we find was a Wednesday. It appears, therefore, that her memory is at fault somewhere. Possibly she went to church on a Wednesday, or possibly the apparition occurred either during the fatal illness or after the death. But in any case a coincidence remains, since it occurred when the family were still unaware that there was anything wrong.

(460. 1.)

From Miss H. L. H.

July 4th, 1890.

“I was in Staffordshire, and on the night of August 7th, 1877, retired to rest between eleven and twelve, but I could not sleep. About two, as near as I can remember, while still awake, a strange feeling came over me, as if I was not alone, and sitting up to look, two scenes came vividly before me; in the first, I saw my dear brother (who, as I believed, was far away in Bangkok) lying at the foot of my bed, dying. I remember I cried out, ‘No one there who loves him, and no last message.’ Then I saw a coffin in the same place, and felt he was dead. [I was] in good health. [Age] over 20.

“In December we heard that my brother had died in hospital at Singapore on his way home, unconscious, and with no one there who knew him. At the time I had this vision we were not aware of my brother’s illness.”

The collector, Mr. G. R. Farncombe, says:—

“Miss H. assured me that her experience took place on the day of her brother’s death, but the exact hour of this she did not know. Whether she had an independent recollection of the date I cannot say.”

In answer to the question whether she had ever experienced any other hallucinations, Miss H. writes:—

“On two occasions I have heard the voice of my father calling me by name, once before and once after his death. In the last [case] I appeared to see him as he stood by me at night.”

Professor Sidgwick called on Miss H. on September 21st, 1891, and writes on the same day, from notes taken at the time of his interview:—

“The two scenes seen on the morning of August 8th were completely externalised, and appeared to be in Miss H.’s room; the coffin in the second vision appeared to be across the bed. She is quite convinced that it was not a dream in either case; in the second case she remembers sitting up and looking at the coffin. She was under no anxiety about her brother *on the score of illness*—he had been ill earlier in the year, but they had heard that he was better. They were, however, *slightly* anxious on account of not having heard from him for some time.

“Within a week after the visions, Miss H. wrote to her father, describing what she had seen, in consequence of which he wrote to the Consul at Bangkok to inquire about his son. Before he received an answer to this letter, the news came of the son’s death at Singapore; later, he received a certificate of death, giving as its date August 8th.

“Miss H. remembers distinctly that this was the date of her visions; it was a Sunday morning;¹ she was asked by the vicar’s wife after church why she looked strange and whether she was unwell. She is not a good sleeper, but was not specially suffering from sleeplessness at the time—was, in fact, in normal health.

“The night of August 7th there had been strange noises in the house, heard by Miss H. and the two other persons who were the inmates of the house besides the servants—the latter having gone upstairs did not hear them. The noises heard were as of heavy doors banging; a window was seen to shake, and, thinking some one must be there, they went and searched in the yard, but found no one. The night was quiet, and the phenomena could not be explained by wind. In the morning it was found that a lamp placed on the window-sill had fallen and was broken, also the looking glass of a servant boy—a ‘tiger.’ Miss H. did not regard the noises as supernatural *before* the visions had occurred; though afterwards she was disposed to connect the two. No corroboration of the coincidence of visions and death is now obtainable; her father died in 1879.”

In the next case the hallucination appears to have coincided exactly with a severe—though not fatal—attack of *angina pectoris*.

(34. 20.)

From Miss M. A. King.

(The account was written during the first half of the year 1889.)

Belle Vue, Exeter.

“I heard a voice say, ‘Come to me, I’m so ill, come to me.’ This happened at five in the morning, one day in October of 1888. I was lying awake, having been dreaming vividly. My health was perfect, and I was in no grief or anxiety at the time.

“[The impression was that of] some one with whom I was most intimate, but whom I had not seen for two months. She was at the time 200 miles away, and at that exact time was undergoing a severe attack and spoke the same words that I heard.

“No other person was present.

“I have not had any other experiences of this sort definite enough to describe.

“M. A. KING.”

In answer to our inquiries, the collector, Mr. Lauder Smith, wrote:—

Trinity College, Cambridge, *August 22nd*, 1889.

“DEAR SIR,—I have obtained some of the further information which you desired in Miss King’s case of thought-transference. I sent your letter to Miss King, and she replied as follows:—

“(1) I did not mention the experience to anyone at the time except to the friend in question, to whom I wrote the same day. She answered at once, telling of the strange coincidence.

“(2) My friend was subject to occasional heart attacks attended with much pain and the result of ague, but she was in good general health at the

¹ We find, however, that August 8th, 1877, was a Wednesday.

time and I had no thought of her being ill. The occurrence was impressed on my mind by the unusualness of my waking at four in the morning, and of my staying awake.'

"Miss King also enclosed part of the letter from Miss Ridd, the friend in question, which she mentions as having received in reply to her own; it ran as follows:—

" 'I didn't mean to tell you about it, but the coincidence is so strange I must. Sunday morning about four o'clock I had awfully bad pain, thought I was going to die for a few minutes, and when I could speak I stretched out my arms to your photo and said, "My Trix, come to me, I'm so ill, come to me!" Wasn't it strange?'

"I wrote to Miss Ridd, and she replied: 'Now to answer your queries. Yes, I did say those words aloud that Miss King quotes: I was sitting up in bed and addressed my remark to a photo of [her] that stands on my mantelpiece. She wrote to me telling me of her strange dream (*sic*) before I mentioned the fact to her and before she knew that I had been ill.'

Miss Ridd unfortunately could not find Miss King's original letter to her describing her experience.

Miss Johnson writes:—

August 15th, 1891.

"I called on Miss King this morning and saw her and Miss Ridd together. Miss King gave me a verbal account of her experience, which seemed to differ slightly from her written account, but only, I think, because she had been very careful in the latter to put down only what actually came within the scope of the questions. She said that she had had a vivid dream of going out of the front door of her house at Exeter and meeting the postman, who brought her a letter from Miss Ridd. On or in the letter was written, 'Come to me, Trix, I'm so ill.' Then she woke and heard the same words resounding in her ears. She thought it possible that she had been awakened by them. I asked if it was just like a real person speaking, and she said, Yes; also if she definitely recognised the voice. She could not remember exactly, but said that she thought it could not have been anyone else but Miss Ridd, as no one else called her Trix. It never occurred to her that it could be anyone else. She was much impressed by it and stayed awake a long time afterwards. It was very unusual for her to wake at all in that way in the morning.

"I asked how they had established the coincidence, the date being nowhere exactly stated. Miss King said she had written the same day to Miss Ridd in London, who had answered by return. As to the exact hour, Miss Ridd remarked, 'Don't you remember you heard the Cathedral clock strike just after?' Miss Ridd herself had noticed the time because of having to take some medicine at four, and told how she had spoken the words to the photograph of 'Trix' in her room. I pointed out that Miss King had given the time as five on the schedule. They both agreed that this must have been a slip, both appearing to remember four as the hour of Miss King's experience, as she says in her letter, quoted by Mr. Lauder Smith.

"Miss Ridd's illness was angina pectoris, which used to come on occasionally quite suddenly at night. There was no expectation of it just then in either of their minds, and she had not had it for some time.

“Miss King said that this was the only time she had ever heard a hallucinatory voice ; she had not even ever imagined that she heard herself called.”

Miss King writes later :—

“I do not remember ever dreaming of Miss Ridd's being ill, except once when I dreamed of her in a rather skeleton-like condition, but as she changed into several other people before I woke, the dream only impressed itself on my mind by its grotesqueness.

“I had been from time to time a little anxious about Miss Ridd's condition, but was not so at that time, as she had not spoken of any attacks, and I believed her to have been very well for some time.”

It may be added that Miss Ridd has had one hallucinatory experience—which, however, contains no evidence of veridicality—relating to Miss King. She felt her hand clasped, a face pressed against hers, and her name spoken distinctly.

The next case is one of those not taken account of in our statistics, because the sounds heard, though vocal, were not articulate (see Chapter II., p. 36). But the impression was a perfectly definite one, and unique in the experience of the percipient, and the evidence for a telepathic origin seems strong. It seems, therefore, sufficiently interesting to be worth printing here, though excluded from the Tables.

(105. 1.)

From Miss C. Clark.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“I heard someone sobbing, one evening last August (1888), about 10 p.m. It was in the house, in Dunbar, Scotland, as I was preparing to go to bed. Feeling convinced that it was my youngest sister, I advised another sister not to go into the next room, whence the sounds seemed to proceed. After waiting with me for a few minutes, this sister went into the dining-room, and returned to me saying that our youngest sister was in the dining-room, and not crying at all. Then I at once thought there must be something the matter with my greatest friend, a girl of 24, then in Lincolnshire. I wrote next day, asking her if at that hour on the previous night she had been crying. In her next letter she said yes ; she was suffering great pain with toothache just at that time, and was unable to restrain a few sobs.

“I felt convinced that it was my sister whom I had just left in the dining-room; from the sound of the sobs I knew that she could no longer be there, and thought she must have left that room and gone into the bedroom adjoining mine. Just after I heard the sobs, another sister came into my room, on her way into the inner bedroom. I told her not to go there, as she would disturb the sister who, as I told her, was crying. I alone had heard the sobs.

“This has been the only similar experience I have had.

“CECILY C. CLARK.”

In a letter to Miss Porter (for whom the case was collected), Miss Clark enclosed copies of portions of the correspondence which had passed between

her and Miss Mabel Maughan, the friend referred to, on the subject. Miss Maughan is the sister of the agent in the experimental case No. 98. 13, (see p. 273). This correspondence is printed below. Miss Clark says also :—
 “I had never before seen or heard anything of the kind, and have not done so since.”

Miss Maughan writes :—

July 21st, 1889.

“DEAR MISS PORTER,—You asked for some account of my sensations on the night on which my friend heard me crying with toothache. My sister and I slept together. She fell asleep very soon after going to bed, but I was kept awake with pain in my teeth. After sitting up in bed applying various remedies, none of which did me any good, the pain became so intense that I could not refrain from sobbing for a short time. I remember perfectly well that, with the exception of two or three audible sobs, I made no sound, as my sister had gone to bed very tired, and I was anxious not to disturb her. Not till I fairly broke down did I think of my friend, but then I wished intensely that she were with me.

“MABEL MAUGHAN.”

Extracts from letters.

I. [From Miss Clark to Miss Maughan.]

Dunbar, *Wednesday, August 22nd, 1888, 9 p.m.*

“Were you crying on Sunday night near 11 o'clock? because I *distinctly* heard someone crying, and supposed it was H— in the next room, but she wasn't there at all. Then I thought . . . that it might be you . . . ”

Thursday, August 23rd, 1888, 4.45 p.m.

[Continuation of letter of August 22nd, not posted until 23rd.—F.P.]

“Thank you very much for your letter just come. I am so sorry your face is sore; did it make you cry on Sunday night? . . . ”

II. [From Miss Maughan to Miss Clark, received by the latter on August 23rd, 1888.]

E. Kirkby Vicarage, Spilsby, *Tuesday evening, August 21st, 1888.*

[Post-mark Spilsby, August 22nd, 1888.—F. P.]

“ . . . On Sunday we went to see Wroxham Broad . . . We had an immense amount of walking to do altogether, and I think I got a little cold in my face in the morning, and all night I suffered with it, and my face is swelled still . . . ”

III. [From Miss Maughan to Miss Clark, received by the latter August 26th, 1888.]

Thursday, August 23rd, 11 p.m.

“I am putting bread poultices on my gums. I have never had such a huge swelling before, and it *won't* go down. It is so horribly uncomfortable . . .

“*Saturday afternoon.*—Thanks for letter. Yes, I was crying on Sunday night—only on account of the pain. It was awful, but I only cried quietly, as Edith was asleep. . . . ”

Mr. Podmore writes:—

February 10th, 1892.

“I called on Miss Clark and Miss Ethel Maughan yesterday. The mention of ‘next day’ in the original narrative as the date of Miss Clark’s first letter is a mistake. I saw all the letters referred to, and verified the extracts. The experience was evidently very impressive to Miss Clark.”

Here, as in the last case, the documentary evidence shows that the experience was held to be remarkable before the coinciding event was heard of.

A coincidence between a hallucination and an accident to the supposed agent resembles a death-coincidence in the definiteness and brief duration of the coinciding event. We have five of these in the Census. The best evidenced of the five, from a telepathic point of view, is perhaps No. 343.5, which will be found in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 141; a young sailor in Australia appeared to his sister in England within twelve hours of a narrow escape from drowning, the wet appearance of the phantasm and the words spoken adding to the force of the coincidence.

Hallucinations Coinciding with Emotional States of the Agent.

It would of course be difficult to classify all the possible kinds of coincidences, and we may say generally that, besides those we have already enumerated, there are some twenty cases in the Census with some *primâ facie* claim to be regarded as telepathic on account of the circumstances of the supposed agent at the time of the hallucination. Four of these seem worth quoting here. The first is one of the cases about which there is contemporary documentary evidence; it occurred when the agent was in mental trouble and her thoughts were strongly directed to the percipient.

(290. 3.)

From Miss L. Caldecott.

February 11th, 1890.

“A sensation of faint glowing light in the darkest corner of the room made me first look in that direction (which happened to be next the door), and I then became aware of some one standing there, holding her hands outstretched as if in appeal. My first impression was that it was my sister, and I said, ‘What’s the matter?’ but instantly saw who it was—a friend, who was at that time in Scotland. I felt completely rivetted, but though my heart and pulses were beating unnaturally fast, neither much frightened nor surprised, only with a sort of impulse to get up and go after the figure, which I could not move to do. The form seemed to melt away into the soft glow, which then also died out. It was about half-past ten at night. I was at my home in ——. The date I am unable to fix nearer than that it was either August or September, 1887.

“I was perfectly well. I was reading Carlyle’s *Sartor Resartus* at the time. I was in no trouble or anxiety of any kind. Age about 26.

“I had not seen my friend for about a year. I wrote to her the day after this happened, but, before my letter reached her, received one in which she told me of a great family trouble that was causing her much suffering, and saying that she had been longing for me to help her. Another letter in answer to mine then told me that her previous letter was written about 10.30 on the night I saw her, and that she had been wishing for my presence then most intensely. My friend died very shortly afterwards.

“No other persons were present at the time.

“L. CALDECOTT.”

Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

December 2nd, 1891.

“I called on Miss L. Caldecott this afternoon. She has found one of her friend's letters—the one in answer to her own describing the apparition. The letter is dated August 16th, 1885, so that Miss Caldecott's date in her account is wrong. Miss Caldecott read me out the part bearing on the subject, and I wrote it down from her dictation, afterwards reading it over to her, while she compared it with the original. It ran as follows:—

“‘Your account is very strange, and I cannot quite make up my mind what to think of it. If it had not been that on that very Tuesday night I really was thinking of you very much, and wishing from the bottom of my heart that I could get at you, I should be inclined to say that your apparition was entirely subjective, and that you imagined you saw me. But if there is any connection between mind and mind, why should it not be so, and that it really was because I was wishing so hard I could be with you. You know that was the night I got back. I unpacked some of my things, and then began to write to you. It was then somewhere between 11 and 12. At all events, I remember it struck 12 some time after I got into bed. . . . Tell me anything you can of my general appearance, and so forth. If you saw me as I was at the time it seems fairly conclusive it was my thinking of you caused you to see me, and not indigestion on your part, and entirely independent of me.’

“It will be seen that the hour named is different from that mentioned by Miss Caldecott in her account—between 11 and 12 instead of between 10 and 11. But Miss Caldecott says her memory is bad, and I think she has no independent recollection of the hour any more than of the day. She remembers being struck with the closeness of the coincidence at the time. And the sentence in the above letter referring to the hour seems to indicate that her friend also thought the hours coincided. It reads as if Miss Caldecott had in her letter named a time between 11 and 12.

“I asked particularly about the appearance. The corner of the room where it appeared was shaded by a wardrobe. Her attention was caught by the light, which made her look up. It was not a bright light like a fire, but it seemed to radiate out—glow out. Later, she said it was the sort of light you see when some one approaches along a dark passage with a candle. She saw the cornice (I am not sure whether of wall or cupboard) at the same time. The face and hands were the clearest parts. The hands were held out, palms upwards. She looked as Miss Caldecott was accustomed to see her, but she did not notice the dress particularly. She did not see the figure clearly at all below the knees. She showed me the sort of

distance, which I should judge to be about 10 feet. The feeling of her heart beating fast was only what one feels after anything sudden and startling. She only felt it after the figure disappeared. She cannot at all judge of the duration of the experience.

“She has on two other occasions seen figures, both times when very weak after an illness and not sufficiently recovered to be up. When she saw the figure described in her answer to our questions she was remarkably well, and had just been taking a holiday, which she had enjoyed very much.”

In the next case, the coincidence is somewhat similar, except that the emotion is due to imagined, and not to real circumstances.

(41. 3.)

From Mrs. Malleson.

Highfield, Haling Park-road, Croydon, *April 12th, 1889.*

“What I am about to relate happened in the autumn of 1874 or 1875, I cannot remember which, as we spent some months of both those years in the same place and under very similar circumstances. We were living in a small house close upon the sea-shore, in a somewhat lonely situation, between Littlehampton and the village of Rustington. My husband and one of our sons, about sixteen, were to take the night boat from Littlehampton and cross to the French coast, returning in a few days. I was not in strong health, but certainly not ill: I was in the habit of taking long rides on horseback, and spending hours of the day upon the shore. . . . With no cause for special anxiety, I felt a little lonely and depressed at the thought of [my husband’s] leaving me, and of our being parted by the sea. I determined to go to bed before they started. . . . Before I proceed further, I wish to say that although I had all my life been a dreamer of very vivid, consecutive, and striking dreams, yet I was not subject to any form of nightmare, that I knew nothing of a half-waking state, but, on the contrary, was always conscious of a thoroughly defined line between the two conditions; and that I had never, upon any occasion, dreamed of being where I actually was. I mention this because it made the incident I am about to relate far more striking to me at the time. I had no doubt then, and I have never had any since, that I did actually awake when I thought I awoke, nor was I conscious of any farther awakening.

“I had slept for some hours when I was suddenly awakened by feeling some one bending over me. I was conscious of lying in the same position in which I had fallen asleep. My room was dark, yet I felt no doubt that it was my husband. I felt a strange thrill and a vague anxiety, but no fear. I did not doubt that it was himself in bodily presence, and yet I remember a strange momentary feeling that he could read my thoughts. I said, ‘Oh, Willie, you have come back!’ I put out my arms and felt his coat. He answered, ‘Yes! I am come back.’ I remember that the tone was very solemn and my fears were aroused. I asked, ‘Has anything happened?’ he replied in the same peculiar low, solemn tone, ‘Yes! something has happened.’ Then I thought of the boy and asked eagerly, ‘Where is Eddy?’ There was no answer, and after a moment’s pause I felt that I was alone. I raised myself on my arm and endeavoured to penetrate the dark-

ness. I looked towards the door ; I was sure there was no one in the room, and equally sure that there had been no sound or stir of one leaving it. Then in an instant came the conviction that it was not in his ordinary bodily presence that he had been there, and at the same time the agonising realisation that it was himself to whom something had happened, although I reflected that he could not have been drowned, because his clothes had not been wet to my touch. I struck a light and went to look at my watch, for which purpose I had to get out of bed ; it was five o'clock. . . . I remained restless, anxious, and miserable until Sunday morning, when I received a letter from my husband, my vision having taken place on the morning of Friday. When my husband returned I told him of my vision. He was vexed that I had been so much troubled, and merely said, ' Well, you see I was in no danger, nothing was the matter, so I hope you will never believe in visions or presentiments any more ! ' I may say that although this was and has remained my only vision, I was and am apt to have ' presentiments ' during his absences.

“ K. E. MALLESON.”

Mr. Malleison writes :—

April 22nd, 1889.

“ My wife has related that my son and I left Littlehampton by a steamboat that was to cross in the night to Honfleur. We no doubt stayed some time together on deck, and then I went below to try to get some sleep, while he preferred to remain in the fresh air. I got into a berth, partly undressed myself, and, I believe, fell asleep, until I was awakened by two men who were sitting at the table in the cabin, talking. Presently they rose to go up the cabin stairs, and I said, ' I have left a boy of mine on deck. If you are going up, would you mind seeing how he is getting on ? ' They said they would, and I remained quietly in my berth until they returned. To my question whether they had seen him, they replied, ' No, they had not noticed him anywhere. '

“ Not long after this my imagination began to work upon their answer, at first merely as a sort of occupation for my mind, and I pictured myself searching for my son all over the deck in vain, and questioning the sailors, and getting to hear nothing about him. Then my mind began to dwell upon the supposition that I should never see or hear of my dear lad again—but this only as a supposition, a story, as it were, told to myself. I was not in any real fear, but after a little time my imagination gained greater hold of me, and I found myself pacing woefully along the lonely sea road to our cottage with the terrible news to tell my wife that our boy was gone—was lost—had fallen overboard, no doubt, and no one had even seen or heard him. The story had now taken possession of me, and I could not by any means shake myself free of it. That solitary walk—the agony of the interview that would follow—the thought of what I should say—how tell the awful misfortune—what she would say—how look—what answer I was to make to the inevitable question, ' Where is Eddy ? ' all this was acting itself before me, and my pulses violently beating. The last question was more than I could endure, and I rose and went on deck, thus putting an end to a state of mind perfectly new and strange to me, which I have never experienced before or since. True, for a time I

could not find Eddy anywhere, but before I had become seriously uneasy I discovered him snugly hidden away under a great sheet of tarpaulin. I don't remember looking at my watch, but it was daylight, and we remained on deck a couple of hours or more before getting in to Honfleur to breakfast.

"When my wife told me on our return to Littlehampton how I had appeared to her, I refrained at the time from telling her my half of the experience. She was not strong, and I feared for her the excitement of so strange a corroboration of her vision.

"WM. MALLESON."

Mrs. Malleson says that she has on many occasions seen "quite clearly and for a considerable time" apparitions of persons who were elsewhere, but only when she was "either suffering in health or from anxiety of mind," except on one occasion, when, being "perfectly well," she saw an apparition of a young lady who was staying in the house walking into a room in front of her. She followed, and found the room empty.

In cases such as both of those last quoted, it is, of course, difficult to judge to what extent the agent's condition was exceptional; and, in the second, there is the additional doubt as to whether the experience might not have been due simply to the percipient's state of mind. But those who think that the fact of telepathy is proved, will feel little doubt that these two cases are examples of it.

Hallucination corresponding to the Agent's Thoughts.

In the next case, the coincidence is as definite and unmistakable as could be desired, and any doubt as to the telepathic causation is of a different nature.

(31. 2.)

From Miss S. Mallet.

25, Highbury New Park, N., *May*, 1889.

The collector, Miss A. V. Mallet, writes:—

"My sister Sophia Mallet had written *No* when I reminded her of the following incident, and she changed her *No* into *Yes*. It occurred on December 12th, 1886; she had gone through a surgical operation under chloroform and was just recovering from the effects; our own physician, an old and intimate friend, was standing by her bed feeling her pulse, when she thought she heard him say, 'How A. is altered; he used to be so handsome and now he is quite a fat fellow.' It struck her as a very strange thing for him to say. When he had left the room she said to the nurse, 'What made Dr. H. speak of Mr. A.?' 'He did not, ma'am.' 'Oh, yes, he did, and said he was become quite a fat fellow.' The nurse looked at our own maid, who was also standing by the bed, and who said, 'He said you were going on all right, nothing else.'

"Now, they did not know it, but Mr. and Mrs. A. had called just as the surgeons were leaving the house; they came to me in the drawing-room. Dr. H. left them with me to go up and see my sister; when he came down

after they were gone he used the identical words to me about Mr. A. which my sister thought he had said to her ; I can only suppose that the thought was passing through his mind while he had his fingers on her pulse, and that, her nerves being in an abnormal state, the impression was conveyed to her mind, and it seemed to her that she heard him say the words.

“ A. V. MALLET.

“ SOPHIA MALLET.”

Miss A. V. Mallet explains that she and her sister drew up the account together, the latter adding her signature to certify that it was correct. No notes were made at the time. She writes later :—

May 31st, 1889.

“ I was in the drawing-room with Mr. and Mrs. A. and Dr. H. when my sister asked the nurse and maid. I did not hear of the occurrence till the next day, as I was only allowed to see my sister for a minute or two the first evening. The nurse and maid were both repeatedly questioned, and never varied in their account. The whole thing was the subject of discussion amongst us all and several of our intimate friends for some weeks. The nurse we have never seen or heard of since she left, three weeks after the operation. I do not even remember her name. Our maid left us a year ago to join some relatives in America. We have no means of tracing either of them. My sister and I were both struck by the expression ‘ fat fellow.’ If Dr. H. had said ‘ Mr. A. has grown so stout ’ it would not have impressed us nearly so much.”

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :—

December 3rd, 1891.

“ I have just returned from calling on the Misses Mallet. Miss Sophia Mallet was still more or less under the influence of the chloroform when her experience occurred, and in a somewhat dazed condition. The only hypothesis she can suggest other than the telepathic is hyperæsthesia, viz., that she really only heard the words when he said them to her sister a few minutes later downstairs. That this doubt should be possible shows that her ideas about it are not quite clear ; but she distinctly thinks she heard the words while Dr. H.’s hand was on her pulse. They sounded far off. The room where she was is not over the drawing-room, where the words were actually spoken, and I was informed that it was difficult to hear the piano from one to the other. Miss S. Mallet does not seem to remember hearing the real words spoken by the doctor in her room about her being all right. She had been under chloroform for about three-quarters of an hour. The matter was a good deal discussed and inquired into at the time, so that I should think Miss A. V. Mallet’s impression about it is correct, and that she is a more ‘ first-hand ’ witness than her sister, owing to the dazed condition of the latter.”

This case is interesting as a possible example of the effect of drugs in heightening the telepathic faculty. That there was either hyperæsthesia or thought-reading seems clear, and that the phenomenon was partly due to the effect of the chloroform seems also certain. It is worth noting that we have reason to believe that the hypnotic state (which the effect of chloroform and other drugs occasionally resembles

in the suggestibility induced¹) is favourable to thought-transference and in some cases to hyperæsthesia.²

Reciprocal Telepathic Impressions.

The next case is a possible example of a "reciprocal" case, in which, as defined in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 153, each of the two persons concerned appears to be receiving a telepathic impulse from the other, so that each is at once agent and percipient. The indications of reciprocity are, however, only slight, since there is no certainty that Miss ——'s dream gave her any information as to Mr. Evans' condition at the time, nor is it clear that it was exactly contemporaneous. The evidence that his experience was not purely subjective depends on the apparition presenting a true feature unknown to him (the silver cross), and is strengthened by the fact that Miss ——'s thoughts were occupied with him that afternoon.

(78. 16.) From the Rev. C. L. Evans.

(The account was written in 1889).

Shireshead Vicarage, Forton, Garstang, Lancs.

"Two years ago I had occasion to undergo a course of magnetism, under the treatment of Miss —— . I was under her treatment for six weeks, and derived considerable benefit from her treatment. A warm friendship sprang up between us, as she had wonderfully improved my sight. I went up to St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, at the commencement of the October term, as my eyes were so much stronger. One afternoon, as I had just come in from the river, being rather tired, I sat down for a minute before I changed, when, to my great surprise, the door opened, and Miss —— appeared to walk in.

"She was looking rather pale at the time, and looked intently at me for about a minute, then left the room as slowly as she had walked in. I was much alarmed, as I fancied that something must have happened to her, and I immediately sat down and wrote off two letters, one to Miss ——, asking if she was well, and another to my mother, telling her of the strange occurrence. The next day I had back the two replies. My mother said that on that very afternoon she had called on Miss ——, and naturally they had been discussing my case. She said that my description of Miss ——'s dress, &c., was perfectly accurate. I then read Miss ——'s note. She stated that my

¹ See Dr. von Schrenk-Notzing, *Die Bedeutung narcotischer Mittel für den Hypnotismus*, in the *Schriften der Gesellschaft für psychologische Forschung*, Heft. I., Leipzig, 1891.

² It is possible that in hypnotism there may be a correlated heightening of the psychical with the physical sensory faculties, though the former may not in any way directly depend on the latter. Supposing that a certain mind is constantly receiving telepathic impulses, most or all of which, as a general rule, remain latent or subliminal, the same conditions which produce hyperæsthesia of the senses may tend to translate the subliminal into supraliminal percepts.

mother had called, and had left at about half-past four, she then had lain down for a few minutes, and was thinking and wishing to see me. She had a distinct impression that she saw me during this sleep, or trance, but when she awoke the impression was not very vivid. The time exactly coincided, and she said that my description of her was very accurate. At the time that she appeared to me I was not thinking in the least of her.

“CHARLES LLOYD EVANS.”

Mr. Podmore writes :—

April 25th, 1892.

“I called on Mr. Evans on the 20th instant, and had a long conversation with him.

“The occurrence took place in November, 1887. It would be about 4.15 p.m. He was resting in his chair—in boating clothes—with the door ajar. He heard a knock or sound as of someone entering; turned round and saw Miss ——— come into the room and walk towards him. She was dressed in red bodice and dark silk skirt (a not unfamiliar dress), but with a silver filigree cross hanging from a chain round her neck, which he had never seen before. He learnt afterwards that the cross had been given by General——— only a few days before the incident. The figure looked him straight in the face—then seemed to fade away bit by bit. He was himself perfectly well, and not a bit sleepy.

“He has had no other hallucinations. His age at the time was 20.”

Mr. Podmore wrote to Mr. Evans’ mother asking for her corroboration of the incidents described by her son, and she replied :—

April 27th, 1892.

“In reply to the questions you asked me about the apparition of Miss ——— to my son, when at Oxford, I can fully verify his statement. He wrote to me the same afternoon, begging me to call upon Miss ——— and see if she was ill, detailing me the account of what he had seen, and also describing her dress minutely and the cross she was wearing. I called upon Miss ——— the following day, and read her my son’s letter, giving the hour at which she had appeared to him. She told me that she had not been feeling well, and was lying down on the couch thinking, too, of my son, and that she went off into a sort of trance, and she saw him distinctly looking at her and he was very pale. . . . [She] told me that my son had at once written to her, fearing that she must be ill, and told her the circumstances under which she appeared to him. When I saw Miss ——— she was then wearing the same dress and filigree cross which Charlie had described to me in his letter, and which he had never seen her wearing before.

“MARY E. EVANS.”

Mr. Podmore afterwards saw Miss ———, and gives the following account of his interview :—

July 17th, 1892.

“I called on Miss ——— this afternoon.

“Her account of the matter is that Mrs. Evans (the percipient’s mother) called on her on the afternoon of the vision, and talked much about her son. After Mrs. Evans left—probably about 5.30 p.m.—Miss ———, as usual, lay down to sleep for a few minutes, and woke about 6 p.m. with the recollection

of having seen Mr. C. L. Evans. She can recall no details of appearance—merely the recollection of having been in the same room with him. The next day she received a letter from Mr. C. L. Evans telling of his vision, and on the same day another visit from his mother. Miss ——— was wearing the dress and filigree cross described. The cross, as stated, had been given to her only a few days before.

“She is not sure of the time at which her vision or dream occurred. It may have been earlier than 6 p.m., her hours being very irregular. She had compared notes with Mr. Evans, and was under the impression that their experiences coincided. But I think that her first statement—6 p.m.—is probably correct. If so, her dream would have come one and a-half to two hours after Mr. Evans’ vision.”

We have in the Census one other seemingly reciprocal case, but we have not been able to obtain enough information about it to make it worth considering evidentially. Cases which are clearly reciprocal seem to be very rare, but if established, they would be of great theoretic importance as throwing light on the nature of telepathy. For, especially when they contain any element of what Mr. Gurney calls “telepathic clairvoyance,” they seem to show—using his words—“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.” (*Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 162).

It will be convenient, before proceeding to the next class of veridical hallucinations, to consider what characteristics, if any, distinguish those we have been discussing from hallucinations in general. The telepathic hypothesis does not require that there should be any difference. On the contrary, if all hallucinations are sensory manifestations of conscious or subconscious ideas, all that telepathy has to do is to introduce the idea; and there is no reason *a priori* why the telepathically received ideas should externalise themselves as sensory hallucinations either more often in proportion than ideas which arise spontaneously, or in a different manner. Experience, however, gives some ground for thinking that telepathic ideas do project themselves as hallucinations more readily than others; at least, this seems to be the most natural explanation of the number of telepathic hallucinations as compared to the number of telepathic ideas rising above the threshold of consciousness without producing sensory hallucinations. No doubt, the non-hallucinatory impressions,—*e.g.* of a dying person,—would not, unless unusually vivid, excite special attention, but would be lost in the general mass of ideas that pass through the mind. Still, there are instances of feelings, impressions, and impulses to action, which there is strong ground for attributing to a telepathic

origin (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 232—294), and the student of telepathy can hardly fail to be surprised that in spontaneous cases these are not more numerous in proportion to the hallucinations, unless the explanation is to be found in a special tendency of telepathic ideas to produce hallucinations.

Such a tendency would naturally be accompanied by a greater force and insistency on the average in the hallucinations produced, and we believe that there is some indication of such a greater insistency in the coincidental cases. One indication is the larger proportion of coincidental cases in which some kind of note has been made of the occurrence before the coincidental nature of it was known (see p. 221).

The larger proportion of bisensory hallucinations among coincidental cases is probably another indication. In estimating the number of bisensory cases, it will be best to omit those which are only classed as bisensory because some non-vocal sound accompanied the visual or tactile hallucinations; since it is often doubtful whether these sounds were not real, so that to count them as hallucinatory is apt to be misleading. From Table II. we see that the hallucinations described at first-hand, in which more than one sense was affected, amount to about 9·5 per cent. of all the hallucinations. But among the 180 coincidental cases which we have discussed in this and the two preceding Chapters, more than one sense was affected in 14·5 per cent. If we limit ourselves to the 80 visual death-coincidences, 17·5 per cent. is the number which are bisensory or trisensory, while in the 381 apparitions of living persons with which these are to be compared, only 12 per cent. are bisensory or trisensory.¹ These differences are very marked, and the conclusion that a relative preponderance of bisensory cases is to be found among the telepathic ones is in accordance with that arrived at by Mr. Gurney on the basis of his collections of telepathic and purely subjective hallucinations (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol II., pp. 23, 24).

Since bisensory cases are more impressive, and therefore presumably better remembered than other subjective cases, we may assume that the real proportion of the bisensory cases that are not coincidental to the whole number of non-coincidental cases will be considerably exaggerated in our returns: whereas we have agreed that we cannot assume any material effect of forgetfulness in estimating the real number of telepathic hallucinations, whether bisensory or not. Hence the real ratio of the bisensory telepathic cases to those which are not bisensory, must be assumed to exceed the general ratio of bisensory to non-bisensory cases, by a difference much greater than that shown in our statistics.

CHAPTER XV.

COLLECTIVE HALLUCINATIONS.

Hallucinations simultaneously experienced by two or more percipients—which we distinguish as “collective”—are obviously of great interest in the general consideration of the cause and nature of hallucinations, even if the collectivity is due to transference from one percipient to another by suggestion through the senses. But the interest becomes still greater if, this explanation being excluded, we are driven to suppose, either that the transference between the percipients has been effected by purely mental suggestion, or that the hallucinations have been simultaneously produced in both percipients by some supernormal cause. We have therefore examined this part of our evidence with special attention.

At first sight, the quantity of this kind of evidence appeared to be ample—at any rate so far as visual hallucinations are concerned. The Census contains 95 instances, reported to us at first-hand by at least one percipient, of figures or objects believed to have been hallucinatory and to have been simultaneously seen by two or more persons. To compare with these we have 992 instances of unshared visual hallucinations reported at first-hand, in 188 of which the percipient states that he had a waking companion.¹

The auditory collective cases reported are less numerous than the visual, and bear a smaller ratio to the whole number of auditory cases. There are, however, 34 cases in which two or more percipients are said to have heard approximately the same hallucinatory voice simultaneously, in 5 of which the percipients were in different rooms. The number of unshared auditory hallucinations reported at first-hand is 459, in 60 of which the percipient states that he had a waking companion.

Collective cases where the sense of touch is affected are—as might be expected—rare. Indeed we have only two first-hand cases that could possibly be placed in this class, and in one of them the experience is too trivial and vague to be worth considering. The other is an interesting case, which we have given in the discussion on physical effects connected with hallucinations (see p. 204). But the visual and auditory cases, taken together, appeared at first sight to constitute a strong body of evidence for collectivity.

¹ The numbers given in this and the following paragraph apparently disagree with the Tables, since in some of the collective cases more than one percipient is included in the Census, and in the Tables each percipient in the Census is reckoned separately. There is no case in which two percipients both see an apparition and at the same time hear a voice, so that the numbers given of visual and of auditory collective cases are mutually exclusive.

A closer inspection, however, showed us that important deductions had to be made from this evidence: since there are special reasons for doubting either the *collective* or the *hallucinatory* character of a considerable number of the experiences.

First as regards the collective character. We are so accustomed in ordinary life to find our visual and auditory experiences shared by others, that the assumption of their having been so shared on any particular occasion is probably liable to be made—at the time or afterwards—on insufficient grounds. At any rate we have found in a few cases that a supposed second percipient, when applied to, has no recollection of the incident; which renders it doubtful what his impression was at the time. Second-hand evidence for collectivity cannot therefore be ranked above second-hand evidence for other questions connected with hallucinations; and it is only in 43 out of the 95 visual cases reported as collective that we have been able to obtain evidence of the sharing of the experience, beyond the recollection of one percipient—partly because the second percipient is often dead or has been lost sight of.

But, granting that the perception was collective, there may still be room for doubt as to whether it was really hallucinatory. We have already¹ given reasons for thinking generally that some of the experiences counted in our Tables were mistakenly reported as hallucinatory, and further that this mistake is especially likely to be made out of doors. The fact, therefore, that over 44 per cent. of the collective experiences occurred out of doors, and only about 15 per cent. of those that were unshared, renders it probable that proportionally more of the former have been erroneously regarded by the percipient as hallucinatory: and this probability is strengthened by the fact that a larger proportion of out-door cases are collective, than of indoor cases in which the percipient had a waking companion.² The presumption thus afforded is confirmed by an examination of the evidence in particular cases. If we go through the realistic human apparitions that occurred when the percipient was up, asking ourselves this question—"If the facts are correctly stated, is it certain that the figure seen was not a real human being?"—we find that we answer "No" in a considerably larger proportion (nearly double) of collective cases than of others, and this though we leave entirely out of consideration the collective character itself. Of course, an estimate of this kind has, as a statistical statement, only a relative value. A judgment so formed is sure to

¹ See Chapter II., p. 37; Chapter V., p. 98.

² Taking only those cases where the percipient had a waking companion, we find that, out of 194 where he was indoors, 53 or 27 per cent. are said to have been collective; and out of 88 where he was out of doors, 42 or nearly 48 per cent. are said to have been collective. In one case, it is not stated whether he was indoors or not.

depend largely on the idiosyncrasies of the person judging, and moreover fuller or better given evidence might alter the aspect of the case. There seems, however, no reason why, if the same person judges of both the collective and non-collective cases, the same errors of judgment should not affect both classes equally; so that this relative estimate may be taken as fairly trustworthy. In view of these considerations, we think that any conclusions about collective hallucinations must rest upon individual cases carefully scrutinised, and not on the alleged numbers, respecting which we cannot regard ourselves as having sufficiently accurate information. We shall, therefore, only quote here some of those which seem to be evidentially the best cases.

Collective Visual Hallucinations.

Before we proceed to give fresh narratives, we may remind the reader that we have already come across three cases believed to have been collective among the death-coincidences. In the first of these, No. 147. 23, p. 218, the evidence of the second percipient is unobtainable, but if there is no exaggeration, the description makes it difficult to suppose that there was any mistake as to the complete and independent recognition of the figure by both percipients. In the other two cases (Nos. 422. 25, p. 227, and 418. 4, p. 230) the account is signed by three and two percipients respectively, and in the second we have ascertained that the percipients believe themselves to have seen the figure independently—that is, without verbal suggestion by one to the other.

In the case we have next to quote, there is—apart from the collectivity—no element of coincidence. It seems a clear case of collective hallucination, the disappearance of the cat proving it to have been hallucinatory.

(535. 2 and 3.) From Mrs. Greiffenberg and Mrs. Erni-Greiffenberg.

The collector, Mr. F. C. S. Schiller, tells us that he heard the story in October, 1890, from the two percipients. The following account was put together by him from an account (which he also sent us) written by Mrs. Erni-Greiffenberg, and various conversations which he had with both ladies on the subject. He afterwards obtained their signatures to it. Neither of them has had any other hallucinatory experience.

December 14th, 1890.

“In the beginning of the summer of 1884 we were sitting at dinner at home as usual, in the middle of the day. In the midst of the conversation I noticed my mother suddenly looking down at something beneath the table. I inquired whether she had dropped anything, and received the answer, ‘No, but I wonder how that cat can have got into the room?’ Looking underneath the table, I was surprised to see a large white Angora cat beside

my mother's chair. We both got up, and I opened the door to let the cat out. She marched round the table, went noiselessly out of the door, and when about half way down the passage turned round and faced us. For a short time she regularly stared at us with her green eyes, and then she dissolved away, like a mist, under our eyes.

“Even apart from the mode of her disappearance, we felt convinced that the cat could not have been a real one, as we neither had one of our own, nor knew of any that would answer to the description in the place, and so this appearance made an unpleasant impression upon us.

“This impression was, however, greatly enhanced by what happened in the following year, 1885, when we were staying in Leipzig with my married sister (the daughter of Mrs. Greiffenberg). We had come home one afternoon from a walk, when, on opening the door of the flat, we were met in the hall by the same white cat. It proceeded down the passage in front of us, and looked at us with the same melancholy gaze. When it got to the door of the cellar (which was locked), it again dissolved into nothing.

“On this occasion also it was first seen by my mother, and we were both impressed by the uncanny and gruesome character of the appearance. In this case, also, the cat could not have been a real one, as there was no such cat in the neighbourhood.

(Signed) “MRS. ERNI-GREIFFENBERG.
“MRS. GREIFFENBERG.”

In the following case there was no vanishing, and the figure left the field of view as a real figure would have done, but it was clearly recognised by both percipients, and it is difficult to suppose that the real person came into the church and forgot all about it. It is on this that the evidence for the hallucinatory character of the experience depends.

(647. 7.)

From Miss C. J. E.

March, 1892.

“I was playing the harmonium in the church of — at about 4 p.m., August, 1889, when I saw my eldest sister walk up the church towards the chancel with a roll of papers under her arm. When I looked up again she had disappeared, and I thought she had just come in for a few minutes and gone out again; but when I asked her afterwards what she wanted in the church, she was much surprised, and told me she had been in the rectory library all the afternoon, studying genealogical tables. I am not sure of the exact date, but it was about the time I mention.

“I was practising on the harmonium; as far as I remember I was quite well and not worried about anything. I was eighteen years old. A younger sister was the only other person in the church with me at the time. She was standing beside me on an old stone coffin, and also noticed my eldest sister walk up the church with papers under her arm, but thought it nothing unusual and looked away, and when she looked back again my sister had disappeared.

“My eldest sister looked just as usual and wore her hat and jacket, as I and my younger sister both noticed. She walked rather briskly, looking

straight before her. She assures us that she was sitting alone in the rectory library (the rectory is within a stone's throw of the church) *all* the afternoon."

In answer to the question whether she has had any other hallucinations Miss E. says: "I have seen dark forms in my room at night when there was no one in the room but myself, but as I am nervously inclined I am not very positive about it, as it may have been partly imagination. But the apparition [of my sister] I positively saw."

Miss E. writes further :—

April 14th, 1892.

"I am *quite* sure that the figure could not have been any one else looking like K., for I saw distinctly every detail of her face and figure and dress, and noticed that she was looking straight before her. My sight is excellent, and I know I could not have been mistaken. When I looked up, the figure was about three yards from me, I should say. The figure *may* have gone back past me without my noticing it, but I think it very improbable, as I was sitting with my face towards the aisle through which it must have passed."

The other percipient, Miss H. E., writes :—

"My sisters and I were spending the day with our uncle at — ; as he is the rector his garden leads into the churchyard. In the course of the afternoon C. and I went into the church ; she began to play the harmonium and I stood on a stone coffin beside her with my hand on her shoulder ; my sister was playing a hymn and I was looking down at the book to read the words. C. casually looked up ; I did the same, and following the direction of her eyes saw K. walking to us up the church with—and this rather surprised me—a long bundle of papers in her hand. We made no remark and took no further notice of her movements, for when we go to — we often just wander in to see the church. It was certainly K. herself ; I could see her face quite well. C. and I finished our hymn and found that she had gone. C. and I soon after went in to tea. At tea we were surprised to hear K. say, 'I am so sorry I did not see the church, but part of the afternoon I was looking at pedigrees in the study; before that I passed the church gate ; I was going in, but turned back to the study instead,' or words to that effect. C. and I exchanged glances, but said nothing. However, next morning we attacked K. on the subject ; she was much surprised, had certainly not been in church at all, but had first been in the library studying the family pedigree, and then gone to the church gate and returned. My sister and I both have perfectly good eyesight. It seems impossible that K. can have visited the church, but my sister and I are both positively certain that we saw K. or her likeness. The day after we both described the details of her dress, so far as we could recollect them, and K. said that it was a correct account of her dress the day before. I saw the pedigree papers before I went out, and both C. and I thought them very like the papers the figure had in her hand. These are, as far as I remember, the details of the case without exaggeration or diminution.

"It was possible, but rather improbable, that K. should have left the church without our notice, because she must have passed back the same way close to us."

Miss K. E. writes :—

“Upon the afternoon during which this curious incident happened, I wandered about my uncle’s garden for a while, and half thought of going into the church, but changed my mind and did not. I went into the library, and, being interested in genealogy, studied my uncle’s family pedigree until tea time, when I remarked to my sisters that I had not been to the church all the afternoon, and they told me that they had seen me there. I felt no unusual sensations during the afternoon, and am much mystified by the incident.”¹

A case of a recognised figure seen out of doors is the following :—

(317. 14.)

From Miss A. E. R.

(The account was written in 1890.)

“When out in camp in an Indian jungle, my sister and I were anxiously awaiting the return of her husband, who had left in the morning on a surveying expedition, promising to return early in the afternoon. Between six and seven p.m. we were very uneasy, and were watching the line of road, I should say, 200 yards distant from where we stood. Simultaneously we exclaimed, ‘There he is,’ and I distinctly saw him, sitting in his dog-cart driving his grey horse, the syce occupying the seat behind. We at once returned to the tents—my sister ordering the bearer to get the Sahib’s bath-water ready, and the butler to prepare dinner—I running to set my brother-in-law’s mother’s mind at rest as to the safety of her son. However, as time passed on, and he did not appear, our alarm returned, and was not allayed until he arrived in safety at eight o’clock. On interrogating him, we found he was just starting from the surveying ground, about eight miles distant, at the very time we had the above related experience. I should add, we were both in good health and certainly wide awake at the time, and I have never before or since had any experience of the kind.”

Miss R. was about ten years old at the time of this incident. Her sister, Mrs. H., writes to the collector, Miss B. Garnett :—

December 17th, 1890.

“In answer to your request, I write to say that I fully endorse the statement made by my sister with reference to our experience in India. I was present at the time. Also I may state that there was no possibility of our

¹ A somewhat similar but very remote case is mentioned on p. 262, in connexion with another experience of the percipient, Miss Hawkins Dempster: another from the Census has been printed in the *Journal* of the S.P.R., Vol. IV., p. 140. A case which belongs to the Census (No. 91. 16) is published in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 210 (No. 327):—the figure seen was out of doors but at no great distance. Two other cases from the Census, of recognised figures collectively seen out of doors, were printed in the *Journal*, Vol. VI., pp. 129—133: but in both the distance renders the recognition—on which the hallucinatory character mainly depends—somewhat doubtful. On the other hand, the figure was in both cases very marked; and in one of them one of the percipients afterwards had a hallucinatory vision of the same person.

mistaking any other person for my husband, as the road ended at our tents, and the figure we saw must necessarily have driven straight to us. I should also say we were in an isolated part of the country.'

Mr. Myers called on Mrs. H., and she informed him that the incident took place "about 18 years ago," when her son, who was then twenty, was about two years old.

Mr. Myers writes:—

December 5th, 1891.

"Mrs. H. explained to me in conversation that a mistake of identity was impossible, both from the lonely nature of the country and from the great height of her husband, who is about 6ft. 4in. tall."

Mrs. H. added a further note to her sister's account, to the following effect:—

December 5th, 1891.

"I fully endorse all the details of this account. I may add that the time I saw my husband was about the hour I expected him home. He had been detained later than he expected, and I know would be concerned as to my anxiety about him. I have never had any other similar experience."

In this case the proof that the figure was not real depends not so much on the recognition—for the distance was probably too great for certain recognition—as on the combination of that with the very great improbability that any human being whatever was driving a dog cart in the place at that moment.

In the following case the apparition was that of a dead person, and there seems to be little room for mistake as to its hallucinatory character.

(728. 16.)

From Dr. S. da G.

March 17th, 1892.

"I saw what seemed to be my *fiancée's* sister at a window in the garden. Her head was tied up in a handkerchief; I approached her, but on arriving opposite the window I found it closed. Nobody was there; yet one moment before I had seen the form, and I did not hear the window close, for which, indeed, there was no time. I stood before the window, gazing at it in perplexity, when suddenly the panes seemed to disappear and the same form was leaning on the sill looking out upon me. It was not the sister of my *fiancée*; I recognised the appearance as that of my *fiancée's* mother, for I had seen her portrait in the house. I retired towards the place where my *fiancée* was sitting. I was horrified, but not to alarm her I did not run. When I came back to her she saw the form accompany me. It was visible only down to the waist. She had also seen what she supposed to be her sister at the window, and told me not to pay her any attention. There was at the time some misunderstanding between them. As I was going up the steps of the verandah I felt as it were a finger pulling me back by the collar. I did not look back, but G. screamed out, 'Look—my mother!' and fainted away. Place: Rio de Janeiro. Date, 1876; hour, nine o'clock p.m.

“I [had been] talking with my future wife on subjects of everyday life. Health and spirits of both good. Age at time between 21 and 22. (My wife was 21.)

“Our first impression was that my future sister-in-law was listening to our conversation. This annoyed me, and was the reason of my going to the window. I afterwards recognised my *fiancée’s* mother by the portrait in the family album, which I had already seen. She had been dead seven years.

“The light by which the above apparition was seen was that of the gas-lamp which stood just opposite the garden gate.”

A plan was enclosed, showing the position of the verandah in which Dr. and Mrs. da G. were sitting, the lamp in the street beyond, and the window of the house looking out on the garden, at which the apparition was first seen.

The collector, Professor Alexander, writes :—

Rio, *May 16th*, 1892.

“In answer to questions, the wife of Dr. da G. declares that she recollects seeing the figure at the window and behind Dr. da G. as he came towards the steps. It was visible from the waist up. She does not remember if it had a handkerchief tied round its head or not. She thought that the form at the window was that of her married sister, but she afterwards recognised her mother. She thinks that she told him at the time that it was her mother. She cried out at the moment that Dr. da G. felt himself pulled from behind. When she did so the form disappeared. This happened when they were on the verandah engaged in conversation. (Donna da G. does not seem to recollect the occurrence so well as her husband.)

“A. ALEXANDER.”

In the next case the figure is unrecognised, and the reasons for regarding it as hallucinatory are, first, its disappearing more rapidly than, as it seemed, a real person could have done; and, secondly, its oddness, suggesting that if it was a real person he must have been masquerading in a strange dress.

(256. 17.)

From Mrs. Goodhall.

27, Nevers-square, S. W., *February 6th*, 1890.

“Time, summer’s evening, towards the day’s wane, but still quite light. Place, the broad plateau of a high hill, between Willesden and Ravensden, on the road to the town of Bedford. Year, either 1873 or 1874. The road unusually wide, with deep margins of grass on both sides. I was being driven by my daughter in a low pony carriage, when I suddenly saw a figure, dressed in black from head to foot, advancing; it appeared to glide along. I said to my daughter, ‘Oh, do look at that strange figure!’ It passed on the left side of the carriage, on the grass, within two yards of us; as it did so, it turned its face directly our way, and of all the fiendish faces it was the most horrible you can imagine; its garments seemed to train behind it. My daughter looked back after it as it passed us; she says it turned its face over its shoulder, and looked towards us. I myself turned round immediately—it was gone. I told people in the county what we had

seen, but could never learn any history beyond the saying of the people, that part of the road was supposed to be haunted. The figure passed about three-quarters of a yard beyond the roadway.

“I was in good health and quite happy; age about 50.

“[The figure had] no likeness to any one I ever had seen or have seen since.

“My daughter, who was driving me at the time, confirms my statement.”
[Miss Goodhall adds here a note:—“I do. (Signed) MAY C. GOODHALL.”]

“I took no notes of the experience, but often spoke of it to others at the time, and also since.

“CHARLOTTE E. GOODHALL.”

Mr. Podmore writes:—

June 7th, 1892.

“I called to-day on Mrs. Goodhall. The figure was seen, according to the testimony of both ladies, in all but full daylight—a quite unmistakable figure. They could not determine which saw it first. But their interest was aroused at once, because, as both assured me, the figure seemed to glide, not walk. Mrs. Goodhall described the face as fiendish. Miss Goodhall said that it had a nasty expression, and a large mouth; like a man’s coarse features in a woman’s dress. Miss Goodhall looked round at once, and the figure had disappeared. It could not have disappeared if a real figure, as the distance from the hedge was too great. The vision can have lasted only a few seconds in all.

“Miss Goodhall has had no other hallucinations; but Mrs. Goodhall has had two or three auditory hallucinations.

“Mrs. Goodhall wrote a full account of the vision seen by herself and Miss Goodhall to her married daughter, in India at the time. The letter has unfortunately been destroyed; but Mrs. — told me that she remembered reading of the incident.

“I also saw an account written in a diary by Mrs. Goodhall three years (or more) after the event; which corresponds, almost word for word, with the account given to us.”

In the case of unrecognised figures collectively seen out of doors, it is usually on their unexplained disappearance that the evidence for their hallucinatory character depends; and the value of this evidence is often hard to estimate. We referred in Chapter V. (p. 98) to a case in which the two percipients took different views of a figure seen by them—one regarding its mysterious disappearance as explicable on the hypothesis that it was a real man, and the other holding the opposite opinion. When the two percipients agree that a real person could not have got out of sight in the manner in which the figure was seen to disappear, we must, at least, regard the disappearance as difficult of explanation; and this was, doubtless, the case in the experience just quoted.¹ Still, while there is the smallest possibility of bodily disap-

¹ This statement applies also to No. 513.3, which was printed in the *Journal* of the S.P.R., Vol. VI., p. 137.

pearance behind an obstacle to vision, some doubt as to the hallucinatory character of the experience must remain; and we require clearer cases to prove the fact of collective hallucinations.

Indoors, even when bodily disappearance is not absolutely excluded, there is often an additional difficulty in supposing an unrecognised figure to have been a real person—namely, the improbability of a stranger being there at all. This is the case with the following experience¹—where, however, the figure seen was very indefinite.

(49. 2 and 3.)

From Mr. and Mrs. C.

(The accounts were written in 1889.)

Mr. C. writes :—

“The place, my father’s house, a village rectory in the Eastern Counties; the room, that in which my mother died; the time, night, between 12 and 3 a.m.; date, July, 1879. My wife and I were both asleep, when I woke suddenly, found her sitting up, also just awake; she said: ‘What is that?’ At once I pointed to where, at the bottom of the bed, I saw indistinctly a white figure, unrecognisable, which at once vanished. I got out of bed and explored the room. There was no moonlight effect to account for the experience, the shutters being shut; no white garment, no apparent cause. We were both startled by the mutual experience, which was too short to accurately investigate; but we undoubtedly were both awakened at the same time by the consciousness of the presence of something in the room; both saw the same white unrecognisable figure, in the same place. I was asleep, but awakened into possession of every faculty at once by the consciousness of the above experience. We were both in excellent health. My mother had died some ten years before, and we had not been speaking of her; in fact, I had not told my wife that the bedroom we occupied was that in which my mother had died. The figure was too evanescent and unrecognisable, and insufficiently defined in outline, to identify. My wife was with me at the time, and gives her account so far as she remembers it. I should not have thought any more at all of the experience, but for the identity of our mutual experience. The date was no particular anniversary, nor impressed, by any event afterwards heard of, on the mind.

“C. V. C.”

Mrs. C. writes :—

“I saw a white form, without features visible, move at the end of the bed where I was lying, from near the middle to one side, where it vanished. This took place in the year 1879. I was asleep in bed and awoke in terrible fright with the feeling that some one was in the room, and I then saw the moving figure I have described. I was in perfect health at the time and in

¹ The statement applies also to two collective cases belonging to the Census—viz., No. 731.19, 20, and 21, and No. 717. 16, which were printed in the *Journal*, Vol. VI., pp. 133-37; and still more to one (No. 451. 4) published in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 619 (where it is numbered 666).

no trouble or anxiety. I had no impression of any particular person, it seemed simply a figure. My husband was with me, and experienced exactly the same sensations.

“H. E. C.”

Neither Mr. nor Mrs. C. has ever had any similar experience.

Mr. Myers writes :—

October 13th, 1891.

“I saw Mr. and Mrs. C. to-day. They are quite sure that each independently saw the figure. The incident occurred when they were paying their first visit to Mr. C.’s father’s house after their marriage. It was the first time that Mr. C. had been in that room since his mother’s death. There was no light in the room, and they cannot tell how the moving object, ‘like a white petticoat,’ was seen.”

Here the vagueness of the figure and the dimness of the light seem to leave room for the supposition that the experience was an illusion, rather than a hallucination, although the percipients failed to discover any basis for illusion. In this respect the case resembles a collective experience (No. 196. 2) quoted in Chapter V., p. 100.

In the next case the visual hallucination is of a slight kind, but its collective character appears unmistakable.

(37. 13.)

From Miss H. Wilson.

The Cottage, Ditchingham, Bungay, *August, 1888.*

“It was Sunday night. F. T., my cousin, Mrs. H. (an old servant and friend of the family), and I were sitting in the drawing-room. All the rest of the family were gone to church, the house was shut up, the shutters closed, and door shut.

“F. and I sat opposite each other on the same side of the table; two candles were on the table.

“I sat reading with my back turned to the candle near me, so that the light fell on my book. Suddenly the light disappeared, so that I could not go on reading. I looked round quickly, and saw a dark shadow pass between me and the candles. The shadow was so thick as to seem almost like a substance, but I did not see any *shape*. We both exclaimed, ‘I thought both the candles were going out,’ and F. said, ‘It seemed to me to come from the door.’ When the shadow had passed, the candles were perfectly clear and steady; the old nurse was stooping low over the fire, on the same side of the room as we were. She was in great trouble about a sick brother, and when we spoke to her did not seem to have noticed anything or heard us talk.

“Early next morning she was called away—her brother had died that night at 3 a.m.”

Miss Wilson writes later :—

September 6th, 1888.

“I enclose [my cousin’s] account of our experience, which you may find useful, though, probably through her natural timidity and nervousness, her recollection of what happened is not quite so clear as mine. I can quite

clearly remember that she said in answer to my remark, that 'it seemed like a thick shadow between me and the candle,' 'It seemed to me to come from the door.' The door was on her side of the room.

"———, a serjeant of H.M. —th, was the man's name, and he died in his own house at 3 a.m. on the night of March 4th last, or rather the morning of March 5th.¹ The doctor called his disease blood-poisoning. A few hours before his death he got out of bed in his restlessness, and neither doctor nor friends could persuade him to return to it. You will observe that the soldier died a few hours *after* we saw the shadow."

The note enclosed from Miss F. T. was as follows:—

"My cousin and I sat in the drawing-room on the evening of Sunday, March 4th, between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m., with a pair of composite candles on the table between us, or rather nearer my cousin, who was reading aloud. The elderly woman, sister of the man who was dying, sat on my left near the fire, looking down, too much absorbed in sad thoughts to notice anything. Suddenly the candles appeared to be momentarily obliterated, whether by a shadow passing by them or what I can scarcely say, and I exclaimed 'What's that?' or some such thing."

Miss Wilson has had another visual hallucination, given on p. 79, besides two referred to on p. 163.

Mr. Podmore writes:—

April 29th, 1892.

"I called on Miss Wilson to-day, and heard from her a full account of her several experiences.

"The time at which she saw the shadow was, she believes, about 8.30. A note was made at the time of the occurrence in an old pocket-book. Mrs. H. is still living, but even at the time knew nothing about the occurrence, which took place at Miss T.'s house.

"The shadow was extremely distinct, about the thickness of a man's body, height not noticed. It passed from the direction of the door, past Miss T., and Miss Wilson saw it just as it passed between herself and the candle, and then disappeared behind her. She is very positive that it could not have been due to any wind or mere flickering of the candle. It was a solid-seeming mass of almost black shadow. The occurrence made a strong impression upon Miss T., who is very nervous."

Mr. Podmore wrote to Miss T. for a fuller account, especially as to whether she saw the shadow before Miss Wilson, which the latter believed to have been the case. The following is her reply:—

May 5th, 1892.

"In answer to your letter of the 29th last, I can only say that my impression of the occurrence was something of a mist or shadow obliterating the candles. I said, 'What's that?' and my cousin looked up and left off reading, I believe quite simultaneously. I was not conscious of any

¹ March 4th, 1888, was a Sunday.

draught; but the shadow or whatever it should be called seemed to come from the direction of the door. I do not think I can say anything more."

This case, as will be seen, is at once collective and coincidental; but, in the absence of any recognition, the coincidence, we think, is not sufficiently close to establish clearly the telepathic origin of the experiences. If we regard the origin as telepathic, it will be another example of the phenomenon of *deflected* telepathic communication, discussed on p. 265; since it was the old nurse who was concerned with the dying man.

Collective Auditory Hallucinations.

We now pass to collective *auditory* hallucinations. The following is a good specimen of this class.

(735. 3 and 12.) From Messrs. de B. and V.

Mr. de B. writes:—

Rio de Janeiro, *April 3rd*, 1892.

"I heard a voice call a friend, who was with me in the same room, by his name—'Senhor V.' Place, Rua de S. Christina, Rio de Janeiro. We were both in bed in the same room. This happened in 1872.

"I was lying still in bed, but awake. Health good. I naturally sympathised with my friend, who had lost his wife on the previous day. My age at time was 42.

"I did not myself recognise the voice; but it was the name used by my friend's wife in addressing her husband. The friend above referred to, Sr. F. V., also heard the voice. Each of us asked at the same time if the other had heard it. I was staying at his house to keep him company in his bereavement.

"[With regard to other experiences], I may have felt hallucinatory impressions of touch, but I am not sure about it."

Mr. V. writes:—

Rio de Janeiro, *April 4th*, 1892.

"I awoke, hearing the voice of my wife calling me by name—'Senhor V.' The call was repeated after I had awaked, and it was then that each of us (Sr. G. de B. and I) asked the other if he had heard the voice. We spoke simultaneously. I slept in a bed made up on the floor. My friend slept in another bed, so placed that our heads were near together. The lamps were still alight in the street, but there were faint indications that the day was just breaking. Date, night of May 7th, 1871 (and not 1872); place, Rua de S. Christina, Rio de Janeiro.

"I had been sleeping a troubled sleep, but was awake the second time that the voice called. On the 6th of May my wife died. She was buried on the 7th. I was, therefore, under the influence of grief. Age at time, 38."

Mr. V. has had one other hallucinatory experience, thus described :—

“At the request of my dying son, Arthur, I had been to light the candles in the chapel. I had lighted them before, and was surprised to find them put out. On withdrawing I closed the door of the chapel. The sacristy, where I then was with my friend, Sr. J. B., was completely in the dark. I saw before me the form of Arthur dressed in the habit of St. Francis, to whose Order he belonged. The form shone with a light of its own. This was in 1886. Age 53.

“Arthur had received the last Sacrament and was dying. He was still living at the time of the vision. He died shortly after, and was buried in the habit of the Order to which he belonged. The vision was very distinct.”

Professor Alexander adds :—

“Sr. J. B. declares that he himself saw nothing.”

A case in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 221 (No. 336), which also comes into the Census, may be compared with this,—both being recognised voices of persons recently dead.

In the following case the voice was unrecognised ; but, like the one quoted at p. 318, it is a coincidental case which may have been telepathic in its origin.

(138. 18.)

From Mr. C. H. Cary.

Secretary's Office, G.P.O., *March 24th*, 1892.

“I heard a voice say ‘Joseph ! Joseph !’ [at] Bow, London, E. The date was March 8th, 1875, the time about 8.30 p.m.

“[I was] talking with my father and cousin (Joseph) about the battle of Balaklava. In good health, &c. My age was nearly 13.

“I never remember seeing the person whose voice it was afterwards believed to be. The individual was dying at the time.

“My father, R. H. Cary, and my cousin, Joseph Cary [were present]. All three of us heard the voice, which we suppose to be Joseph's grandmother.

“C. H. CARY.”

Mr. Cary writes to the collector, Mr. Podmore :—

March 25th, 1892.

“I herewith enclose the form you gave. I have filled it up to the best of my remembrance, and am thoroughly convinced of the truth of what actually occurred. The name of the individual whose voice it was supposed we heard was that of my cousin's grandmother (no relation of mine), Mary Victor ; she died at Lynwood, Paul, near Penzance.”

Mr. Cary further informs us that he has had no other hallucinations, except the hearing of footsteps. He heard them first in 1879, and his brother died shortly after. He did not then know that such sounds were regarded as premonitory of a death. He has heard them twice since, and on each occasion a cousin of his died. His father also had heard them more than once, and each time lost a brother. Mr. Cary says of these sounds : “I express no opinion of belief or disbelief as to their supernaturality.”

Mr. Podmore writes:—

“Mr. Cary explained to me that the voice was heard on the day, and, as he believes, near the actual hour, of death. Mrs. Victor was known to be very ill, but her death was not supposed to be imminent.

“So far as he knows the voice was heard independently by all three persons. It was, indeed, mistaken for the voice of Mrs. Cary (narrator’s mother), who was in an adjoining room.

“When the telegram came announcing the death, Mr. Joseph Cary said that it must have been his grandmother’s voice which he heard.

“Mr. C. H. Cary did not recognise the voice at all, and he believes his father did not either. It merely seemed to them to be a woman’s voice.

“There were no ties of affection between the deceased and the narrator or his father.”

Mr. Podmore has written three times to Mr. Joseph Cary, asking for his recollections of the incident, but has received no reply.

Mr. R. H. Cary, in answer to a request for his corroboration, wrote to Mr. Podmore:—

49, Gladsmuir-road, Highgate, N., *March 31st, 1892.*

“DEAR SIR,—With reference to your enquiry concerning the voice which was heard at the time of the late Mrs. Victor’s death, I am able to state that my son, my nephew, and myself were sitting together, and we all heard it distinctly. This occurred about fourteen years ago. The account given by my son exactly coincides with my own recollection.

“R. H. CARY.”

We have verified the date of death at Somerset House.

We have one other collective auditory case—besides the one just quoted—which is stated to have been coincidental, but with illness, not death: in this, also, the percipient’s name was called in an unrecognised voice.

Collectivity with Partial Dissimilarity.

There is a somewhat different, but important, kind of collective hallucination in which the percipients have simultaneous hallucinatory experiences involving something of the same idea, though differing markedly from one another. The following¹ is a good illustration (for another instance, see No. 740. 9, p. 373).

(703. 24.)

From Lady C.

October 13th, 1884.

“In October, 1879, I was staying at Bishophthorpe, 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

¹This case has already appeared in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 203. We have accordingly given the percipients’ accounts as there published.

called out at once, 'Did you see that?' and at the same time 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."

Miss Z. T.'s account is dated 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 Bishoptope, York."

"Z. J. T."

There are about 8 cases more or less of this type in our collection, but the evidence in most of them is deficient in various ways. The following is an auditory case of the kind, which, though one of the percipients was young at the time and the evidence of the other can no longer be obtained, seems to us worthy of consideration. The surviving witness is well known in the educational world, in which he occupies an important position. It will be observed that the experience is coincidental as well as collective.

(289. 13.)

From Mr. P. B.

June 15th, 1890.

"I heard my grandfather call me by name in our own house. I was about nine, and not of nervous temperament, nor apprehensive of anything. I cannot fix the date, and quite forget the exact hour; but my mother thought at the same moment that she heard herself called, and we both came, from different rooms, to answer. I did not know what my grandfather was doing or where he was at the time. As a matter of fact he was, at the same time, dying at Fenchurch Street Station."

Mr. B. states that he has never had any other experience of the kind.

Mr. Podmore writes:—

November 24th, 1891.

"I called to-day on Mr. B. His grandfather's (mother's father) name was S. L.; he lived at Prestwich, near Manchester: but he died quite suddenly (Mr. B. could not state the cause of death) at Fenchurch Street Station, in or about 1868. He was about 84 years old at the time, and apparently well and hearty. He had come up from Manchester a few days before on purpose to see his grandson before he went to school. He was much attached to the boy. Mr. B. was living with his parents at Bow at the time, and was about 9 or 10 years old (he is now 33). Mr. L. had gone out for the afternoon; was expected back for dinner at about 6 p.m. There was

no cause for anxiety at all. Some time between early dinner and 6 p.m. (probably about 3 p.m.) Mr. B. thought he heard his grandfather call him, 'Percy': he ran into the hall and met his mother, who thought she had heard her father call, 'Sarah.' Mr. B. recognised the voice, and states that his mother (now dead) recognised it also. He is pretty sure that it was not a real sound mistaken for the grandfather's voice. As Mr. L. did not come in at 6 p.m., Mrs. B. grew anxious, and went out to search for news of him; and whilst she was absent—about 7 p.m.—a messenger came to announce the death. Mrs. B. was much impressed by the coincidence of the voice with the death. She was by no means a nervous or fanciful woman; and, her son believes, had had no other experience of the kind. Mr. B.'s father—the only other witness—is dead.

"Mr. B. trusts the accuracy of his own memory for the facts here set down. He has had no other experience, and has no special interest in the subject."

Another case which is, in its essential features, of the same nature as a collective hallucination with different percepts, will be found in Chapter XVII., p. 383, (No. 726. 14). Here, however, the experience of one of the percipients seems to have been a pseudo-hallucination rather than a completely externalised sensory hallucination.

The class of cases in which one percipient sees an apparition, while he and others collectively hear a non-vocal sound, such as footsteps, or see a door opening and closing, has already been discussed in Chapter X. In such cases it is generally possible that the noise or movement was real, and it may in some cases even have been the immediately suggesting cause of the hallucination.

Explanations of Collective Hallucinations.

The reader has now before him the cases in the Census which seem to us on the whole to afford the best evidence for collective hallucination. Here, as with the death-coincidences, there is of course no sharp line marking off the more convincing cases from the others. Different judges would probably form different estimates, and some, for instance, of the narratives from the Census already printed in the *Journal* of the S.P.R., Vol. VI., and referred to in foot-notes on previous pages, might in the judgment of some persons seem more impressive than some of those in the present chapter.

The cogency of the evidence in the aggregate will also be differently estimated by different persons. Few, however, are likely to regard it as strong compared with that for apparitions coinciding with deaths, and if the case for collective hallucinations rested on the Census alone, it would perhaps be rash to regard it as conclusively proved that hallucinations may be shared. It does not so rest, however. Readers of *Phan-*

tasms of the Living will remember that a considerable mass of evidence for collective hallucinations was there presented and discussed (see Vol. II., Chapter XVIII.), and since then further cases have been received and laid before the Society from time to time in the *Journal*. Among the latter, we may especially refer to the case of the brothers Ellwood (*Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 286) who state—in an account written within two months of the experience—that they simultaneously saw a hallucinatory figure standing at their bedside; the case of three sisters—the Misses Du Cane—who collectively saw the figure “of a young man of middle height, dressed in dark clothes and wearing a peaked cap,” which vanished “within a few inches of” two of them (*Journal*, Vol. V., p. 224); the case of Lady B. and Miss B. (*Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 145); and, finally, the very remarkable case narrated by Miss Atkinson—a few months after the experience—in an account (*Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 230) from which we extract the following:—

“My friend had been telling me of a very dear old friend of the family [Dr. —] who was buried in the church. . . . I remember that the neglect of his wish [to have a window put in to his memory] quite made me angry. . . . Just then I saw an old gentleman behind us, but, thinking he was looking over the church, took no notice. But my friend got very white and said ‘Come away, there is Dr.—!’ Not being a believer in apparitions, I simply for the moment thought she was crazy, though I knew they were a ghost-seeing family. But when I moved, still looking at him, and the figure before my very eyes vanished, I had to give in. . . . When we got outside my friend told me that his was the figure which came to different members of their family so often, and, indeed, had been the cause of their leaving one house.”

To all this previous evidence, that included in the Census adds material confirmation, and we do not think it can reasonably be doubted that collective hallucinations occur, though unmistakable ones are somewhat rare.

If this be so, we may probably regard our collection as a typical one; and may conclude from it that collectivity is fairly distributed over the different classes of hallucinations; since an analysis of the cases stated to be collective shows that all the classes into which we have divided visual and auditory hallucinations are adequately represented among them, except visions and religious apparitions.¹

Another point on which our statistics are calculated to throw light is the question how far hallucinations tend to be shared, when there is more than one person present. As already stated, the cases in the Census in which a visual hallucination is shared are about a third of those in which we know that two or more persons

¹ See Table in *Appendix F*.

were together and awake—namely, 95 out of 283. Among the 95 cases there are 38 in which there were more than two persons present, and in 23, or about three-fifths, of these all present shared in the experience. At first sight, therefore, it appears legitimate to infer that shared visual hallucinations are more rarely unseen by some present than hallucinations confined to a single percipient. But in view of the probability that in collective cases many of the supposed hallucinatory objects were real, it would be unsafe to draw any inferences from this ; especially as, among the 38 cases, examination shows that in a considerably larger proportion of those where all present saw the object than of the others, there are grounds for suspecting that the objects were real and not hallucinatory.

We may further use our collection as a basis for the discussion of the important question, how any hallucinations at all come to be collective. There are four possible hypotheses apart from the supposition that the object collectively perceived, while not belonging to the ordinary external world, was yet a real object subject to physical laws. The difficulties of this supposition have been discussed by Mr. Gurney in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., Chapter XVIII., and need not detain us now.

Of the remaining four hypotheses, the first is that some real external object suggests to each percipient through the senses a hallucination which assumes a similar form for each owing to similar associations and trains of thought. This explanation seems to us admissible in special cases, *e.g.*, in No. 317. 14, p. 308, where, as both sisters were actually expecting to see the same sight in the same place, some movement in the distance may have acted for both as a starting point for the hallucination. But, as the narratives above given sufficiently show, this explanation cannot cover more than a small part of the cases of alleged collective hallucinations, and we must therefore for the remainder have recourse to one or more of the other three hypotheses. These are :—

(1) That a hallucination experienced by one percipient is transferred to the other by verbal or other suggestion through the ordinary senses.

(2) That the hallucination of one percipient is similarly transferred to the other, but telepathically—by mental suggestion.

(3) That there is an external agent directly affecting the minds of both percipients and producing a hallucination independently in each, in some supernormal manner.

The last hypothesis has been amplified by Mr. Myers in a “Note on a suggested mode of psychical interaction,” appended to *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., p. 277, *et seq.* The view there set forth was

that in all cases there is an agent, who is himself telepathically or clairvoyantly affected, and that the appearance of this agent, A, to the percipients, B and C, depends on A's own perception of his own presence (psychically) in the scene where his phantasm is observed. Now there is, no doubt, a small amount of evidence supporting the view that persons clairvoyantly or telepathically perceiving a locality to which they feel themselves temporarily transported, as it were, may sometimes manifest themselves more or less clearly to a person in that locality. The experience of Mr. and Mrs. Newnham, in which Mr. Newnham dreamt very vividly that he saw Mrs. Newnham, to whom he was then engaged, going upstairs in her own house, and that running up after her, he clasped her round the waist; while Mrs. Newnham, who was actually going upstairs at the time, thought she heard his step and felt his arms,¹ is a case in point. And another possible case is one of Dr. Backman's experiments, in which a clairvoyant girl describes a room in which a gentleman was sitting—he at the same time imagining that he saw a woman.²

But the evidence of this kind in our possession is not, in the view of the majority of the Committee, sufficient to justify us in regarding reciprocal telepathic influence as a completely established fact; and even if it were otherwise, the rarity of the proved cases of reciprocity would still be a serious objection against admitting the hypothesis that we are now considering as a universally applicable explanation of collectivity.

Further, if this reciprocal action between agent and percipient were a general explanation of collective hallucinations, we should expect to find that the agent, when a living person, was sometimes aware of it; *e.g.*, in the case of Miss K. E., seen by her sisters in the church, p. 306. But in the present collection we have no instance among the collective cases of consciousness of any reciprocal action: and there is only one such case—an auditory one—in *Phantasms of the Living*.³

Finally, if Councillor Wesermann's record of an experiment, given in the *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VI., p. 287, be accepted as trustworthy—and we know no reason for distrusting it—it seems to us to afford a crucial instance against the theory that reciprocal action between the distant agent and the percipients is a necessary condition of collective percipience. In this case we have an apparition experimentally produced—an apparition not of the agent himself, but of a dead person; it appears to the person whom the agent intended to impress, but not

¹ *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., p. 225.

² *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. VII., pp. 206-207.

³ Vol. II., p. 164 (No. 308).

in the place where the agent believed the percipient to be; and it appears not only to the intended percipient, but to a person unknown to the agent, and of whose local proximity to the intended percipient the agent was entirely unaware, until informed of it through the ordinary channels of intelligence. Hence it seems clear (1) that the agent's success in impressing the percipient whom he intended to impress was entirely independent of the locality of the latter, and (2) that the channel of communication with the secondary percipient was through the first percipient and not through the agent's thought of the locality.

The question, however, still remains whether the mere fact of collective perception of an apparition is a ground for supposing some supernormal action of an external agent on the joint percipients. This supposition is difficult to reconcile with the numerous¹ cases in which the person represented in a collective hallucination is known not to have been passing through any crisis at the time of the hallucination: but a stronger argument against it lies in the cases where the apparition is not human. The cat, for instance, in No. 535.2 (see p. 305) can hardly have caused its apparition by projecting itself psychically first into one house and then into another, in which the percipients happened to be.

It is true that collective non-human apparitions are rare, but so are non-human apparitions which are not collective; indeed, collective experiences are more than proportionately represented in the non-human classes.²

On the whole then, we can only allow, at most, a restricted application to the hypothesis that in collective hallucinations an external agent affects both percipients directly. In a considerable proportion of cases we have to fall back on the other two hypotheses, and suppose that the phenomenon is due to the influence of one percipient on the other, either through ordinary or through telepathic suggestion. Of course, in cases in which there is a distant agent,—as in Councillor

¹ In 14 of the 27 cases reported to us of recognised apparitions of living persons collectively perceived, the person represented appears, from the statements made, to have been at the time in a perfectly ordinary condition.

² In one case in our Census (No. 296. 1) a hallucinatory chair is said to have been seen by two persons; one of whom (Mrs. Savile Lumley) describes the experience,—which occurred many years ago—as follows:—

“While taking a lesson in drilling and callisthenics, with a class of girls, at 20, Camden Place, Bath, in the forenoon . . . I and another girl distinctly saw a chair over which we felt we must fall, and called out to each other to avoid it, but *no chair was there*. All chairs were removed to make room. [I was] 14 or 15, in good health. Several [persons were present], but only one other saw the same—the girl who was immediately behind me.”

Wesermann's case, and presumably in the coincidental cases,¹—the experiences of the simultaneous percipients may be both directly produced by him ; but, even when this is to some extent the case, we are disposed to think that they are still seldom wholly independent of each other. If they were, it appears to us in the first place that, considering the variety of forms that telepathic impressions take, the hallucinations of different percipients in collective cases would be more often decidedly divergent than they are—would appeal to different senses, for instance, or one percipient would see an apparition standing and another would see it sitting, one would see it in one dress and one in another, etc. Or, if this does not happen because the form of the phantasm is due to the agent's thought, we should at least expect that it would generally be seen by the different percipients to occupy different positions in the room.

It is not necessary to suppose that, if there is action by one percipient on the other, or mutual action between their minds, their percepts will in all respects agree. For instance, in No. 703. 24 (see p. 317), where the hallucinations affected different senses, they may still have been the result of thought-transference between the percipients. All that we are maintaining is that it is difficult or impossible to explain the degree of agreement which we usually find on the assumption that the percepts are independent of each other.

We pass, then, to consider what, in collective cases, is the nature of the action between the minds of the percipients. Does it take place through the ordinary channels of sense, or is it telepathic? As regards the first hypothesis, we explained in Chapter X., pp. 176-7, that we have at present no conclusive evidence for the possibility of the *sudden* production of a sensory hallucination in a person in an entirely normal² state, by word or gesture. But it is quite possible that the vividness of impression, produced in A by the hallucination, may be required in order to enable his word or movement to convey the impression to B with hallucination-producing force. A mere idea or effort of the imagination is a very different thing from the feeling of reality which a hallucination momentarily gives. At any rate, it would not be safe to assume that the action between the minds has been telepathic, unless

¹ The proportion of collective cases among coincidental hallucinations in the Census is slightly smaller than among hallucinations generally, but there is not a great difference. Seven visual death-coincidences are said to have been collective out of 26 in which the percipient had a waking companion.

² The instances known to us in which hallucinations have been produced by verbal suggestion, outside the hypnotic state, are either (*a*) cases of persons who have previously been hypnotized, or (*b*) cases where the effect has been produced by prolonged and insistent effort.

we have excluded the possibility of ordinary suggestion, and it is very difficult to exclude this completely. There is hardly a case among those which we have given in the course of the present report, where we can feel sure that it did not operate in some degree. It is obvious, however, that suggestion of this kind would more easily account for the phenomenon in some cases than in others. If the figure seen is that of a person who is well known to both percipients, who is more likely to be in that place than any one else, or still more if he is actually expected by both (as in No. 317. 14, p. 308), a very small amount of sensory suggestion from A might convey the idea to B, and if they were both to have hallucinations they would be likely to have similar ones. On the other hand, if the figure seen is an unfamiliar one (as in No. 535. 2, p. 305, and 256. 17, p. 310), we can hardly conceive that the idea of it could be conveyed from one percipient to the other through the senses in the brief time available. No doubt there is a possibility that in comparing notes immediately after the experience, the percipients may have unconsciously brought their recollections into a unison of detail not warranted by the original impressions. But our enquiries have not produced any positive evidence that this has occurred: and to suppose it to have occurred to the extent required in order to explain collective hallucinations entirely by sensory suggestion, seems to us unwarrantable and extravagant.

We think, therefore, that in the explanation of these cases, the hypothesis of ordinary suggestion must be at least supplemented by that of telepathic suggestion. For those who believe in telepathy, mental suggestion is really an easier explanation of collective hallucinations than verbal suggestion; for not only can we imagine the idea thus conveyed pictorially, as it were, and with full details, in an instant, but we have actual experimental instances of hallucinations telepathically produced in persons in a normal state, by the intention of another person. In these experimental cases, moreover, the effect was produced under apparently less favourable circumstances—namely, greater distance and absence of any indication that there was anything special to be looked for.¹ On the whole we are inclined to think that in collective cases there is generally a combination of telepathy with suggestion by word or gesture, each helping the other; and that this is the reason why the proportion of collective cases out of those in which a second possible percipient was present is large compared with the proportion

¹ In visual collective cases there must generally be at least the indication given by the direction of the eyes—an indication to which most of us are habitually sensitive. For evidence of this among cases printed in this chapter, see especially Nos. 535. 2 (p. 305), 647. 7 (p. 306), 256. 17 (p. 310).

of successful cases of telepathy among those in which we must suppose that persons dying, or in some other crisis, have desired to communicate with their friends.

The Sharing of Hallucinations by Animals.

Before concluding this chapter, we have to discuss a special class of alleged collective hallucinations of which nothing has as yet been said—those, namely, in which it is believed by our informants that animals who were present with them when they saw apparitions shared in the experience. There appears to be some evidence (occasionally very slight) of this in 15 out of the 27 cases in the Census where the presence of animals¹ is recorded.

There is, so far as we know, no reason to assume that animals cannot experience hallucinations; but it is necessarily very difficult to prove that they do experience them; because, as they cannot describe what they see and hear, we can only infer it from their behaviour, for which there may be other causes besides the apparition. In some cases it is at least as plausible to suppose that the emotion of the horse or dog is caused by the behaviour or appearance of his master when seeing the apparition, as to suppose it caused by any sharing of his master's hallucination. For instance, consider the case of Mr. Mamtchitch, quoted in Chapter XVII. Mr. Mamtchitch tells us, at p. 389, that certain effects observable by those with him are produced on himself each time he sees the apparition which has so frequently recurred in his experience. Is it not probable that the behaviour of the dog described at p. 390 was due to the distress caused by his master's unusual state rather than by seeing the apparition, especially as he does not seem to have behaved as he habitually did when a stranger intruded into the room?² When the action of the animal which leads to the inference that he is a co-percipient precedes the seeing of the apparition by the human percipient—which is said to have occurred in 5 of the 15 cases in which animals play a part—there is, no doubt, generally suggestion from the animal; but that may be the whole of his share in the phenomenon. In the following case, for instance, the dog's growl and the direction of his gaze suggested to Mr. S. that some one was coming in; but the dog's action may have had quite a different cause.

¹ In all but one of these cases, the animal was either a horse or a dog. In the other case it was a parrot, but the details of the account are too meagre for it to be possible to lay any stress on it.

² The evidence for Mr. Mamtchitch's little son sharing his hallucination on one occasion (see p. 390) is much stronger than that for the dog's doing so; because, though the child could scarcely speak, he could say enough to show that he thought he saw a woman.

(157. 11.)

From Mr. H. E. S.

August 8th, 1892.

“[When aged about 18] about the year 1874, in my father’s house, I got up one summer morning about five o’clock, and lighted a fire to get myself some tea. A large bull-terrier dog used to follow me about everywhere, so of course he had to be near me when I was getting the fire to light. He gave a short growl and looked towards the door; this caused me to look round, and to my great terror I saw a tall, dark figure with flashing bright eyes coming into the kitchen towards me. I screamed for help and fell to the floor. My father and brothers ran down from their bedrooms thinking that thieves were in the house. I told them what I had seen, but they said it was an imagination caused by a recent illness. But why should the dog have seen something as well as myself? This dog often used to see things invisible to me. He would start and snap at them, and then turn to me a look with his big eyes, as much as to say: ‘Did you see that?’”

In this case the percipient had had two other hallucinations, one before, (at the age of five years), and one after that here quoted, so that he probably had a more than average susceptibility to them; though it appears that the dog’s behaviour often suggested the presence of things invisible to him, without producing a hallucination.

In the two following cases there is even less indication that the dog saw the apparition, though there is a good deal of indication that he was the cause of his master’s seeing it.

(116. 11.)

From the Rev. J. W.

(The account was written in 1891.)

“[I saw] lady looking into room about 12.30 [a.]m. ; saw her in clear moonlight; about the year 1862. [I was] reading and writing, till called out by howling of dog. [I] believed she was on [the] sea at the time. No person present, but the dog shared the experience, as he was in the utmost terror. [I have] never again [had such an experience. I] took no notes but never forgot it.”

(283. 25.)

From Mr. L. D.

January, 1890.

“I was awakened by a little dog (which used to lie at the bottom of my bed), and looking towards the window, I distinctly saw the figure of a woman. She was dressed in a low necked dress and short sleeves bunched up on the shoulder. I asked about it and could gain no information.”

In the following case it is doubtful whether the dog’s excitement began before or after the experience of the human percipient. It will be noticed that to those persons who did not see the apparition, the dog’s behaviour does not appear to have at the time suggested the need of a supernatural explanation.

(583. 14.)

From Mrs. T.

(Translated from the original Russian by Mr. Aksakoff.)

October, 1891.

Notes prises sur le récit de Madame T.

“ En 187— Madame T. se trouvait un jour chez ses voisins de campagne, M. et Mme. B., à P., leur bien (au gouvernement de Twer). La conversation s'engagea sur un événement tragique, qui eu lieu dans la famille des T., qui finit par le suicide d'un des parents de Mme. T. ; tout à coup elle le vit apparaître dans la chambre contigue au salon où ils se trouvaient, et dont la porte était ouverte. Au même moment, le chien de la maîtresse de la maison, qui était couché à ses pieds, se redressa, et commença à aboyer furieusement dans la direction de la porte. M. et Mme. B. ne virent rien, car ils tournaient le dos à cette porte, et Mme. T. ne leur dit rien de ce qu'elle avait vu.”

Confirmation de ce récit par une lettre du témoin, Madame B.

October 15th, 1891.

“ C'était en 187— à notre bien, P. (gouv. de Twer). Nous étions trois : Mme. T., notre voisine, qui était venue nous voir, mon mari et moi ; nous nous trouvions dans le petit salon de notre maison de campagne, non loin d'une porte ouverte donnant sur ma chambre à coucher, éclairée par une grande fenêtre. Madame T. était assise sur une couchette, en face de cette porte ; moi j'étais assise auprès d'elle sur un tabouret, aussi en face de cette porte ; mais mon mari se trouvait dans un coin, de façon qu'il ne voyait pas cette porte. A mes pieds était couché mon chien Beppo, la tête tournée vers cette porte. Nous parlions de l'événement qui venait d'avoir lieu dans la famille des T., où la femme, entraînée par la passion, abandonna ses enfants et son mari, et celui-ci, dans son désespoir, se brûla la cervelle. Mon mari accusait la femme, Mme. T. accusait le mari, qu'elle avait toujours beaucoup aimé, mais dans ce cas elle ne l'excusait pas. Tout à coup elle se tut, et le chien, relevant la tête, se mit à hurler et voulut se précipiter vers la porte ouverte de la chambre à coucher ; tout son poil se hérissa, et il s'arrachait de mes mains pour se jeter sur quelqu'un. J'avais grande peine à le retenir ; mon mari voulait le battre, et moi je le défendait. Ni moi, ni lui, nous ne vîmes rien hors la colère de notre chien. Mme. T. se taisait, et quand notre chien se calma, elle proposa de passer dans la salle, où se trouvait son mari. Bientôt M. et Mme. T. partirent et ce n'est que plus tard, quand j'allai leur faire une visite à leur campagne, que Mme. T. me dit qu'elle avait vu, au-devant de la porte de ma chambre à coucher, le fantôme de celui qu'elle accusait—vêtu de blanc, et avec une expression de désespoir dans ses mouvements, comme lui reprochant qu'elle aussi était contre lui. ‘ Votre Beppo a vu la même chose, me dit elle, il était furieux et voulait se jeter sur cette apparition. ’ J'ai bien vu la furie de Beppo, mais je n'ai pas vu l'apparition. ”

The following is an instance of a horse supposed to see an apparition. It is, again, rather doubtful whether the unwonted experience began with the animal or with the man. In the latter case we must allow for the disturbing effect on the pony, which would certainly be

considerable, if—as must have happened—his rider pulled him up as though there was an obstacle in front of him, when there was none.

(532. 6.)

From Captain C.

December 5th, 1891.

“Between 10 and 11 one moonlight night, in December, 1865, or January, 1866, in Darjeeling, whilst riding my hill-pony at a sharp trot along the mountain road from that station to the convalescent depôt, Jullapahur, where I happened to be stationed at the time on sick leave, I suddenly saw before me what appeared to be a dead native, wrapped in a white sheet, and lying stretched across the road. My pony evidently saw the apparition, or whatever it was, at the same time, for he instantly reared up and fell over backwards with me on the road, and dragged me close to the edge of a ‘khud’ or precipice. I regained my feet just in time, and raised the prostrate animal by the bridle. Found it trembling in every limb, and much frightened. Looked round angrily to ‘wig’ the native—thinking him to be, perhaps, a drunken Bhootea, or Hill-man, lying there, when, lo and behold! *he had disappeared!* On one side was the precipice, on the other the precipitous mountain side, clothed with a few trees higher up, *and not an object else to be seen but the white road!* Mounting, and making my way half or three-quarters of a mile further on to my bungalow, I handed the pony over to one of my servants. He presently came to me and said, ‘Sir, what is the matter with the pony; he is trembling all over?’ After a while, my syce, or groom, came running up and entered the stable. (It is usual for native grooms, or syces, in India to run on foot after their masters’ horses.) He likewise soon presented himself before me, saying, ‘Sir, what is wrong with your pony; he seems to be much frightened?’ I then told him what had happened, and asked if he had met or seen anyone on the road? ‘No, sir; not a soul all the way,’ replied he. ‘Did you notice anything strange at all?’ ‘No; nothing whatever, sir.’

“I remained some months after that at Jullapahur, and never could I ride my pony up and down that road leading to Darjeeling without his showing the utmost trepidation whenever he approached that particular spot. I may mention that I was a good deal cut and bruised by the sudden and unlooked-for fall, and so also was the unfortunate pony. And to this day I cannot account for my adventure.

“[I was at the time] on nine months’ sick-leave from Bhootan, where I had contracted fever during the campaign, but was convalescent at the time, and able to go about in the better climate of the hills at Darjeeling; was then about 24 years old.”

In answer to enquiries, Captain C. adds:—

“The apparition, when I first saw it, seemed to be quite close—a yard or two only in front of my pony’s head. I came across it *very suddenly* in trotting quickly round a sharp curve of the road, which curve was made by the road running round a somewhat pointed spur of the mountain there jutting out. The road was white—a good and smooth one—and the night bright moonlight, with occasional intervals of less light, *i.e.*, when the moon became obscured by passing clouds, but even then it was by no means too dark to see objects around. Bhooteas and other Hill-men were in the habit of visiting

the bazaar (Darjeeling) with loads of firewood, fowls, and vegetables for sale, and some of these occasionally indulged too freely in arrack and toddy, and have been known to lie about the roads in a state of intoxication. I consequently took my apparition at first to be a drunken Bhootea, lying wrapped up in his sheet on the road ; but the remarkable thing is, if so, *where could the fellow have disappeared to so very rapidly and completely*, for on my right hand was the tremendous 'khud,' or precipice, and on my left nothing but the steep mountain side, up which there was nothing to prevent my seeing a good way till the trees were reached. I had in those days, and have still, capital sight, and having had rather a stirring life, having gone through many a trying and dangerous experience, both in time of war and of peace—the Indian Mutiny campaign, and Bhootan War, etc.—I am not easily upset or frightened. But what the thing could have been beats my comprehension, nor could any of my brother officers or friends in Darjeeling at the time, or afterwards, solve the mystery."

Readers of the *Journal* will remember that it has been maintained (see *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. IV., p. 296-7) that "one of the most commonly reported incidents connected with a post-mortem phantasm is the evident terror shown by animals present at the time, a feature which," the writer says, "is absent, so far as I know, in phantasms of the living." He calculated that of the cases published by the S.P.R., animal terror was not recorded in connection with any recognised phantasm of a living person, but was reported in about 12 per cent. of other cases, "nearly all unrecognised, but generally assumed by the percipient to be post-mortem, for reasons more or less cogent." This result is not confirmed by the present collection. Fear or alarm seemed to have been exhibited by the animals in about 8 of the 15 cases in which they are supposed to have seen the apparitions seen by human percipients. In one of these, viz., No. 116. 11 (see p. 327), the apparition was of a living person ; in one, viz., No. 422. 22, (see p. 390), of a dead person ; and in the other six unrecognised. In none of the unrecognised cases is there any good reason for associating the apparition with a dead person, and, except in one case (No. 80. 21, see *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. IV., p. 139), no reason is even suggested.

On the whole the reported cases of animals seeing apparitions do not appear to us to afford material support to the evidence for collectivity, nor need they, we think, influence our views as to its causes.

CHAPTER XVI.

PREMONITIONS AND LOCAL APPARITIONS.

In Chapter XIV. we gave some instances of hallucinations occurring during the illness of the persons whom they represented or suggested to the percipient. We there regarded such an experience as due to telepathy,—supposing it to be probably contemporaneous with a crisis of illness and caused by the condition of the mind or nervous system of the person passing through the crisis. At the same time, we are aware that, where the illness had a fatal termination, the popular view of such a hallucination—so far as it was regarded as more than merely subjective—would be that it was “premonitory” of the death that followed.

We do not think that there is any adequate justification in the cases which we have given, or in other cases of the same kind, for introducing the vast difficulties involved in this view. There is no sufficient reason for regarding them as caused differently from other hallucinations occurring during the illness of the persons represented or suggested, where the illness does not end fatally,—of which we have given two examples. But in view of the traditional belief that apparitions of living persons are generally premonitory of the death of the person represented, it may be worth while to mention that out of the 301 such apparitions—other than death-coincidences—reported to us in the Census, it is stated in only 22 cases that the person represented died some time after; the interval between the apparition and death varying from 15 hours to a year. Of these 22, 7 coincided with a sudden and fatal illness of the agent, unknown to the percipient (being included in the 11 cases of coincidence with illness mentioned on p. 278). In 6 other cases, the apparition occurred during the course of an illness, about which the percipient was in more or less anxiety. There remain therefore only 9 cases¹—in two of which the interval between hallucination and death was as much as a year—which we have no ground for attributing either to telepathy or to anxiety; and these are clearly insufficient to show that there was any real connexion between the apparition and the death that followed it. Indeed, it can hardly be said that the circumstances strongly suggest such a connexion, except in one case (No. 1. 5), where the percipient, lying awake in bed in the early morning, saw an apparition of her brother sitting in the room. About 15 hours later, he was killed in a railway accident. The incident occurred about 25 years before it was reported to us, and no corroboration is obtainable.

¹ One of these is No. 470. 1, see p. 193.

There are, however, seven or eight cases of hallucinations of a different kind (that is, other than recognised apparitions of living persons) which have perhaps a *prima facie* claim to be regarded as prescient or premonitory. Of these we proceed to give the most interesting; but we cannot regard them as constituting an important addition to the evidence already collected on this subject.¹

(458. 9.)

From Mrs. McAlpine.²Garseadden, Bearsden, Glasgow, *April 20th, 1892.*

“I remember in the June of 1889, I drove to Castleblaney, a little town in the County Monaghan, to meet my sister, who was coming by train from Longford. I expected her at 3 o’clock, but as she did not come with that train, I got the horse put up, and went for a walk in the demesne. The day was very warm and bright, and I wandered on under the shade of the trees to the side of a lake, which is in the demesne. Being at length tired, I sat down to rest upon a rock, at the edge of the water. My attention was quite taken up with the extreme beauty of the scene before me. There was not a sound or movement, except the soft ripple of the water on the sand at my feet. Presently I felt a cold chill creep through me, and a curious stiffness of my limbs, as if I *could* not move, though wishing to do so. I felt frightened, yet chained to the spot, and as if impelled to stare at the water straight in front of me. Gradually a black cloud seemed to rise, and in the midst of it I saw a tall man, in a suit of tweed, jump into the water and sink.

“In a moment the darkness was gone, and I again became sensible of the heat and sunshine, but I was awed and felt ‘eerie,’—it was then about 4 o’clock or so—I cannot remember either the exact time or date. On my sister’s arrival I told her of the occurrence; she was surprised, but inclined to laugh at it. When we got home I told my brother; he treated the subject much in the same manner. However, about a week afterwards, a Mr. Espie, a bank clerk (unknown to me), committed suicide by drowning in that very spot. He left a letter for his wife, indicating that he had for some time contemplated his death. My sister’s memory of the event is the only evidence I can give. I did not see the account of the inquest at the time, and did not mention my strange experience to any one, saving my sister and brother.

“F. C. McALPINE.”

Mrs. McAlpine’s sister writes:—

Roxboro’, *February 15th, 1892.*

“I remember perfectly you meeting me in Castleblaney, on my way home from Longford, and telling me of the strange thing which happened in the demesne. You know you were always hearing or seeing something, and I paid little attention, but I remember it distinctly—your troubled expression more than the story. You said a tall gentleman, dressed in tweed, walked past you, and went into a little inlet or creek. I think, but am not sure, that you said he had a beard. You were troubled about it, or looked so; and I talked of other things. You told me while we were driving home. I

¹ See *Proceedings*, Vol. V., pp. 288-354.² For other experiences of the same percipient, see pp. 279-282.

think, but I am not sure, that it was about the 25th or 27th of June, 1889, that I left Longford. I am sure of that being the day, but cannot remember the date. *It was in June*, and on the 3rd of July, 1889, a Mr. Espie, a bank clerk, drowned himself in the lake in the demesne in 'Blaney. I have no doubt that the day I came home you saw Mr. Espie's 'fetch.' ”

The following account is taken from a local paper, the *Northern Standard*, Saturday, *July 6th*, 1889 :—

“*Sad Case of Suicide.*—The town of Castleblaney was put into a fearful state of excitement when it became known on Wednesday last that Mr. Espy had committed suicide by drowning himself in the lake in the demesne. Latterly he was noticed to be rather dull and low in spirits, but no serious notice was taken of his conduct, nor had anyone the most remote idea that he contemplated suicide. On Wednesday morning he seemed in his usual health, and, as was customary with him, walked down to get his newspaper on the arrival of the 9.45 train from Dublin. He met Mr. Fox (in whose office he has been for years) at the station, and having procured his paper walked up to the office, wrote a note in which he stated what he was going to do and indicating where his body would be found. This seemed to concern him a good deal, for he seemed very anxious that his body should be recovered without any delay. He had fishing tackle in his pocket, and having tied one end of a pike line to a tree, and the other end round one of his legs, he threw himself into about three feet deep of water, where he was found shortly afterwards quite dead, and before the note that he had left in the office had been opened.”

It is possible that, if we knew more about the intending suicide, we should perceive that the simplest explanation of this case is a telepathic one. If the clerk's mind was brooding on his purpose of putting an end to himself, and on the spot which, as the letter he left shows, he may have already selected for the purpose, the fact that the percipient was at that place, and that her mind was therefore occupied with it also, may have afforded the connecting link required to enable her to receive the telepathic impulse.

In the following case, we cannot be sure, in the first place, that subconscious physical sensations did not suggest the prophecy and, in the second, that the expectation created by the prophecy did not bring about the punctual but unsuccessful attempt to fulfil it.

(690. 1.)

From Mrs. T. E.

[The following account was written by the collector, from information given him verbally by the percipient, Mrs. E., who afterwards signed it. It was enclosed in a letter dated Berlin, April 14th, 1890. For other experiences of Mrs. E.'s, see pp. 174 and 186.]

“Mrs. E. told me, herself, each and all of the occurrences related in this paper while I was in Berlin in April, 1890.

“Mrs. E. is a widow lady and an American, but of English extraction; she describes herself as being not imaginative, not credulous, not eccentric,

not hysterical, and not of a neurotic constitution. She has had one or two 'low, nervous fevers,' but neither in the feverish condition, nor in that of convalescence, has she had any hallucinations.

"Throughout her entire life she has been 'haunted' with presentiments (being able to foretell future events both in her own life and in other persons' lives), as well as being tormented by 'voices and 'visions,' the most typical of which are concisely given below. She describes both the voices and visions as being invariably of the nature of *intruders* bursting in upon and disturbing the current of thoughts at the moment. All the hallucinations were most vivid and apparently 'real.' This susceptibility is apparently transmissible, for Mrs. E.'s only daughter is the subject of similar hallucinations. Mrs. E. yet hears voices, often daily for some time.

"All the recorded cases happened in America.

"[The following] occurred in the year 1845. Mrs. E. was in good health, and had at that time, had none of the before mentioned fevers, which came on between the ages of 30 and 50. Mrs. E. had slept well, and was in the act of getting up, when apparently the quiet was broken in upon by an announcement being made as though someone had come in at the bedroom door, and said in a loud voice these words:—"To-day at 6 o'clock you will die." There was nothing more, but these words seemed to resound throughout the room. Mrs. E. resolved to tell no one of the announcement, and also not to brood over it, if possible, at all. To accomplish this, she went in the course of the afternoon to the house of a married sister of hers, where there would be sure to be something more or less stirring going on.

"This had the effect of distracting the attention from the certainly very distressing prophecy, and Mrs. E. had the benefit of her sister's society till 6 o'clock began to be struck by the clock. As it commenced sounding Mrs. E. said to herself, 'There now, it's 6 o'clock already and nothing has happened,' but the statement was premature, for before the chime ceased, blood was gushing out of both nostrils in a copious stream. The alarm was raised, and the whole household flocked round and applied the usual remedies of cold keys, &c., but quite without success. This profuse and alarming hæmorrhage did not cease till bucket-fulls of cold water were poured on the head and down the spine. When the doctor arrived he said a very large quantity of blood had been lost, and life only just saved and no more.

"As might be well expected, Mrs. E. was very weak for days after this occurrence. Though this was the first in point of time of the more important hallucinations of Mrs. E.'s life, it is in certain respects quite the most extraordinary by reason of the striking sequel to, and almost complete fulfilment of, the prophecy.

"D. F. H."

Mrs. E. adds:—

"I certify that this report is correct.

"I. S. E."

Mrs. E. at our request obtained the following corroborative note from her sister:—

May 18th, 1890.

"At Mrs. E.'s request, I write to inform you that I am her sister, and it was at my house [that] the hæmorrhage of her nose took place on the day when it was announced to her, that at six o'clock on that day she would

die, and according to the prediction, this hæmorrhage came on before the clock had done striking six, and continued until she was greatly exhausted, and after everything had been done to stop it.

“ I willingly certify to the truth of all my sister has told you about this, and in her experience in seeing and hearing unnaturally, as it has always been known in our family.

“ L. C.”

In an earlier premonitory experience of this percipient, which we give from the same narrative, the narrator's words themselves suggest that the prophecy tended to cause its own fulfilment.

“ The very earliest occurred when she was quite a girl. On this occasion, when she was in a crowd, a voice by her side (apparently) said quite distinctly, ‘ That man will be your husband.’ The person whom she was looking at at the moment did, years after, become her husband. At the time of the announcement she did not know him ; the ‘ spell ’ of this shaped her course when she ultimately did make his acquaintance.”

In the next case again, the indication given by the apparition is too vague and doubtful to add strength to the case for premonitions.

(587. 5.)

From Mrs. Cockman.

26, Dartmouth Park Avenue, London, N.W., *November 2nd*, 1891.

“ At 29, Grove Road, N.W., on November 12th, 1882, at 5.30 a.m., I saw, being wide awake at the time, a slight ethereal looking figure standing at the side of my bed, its face turned towards me, and gazing wistfully at me. We always slept with the bedroom door wide open to admit of the light coming in from a gas jet which was immediately over the door on the landing. By this light, I saw the figure pass slowly into the next room (the door of which was also wide open), where our eldest son, a boy of 10, was sleeping. I woke my husband and told him what I had seen. He went at once into our son's room to make sure he was not walking in his sleep (a thing he had never done), but from the position of the bed-clothes and from the boy's sound calm sleep, this theory was upset. My son went to school as usual in the morning, apparently in good health, but on coming home in the afternoon complained of feeling unwell, and the following day scarlet fever declared itself. I at once connected the vision with my son's illness. I was myself in good health at the time, and free from anxiety. My age was 34.”

Mrs. Cockman adds the following account of an apparently telepathic incident.

“ In 1878, I had a presentiment, while spending the evening with some friends, that all was not right at home. I combated this feeling, but could not conquer it, and begged my husband to take me home at once. On our arrival, directly the door was opened, I heard a harsh grating sound coming from the nursery, and on rushing upstairs, found my little girl of two convulsed with croup. The child was quite alone in the room, the nurse having left her, thinking she was asleep.

“ MATILDA COCKMAN.”

Mr. Podmore writes :—

March 30th, 1892.

“I called on Mr. and Mrs. Cockman to-day. As regards the first incident, Mrs. Cockman explained that she had probably been lying awake some little time—it was about 5.30 a.m. She is sure that she was completely awake. She saw the figure clearly, but did not recognise it. The figure was clearly visible as it went round the corner into the next room, from which there was no other exit. Mr. Cockman corroborated, and expressed himself convinced that the figure could not have been a real figure.

“Both are quite certain that the figure appeared on the night of Sunday-Monday (12th-13th November, 1882), and that the boy came home ill from school on Monday, the 13th. That this date (November 13th, 1882) was actually the beginning of his illness is proved by an entry in a small book (shewn to me) given on the following Christmas day, by Mr. Cockman to Mrs. Cockman, in commemoration of the boy's recovery.

“There was no anxiety. It was not known that scarlet fever was in the school until later.

“In the second case they were dining out near Addison Road, intending to spend the evening there. No special cause for anxiety. In accordance with her usual custom, Mrs. Cockman had asked a lady friend (in this case a trained nurse) to stay in the house, together with the ordinary nurse, during her absence. All through dinner she felt very uneasy and uncomfortable, and immediately that Mr. Cockman and the other men returned to the drawing-room, she insisted on going home, and actually reached home about 9 p.m.—two hours earlier than she had intended. Her uneasiness was not connected at the time with the child ; it was merely a vague sense of something wrong at home. Mr. Cockman remembers the incident well. He believes it to be unprecedented in their lives. Mrs. Cockman, though rather nervous about her children, had no special cause for anxiety (there had been no previous warning of croup) and had never on any other occasion allowed any feeling of nervousness to interfere with plans.”

Mr. Cockman corroborates as follows :—

26, Dartmouth Park Avenue, N.W., March 30th, 1892.

“DEAR SIR,—I have pleasure in stating in writing that I distinctly remember the two occasions to which my wife refers, and remember speaking of the first the next day to two of my colleagues. When my wife saw the apparition, she waked me and I *instantly* went into the room towards which it had moved, but both the boys were fast asleep, and from the position of the bed-clothes one could easily see they had neither of them been out of bed. The clothes were closely tucked up.

“On the other occasion, when my little daughter had croup, I do not remember quite so vividly *all* the circumstances, but *do* remember my wife's general feeling of uneasiness, and that she begged me after dinner to let her go home, that she felt something was wrong at home—and we left much earlier than we should have done in the ordinary way. Arrived there, we heard, the instant the door opened, the ominous barking croupy sound, and on my wife's going upstairs she found the child almost in convulsions. She had gone to bed quite well, and was at the top of the house, where the nurse had not heard her. I did not make a note of the date of this occurrence—

I do not think we then thought so much of such things as we should now. Of the first apparition we have means of fixing the dates very exactly.

“C. ROADNIGHT COCKMAN.”

In the cases just given—whether premonitory or not—the hallucination has no effect in preventing the danger. But we have three cases in which such an effect is reported. In one case (No. 262. 6) a miner reports that he “felt some power push” him “under a hollow place,” while, “at the same moment, a mass of earth fell on the place where” he “had originally sat, which would have inevitably killed” him. In another (No. 579. 21) the percipient states that she heard a voice saying, “cross the road,” just before a runaway horse came round the corner. The third case is the following:—

(293. 13.)

From General M.

April 20th, 1890.

“I was a captain in the staff of the army at the siege of Delhi, in 1857; and, among other duties, often carried orders and messages for the general in command.

“On one occasion I was sent by the general with some message or orders for Sir Charles Reid, who commanded all our advanced posts along the well-known ‘ridge.’

“He was not at his headquarters, but had gone towards the extreme right and most exposed part of the ridge, so, leaving my horse under cover, I proceeded on foot along the road towards the ‘right battery.’ Just as I reached a turn of the road, which was specially dangerous owing to its being entiled by the enemy’s guns in position, I heard my name called out, on the left hand, and, seeing a group of officers standing by the breastwork which lined the front of our position, I went towards them; and, just as I left the road, the spot was torn up by a shower of grape-shot, which, had I been there, must have killed me! As I approached the officers, among whom I expected to find Sir C. Reid, one of them remarked on the narrow escape I had just had: but on my asking why they had called out to me, I was told, to my utter surprise, that *no one had done so!* I heard the summons, however, which saved my life; and whether I *fancied* that some other of the many sounds in the air at the time was my somewhat peculiar name, or whether the call to me at that fortunate moment was a ‘spirit voice,’ as one of my friends at once pronounced it, or was altogether the product of my own imagination;—the facts remain that I heard, or thought I heard, an unrecognised voice summon me from the road; that by obeying the summons I escaped death, or at any rate very serious wounding; and that no human being had so called out to me!

“I had to hunt for Sir C. Reid, at a still more remote part of the ridge; all along which a hot fire was being kept up; but I delivered my message, unharmed, and without any other incident occurring, or any other ‘hair-breadth ’scape’ that I know of!

“My journal of the Delhi Siege has been lost or stolen, so I cannot give the exact date—and may, perhaps, have omitted some detail of the ‘experience.’ It was, however, some day in July or August, 1857, when the ‘ridge’ was, as we used to say, extra ‘lively.’”

Unrecognised Local Apparitions.

We now come to the consideration of a class of cases in which the arguments for assuming a supernormal cause rest on entirely different grounds from those hitherto discussed: we refer to the apparitions seen in so-called “haunted” houses. Speaking generally, there are two main lines of argument available in favour of a supernormal origin in these cases. The first relies on the fact that apparitions are seen in the same place by two or more persons quite independently—each percipient being, at the time of his experience, unaware that any similar phenomenon had occurred in that locality. Now, considering that hallucinations sometimes occur during morbid physical conditions, and that they can easily be induced in the hypnotic state, we clearly ought to assume that a hallucination is subjective, unless there is some special ground for thinking otherwise. The present collection shows further that hallucinations which there is no ground for regarding as other than subjective are not very uncommon phenomena. Hence the mere fact of apparitions being seen in the same place by two persons independently is far from being a conclusive proof of the supernormal origin of the apparitions.¹ But the force of the evidence of course increases as the number of independent percipients increases, especially if they have had no hallucinations in other places, or only veridical hallucinations; while any resemblances between the figures seen also add to the evidence.

The second line of argument connects the apparitions with some former inhabitant of the place, proceeding on the basis of facts (*e.g.*, details of resemblance) unknown to the percipient at the time of the hallucination.

In attempting to estimate the force of these arguments, we have to take into account, with regard to alleged resemblances between the apparitions seen by independent percipients, the uncertainty of comparisons founded on mere descriptions; the frequent pre-conception that the apparitions represent the same person, and the consequent tendency to emphasise unduly any resemblances that there may be; and the possibility of chance resemblances, unless the details relied on are of a very unusual kind. The same difficulties arise in attempting to judge

¹ Especially if, as often happens, the two percipients belong to the same family, since, as we have said above (see pp. 154-9), there is some reason to think that hallucinations run in families.

of alleged resemblances between the apparition and any given deceased person ; and in such cases, we also have to estimate the chance that an apparition seen in any house will resemble in some degree some previous inhabitant of the house. And, since the most primitive, and still the most widely spread and deeply rooted, conception of apparitions is that they represent dead persons, any accidental resemblance is likely to be unconsciously exaggerated ; and resemblances which did not really exist are likely to be read back into the experiences afterwards. Further, on account of the peculiar kind of interest attaching to this class of apparitions in the minds of many persons, there is a special probability of accretions to the original narrative, and second-hand evidence on any point is therefore liable to be specially untrustworthy.¹

In view of these considerations, the reader will not be surprised to learn that in many of the cases of unrecognised apparitions reported to us in the Census which were said to be connected with "haunts," the reasons alleged for regarding the experience as other than subjective seem to us entirely inadequate. When out of the cases reported we select for special consideration those which in our opinion afford any *primâ facie* evidence of a supernatural origin, we find that they amount to some thirty in number : of these we give below the best authenticated. In 15 out of the 30 cases, the apparitions—which were in all cases unrecognised—were not associated by the percipient with any particular deceased person. In the other 15 cases, the apparition was supposed to represent some dead person, whom the percipient had not known. The two cases in which the evidence for the connection is perhaps the strongest happen to have been already published in the *Proceedings S.P.R.*,—one as the "Record of a Haunted House" (Vol. VIII., p. 311) ; the other as G. 188 (Vol. VI., p. 270). In both these cases, not only was there first-hand evidence of a certain degree of resemblance between the figures seen and the persons in question, but also similar figures were seen by several different percipients independently. In a third case, No. 33. 25 (see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. V., p. 462), the evidence for identification is weaker, and, as far as we know, the apparition was only seen once ; but it was seen in a room in which the percipient afterwards heard that a man had died about a year before.

Two out of the thirty cases have been quoted in previous chapters, namely, No. 483. 10 (see p. 157), and No. 588. 22 (see p. 101). In the first of these, the apparition was supposed to represent a former inhabitant of the house ; but the evidence for this rests on remote

¹ Compare, for instance, the remote with the first-hand versions of the case No. 267. 1, given below (see p. 358-362).

testimony, and the same testimony states that this former inhabitant himself used to see an apparition which he did not recognise, in the same house. In the second case, the narrative sent us shows that the apparition was not seen by the two servants independently.

Before proceeding to discuss the other cases individually, we may refer to some general characteristics of the class which it will be necessary to bear in mind.

Noises in "Haunted" Houses.

One of the most commonly reported features in cases of "haunted" houses,—as has been remarked in articles on the subject previously published in our *Proceedings*, and is borne out by the cases in the present Census,—is the frequent occurrence of alarming and unaccountable noises in the house. In many cases, the reputation of the house as "haunted" rests on these noises alone, and in many others, it is the noises that attract most attention, while the seeing of an apparition by one or more persons in the house seems a merely subsidiary phenomenon; for instance, in the well-known story of the Willington Mill (see *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. V., pp. 331-352).

We gave reasons in Chapter X. (p. 180) for doubting whether noises of this kind are hallucinatory. But in addition to what was there said, it is important to bear in mind that auditory illusions—especially with regard to the localisation of sounds—are much more possible and frequent than analogous visual illusions. Further, the noises in question are generally, though not invariably, reported to be heard at night, when mistakes are especially liable to occur, because the real sounds which are audible at night are often comparatively unfamiliar, while the impressions derived from them cannot be corrected by the sense of sight. And in many cases the hearers are in a state of alarm and expectancy, which would tend to make them misinterpret their impressions of ordinary sounds.

At the same time, the sounds described are sometimes such that it is difficult to conceive of any ordinary explanation of them which would not have been discovered by the persons living in the house and constantly looking out for some such explanation.¹

¹ There are also a few cases where it is reported that the sounds indicate some intelligence, *e.g.*, when raps on the wall reply to spoken or mental questions. We have, however, only one case approaching this kind among those reported in the Census; here it is merely stated that the noises became more violent when the hearer addressed remarks to the supposed unseen intelligence; but we have been unable to obtain confirmation of this statement, and such an effect is one which it would undeniably be very easy for a person who was strongly impressed with the phenomena to imagine.

Supposing, however, that these noises are in some cases real external sounds misinterpreted, it seems probable that they may lead to the apparitions being seen, through raising expectancy in the hearers. In Chapter X. (pp. 178-180) we have given some evidence that real noises do occasionally have such an effect; and in many of the cases of "haunted" houses, it is stated that the noises had been constantly heard and talked over before any apparition was seen. The following is an instance :—

(284. 15.)

From Miss K. B.

May 30th, 1890.

"The circumstances I am about to relate occurred during two visits that I paid to Ireland in the months of August and September, 1880 and 1881. The house in which I stayed was really an old barracks, long disused, very old-fashioned, and surrounded by a high wall; in fact, I am told it was built during the time of Cromwell as a stronghold for his men.

"The only inhabitants of this barracks were Captain C. (a retired officer who was in charge of the place), Mrs. C., three daughters and two servants. They occupied the central part of the building, the mess room being their drawing-room. The bedrooms are very lofty, and some are connected one with the other by doors leading into each other. The room I occupied was one adjoining two others, and those were occupied by the three daughters of Captain C., named E., G., and L. The first recollection I have of anything strange about the house is that each night I was awakened at about 3 o'clock a.m. (judging the time from the dawn which followed) by a tremendous noise apparently in the next suite of rooms, which were empty, and it sounded as if some huge iron boxes and other heavy things were being thrown about with great force. This continued for about half-an-hour, when in the room underneath (the kitchen) I heard the fire being violently poked about and raked for some minutes, immediately followed by a most terrible and distressing coughing of a man, very loud and violent. It seemed as if the exertion had brought on a paroxysm which he could not stop. I should here say that in large houses in Kilkenny the fires are not lighted every day, as the Kilkenny coal has the property of burning very slowly without flame, and it is only necessary to make it up every night about 11 o'clock, and in the morning it is still clear and bright. I had heard about this coal, and I remember wondering why it was necessary for Captain C. to get up in the middle of the night to stir it so violently, and the horrid noises perplexed me; but as I am not a nervous subject I forgot all about it till the next night, when the very same thing occurred, and this time I felt a great desire to awaken the girls in the next rooms, but did not like to.

"The next day I said to E. 'E., I hear such strange noises every night, are any people in the adjoining part of the building?' She turned very pale, and looking earnestly at me, said, 'Oh, K., I am so sorry you heard, I hoped no one but myself heard it. I would have given worlds to have spoken to you last night, but dared not move or speak! I was bathed in perspiration with terror.'

"I laughed at her and said, 'Why, E., one would think to see you, you thought it was ghosts.' She said, "Oh, I don't *think*, but *know*, and it is so

dreadful, this goes on night after night,' and when she went on to tell me that the place was said to be haunted, and told me a lot of weird things that had been seen and heard. My answer to this was a disdainful laugh, and I said, 'Oh, you Irish people are full of superstition; you think everything that happens is supernatural.' After this the subject was not mentioned again, and I did not feel a bit scared when the same things went on at night during the rest of my week's visit. I went home, forgetting all about it till the following year, when I again visited my friends and spent six weeks there.

"This time there were two other visitors besides myself, a Colonel and Mrs. C. They occupied the tri-une room, where I had been before, and to me was allotted a huge room on the top of the house with a long corridor leading to it. The girls were in a large room opposite mine.

"I don't remember once thinking of the strange occurrences of the former visit till one morning when I was awakened about 4 o'clock (I should think) by a very noisy martial footstep ascending the stairs, and then marching quickly up and down the corridor outside my room. Then suddenly the most violent coughing took place that I ever heard, which continued for some time (it seemed ages to me) while the quick heavy step continued its vigorous march. At last the footsteps faded away in the distance, and I then recalled to mind the very same coughing after exertion last year.

"At breakfast that morning I said, 'Oh, Captain C., what a horrible cough you have.' He looked surprised and answered, '*I* a cough? why I haven't a bit of one?' I then turned to Colonel C. and said, 'Was it you, Colonel, who were making such a noise at 4 o'clock this morning?' He said, 'Faith, you won't catch me prowling about at such unearthly hours! and I haven't the shadow of a cough.' I noticed that all the C. family looked uncomfortable, and nothing more was said till E. came to me in a most mysterious manner with tears in her eyes and said, 'Oh, K., please don't say another word about that dreadful coughing; we all hear it often, and especially when anything dreadful is going to happen. Mother can't bear to hear it mentioned, and we don't want L. to hear it mentioned, she is so delicate and easily upset!' After this I thought, come what will, I'll say nothing more, but I would give a good deal to fathom it all!

"Some nights after we had been having a dance (indeed we did this most nights), but on this particular evening when I went up to bed, the moon was shining so brilliantly that I was able to read my Bible by its light, and I left the Bible open on the window-sill, which was a very high one and on which I sat to read, having had to climb the washstand to reach it. The blinds were not drawn, as I liked the light, and I soon got to bed and fell fast asleep. I could not have been long asleep when I was suddenly awakened by a strange feeling that some one was in the room. I opened my eyes and turned round, and opposite me on the window-sill where I had been sitting before going to bed, I saw in the moonlight (which was still very bright, though not shining direct into the room) a long, very thin, very dark black figure bending over the Bible and apparently earnestly scanning the page. It took only a second to see this, but, as if my movement disturbed the figure, it suddenly darted up, jumped off the window-ledge, on to the washstand, and thence to the ground, and flitted quickly across the room, which was

very large, and contained a large round table at the other end on which were a lot of bangles and other silver ornaments. I tried to see where the figure was, but I could only hear a slight jingle as if some one were feeling quietly my bangles and rings. I thought it might be a servant walking in her sleep, or perhaps some one to steal my jewelry. I sat up and looked hard over in the corner of the room, but could see nothing. I then determined to wait till the figure should go out of the room, which could not be done without my seeing it pass in the light of the window, but, although I did not take my eyes off the spot till daylight fairly set in, I saw nothing further, and am convinced that nothing and no one left the room.

“In the morning G. C. brought my breakfast to me in bed, as she said I must be tired after our dancing, and indeed I *was* tired, but not from dancing! When she came I said ‘G., I have seen your ghost at last!’ She said not a word but rushed out of the room.

“When I next saw her I said ‘G., you don’t believe what I told you about the ghost, but it’s true!’ and then I related to her the events of the night. She said, ‘Oh, yes, indeed I only believe it too well! that is just what dear H. saw before he died!’ (H. was her brother who died of consumption, aged 24.) I said, ‘I hope you don’t mean I am going to die,’ and she said ‘something always happens after that appears.’ I may as well add here that nothing dreadful *did* happen. I heard afterwards that a Colonel had cut his throat in that very room many years before, and that the place has ever since been haunted.”

Miss B. had had one other hallucination about three years previously. She was awakened by feeling the bed clothes pulled off her. She sat up to replace them, and then saw an apparition of her uncle walk into the room. He was at the time seriously ill in the same house, his wife watching by him, and he died shortly after.

The next case is an interesting example of the gradual development of the phenomena,—the sounds heard increasing in violence, while the vague figure first seen took by degrees a more and more definite form, approximating to the legendary one, but only apparently after the percipient had become familiar with the legend. A figure with a somewhat similar costume was, however, also seen by a visitor who had not heard of it beforehand.

(114. 6.)

From Miss L. H.

[We give an abstract of Miss H.’s account, which was written in 1891.]

In January, 1873, Miss H. and her aunt, sleeping together, saw their bedroom door opened and a curious pale light streaming in. The door shut as Miss H. got up, and she found it dark outside and no one there. Soon they began to hear noises, doors opening, footsteps, etc., at night, and heard that the house was reputed to be “haunted.” Miss H. then began to feel touches when she was in bed, and the bed shaken, etc., and the noises continued. One night she saw in the moonlight a figure burst through a closed door and rush past her bed to the window; she heard the sweep of garments as it went by. The noises constantly increased, and “by degrees,” she writes, “I used to see

a figure, always the same, of a man in a military cloak of the old style, seeming to keep a hand over its eyes." By this time she had heard that the house was supposed to be "haunted" by its late owner, a Waterloo officer, who had built it and died there. Miss H.'s aunt had seen a hand round her bed-curtains, and felt her own hands touched, and a lady, Miss D., staying in the house, saw a figure twice at night; though, Miss H. states, "we never prepared our visitors at all for it, and some were not visited." Miss H. went on living at the house after her aunt's death in 1882 until 1886, the noises, etc. continuing to trouble all the inmates at intervals during the whole time.

In an interview with Mr. Myers, Miss H. informed him that she had had two other experiences; she saw an apparition of her mother at the time of the latter's death,¹ and an apparition of her aunt soon after her death.

Miss D. writes:—

April 10th, 1892.

"During the month of August, 1881, I was visiting Miss H., at——. After a few nights, I retired to my room as usual, and when I had been in bed an hour or so, a cloaked figure came into the room, having previously opened (very quietly) the door. I wish to state emphatically that this is no imagination, nor a dream. I was wide awake and in good health. The figure came close to the bed, and glided away towards the window, passing the foot of the bed, and disappeared. A few nights after, the same thing occurred, except that the figure on entering the room came quite up to the bed, and gently stroked my forehead, smoothing the hair from it.

"I have never before or since seen anything of a similar nature."

In the next case, several percipients were concerned; the one who gives the principal first-hand account (Miss H. M.) saw two distinctly different figures, each several times, and it does not seem clear that either of them had any particular resemblance to the figures seen by the other witnesses, who were probably familiar with the reputation of the house. It is an interesting feature in the case that, on two occasions, the two percipients concerned had different but corresponding percepts at the same time. On the first occasion, both saw the door open and shut, while one saw the ghost walk in; and on the second occasion, one felt a touch on his arm, while the other saw the ghost touching him. The evidence, however, for this last incident is only at second-hand, and of the first it must be observed that the possibility of the door having been opened by ordinary means does not seem to be excluded.

(264. 23.)

From Miss E. L. T.

June 7th, 1890.

"In March, 1889, I was staying in a house in——, and several times had a strong impression that some one invisible was in the

This occurred in childhood, and no corroboration is now obtainable. We did not, therefore, think it worth while to press for a first-hand account, and the case, consequently, is not included in the first-hand death-coincidences discussed in Chapters XI and XIII.

room. At the same time it was usually *seen* by one person, sometimes by two. On one occasion I saw the door open, when a lady who was with me saw a figure (grey) come in and vanish. The door was a very heavy one, and we remarked that there was no wind at the time. I was singing, between 12 and 1 o'clock (midday). I was in my usual health; no grief or anxiety; age 26. [The] lady with me was playing my accompaniment on the piano, which was a grand. We were facing down a long room, at the other end of which was the door. We finished the song, though much startled. Then I asked my friend if she had seen anything. She said she had seen the grey figure come in, walk up to a writing table, and vanish.

“Several times in that room, generally in the morning, I had the impression of some one having come into the room, nearly always while music was going on; sometimes in other rooms at night. Several times I have heard mysterious music by day and night from the garden. Once I was sitting at the writing table (where the ghost has been seen to vanish), when I suddenly felt a fearful coldness come over me, which lasted a few seconds; then I suddenly felt quite warm again.”

The experiences of the other percipients in this case are described as follows by Miss T.'s sister, who was with her on the same visit. Her account was written not later than 1892.

“When first we visited ———, no one had ever seen a ghost there, or suspected the place of being haunted in any way. It was in January, 1889, that curious things first began to happen. There was a large party in the house, the M.'s themselves [the owners of the house], etc. One night E. [the writer of the above account] could not sleep, and about 3 o'clock she heard three loud knocks on the wall at the side of her bed. The knocks had a peculiarly metallic sound, and she tried several experiments the next day to get the same sound, but could not produce it.

“The next morning, G. M. came down to breakfast and said H. M. [her sister] was not coming down. She was very tired, having seen a ghost! Her story was: she was awakened by seeing a light, then she saw the figure of a man, with his head bent, as if reading a book. The light was strong enough for her to see G.'s bed distinctly. The light and the man faded away, and H. never saw the same figure again, but she afterwards very frequently saw the figure of a grey lady in the drawing-room. It usually came in by the door, and vanished in front of the looking-glass, though it occasionally came into the middle of the room. It appeared both by daylight and candlelight, most frequently about 12 mid-day, and generally came when music was going on. Mr. H. T. [one of the visitors] saw the same figure on one occasion in the drawing-room. And another day when tea was going on in the hall, he felt a touch on his arm. He saw nothing, but was much frightened. He afterwards asked H. if she had seen the ghost that day. She said, ‘Yes, I saw it touch you on the arm.’ The ghost was seen several times that year, and very mysterious noises were heard at night.

“In the March of that year—1889—E. T. was again at ———, and she was very often aware of the presence of the ghost, and, on asking H. afterwards, found that she had invariably seen it at the time. They agreed that they would never say anything at the time, but would find out after if what they had seen and felt had occurred at the same time. One day, E. was

singing, H. playing her accompaniment. It was between 12 and 1. The door of the room (a large and heavy one) opened, and H. saw the ghost walk in. E. did not see it, she only saw the door open and shut, but she felt it was there, and it required some courage to finish the song.

“Miss G. H. was at ——— that same March. She, like the rest of the party, was greatly disturbed by the noises in the night. One night she was brushing her hair before the looking-glass, when she saw a ghost standing behind her. The door was open. It went out of the room when she turned round, and she followed it down the passage till it disappeared.

“Miss D. is said to have seen the ghost once, and the butler saw it crossing the grass towards the chapel one evening when hymns were being sung in there. Mysterious music has been heard there. E. T. heard it twice, Miss G. H. heard it, and three maids heard it once at night.

“The ghost was seen and noises were heard in 1890 and 1891, but at less and less frequent intervals. I was in the drawing-room once when the ghost was seen, but I did not feel it then.”

Among the other witnesses referred to, Miss H. M. is the only one from whom we have been able to obtain a first-hand account. She writes as follows :—

February 24th, 1890.

“[I] saw a white figure standing at the foot of my sister’s bed on January 13th, 1889, at 4.40 a.m. I have also seen the same figure twice during the summer. I have been looking out of the window and [have] seen it standing in the garden. I often used to see a grey figure come in at the drawing-room door and vanish, generally between 12 and 1 in the daytime, and always when music has been going on. No one else has seen it, but several people have felt it.

“When the white figure first appeared, I was in bed—the other times looking out of the window. I am generally playing when I see the grey figure, or sitting in the room while others are playing or singing. My age was 21 when I first saw them. I am now 22.

“The grey figure appears to have no features. The white one has a very good profile, but I cannot recognise it. When the white figure appeared in the garden, amongst five of us who were looking, only one, a boy of 19, saw it besides myself. People have *felt* the grey figure, but never seen it. I have not seen either since last September.”

The next case, though remote, is interesting, because the apparition was seen in the first instance collectively, and when none of the percipients were in any condition of expectancy or alarm about it. Though noises formed part of the phenomena, they were not heard until after the apparition had been seen. The only living witnesses were children at the time, but their recollection of the incidents seems to be clear.

(679. 2.)

From Mrs. Yearsley.

Chalk Hill House, Kingsbury, N.W., *December 2nd, 1891.*

“I saw a ghost of a woman standing in a recess by the stairs. I was coming downstairs, having been sent by my mother to take some work to her

bedroom. It was, as nearly as I can remember, when I was six years of age. It was about 4—4.30 in the afternoon, at No. 2, Kent-villas, Asylum-road, Peckham. The apparition, as far as I could see, looked simply like the figure of a woman with a shawl over her head, and at first I took her for one of the maid-servants, but she was in the kitchen at the time. No [other persons were present], but others of the family saw a similar apparition at different times. I myself saw it on two occasions ; [the second] time I saw it pass across a room as I passed by the open door of that room.

“The above occurred in either 1853 or 1854. “J. B. YEARSLEY.”

The following account was contained in a letter to the collector, Mrs. Yearsley's son, from her sister, Mrs. Compton :—

93, East Dulwich Grove, S.E., *July 6th* [1892].

“The haunted house we lived in for over three years still stands, and was let the last time I passed it, some months ago. The address used to be No. 2, Kent Villas, Asylum Road, Peckham. No doubt that is altered now.

“The first I ever saw of the ghost,—or old woman, as we children always called it,—was the very day we moved into the house. The men were putting down carpets, etc., and your mother and I and George and Maggie were sent to play upstairs to be out of the way. We chose the top staircase leading to the upper bedrooms. This staircase had a small dark lumber room underneath it, the door of which was almost exactly opposite my mother's bedroom. We had been playing for nearly an hour when we saw what looked like a tall, thin woman, with a plaid shawl of a red and white pattern put over her head and a little over one side of her face, come slowly down the stairs from the upper front bedroom ; her dress rustled behind her. We all drew back against the wall, while she passed us and went down the stairs, turned a little to the right, and disappeared into the lumber room. We were all dreadfully frightened, and flew, and some fell, down the stairs to tell what we had seen. My mother was very angry, and said we had been playing at ghosts till we imagined we had seen one, and we were all sent back again. We sat huddled together till called to bed. All this took place on a bright summer afternoon. The very next Sunday we were dining in the breakfast-room, and in the middle of dinner we heard the latch lifted of the half-glass door leading to the garden. Several of us looked up and saw the door open, and the *shadow* of some one go quickly up the stairs. My father called two of the boys, saying, ‘some one has got into the house.’ They took heavy sticks, and one stood in the hall, so that no one could pass without being seen, and the others searched every corner of the house and saw nothing.

“My eldest brother often came home late from the Stock Exchange on account nights, and mother always let him in, to see that he was all right. The first time he was late in that house, he came downstairs again in half-an-hour to know if any of the children were ill, as he declared my mother, as he supposed it to be, had gone up and entered his room, sighing deeply, and then had gone into the children's room, and had left his door and the children's wide open.

“The noises in the house were at times almost unbearable—exactly as though half-a-ton of coals had been shot down the stairs. Mother never

actually *saw* the old woman, though she constantly followed the sound of the footsteps up the stairs to try and discover what it could be; and once, while sitting up late, reading in front of a long glass on her dressing table, she heard it come downstairs, and made up her mind she *would* look; but directly the door began to open she covered her face, and distinctly heard it come all round the room and go out, leaving the door open.

“One afternoon, I was sent upstairs to the children’s bedroom. After finding what I wanted I came down the top flight of stairs, and right in front of me stood the old woman in the doorway of mother’s bedroom. I stood, too frightened to move, especially as I had to pass her to reach the lower staircase. If I saw her face now, after all these years, I should know it. The hair was very dark and smooth; the one eye not covered by the shawl was turned up, and the face like death. It had the look I have since seen on the faces of the dead. How long I stood I don’t know—it seemed hours. At last I made a desperate effort and passed it, and with one bound was downstairs, and I fell at the parlour door. I was unable to move, and they dragged me in and well scolded me, and I was forbidden to speak of it to the others. An hour afterwards your mother was sent up for something, and as she was a long time gone, mother called to her to come at once, and when she did, she said cook was standing at the lumber room door with a shawl over her head, and she had been trying to make her speak, but she was too cross. At last we got quite used to seeing the thing about the house, although, for my part, I lived in dread of it. I saw it constantly; it used to come into my room and stand by my bed, but I don’t remember seeing it once when it was quite dark. The noises got too dreadful, and we hunted for another house, although my father hesitated about taking the one we all fixed upon; but the old woman settled the question, for father having gone to bed early with one of his favourite bilious attacks, he heard some one coming, and in walked the old woman, which so frightened him that he was up by 7 o’clock next morning, and off to take the new house.

“After all the furniture had gone, and your mother and I and Maggie were sleeping in beds on the floor, we were all talking and telling fairy tales, when Mag suddenly dived under the clothes. We soon knew the reason; at the very foot of our bed stood the old woman, and your aunt had seen it first. The people who took the house from us left very shortly, as they said they could get no rest for awful noises. How it has fared since, I don’t know. I fear I have a sort of faculty for uncanny things (?), as the old woman is not the only odd thing I have seen; and I always know when trouble or death is coming to any member of the family—I wish I did not.”

Mrs. Yearsley adds :—

July 31st, 1892.

“I have read my sister’s (Mrs. Compton) description of the events which took place at 2, Kent-villas, Asylum-road, Peckham, in 1853-4. It perfectly describes my experiences as well as hers, and I do not think there is anything I can add.

“I perfectly remember the occasion of our sitting at a meal, and seeing the shadow as of a person going up the stairs from the half glass door from the garden. I also can distinctly remember meeting the apparition at the top of the stairs and speaking to it, and then feeling very frightened,

and going downstairs as quickly as possible, and my mother calling to the servants directly, thinking one of them might have been upstairs, and that I might have imagined I had seen this phantom, though really guessing what I had seen. At that time I was about 6 to 7 years of age, and my sister, Mrs. Compton, 8 or 9½ years.

“J. B. YEARSLEY.”

Mrs. Yearsley's other brother and sister mentioned in the account are no longer living. Another surviving brother does not recollect the incidents clearly enough to give an account.

Recognised Local Apparitions.

As said above, the great majority of apparitions that seem to be associated with special places are unrecognised. We have, however, three cases in the Census where an apparition of a dead person known to the percipients is believed to have been seen by more than one person independently in the same place.

In the first case, the figure was seen in the room in which the person it was thought to represent had died ; but it was only recognised by one of the percipients after the other had seen an unrecognised figure in the same room.

(570. 4.)

From Mrs. L. F.

January 24th, 1892.

“In the bedroom where I was sleeping I saw my grandmother. She was in her night-dress and cap, and walked from one side of the fire-place to the other, and then vanished. The room was the one she died in. I was alone in bed. I was not grown up at the time, and don't remember what age I was, or any other particulars as regarding my health. My grandmother [had lived] in the house with me, but I don't remember how long after her death it was that I saw her. [I have] never [had any other such experience.]”

The following account of a somewhat similar experience in the same room is from Mrs. F.'s step-sister :—

(570. 5.)

From Miss A. C.

January 24th, 1892.

“In the autumn of 1874 I saw one night in the room I was sleeping [in] an old woman come in and walk to the chair beside my bed ; it was in my own home, and the room the one she died in some years before.

“I was in bed ; I do not remember what was my state of health. I was about 17 years old. I did not recognise ever having seen the old woman before. I was sleeping with some one at the time [who was], I think, asleep. I have never seen any one since.”

In reply to our request for further particulars, Miss C. writes :—

March 1st [1892]

“As well as I can remember, the person had on a white cap like an old woman's night-cap. I did not recognise ever having seen her before. Some time before, Mrs. F.'s grandmother died in that same room, and she was the

person Mrs. F. saw, after I had seen the other apparition. I had never heard the room was haunted or of any one having been seen in it since."

In the next case, we are not expressly told whether the person represented by the apparition had any connection with the place in which it was seen; but the contrary seems to be implied. On the other hand, in the case of the second apparition seen by Miss L. H., the association seems to have been a local rather than a personal one. The frequent recurrence of both hallucinations in Miss H.'s experience is to be noted; and also the indication of a hereditary tendency to hallucinations of the kind, since they were experienced by Mrs. H. and two of her children. But heredity does not appear to be a sufficient explanation of the phenomena, as there is some evidence that both apparitions were also seen independently by other persons.

(698. 24.)

From Mrs. H. H.

March 8th, 1892.

"I saw in 1872, in the month of December, an old gentleman, apparently an invalid, crossing a room in a house in —, where I was then lodging. As near as I can remember, the hours were 12 p.m., 1 p.m., and 8 p.m. The only thing I observed at the time was that he looked very ill, and wore a long brown Turkish dressing-gown with big tassels. On three occasions I had this experience. Twice on entering the room I saw it, and on one occasion it appeared while I was at lunch. I was in very good health, and not suffering from grief or anxiety. I was 51 years of age. Many years before I was in the habit of seeing the gentleman almost daily. My little son and his nurse [were present, and] all saw him distinctly, as did my daughter, on the second time of his appearing."

From the following statement, received from Miss L. H., the daughter referred to in Mrs. H.'s account, it does not seem clear that the apparition was ever seen collectively, as Mrs. H. appears to imply, but the evidence goes to show that a similar apparition was seen independently by several different persons, without any communication with one another on the subject.

June 17th, 1892.

"L. H. was the daughter who saw the old gentleman in the dressing-gown, spoken of by her mother, Mrs. H., but the son spoken of was only a little child at the time and was laughed out of the idea that he had seen any one, at the time; and when the lodgings were given up, no reference to the apparition was ever made before him, as he was both delicate and nervous. The old nurse spoken of died in November, 1873, but she never doubted having seen it. Till Mrs. H.'s little son spoke of having seen 'an old man,' neither Mrs. H., L. H., nor the nurse spoke to each other about it, as naturally each one thought it could only be imagination. The person seen was known in life to all but H. H. (the little boy); he was indistinctly remembered by L. H. as an old man who was always ill; but both the nurse and Mrs. H. knew him well."

In reply to further enquiries, Miss H. writes :—

August 31st, 1893.

“I will endeavour to give you all the details I remember of the apparition seen by me in 1872. I was not sleeping in the house in which my mother was lodging, but I used to go in and out several times during the day. The sitting-room was an upstairs room ; one window looked into the street, and the other exactly opposite it into the garden. The figure used to glide quite suddenly between the fireplace towards the garden window. Whilst I was watching it, it apparently *melted*. I never really saw the disappearing ; one moment it was there, the next, I used to think it was all rubbish, and I must have let my eyes deceive me.

“I am not quite sure how long my mother was in the house, for I was at a boarding-school in the town ; but I know the first time I saw the apparition was December 13th. I can fix the date, as I was home for two days for my sister’s wedding, which took place the day before. It must have been some time between 10 a.m. and 1 p.m., as I was lunching with friends that day and should not have been in the house after 1 o’clock. After that one occasion I did not see any more of it till my holidays began, say about December 20th, and I left on January 14th ; but between these two dates I constantly saw it, nearly always by daylight ; though once I remember seeing it exceedingly distinctly by firelight. I remember I was alone on that occasion, and it stayed long enough for me to notice [that] the girdle of the dressing-gown it appeared to be wearing had a big upright loop to it.

“I had no idea that any one else saw it till some time afterwards, except my brother, who was very little then, and he had declared several times he saw an old man in the corner ; but he was very delicate and nervous, and they used to tell him it was the shadow of a tree waving about—he was so easily frightened. I used not to say anything, for we are a very matter-of-fact family, and I knew I should be unmercifully chaffed, if I had said anything to my brothers and sisters (of whom I had several). Our old nurse did not tell my mother or me anything about it till she was out of the house, and my mother was equally silent. I think they were both afraid of alarming us ; though there was nothing to alarm any one in the apparition. It was a very gentle, mild-faced old man, and not one bit like a story-book ghost.

“I should think it was about September, 1873, that I first heard it had been seen by my mother, and a little later than that my nurse told me she too had seen it.

“They have been with me in the room when I have seen it, but whether they saw it at the same time, of course I cannot tell. You see, we never thought any one else would be interested in it.

“There was a distinct feeling of some strange personality, so to speak, in the room, that involuntarily used to turn my head to that part of the room each time I saw the apparition. I never used to *look* for it, but when it was there, I *knew* it ; and sometimes I used not then to turn round, if I was very much interested in what I was doing. I got accustomed to it ; and I don’t think I was ever too well pleased at having to force myself into a belief in such things. I hardly ever speak of my own experiences, for it is, I find, only about one person in a hundred who gives one credit for telling nothing but the honest truth.”

Miss H. has had another somewhat similar series of experiences, which she thus describes :—

March 8th, 1892.

“ I have seen on several occasions the figure of an old man, always in the house, though not in the same place in the house. The hours of appearance have varied, but it has oftenest been broad daylight. The dates have been from 1874 to the present year. I was occupied in no particular way. I was in perfect health on most of the occasions, and had neither grief nor anxiety. When I first saw it I was eighteen. I never saw the person in life. Sometimes the figure has been resting in an armchair, sometimes it appears to have come in from a ride. No one has been with me at the time, though I have heard others speak of the same figure appearing to them. I have never tried to count how often I have seen it, but it may be about three or four times in a year. The old man has very bright blue eyes and a good deal of colour ; he is always dressed in white riding breeches and black coat.”

In answer to questions, Miss H. writes :—

“ To the best of L. H.'s knowledge the figure was seen quite independently, no one person having told another it was to be seen, or that he or she had seen it. There was no special reason for connecting it with any deceased person at the time it was first seen by L. H., although from photographs and a picture *afterwards* seen, she had no doubt as to its identity. L. H. is sorry not to be able to give any particulars as to any fixed dates or occasions of its appearances, for they are most erratic,—coming sometimes frequently and close together, and then not again for months ; but they are much more usual in daylight than at any other time.”

Miss H. adds later :—

August 31st, 1893

“ I have seen [the apparition] once or twice within the last four months, but I have not heard of any one else having seen it within that time.”

Mrs H., being an invalid, was unable to receive visitors, so that we have not had an opportunity of a personal interview with her or Miss H.

In the third and last case of this kind, it is doubtful whether the recognition of the figure was at all clearly made out until the percipients had formed a theory—the one that would most naturally occur to them—on the subject. It is also noteworthy that in this case, as in so many of the unrecognised ones, the phenomena began with unaccountable noises, which had alarmed the children a good deal before they saw the apparition ; and it seems probable that, when the experiences had once begun, the alarm and discussion they occasioned may have encouraged both a tendency to experience hallucinations, and a tendency to exaggerate them in memory. But we have first-hand evidence from seven different percipients—six of whom were children at the time, though old enough to give fairly trustworthy accounts—and it is important that the first appearance was a collective one, of which we have three first-hand concordant accounts.

(488. 14.)

From Miss R. N.

(The initials of all the persons in this case are assumed. Miss R. N.'s account was written towards the end of 1891.)

“In July of 1885, I was staying in the country, and was reading in the garden (*Helen's Babies*) one day, when, suddenly looking up, I saw my aunt standing in front of me, she having died in the October previous. In a moment or two she passed on out of my sight. This was my first experience, though she had been seen by several members of the family at home.

“On my return home I saw her many times in the following nine months, and was often conscious of feeling some one in the room, which was empty except for myself. Also during that time I continually heard the most real and awful groans and various sorts of noises, which could not be accounted for in any way. Doors opened and shut in the most mysterious way, and once, when we were all working in the room my uncle occupied when with us, we distinctly heard knocking at the door, and on calling out ‘come in,’ there was no response, and a cat in the room with us was full of terror, though we saw nothing.”

The other principal witnesses in this case were interviewed by Professor Lodge in October, 1891. He informs us that the family consists of Dr. and Mrs. S.; their son, who had come to live in the house after the death of his wife (whom the apparition was supposed to represent) in October, 1884; and their daughter, Mrs. N., with her son and four daughters, R., aged (in 1891) 23, E., aged 20, C. aged 19, and A., a year or two younger. The apparition was first seen in 1884,—soon after the aunt's death,—collectively by C., A. and a friend, Miss G., as stated in their accounts, and soon afterwards on the stairs by Miss G. and A. N. together. It was seen later by a cousin, Miss S.; by a servant who had formerly been the deceased lady's housemaid, and afterwards by Miss R. N., as she relates. The apparition was generally seen in or near Mr. S.'s bedroom and dressing-room, where also mysterious noises—whirrings, voices and taps—were often heard by several members of the household, and doors were said to open and shut unaccountably, much to the alarm of the children; the cat also showed signs of terror. The manifestations went on for about a year and a half, and ceased about February, 1886, when Mr. S. married again and left the house. In July, 1886, he was visiting in the house, when the children again fancied they saw their aunt. The incidents were not mentioned to him, but Dr. and Mrs. S. and Mrs. N. confirmed the percipients' accounts. Professor Lodge gathered that the figure seen was at first unrecognised and the subsequent appearances often vague and shadowy, the recognition being perhaps subsequently inferred, and the children's alarm tending to make them at the time emphasise everything that occurred; though they were inclined afterwards, he thought, in giving him their testimony, to minimise the incidents.

The following accounts are given by the percipients :—

From Miss E. N.

November, 1891.

“In the winter following my aunt's death, 1884 to 1885, my uncle, who was living with us, was away for a short time, and wrote begging my mother to get something for him out of his wardrobe. I went with my

mother into his room at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and as we opened the wardrobe door, we heard the most appalling noise. The only thing I can at all compare it to, is the letting loose of a quantity of clock machinery, and yet that doesn't really describe it, and it was more violent. While it lasted, which was about half a minute, we clung together in terror, and then we looked everywhere for an explanation, but could find none, and never have. No one else in the house heard it, though it was so loud, and we never heard it again.

"During that winter my sisters and others continually saw my aunt, but it was not till the following winter that I saw anything, when, one evening, as I was going upstairs alone, I half saw a figure turn the corner of the staircase in front of me. I should scarcely say that I saw a figure, for what I did see was so shadowy and vague, and was more like the sweep of a dress round the corner, but it was gone almost before I had seen it. I distinctly remember stopping and feeling afraid to go on, but hearing my mother and sisters talking in one of the bedrooms, ran up and joined them. Often during the two years my aunt was seen, I have noticed doors unaccountably opened and shut; also the cat used sometimes to show signs of great terror, and would race about in a frantic way. When alone in a room I have often felt as if some one else were present.

"I was thirteen when my aunt died, and we were very fearless, and until my aunt was seen had no belief in anything supernatural. I have often wondered why I, who was more frightened than my sisters, never properly saw my aunt, while they often did."

From Miss C. N.

[*November, 1891*].

"When I first thought that I saw my aunt, I was 12 years old; it was in 1884, about two months after her death. I was playing in the drawing-room when suddenly I noticed a tall figure in black leave the room. The others had also seen it; we were not frightened, only very much surprised, because we had not seen any one enter, and it was certainly no member of the family. When we ran out of the room to see where the person had disappeared to, there was no sign of her anywhere. Later on the same day, I was going upstairs, when I was again surprised by seeing the same person walking across the landing from one bedroom to another. Just at the same moment my sister and friend came up; they had also seen the figure.

"One evening at about 7 o'clock, when every one of the family were at dinner, I passed my mother's open door; there I saw the same figure standing in the doorway; her face was turned from me towards the room; I looked hard at her for one minute, then ran on. When I reached the top of the stairs I looked again, but she had quite vanished.

"Another evening I went up to my grandmother's room to speak to her; there was a long screen in front of the door, so that I could not see into the room when I first entered. I stopped at the door for a second, for I heard what I thought was my grandmother walking about the room. Just as I was going to run past the screen, the same figure dressed in black with a white shawl, passed me very quickly and went into the dressing-room, which was out of the bedroom. My first impulse was to follow her,

but I heard such a strange noise in the dressing-room that I feared to enter. I do not remember being really frightened at the time, for I never saw the face distinctly.

“The last time that I ever felt anything was nearly two years later, in July, 1886. When my sister and I, who then occupied the room that our uncle had used when he was with us, were just settling to sleep, we were suddenly roused by the most awful feeling of terror; it was quite dark, but we felt that something or some one supernatural was standing by the bedside looking at us. I cannot describe it, for we did not see or hear anything distinctly; for a few minutes we were almost beside ourselves with fear—in too great a terror to move or look up. At last we summoned up courage to rush out of the room. Our mother came back into the room with us, and, after lighting the gas and assuring us that it must have been imagination, we got back into bed, and heard nothing more all night. I never saw anything again, though I often thought I heard sighs and voices in my uncle’s room previously.”

From Miss A. N.

[*November, 1891.*]

“ . . . We were then very young children, and fond of playing hide-and-seek. Our uncle had come to live with us after our aunt’s death, and constantly, when hiding in his room, we thought we heard sighs and groans, that were quite unaccountable. We were naturally frightened at this, and soon learned to avoid playing in his room.

“Before very long we also began to see strange things. One afternoon, when hiding in the drawing-room behind the sofa, some one walked out of the room quite suddenly. No grown-up person had been in the room, and this appeared to be a tall lady in a black dress and a white shawl, who might very well have been our aunt. At any rate, it was nobody in the house, because we ascertained that by inquiring of every one if they had been in the drawing-room at all, and were answered in the negative. Besides, I certainly remember being impressed with the fact that I had seen no one *enter* the room. . . .”

[Miss A. N. describes further two subsequent appearances of the figure to her, and confirms the incident related at the end of Miss C. N.’s account.]

From Miss G.

(Sent to Professor Lodge.)

“In the winter of 1884 I was spending the day at a friend’s house. I was then 11 years old. The little girls of the house and myself were playing at hide-and-seek, and two or three of us ran into the drawing-room and hid behind the sofa. Suddenly I saw a figure pass across the end of the room, and disappear through the door. I could see no face, and the figure glided, rather than walked; it was dark and shadowy, but I could see plainly it was no shadow; neither was it any one of the household. We were all rather startled, but I did not feel really afraid until I saw the same figure again.

“I was chasing one of the little girls upstairs, and when I came in sight of the landing the figure I had seen before passed from one of the rooms to the

other. At first I thought it might be my friend, but she too had stopped on the stairs, and we both exclaimed. We searched all the rooms on that landing, but did not find any one at all. I only saw the figure twice, as I went away from England very soon after."

From Mrs. N.'s niece, Miss S.

(Apparently written in *December, 1891.*)

"The only time I ever heard or saw anything at — House was one day when, standing by myself on the landing of the first floor, some noise attracted my attention, and, looking round, I saw a tall figure in a grey gown come out of one of the bedrooms, and go into the adjoining dressing-room, but without turning its face in my direction. Being quite ignorant of what had been occurring there, I only concluded that it was some visitor, and did not hear until later in the day that there was no one answering to that description in the house. I saw the figure quite distinctly; it made no sound in walking, which did not strike me as at all strange, as it had only a wrapper on, and probably, as I thought, bedroom slippers."

The housemaid referred to in Professor Lodge's account writes to Mrs. N. :—

November 6th, 1891.

"I was rather surprised to hear that you should think it was because I was *afraid* to stay that I left — House; that was *not* the reason. I left because I did not feel well enough to do my work.

"I certainly did hear sounds, and thought I saw a figure in my bedroom several times. As I was not strong, it upset me a little, and made me feel nervous; so once or twice I asked F. to sleep with me, as I felt afraid. The sounds were as if some one was walking back and to across the floor, and made the boards creak; the figure was of a lady in a night-gown. Once it came to my bedside and leaned over me, but, as I had been dreaming of my dear Mrs. S., and was still thinking of her when I awoke, that may have been imagination."

Local Apparitions of Living Persons.

We have also a small number of cases in which apparitions, seen in certain places by more than one person independently, are reported by at least one of the percipients as representing persons who were living at the time.

In the following case, which resembles that of Mrs. L. F. and Miss A. C., quoted above, there is nothing in the experience of either percipient, taken by itself, to suggest a supernormal origin; but it is a curious coincidence that they both saw an apparition of the same person in the same place.

(189. 14.)

From Mr. C. C.

October 8th, 1889.

"Some time in the early summer of 1850, '51, '52, or '53, I was standing on the grass close to the verandah of a country house which we occupied

during those years. The verandah went round two sides of the house but only round one side of the drawing-room. I distinctly saw the appearance of my father, the late Mr. Justice C., standing close to and looking out of the drawing-room window, which opened on to the verandah. I made a mental note at the time, and felt a little anxious till he came down from town, either on that evening or the next. My father was appointed a judge in 1852, and I am inclined to think the above incident took place when he was a judge, but of this I am not at all sure. The house was four miles from H——, where we lived from 1848 to 1853. I was, I think, about 19 years old. I was in good health, and in no particular grief or anxiety.

“My father was in London, attending to his usual business as barrister or as judge, and we were in no anxiety about his health or otherwise.

“My sister (Mrs. R.) had an almost identical experience, seeing the appearance of my father looking out of another window in the drawing-room, on the side where there was no verandah. Whether it was at the same time, we have no means of deciding. Neither of us knew of the experience of the other till the other day, September 29th, 1889, at my brother-in-law’s house. I do not remember [having such an experience on] any other occasion.”

(189. 15.)

From Mrs. R.

October 16th, 1889.

“When I was a young girl, I was one day in the garden of the country house we occupied, and, looking towards the house, saw my father, Mr. Justice C., standing at and looking through the drawing-room window on the ground floor. The window was not open. It was *not* the window opening on to the verandah, mentioned in the previous answer by my brother, Mr. C. C. The impression was momentary, and I was satisfied at the time that it could not be my father himself. It was summer, and in broad daylight. I was walking or playing in the garden. I was not out of health, or in grief or anxiety. I cannot recollect in what year it took place, or my exact age, but I was certainly over ten when we first went to the house and fifteen when we left it (about 1850). I believe my father was away from home at the time, but I do not know what he was doing. No [one was with me at the time]. I was greatly surprised at the end of last month to hear of my brother’s similar experience. I believe I never heard of it before. I do not think I ever mentioned mine to any one at the time or since till we received these papers; but I told it to the collector before hearing my brother’s experience, and he told his before hearing of mine.

“[I have had] no [other such experiences].”

In this case, it may be a mere accident that the apparition was seen both times in the same place—the place being in the house in which the percipients lived; but there is a certain interest in repeated apparitions of the same person. See *Phantasms of the Living* (Vol. II., pp. 77-90) and Miss Maughan’s case,¹ (pp. 273-7).

¹ Another case of this kind taken from the Census is Mr. Hasted’s (see *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. VI., p. 131.)

We have quoted above a case of an apparition of a living person seen in a house which the percipient afterwards heard was reputed to be "haunted" (No. 240. 13, p. 188), but in which the only other definite incident recorded was the apparition of another living person to another percipient. See also No. 684. I (p. 191), where the apparitions of two children were seen at different times by their parents. These cases may, of course, be explained as merely subjective hallucinations, and the occurrence of two of them in the same place may be purely accidental.

The following is a case of similar apparitions seen in the same house by three persons—two of whom saw them independently,—which there is some reason to regard as representing some one who afterwards came to the house. The parallel with "haunts" where the apparition is supposed to represent some deceased person unknown to the percipients, is very close. There was undoubtedly *some* resemblance between the apparition and the person in question, and it seems likely that, if the percipients had had no more opportunity of making the comparison than would be possible in the case of a supposed apparition of the dead, they might have come to the conclusion that there could be no doubt of the identification.

The case is instructive, because we have unusually full and well-authenticated information about it, including an account written before there was any question of identification. We also happen to possess a less authentic account—probably at third-hand—which we print as illustrating the additional impressiveness that narratives of this kind are likely to gain in passing from hand to hand. It will be observed that the tempting hypothesis of reciprocity in supernatural perception is suggested by this account, but the evidence which suggests it is denied by the lady who is in the best position for making statements on the subject.

(267. 1.)

From Mr. G. S.

December 30th, 1889.

"On the Saturday which was on or nearest to October 22nd, 1886, at the house of Dr. E—, —, on entering the drawing-room on the first floor shortly after 4 o'clock, afternoon, I saw, seated on a settee, with her back to me, a young lady in a brown dress, with a broad lace collar. She was present in the room for some minutes after, and I saw her as I sat talking to Mrs. E. and a gentleman caller whose name I forget. Her hair was reddish gold in the gleam of the fire. I only saw the round of her right cheek, which appeared fresh and plump. She appeared to be reading, but I could not see the book. When the gentleman rose to go, I looked round for her expecting, and wishing, to be introduced, but she was gone. The light in the room at the time consisted of a fine open fire, and a gas lamp on each side at the usual level of a bell pull. The girl's back was to the fire, and she sat in the

middle of the settee. Mrs. E. sat on the side of the settee nearest the fire, facing it, and to the right of the settee. The caller sat on a chair near the end of the settee furthest from Mrs. E. I was 28 years of age, in my normal health (*i.e.*, slightly below par), and in good spirits. I had just been completing the exchange of a lease for Mrs. E.'s son L., who had lately married. I never saw the girl before. The gentleman seemed to be looking straight towards the girl, but he took no notice of her, and I did not speak of her to Mrs. E. till he was gone, and Mrs. E. disclaimed any knowledge of her—and was rather frightened—so I laughed the matter off. [I have] never [had any other such experience.]”

Mr. S. wrote an account of his experience shortly after it happened, but this account was unfortunately lost by the friend to whom it was given. The following letter from Mr. S. to the collector, Mr. C. W. C. Oman, of All Souls' College, Oxford, gives further particulars.

October 29th, 1887.

“You may remember my telling you last year that on Saturday, October 23rd (I think that was the date), I saw an apparition, in — Street. Now, on the 20th of this month, it has again been seen by a guest in the same house, and on the 27th by a servant—each time in a different room from the room where I saw it. The guest was a Mrs. R., who called at the house, after I had seen the figure last year, on the same afternoon. This year she was staying in the house; she was not quite well, and was having dinner in bed about 7.30, when in walked a fair-haired young lady, of two or three and twenty, in a brown dress, with a broad lace collar—the dress being of the style that used [to] be known as ‘Princess’ cut. She advanced without a word to the cheval-glass, and began to take down her hair. Mrs. R. was not in the least frightened, taking her for a real flesh and blood woman. She got out of bed, and, walking up to the glass, laid her hand on the girl's shoulder; but it passed through empty air, and she found herself looking at her own self in the glass. Even then, she said, she was puzzled, not frightened. I questioned her this evening about the ‘ghost's’ height, shape, dress, contour of face, etc., and she confirmed my recollection in every way, except the manner of dressing the hair, on which she was lazy.

“The servant, on the other hand, is very clear, both about the lace collar, the colour of the dress, and the dressing of the hair, and its peculiar colour. *She* saw the figure walk into the dining-room, which has only one door, and, following it, found no one in the room. The chimney and window were the only exits, and the latter is over an area lined with spikes, and 15ft. deep. I asked Mrs. R. some questions designed to lead her astray, but she kept straight to details which I could corroborate. For instance, when I suggested puffed sleeves, she stuck to the simple ‘Princess’ cut.”

Mr. S. writes further :—

December 30th, 1889.

“In August, 1888, Mrs. E.'s son P.'s wife (whom he married in Australia, and whom Mrs. E. had never seen) arrived from Sydney. I saw her. She was out of health, and her hair had been cut off shortly before she started for England. It was of a reddish hue. I did not recognise

her. She went into the country, and came back in October restored in health. Shortly after her return Mrs. R. was dining with Mrs. E., and Mrs. P. E. came down in a brown tea-gown and broad lace collar. Mrs. R. and Martha at once recognised her as the brown lady. By Mrs. E.'s desire, nothing was said to Mrs. P. E., who is of a highly nervous temperament, and I believe nothing has been said to her yet. She returned to Australia in the year 1888, only to return this year (1889), and arrive at Mrs. E.'s house at the end of October."

April 23rd, 1890.

"So far as I am aware there is no further reason for thinking that the apparition was Mrs. P. E. beyond the recognition by Mrs. R. and the servant. I have not made personal inquiries to see whether the recognitions were independent in each case. Since I filled up the return I have met Mrs. P. E. She was then in a brown dress of the colour I remember, and something of the shape about the shoulders, but she did not strike me as being the same type of head as that of the apparition I saw. However, I only saw the round of the cheek of the apparition at such an angle that the nose and shape of the eye were quite hidden. The first time I saw her (Mrs. P. E.) she was not in a brown dress. She was then recovering from a rather exhausting illness."

April 29th, 1890.

"[Having seen] Mrs. P. E. [again], I took an opportunity of looking at her from, as nearly as I could, the same angle as I saw the apparition from, and I find I was mistaken in thinking the shape of her head would give a different effect from that of the apparition. From that point of view the outline of her cheek corresponds very fairly with that of the apparition.

"G. S."

Mrs. E. writes :—

May 5th, 1891.

"My son's young wife came to England from Australia in exceedingly delicate health, and Mrs. R., seeing her one day in a long brown tea-gown, exclaimed to me, 'Why, I believe the figure I saw was —; and the servant also seemed to think there was some resemblance; but Mr. S. was never struck by any such likeness to the figure he saw in the drawing-room. . . . I doubt very much if there is any association between her and the figure seen by the others.'"

Mrs. E. sent us the following letter, from Mrs. R. to herself, describing her experience.

May 9th [1891].

"I remember every detail. As you know I am not a nervous or excitable person, and don't get 'mixed up' in my impressions. The facts were these :— I was staying with you in the October of, I *think*, 1888, but I know it was the October before P.'s wife came home on that visit. I had a cold, and remained in bed all day. When [my] dinner [came] I sat up in bed, and ate [it] with the tray on a pillow before me for an improvised table. The gas was full on. I had just finished, had put the tray on the table beside my bed, and was going to lie down, but was still sitting up—when the door opened gently (the red door at the foot of the bed, as the room was then arranged), and a

woman came quietly in. At the first moment I thought it was you, and I had said 'Oh, L., how quick you have been!' before I realised that it was not you. It was somebody I had never seen, but I had no time to see her face properly; she took no notice of me, but walked up to the toilet table and put up her hands as if she was going to take her hair down. The gas shone full on her hair, and I saw that it was fair hair, and she had on a long plain brown dress. I did not feel at all alarmed, but very curious and surprised, and I jumped out of bed, came up behind her, and was going to touch her on the shoulder, when she vanished. You know how small the room was, and that she could not have passed me without touching me. I got back into bed, and *then* I remembered what I had been told about Mr. S. and Martha having seen a brown woman. It had not made much impression on me; and I certainly was not thinking about it when the door opened and my brown woman walked in. When you came up, I told you about it, and we discussed the matter, and wondered what it could mean. I had never seen any one at all resembling the apparition before, but I afterwards distinctly recognised her in P.'s wife, who came home ill, and occupied the same room as the one I had seen her [in]."

Mrs. E. adds, in sending this letter, that she finds, from a diary, that Mrs. R. was staying with her in October, 1887, and was ill in bed about the 19th. Her son's wife came to England in 1888, and she thought it was in October, 1886, that Mr. S. saw the figure, as she knew that he had called on her one afternoon about that time.

The following account was written by Mrs. E.'s parlourmaid, Martha ——.

"In the early part of October, in 1887, while sitting at tea in the kitchen of a large house in the West-End of London, with three other servants (all that were kept besides myself), the visitors' bell rang, and on reaching the hall, before opening the door, I distinctly saw the back of a tall, fair lady walking into the dining-room, as if from the study. It was light enough for me to see that the lady had golden hair, coiled near the top of her head, and a brown dress, made 'Princess' robe fashion, a little long behind.

"I thought it was my own lady, by only glancing at her and seeing my lady's little dog running from her towards the door. I wondered what brown dress it could be, as a few minutes before I had left my lady at the top of the house in a *green* tea gown. Whilst opening the front door nobody could possibly have come out of the dining-room without my seeing them; but on going into the room, to my astonishment, I found nobody there, nor in the study, or anywhere about; and on going upstairs was surprised to see my lady with the *green* gown on still, and neither herself nor the lady [Mrs. R.] that was with her had left the room since I left them before the kitchen tea. We have never been able to account for the strange lady's appearance, although I have since heard that the same lady had been seen by a gentleman sitting in the drawing-room some time previous."

Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

May 9th, 1890.

"I called to-day on Mrs. E., and saw the parlourmaid Martha, who saw the figure resembling that seen by Mr. S. She struck me as a very sensible witness. She does not think she had heard of Mr. S.'s seeing the figure.

(Mrs. R. saw it later than she did), and is at any rate quite sure that she was not thinking of it or expecting it. [The account she gave to Mrs. Sidgwick agreed closely with the account which she wrote shortly after.] Besides Mrs. E. and Mrs. R., no one else was in the house except the servants, and they were downstairs all the time. The light was good enough to distinguish colour, etc., without any doubt. The likeness to Mrs. P. E. did not strike her till after Mrs. R. had called attention to it.

“Noises as of rustling paper have been heard in the back drawing-room, continued for some time and heard by all.”

The following is the more impressive, but less authentic, account, before mentioned.

“Some two years ago a distant connection, a Mrs. R., was at the house of a friend in —— street. She had not risen for breakfast; suddenly she saw a young lady standing by her dressing-table, the chief thing about her being her golden hair; on looking again nothing was to be seen. On going down to lunch she mentioned the matter to her hostess, Mrs. E., and then learned that nearly all in the house had seen the same thing. Some days after, in the afternoon, a gentleman who was calling desired to be introduced to a lady present, and when asked which one, described the figure before seen. News soon came that the wife of a son who had married an Australian lady was on her way to England on account of her health, and when Mrs. E. met her she at once recognised the figure; the servants also did this, and the young wife when she reached the house knew which was her room, etc. It was found that the patient was subject to trances, during which she could not be roused. I met in Surrey a few months back a lady of the same name, and on enquiry found that she was the sister-in-law of the Astral (?) shape. She informed me that the reason the golden hair was so prominent was that, having been cut off during typhoid fever, it had grown into a kind of mass. . . . Several London physicians saw the case.”

In reply to our enquiries as to the accuracy of the further details given in this account, Mrs. E. wrote:—

“The unknown narrator of our story has not been accurate in the facts. . . . Mrs. P. E. has never been in a trance, but when she first came to England she was in such a debilitated condition of health that any over-exertion would cause her to become unconscious for some minutes. She has often told me that while she was ill in Australia she used to try and picture to herself the home her husband used to describe to her, but I do not remember that when she arrived here she recognised any particular room.”

The cases we have given in this chapter, in addition to others of the same kind to be found in previous numbers of the *Proceedings*, constitute, we think, a strong body of evidence showing that apparitions are seen in certain places independently by several percipients, under circumstances which make it difficult to suppose that the phenomena are merely subjective, or that they can be explained by

telepathy,¹ without considerable straining of our general conception of it. It appears, however, that there is in most cases very little ground for attributing the phenomena to the agency of dead persons. The apparitions represent occasionally living and occasionally dead persons, but, as we have said, in the great majority of cases, they are unrecognised; and, in these cases, if they really represent any actual person, there is often no more reason to suppose the person dead than living.

¹ For a discussion of the possibility of this explanation, see Mr. Podmore's paper on "Phantasms of the Dead from Another Point of View," *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 229-313.

CHAPTER XVII.

PHANTASMS OF THE DEAD.

In the present Chapter we propose first to compare recognised phantasms of dead persons with other phantasms, and secondly to consider what evidence, if any, the Census affords of the possibility of communication between the dead and the living. Phantasms of the dead must be understood to include, in addition to those enumerated as such in the Tables under the head of "realistic human phantasms," 16 of the "incompletely developed apparitions" and 2 of the "visions."

As regards the first question, we may infer from the Tables—as was explained in Chapter III, p. 67—that phantasms of the dead are rarer than phantasms of the living; and this would be true even if we transferred the 95 death-coincidences (80 visual and 15 only auditory) to the class of phantasms of the dead. We have also in Chapter III. (pp. 67—68) shown that they are on the whole more impressive than other phantasms. Another characteristic of them as a class, which may be deduced from Table II., is that bisensory and trisensory hallucinations are relatively frequent among them. From Table VII., again, we see that a relatively large proportion of the auditory apparitions of the dead consist of something more than the mere calling of the percipient's name: and from Table V. it appears that apparitions of the dead are rarely seen out of doors. The qualities thus reported to us as possessed more frequently by phantasms of the dead indicate a smaller admixture among them of illusion and mistaken identity, and a more than average degree of fulness and completeness in the hallucinations. They are most of them, it will be remembered, qualities which we have already noticed as belonging to the class of death-coincidences.¹

Apparitions of the dead, like other apparitions, usually appear dressed like ordinary human beings, and without symbolic accompaniments such as white robes or wings. We have, indeed, only one case of wings (418. 5) in this class of phantasms, which is also a case of an incompletely developed figure. Our informant describes an apparition of his mother on the night after her death. He had prayed to see her and "about midnight she appeared as [a] head and shoulders with wings. She kissed me three times on the right cheek. I tried to speak to her, but could not. She then went straight up through the roof. I wakened my brother, who was asleep beside me, but he had seen nothing. [My age was] 19."²

¹ See p. 246, note, and pp. 301—2.

² The date of the experience is February, 1884: the narrative was written in April, 1891.

In four cases it is specially mentioned that the phantasm appeared in the clothes in which the dead person was buried (see for an instance No. 733. 18, p. 141). Usually the appearance in dress or otherwise is what the percipient was accustomed to associate with the person in life (an exception is No. 579. 23, see p. 378), though in 3 cases it is stated that the apparition looked younger than its counterpart when last seen : No. 196. 4, p. 368, is an instance.

We turn now to the question what evidence, if any, the Census affords of the possibility of communication from the dead to the living. To establish this possibility would be a result of far greater importance than any which our investigation has yet achieved ; since it would carry with it proof of continued existence after death, and continued interest taken by the dead in those still in the body. Incidentally it would suggest that telepathy is probably a phenomenon caused independently of any physical process outside of, and intervening between, the bodies of the human beings concerned ; since there is no reason to regard the apparent communications from the dead as of a different nature from those which we are able to trace to living agents ; while it is difficult to suppose that the communication from the dead depends on localisation in space and the setting in motion of a physical medium.

Conversely, if we arrived at the conclusion that telepathic communication between living men occurs independently of any physical process through the intervening space, we should certainly have taken an important step towards proving that the mind is not essentially dependent on the body ; and we should thereby have got rid of an important argument for supposing that the death of the body carries with it the extinction of the mind, or at least the termination of its power of communicating with another mind. On the other hand, while the recognition of telepathic communication between the living may make the reality of communication with the dead more probable than it otherwise would be, it at the same time makes it more difficult to prove. The evidence that an apparent communication from a dead person is not purely subjective must, as in the case of apparent communication from the living, depend, in the main, either on its coincidence with some state of the supposed agent unknown to the percipient, suggesting a causal connexion between that state and the hallucination ; or on information unknown to the percipient being conveyed by the phantasm. Coincidence—as will have been perceived—is the commonest ground of evidence in the cases of spontaneous telepathy which we have laid before the reader in previous chapters ; the conveyance of definite information being comparatively rare. But in the case of phantasms of the dead, our ignorance of the actual condition of the dead makes it possible to establish coincidence only

in a very limited class of cases—viz., those in which the death has taken place, but is not known to the percipient to have taken place. We should therefore expect to find the cases which, *primá facie*, are not explicable as purely subjective hallucinations to be rare among the phantasms of the dead. But even among these rare cases we meet with another difficulty in proving them to be due to the influence of the dead. The difficulty is that verifiable information is seldom unknown to living persons, and, therefore, granting telepathy, the percipient may have received it telepathically from the living and not from the dead. Even if it be really unknown to any living person, but yet verifiable,—*e.g.*, by means of documents put away by the deceased person during his life,—there is still an alternative hypothesis to be taken into account, viz., that an extension of supernormal perception, such as is involved in some (alleged) cases of clairvoyance, enabled the percipient to acquire the knowledge without the aid of any other individual mind. The difficulties that lie in the way of proving communication from the dead are therefore necessarily great, and even if it is to be ultimately established, we must expect the accumulation of the requisite evidence to be slow and laborious.

In the present chapter we intend to lay before the reader the chief cases furnished by the Census of phantasms of the dead which have a *primá facie* veridical character, irrespective of the question whether the truth imparted can be supposed to come from the dead,—a question, however, on which we shall endeavour to throw such light as our statistics afford.

We shall begin by considering the cases in which the ground for attributing veridicality is a coincidence. In dealing with this part of the subject we cannot leave out of account the death-coincidences which we have already considered from another point of view. Indeed, those of them which occur after the death, however near it, are strictly speaking phantasms of the dead; and those which occur at the moment of death are ambiguous,—we cannot say that they are clearly phantasms of either the living or the dead. Our reasons for counting them so far with phantasms of the living were twofold. In the first place, it is with phantasms of the living that we must group them in order to calculate the probability of the coincidence being due to chance alone; the probability that any recognised phantasm of the dead will coincide with the death being one which our data do not enable us satisfactorily to estimate.¹ Secondly, it is desirable in establishing new facts to pro-

¹ It will be remembered that the calculation as to the probability of the apparition of a living person being seen on the day of his death was founded on the registered death-rate (see p. 245). The death-rate is calculated in proportion to the population, but it would be obviously difficult to estimate the factor corresponding to the population in the case of dead persons.

ceed from the known to the unknown. The possibility of telepathy between living persons has been shown experimentally, and, if we accept the result of those experiments, there is little difficulty in extending our conception so as to include spontaneous cases; further,—since we have some evidence suggesting that ideas may sometimes remain latent and only emerge into consciousness by means of a hallucination after an interval of time,—there is no great difficulty in supposing that the telepathic impulse from the dying person may have occurred at or before death, and not have produced a manifest effect on the percipient until a few hours later. A belief in the possibility of communications from the dead is therefore not necessarily involved in the acceptance of the veridical character of death-coincidences. But in studying phantasms of the dead as such, we take a different point of view; from which it becomes important to distinguish and compare three different kinds of death-coincidences,—those in which the hallucination occurs before death, those in which it occurs after death, and those in which it is strictly simultaneous with the death.

The 80¹ cases reported to us as visual death-coincidences divide themselves as follows:—

The apparition is known to have occurred before the death—the interval being from a few minutes to 12 hours—in 7 cases, of which Nos. 645. 11 (p. 233) and 571. 14 (p. 237) are instances. It is known to have occurred at similar intervals after the death in 10 cases, of which Nos. 425. 12 (p. 211), 381. 4 (p. 214), 579. 24 (p. 223), 379. 24 (p. 225), 450. 18 (p. 234), 328. 5 (p. 235), and 579. 25 (p. 241) are instances. In 50 cases the coincidence between the apparition and the death is described in some such way as “on the day and at the time” (No. 362. 21, p. 217), “at that hour” (No. 215. 9, p. 224), “at that exact time” (No. 385. 20, p. 239), “coincided as nearly as we could make out with the moment” (No. 725. 6, p. 237), “about the time” (No. 452. 10, p. 238). Or the hour at which both events occurred is named, as in No. 147. 23, p. 218; or approximately named, as in an unprinted case when the apparition is said to have been seen about 3 a.m., and the death to have occurred “in the night at some time after 12.” In some of these cases we have adequate reason to regard the coincidence as really exact to a minute or two; in others we interpret our informants’ phrases as leaving it undecided whether the apparition preceded or followed the death by an interval of an hour or two or less. In a few cases again, the expression used probably means no more than on the same day or same night,—or even possibly an interval exceeding 12 hours, since we have seen reason² to believe that too

¹ See Chapter XII., p. 208, for the exact definition of this group.

² See Chapter XII., p. 242.

many remote cases are reported as death-coincidences. In the 13 remaining cases out of the 80, the coincidence is not asserted to have had the closeness which ought strictly to be implied in the phrases above quoted, though the apparition is reported to have occurred on the same day or night as the death. For our present purpose neither of these two latter classes can be counted as in strictness phantasms either of the living or of the dead.

Of the 15 auditory death-coincidences—in which voices are recognised, but there is no recognised apparition—two-thirds are similarly uncertain¹; but for the present it will be convenient to confine our attention to phantasms of which one element is a recognised apparition.

We have then, among cases previously counted with apparitions of of the living, 10 in which the person seen was actually dead, although the fact was unknown to the percipient. There are 7 other cases which occurred within 12 hours of the death, but in which the death was known, so that they have been already counted as apparitions of the dead.² One of these has been already described in this chapter. It is of course obvious that the very fact which often makes apparitions of this kind specially impressive to the percipient—the fact that they come at the crisis of acutest grief—also renders it easy to explain them as purely subjective phenomena, caused by the grief which they console.

The class to which we now pass does not admit of being similarly explained. Extending our examination beyond the 12 hours after death, we find 9³ apparitions which occurred more than 12 hours after the death, but while it was still unknown to the percipient. The following are the best-evidenced cases of this class. In the first, the hallucination occurred less than two days after the death, but the force of the coincidence is weakened by the anxiety of the percipient about her friend's illness. It must be observed, however, that the hallucination did not occur during the period of greatest anxiety, but after the percipient had heard that her friend was better.

(196. 4.)

From Mrs. Frank Malleon.

Dixton Manor, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire

[Mrs. Malleon tells us that the account she gives is a copy of notes taken in March, 1885, about a month after the occurrence.]

“ My friend, whom I had known intimately for [the] greater part of my life, had become weak and failing from age, and, for a week or so, I had been

¹ Four of the fifteen (including 23. 11, see p. 256) are strictly phantasms of the living: one (562. 3, see p. 179) is a phantasm of the dead.

² They were accordingly excluded from the discussion in Chapters XII. and XIII., see p. 208.

³ We have excluded three cases in which it is possible—and, we think, most probable—that there was a mistake of identity.

receiving very serious accounts of her condition. On the Saturday morning (January 31st), following days of illness, I received letters to say she was better and fears of her immediate death seemed past.

“On the Sunday evening, however, I had a strong impression that my friend had gone from us; but through cross-country posts I got no news on Monday morning. On the Monday night when I lay down in bed there came to me a conviction that she was trying to make her presence felt, and I became aware of her standing in an angle between my bed and the fire: not oppressed with extreme age as I had often seen her in the last year or so, but in the vigour of middle age when I had had most intercourse with her.

“The colour of her dress and cap—the fashion of both—were absolutely familiar to me as belonging to that time. She stood poised in a natural attitude—her figure with absolute solidity—looking straight at my face lying on the pillow. I felt no fear, but the strain of emotion was so great that I remember thinking, ‘If this strain continues, there is some one in the next room, and if I call out I shall be heard.’

“I shut my eyes, but the impression of the presence remained with me. Then I believe I opened them again, because I am conscious of having received another, and second, impression of the figure standing there. Then it disappeared, and, with all my expectation and wish of having the experience over again, it has never recurred. In the morning following the appearance I received the news of her death, which had taken place between 3 and 4 a.m. on the Sunday morning (February 1st). So vivid was the impression produced that often now even, I avoid stepping on the place in my room where the figure stood.

“ELIZABETH MALLESON.”

Mrs. Malleison states further that when she saw the apparition she was reading in bed by the light of a candle placed beside her, and that this is the only experience of the kind that she has ever had.

Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

February 25th, 1892.

“I have just seen Mrs. Malleison and talked over her experience with her, and seen the exact spot where the apparition stood. It was just at the foot and to one side of the bed in which she lay. There is no doubt that it was thoroughly externalised and vivid. The account written within a few weeks is of course better evidence as to the facts than anything she could tell me now. The apparition was of an aunt of Mr. Malleison’s, with whom she had lived a great deal, who had taught her much and with whom the tie of friendship was very close. This aunt had, Mrs. Malleison says, agreed with a friend in her youth that whichever died first should appear to the other, and had been greatly disappointed at the friend’s non-appearance. Miss Malleison and her father both knew of the apparition before the news came, I understood, and I talked to both of them about it. The apparition wore her favourite colours.”

Mrs. Malleison writes later:—

April 4th, 1892.

“I am sure that my husband was the first person I told of the appearance, but neither he nor my daughter remember my story with sufficient vividness and accuracy to write their testimony, I am sorry to say.”

The following case was originally reported to us as a "death-coincidence," but on investigation it appeared most probable that the apparition was seen several days after the death had taken place,¹ though before the percipient had heard of it, the mistake having apparently arisen from her ignorance of the time the news must have taken to travel.

(656. 26.) From Mrs. Hall, a college bedmaker at Cambridge.

(The account was written on February 11th, 1891.)

"At 7.30 I heard a knocking and turned to the door. I saw an individual, a man which was once my master, and he said: 'Well, Agnes, how are you?' 'Oh, it's Mr. Middleton.' He then vanished. [I was] sitting talking to my husband, in good health, 28 years of age. . . . At the same hour he appeared to me, he died—at 7.30. My husband saw nothing, but heard the knocking.

"A. HALL."

The collector, Mr. F. W. Grantham, added to Mrs. Hall's account the following notes, written, he believes, in May or June, 1891, from information which she gave him:—

"[The apparition] was wearing clothes and a hat. It was February 4th, at Cambridge. I had not seen him for some years and did not know he was ill. He was at Sheffield at the time of his death. I got a letter next morning to say he had died 7.30 the previous evening."

Miss Johnson called on Mrs. Hall at her own house, and gives the following account of her interview, written immediately after it.

May 16th, 1892.

"Mrs. Hall told me that she was sitting with her husband at tea on February 4th, 1891, in the room where I saw her—he was facing the door and she back to and on one side of it. They both heard a knock at the door, and she turned round and saw a man standing on the mat a little way inside. She recognised him as Mr. Middleton. He said, 'Agnes, how are you?' She answered, and then he said no more and she could see him no longer. He did not go out of the door, but simply vanished. She had not seen him come in either, and the door had not seemed to open—she merely turned round and saw him. She was much startled, and told her husband. He had seen nothing and had not heard the apparition speak, and he said it was all nonsense. Next day at dinner-time she got a letter, telling of Mr. Middleton's death. He was a retired butcher, and she had lived in his house for ten years, so she knew him very well. His family have since migrated to America. She did not keep the letter, but thought (she was not sure of this) that her husband had referred to it in writing the account on the B form, which he did on February 11th. (I showed her the B form, and she told me that her husband had written it; some notes are added in Mr. Grantham's handwriting.) She was not able to write then, as she was confined on February 10th, so her husband wrote it the day after, and

¹ The case is therefore counted in the Tables as an apparition of a dead person.

she signed it later. She was perfectly well all the time beforehand, up to the day of her baby's birth, and remembered the date of the apparition in relation to this, and also as having happened a month before her husband's death, which occurred quite suddenly on March 4th, 1891.

"She was not sure by what light the apparition was seen, but it was perfectly clear, just like a real man. She thought it was a real man at first.

"She has never had any other hallucinations of sight, but a week or two after this, she and her husband used to hear constant knockings or hammerings at night. They enquired of their neighbours about it, but could find no cause for it."

As we failed to find in the register any record of the death of Mr. Middleton, Miss Johnson called again on Mrs. Hall to make further enquiries, and learnt from her that he had really died in America, not at Sheffield, having migrated to America with his family some time before his death. Mrs. Hall repeated that it was on February 4th, 1891, that she saw the apparition, six days before her confinement. The letter telling of Mr. Middleton's death arrived some time between February 4th and February 9th; she was not sure of the exact day. She made another search for this letter, but failed to find it. It may be observed that the statement as to the letter arriving the "next morning" was not in her original account, but in the notes added by the collector two or three months later.

Putting together the date of the apparition and the limits of the time during which the letter can have been received, it seems almost certain that the death preceded the apparition, though the latter occurred before the death was known to the percipient.

In the three following cases, it will be seen that the evidence for an external origin is stronger than in those just given; since in all of them, the apparition is not only seen before the death is known to the percipient,—who had not even heard of the illness,—but either definitely indicates that the death has taken place, or presents some other *primâ facie* veridical feature. The first is a vision occurring at the time of the funeral, and giving definite indications of the death. It may be also remarked that the case is one in which a written note was made at the time, by which the coincidence was verified when the news arrived.

(442. 15.)

From Mrs. B.¹

April, 1892.

"At Fiesole, on March 11th, 1869, I was giving my little children their dinner at half-past one o'clock. It was a fine hot day. As I was in the act of serving macaroni and milk from a high tureen, so that I had to stand to reach it, and give my attention to what I was doing,—on raising my head (as much from fatigue as for any purpose), the wall opposite me seemed to open, and I saw my mother lying dead on her bed in her little house

¹ Mrs. B. is the mother of the percipient in No. 442. 17, see p. 213.

at —. Some flowers were at her side and on her breast; she looked calm, but unmistakably dead, and the coffin was there.

“It was so real that I could scarcely believe that the wall was really brick and mortar, and not a transparent window—in fact, it was a wall dividing the hotel in which we were living from the Carabinieri.

“I was in very weak health—suffering intensely with neuralgia—having gone through a bad confinement, brought on by travelling—the baby was almost still-born, on January 31st.

“Owing to a family quarrel, I had left England without telling my people where I was going; but I was so fond of my mother that, when in Paris, I made an excuse to write to an old servant, who lived with my mother, to ask her for a toy which we had left with her—the object being to get news of my mother. Reply came that for years she had not been so well and strong; thus I had no reason for imagining her to be dead.

“I was so distressed at the vision, that I wrote to her (my mother), to give her my address, and entreat her to let me know how she was. By return of post came the statement that she had died on March 5th, and was buried on the 11th. At the hour I saw her, she was removed from her home to Kensal Green Cemetery. She had wished to see me so much that letters had been sent to a great many continental cities, hoping I might be found; but I never got a letter from my sister till long after I had received the news of my mother’s death.

“When I was married, my mother made me promise, as I was leaving home, to be sure to let her know in any way God permitted if I died, and she would try to find some way of communicating to me the fact of her death—supposing that circumstances prevented the usual methods of writing or telegraphing. I considered the vision a fulfilment of this promise, for my mind was engrossed with my own grief and pain—the loss of baby, and my neuralgia, and the anxieties of starting a new life.

“My youngest sister, since dead, was called to my mother, and left Devonshire, where she was staying with friends, to come home. When she arrived at home, she entered the drawing-room, but rushed out terrified, exclaiming that she had seen godmamma, who was seated by the fire in my mother’s chair. Godmamma had been dead since 1852. She had been my mother’s governess—almost foster-mother; had lived with her during her married life, been godmother to her eldest girl, and when my father died, had accepted the duty of taking his place as far as possible in the family, to shield her from trouble and protect her—a duty which she fulfilled nobly.

“My other sister went into the drawing room to see what had scared K—, and saw the figure of godmamma just as K— had. Later in the day, the same figure stood by, then sat on the edge of my mother’s bed, and was seen by both my sisters and the old servant, looking just as she had when alive, except that she wore a grey dress, and, as far as we could remember, she had always worn black. My mother saw her, for she turned towards her and said, ‘Mary’—her name.”

We have verified the date of death through the Register at Somerset House.

Mrs. B. has had several other hallucinatory experiences,—*e.g.*, in 1876, in an Italian church, she saw an apparition of a child, which had been pointed

out to her by her little daughter, then aged three, but was invisible to a friend who accompanied her. It disappeared, and immediately afterwards the body of a dead child, resembling the figure they had seen, was brought into the church. The friend who was with Mrs. B. is now dead, so that no corroboration can be obtained, her daughter not being able to remember the incident. Most of Mrs. B.'s other experiences were, so far as can be ascertained, purely subjective.

Mr. Podmore, who visited Mr. and Mrs. B. on April 8th, 1893, writes:—

April 10th, 1893.

“Mrs. B. gave me a full account of her vision of her mother. She had absolutely no cause for anxiety, the last news being that her mother was better than she had been for years. There was a chronic ailment, but no reason to anticipate death soon. The children were too young to remember it, but Mr. B. told me that he came in a few minutes later and comforted his wife, whilst she was crying on the sofa. A written note of the date was taken and compared with the date given in the letter afterwards received, but all memoranda and letters of that time were lost. Both Mr. and Mrs. B. are satisfied of the coincidence of the vision with the day of the funeral.”

In the following case the hallucination occurred shortly after the death,—perhaps within 24 hours of it,—and the apparition indicated leave-taking. It is an interesting example (the only one in the Census) of a *primâ facie* veridical hallucination coinciding with the arrival of a letter bearing on the subject. Another remarkable feature in the case is the persistent repetition of the percept.

(740. 9.)

From Miss E. L. M.

(The account was written in 1889.)

“On the morning of January 14th, 1876, I was in the B. schoolroom, a small village near to A. in Hants, when I saw what appeared to me to be a favourite cousin. She was close beside me, and appeared in good health, as I had every reason to suppose her to be. I should here explain that I held in my hand a letter which had just been brought to me, *and which I had not yet opened*, telling me that my cousin was seriously ill with scarlet fever. The fact was that at the time she was actually dead, her death having occurred after the posting of the letter. I was waiting for children to assemble in school, and was in good health and in no grief or anxiety. I knew immediately that it was my cousin whom I saw, and believed her to be at the time at her own home. I could not understand what she meant by saying ‘Good-bye,’ which I cannot say I heard, but *saw* by the movement of her lips.

“The village children and my sister [were present]. The former I have no reason to think saw anything, and my sister only laughed at me. I continued to see her all day, and when indoors my sister would persist in strumming on the piano, although I remonstrated with her,—‘How can you

keep on with that noise when Jessie is dead?' I received a letter the next morning informing me that she was dead, after which I saw her only at intervals that day and part of the next, when the appearances ceased."

Miss M. had had previously another veridical experience, which she describes thus :—

"On the night of September 7th, 1864, when sleeping with my mother at Southampton I was suddenly wakened and saw my aunt in the right hand corner of the room looking as I had seen her in bed but a few hours before. Though very ill at the time (consumption), her cheeks were brightly flushed, her hair about her shoulders, and she had a very pleasant expression. The room was quite dark, but she was distinctly visible to me. I was a child of nine years old and in good health. I knew that my aunt was ill, having left her but a short time before. My mother was beside me in bed, and before I called to her, she had been wakened by what she described as something very cold touching her shoulder, but she saw nothing."

Miss M. writes later :—

November 8th, 1889.

"My aunt did die the very same night that I saw the vision of her. We were living about a quarter of a mile from her. I cannot remember whether I was told of her death before, during, or directly after breakfast."

Miss M.'s sister writes :—

November 9th, 1889.

"I distinctly remember the circumstances respecting my cousin Jessie. All one day my sister was telling me she saw her, and that she knew she was dead, and we had a letter next morning, with the news, so that we knew *before* the letter arrived.

"I have asked my mother about it, and she remembers my sister telling her *at the time*.

"She has also asked me to say, that a hand was placed on her shoulder, just about the same time that my aunt died ; she did not see nor feel anything else but the cold hand."

In the remaining case of this group, a detail of the personal appearance of the deceased person, unknown to the percipient, was represented in the apparition. It is possible that it may have been seen on the day of the death, as stated in the first account, but since the percipient finally came to the conclusion that it was a day or two later, we have counted it as a phantasm of a dead person.

(461. 25.)

From Mr. H. F. Dean.

126, Lozells-road, Birmingham, *April 8th, 1891.*

"In the year 1877, my wife's father was in Canada, and had been for many years ; but one evening, passing from one room to another in my own house, I saw him. Fourteen days afterwards I received a letter stating that he died the same day that I saw him.

"H. F. DEAN."

The collector, Mr. G. R. Farncombe, writes from notes taken at a personal interview with Mr. Dean :—

“ The date of Mr. —’s death and of his appearance to his son-in-law was June 9th, 1877. He died in Toronto, having been resident in Canada some ten years. He had formerly lived in Birmingham, but had never met his son-in-law, and had never been in the house—in Warstone-lane, Birmingham—where the appearance was seen. Figure appeared in hall in the evening—hall dark except for light from open door of sitting-room. Mr. Dean was crossing (alone) from one room to the other when figure appeared and advanced, smiling, apparently as if going to speak to him, then vanished gradually. Mr. Dean says on seeing the figure he had an intuitive impression that it was his wife’s father, with whose appearance he was familiar through having often talked it over with his wife. He noticed, however, a scar on his face which he had not heard of. Mr. Dean at once told his wife that he had seen a figure which he thought was her father, but remarked that he had a scar on his face (pointing to place) which she had never told him of. His wife said it was quite true—was precisely in that position and had been caused by a lathe with which her father was experimenting. The figure was seen by Mr. Dean only—in good health and entirely free from anxiety. Mr. Dean does not know the precise hour of his father-in-law’s death—only that it was on the same day on which he saw the appearance. He was not aware of his father-in-law’s illness.”

[Mr. Dean’s signature is here added, certifying that he had read the account and that it was correct.]

Mr. Farncombe continues :—

“ Mr. Dean impresses me as being thoroughly straightforward, and of an intelligence distinctly above his class—that of a somewhat superior working-man. Unfortunately, he told no one of his experience at the time except his wife, whom he will not on any account allow to be spoken to on the subject, as she is of an exceedingly nervous temperament, and he expresses himself as unwilling that such painful memories should be revived.”

Mr. Dean has had one other hallucinatory experience, an apparition of his sister, twenty-two hours after her death, in 1874.

Mr. Myers writes :—

December 19th, 1891.

“ I saw Mr. Dean last night. He is a very good witness; a shrewd, quiet, elderly man, by nature sceptical, and even now by no means certain that the apparition which he has seen can be taken to indicate continued existence. Mrs. Dean was out. He will not allow her to be questioned on the subject; saying that she is of timid disposition, and would be agitated by allusion to the apparition of her father. I feel no doubt that this is in fact Mr. Dean’s reason for keeping the subject from her.

“ He described his experience at length. He was crossing a passage in his house in the dark, when suddenly it became light. Mr. Dean’s account given to me corresponded with that given to Mr. Farncombe, except that he now thinks that his father-in-law had died a day or two *before* the apparition. This cannot be made certain now. I fully agree in Mr. Farncombe’s high estimate of Mr. Dean’s good sense and sobriety of judgment.”

These apparitions of the dead when the death is unknown may be compared—from an evidential point of view—with cases where an apparition occurs during the fatal illness of the person seen, the illness being unknown to the percipient. For in both these kinds of cases alike there is a coincidence of a hallucination with an unknown and important new phase in the condition of the person represented ; while in both alike the probability of the coincidence occurring by chance is greater than in death-coincidences, in proportion to the greater length of the period over which the new phase extends.

Besides these cases where the percipient did not know of the death, there are a number of cases occurring very soon—but more than 12 hours—after a known death. These may be ranked with the cases, about equally numerous, of apparitions occurring during known illness which proved fatal. About one-fifth out of the whole number of phantasms of the dead, whose distance in time from the death has been reported to us, occurred within the week after death ; another third occurred within the year after death.

If now we survey together the various groups of phantasms of the living and of the dead which we have been comparing in detail, we see that there is a marked accumulation of cases about the time of the death. They occur during fatal illness, whether this is known or unknown to the percipient, in increasing frequency as the death approaches,—the largest number being reported as happening at or about the time of the death itself. Then they continue to occur after the death, whether the fact of the death is known or unknown to the percipient, becoming rarer as the death recedes into the distance. The death thus forms a central point about which the hallucinations cluster, diminishing in number on each side of it : and this certainly suggests that there is no discontinuity at the moment of death,—no sudden transition from a state in which communication with the living is possible to a state to which it is not.

And this suggestion is strengthened when we observe how little support is given by our statistics for the assumption that either anxiety about illness or grief for death has an important effect on the whole number of apparitions that occur when the person represented is ill or recently dead. If, for instance, we take the cases of apparitions occurring during the fatal illness of the person represented, but not within 12 hours of the death, we find that the illness was in 7 cases out of 18 unknown to the percipient. It is a still more striking fact that in 10 out of the 17 cases of apparitions within 12 hours after the death of the person represented, the fact of the death was unknown to the percipient ; in 4 of these 10 cases it was not even known that the person was ill, and only in 2 of the 6 cases in which the person was known to be ill, but not known to be dead,

was there any serious anxiety about the illness. In view of these facts, the regular rise and fall in the number on each side of the death becomes a still more impressive phenomenon.

Promises to Appear after Death.

Another argument—to which perhaps some weight should be allowed—for the continuity of the states before, at, and after death may be derived from the apparent fulfilment of promises to try to appear or communicate after death. We made no special enquiry about such promises, and have therefore no reason to think that we have complete information either as to the number made or the proportion fulfilled. We have, however, some facts of interest. Promises are mentioned in three of the 80 cases of death-coincidences—namely, Nos. 362. 21 (p. 217), 215. 9 (p. 224),—in both of which the apparition is stated to have been seen at the time of death,—and No. 379. 24 (p. 225), where it was seen half-an-hour after the death. A promise is also mentioned in one of the 9 cases of apparitions after death, the death being unknown to the percipient: viz., No. 442. 15 (p. 371), where the person seen had been dead a week; and also in one of the 11 cases of apparitions during fatal illness—the approach of death being unknown to the percipient—namely, No. 402. 8 (p. 284), where the apparition occurred two days before the death, during extreme weakness, and probably during sleep, of the slowly dying person.

Now we may probably assume that neither 5 persons in 100 nor 3 persons in 80 of all classes, sexes, and ages make promises to appear if possible to their friends after death: and if so, we may infer that the occurrence of this number of compacts among *primâ facie* veridical cases is not due to chance alone. If it is not accidental, the promise and the apparition must be in some way causally connected. But in the cases referred to, it seem improbable that the connection depends on the state of the percipient; since,—as the death or near approach of death was in all the 5 cases unknown to the percipients,—they could hardly be at the time expectant of the fulfilment of the promise. We seem then almost driven to suppose that the efficacy of the promise depended on the state of the dead or dying person. If this be so, we seem to have in the cases of fulfilment of a promise to communicate—grouped as they are about the time of death and on either side of it—a further indication that there is for the dying person no abrupt transition at death.

There are 5 other cases in the Census of such promises fulfilled—3 of them visual, 1 auditory, and 1 auditory and tactile—the interval after death varying from a few months to 5 years. The following is one of them.

(573. 20.)

From Miss E. M. T.

September 14th, 1891.

“I awoke from sleep and saw a brother who had been dead more than five years standing at the foot of my bed. He stood still, gazing at me earnestly. I cannot remember a voice, but he distinctly conveyed to my mind the impression that I was to have no more anxiety and that all would be for the best. I said ‘Oh, Arthur!’ and jumped up to go to him, when he vanished. This took place [on] a bright, sunny morning about 4.30 a.m. in June, 1872. No one was present. I was in perfect health; but we had family trouble at the time. I was 28. My brother in life had said he would appear after death if possible.”

Miss T. adds:—

“I have not seen him again; but, previously, at the time of his death, in 1867, I had a dream in which I thought I was wandering over a sort of wild country and could find him nowhere. I awoke, crying, feeling he was lost. The dream made such an impression on me that I made a note of it at the time. My brother was in Ceylon. I was in England. About five weeks afterwards we heard of his death in the early morning of the day I had the dream. Just before he died he called my name loudly.

“I have had other sensations of a spiritual presence at times, but have actually *seen* nothing definite at any other time.”

Of course, in cases such as this where the death is known, we have no argument from coincidence tending to exclude the purely subjective action of the percipient's mind; and the fact of the promise may, by producing some degree of expectancy, have helped both to cause and to shape the phantasm. On the other hand, it will be observed that the number of apparitions fulfilling promises after the death is otherwise known to the percipient is only equal to the number of similar fulfilments where there was no such knowledge.

Information Conveyed by Phantasms of the Dead.

Leaving the evidence supplied by the distribution of phantasms of the dead and by their occurrence when the death was unknown, we may consider next those which convey true information to the percipient about facts unknown to him. Three of the cases already discussed belong to this class; in two of which (No. 442. 15 and No. 740. 9, pp. 371 and 373) the information was as to the fact of the death, while in the third it related to a scar on the face (No. 461. 25, p. 374). In the following case there is a veridical feature of this kind, but it is perhaps one that might more easily have been guessed.

(579. 23)

From Mr. Heintze.

2, Rue Pouchkine, St. Petersburg.

“C'était à Moscou, vers le 15 Avril, 1884. Je demeurais rue Mokowaya, dans les appartements de Skworzof. Rentré de mon service au tribunal de

l'arrondissement, vers 4 h., je pris mon diner, et m'étant placé sur un divan je me mis à lire. C'était vers 5 h., il y avait du soleil et la chambre était parfaitement éclairée. Assis sur le divan, je pouvais voir la porte d'entrée. Continuant de lire, je jetai par hasard un coup d'œil vers cette porte et j'y remarquai un petit rond lumineux, pareil à celui que produirait le reflet d'un miroir. Mais ma chambre se trouvait au troisième étage, et dans les fenêtres de la maison en face on ne voyait personne. Je me levai et j'examinai attentivement ces fenêtres. Ayant repris ma place sur le divan, je regardai de nouveau vers la porte. Le rond lumineux devenait de plus en plus grand, et lorsque enfin il embrassa toute la porte, quelque chose de sombre commença à apparaître au milieu. Une figure humaine se forma de plus en plus distinctement, se détacha du mur et s'avança lentement vers moi. Je restai sans bouger, comme pétrifié. Dans cette figure je reconnus mon père, mort en Janvier, 1880. Il était en frac, il avait des moustaches fortement grises, comme de son vivant, mais outre cela une courte barbe complètement blanche, que je ne lui connaissais pas. L'apparition s'approcha de la table qui était devant le divan, en fit le tour, et prit place auprès de moi sur le divan. Je n'étais pas en état de parler, la frayeur m'avait paralysé la langue. L'apparition me tendit la main, machinalement je lui tendis la mienne ; sa main n'avait pas le froid glacial d'un cadavre, elle était seulement fraîche. Il commença à parler : sa voix était sourde, mais elle ressemblait à la voix de mon père.

“Je ne puis citer ici les paroles, qui se rapportaient uniquement à moi et étaient d'un caractère intime. Ayant fini de parler, il disparut subitement.

“J'étais alors en parfaite santé, je n'ai jamais souffert de hallucinations, et je suis sûr qu'en ce moment j'étais complètement éveillé, frais et dispos. Outre cela, je puis avancer des preuves en faveur de la réalité de cette apparition.

“Mon père était par profession maître de musique à Moscou ; après trois mois de maladie, il mourut quand j'étais loin de Moscou, et fut enterré en mon absence. De retour à Moscou je trouvai ma mère tuée de chagrin ; j'évitai de parler avec elle sur ce triste sujet, de sorte que les détails de la maladie et des funérailles de mon père me restèrent inconnus. Mais le soir après cette apparition, je me rendis chez ma mère avec la ferme résolution de la questionner à ce sujet : j'appris alors qu'il avait été enterré en habit noir (frac), que jusqu'au dernier temps il n'avait pas porté de barbe, *mais que pendant sa maladie une petite barbe parfaitement blanche lui avait poussé*, et c'est ainsi qu'il fut enterré.”

“N. HEINTZE.”

The collector, Mr. Aksakoff, adds a note :—

Janvier, 1892.

“Traduit et abrégé de l'original russe publié dans le *Rebus*, 1891, No. 27, et confirmé à moi par Mr. Heintze verbalement. La mère de Mr. Heintze vit encore, mais impossible d'avoir son témoignage, car elle a toutes ces choses en horreur, et considère comme un péché de s'en occuper.

“A. AKSAKOFF.”

A phantasm of this degree of persistency and development is very unusual. Mr. Heintze reports a similarly complicated phantasm coin-

ciding with the death of a friend, which has been counted among the death-coincidences.

A few cases of apparitions of the dead predicting future events fall *primâ facie* under the present heading; but in most of them the event is such as might have been guessed, as for instance when a parent in great anxiety for one child sees an apparition of another dead one who makes predictions as to the course of the illness (No. 91. 12); or when a second marriage is predicted by the apparition of the deceased wife. In one case (No. 535. 1) where the deceased wife appears to a friend at about the same time that the widower had, unknown to the percipient, become engaged to marry again, there is an element of coincidence which gives it some evidential character; but the experience occurred rather more than 20 years ago, and is uncorroborated, and, moreover, the coincidence is not stated to have been exact.

The most remarkable case in our collection of a phantasm of the dead conveying true information is perhaps the following. The phantasm not only gives information, but coincides in time with the death to which its apparent words and actions refer.

(464. 15.)

From Miss L. Dodson.

September 14th, 1891.

“On June 5th, 1887, a Sunday evening,¹ between 11 and 12 at night, being awake, my name was called three times. I answered twice, thinking it was my uncle, ‘Come in, Uncle George, I am awake,’ but the third time I recognised the voice as that of my mother, who had been dead 16 years. I said, ‘Mamma!’ She then came round a screen near my bedside with two children in her arms, and placed them in my arms and put the bed-clothes over them and said, ‘Lucy, promise me to take care of them, for their mother is just dead.’ I said, ‘Yes, mamma.’ She repeated, ‘Promise me to take care of them.’ I replied, ‘Yes, I promise you;’ and I added ‘Oh, mamma, stay and speak to me, I am so wretched.’ She replied, ‘Not yet, my child,’ then she seemed to go round the screen again, and I remained, feeling the children to be still in my arms, and fell asleep. When I awoke there was nothing. Tuesday morning, June 7th, I received the news of my sister-in-law’s death. She had given birth to a child three weeks before, which I did not know till after her death.

“I was in bed but not asleep, and the room was lighted by a gas-light in the street outside. I was out of health and in anxiety about family troubles. My age was 42. I was quite alone. I mentioned the circumstance to my uncle the next morning. He thought I was sickening for brain fever. [I have had other experiences, but] only to the extent of having felt a hand laid on my head, and sometimes on my hands, at times of great trouble.

“LUCY DODSON.”

¹ We have ascertained that this date was a Sunday,

The collector, Mr. C. H. Cope, writes in answer to our questions :—

Brussels, October 17th, 1891.

“I have received replies from Miss Dodson to your enquiries.

“(1) ‘Yes [I was] perfectly awake [at the time].’

“(2) ‘Was she in anxiety about her sister-in-law?’ ‘None whatever; I did not know a second baby had been born; in fact, had not the remotest idea of my sister-in-law’s illness.’

“(3) ‘Did she think at the time that the words about the children’s mother having just died referred to her sister-in-law? Had she two children?’ ‘No, I was at a total loss to imagine whose children they were.’

“(4) ‘I was living in Albany Street, Regent’s Park, at the time. My sister-in-law, as I heard afterwards, was confined at St. André (near Bruges), and removed to Bruges three days prior to her death. (N.B.—She had two children including the new-born baby.)’

“(5) ‘My late uncle only saw business connexions, and having no relations or personal friends in London, save myself, would not have been likely to mention the occurrence to any one.’”

Mr. Cope also sent us a copy of the printed announcement of the death, which Miss Dodson had received. It was dated, “Bruges, June 7th, 1887,” and gave the date of death as June 5th. He quotes from Miss Dodson’s letter to him enclosing it, as follows :—“[My friend], Mrs. Grange, tells me she saw [my sister-in-law] a couple of hours prior to her death, which took place about 9 o’clock on the evening of June 5th, and it was between 11 and 12 o’clock the same night my mother brought me the two little children.”

Professor Sidgwick writes :—

November 23rd, 1892.

“I have just had an interesting conversation with Miss Dodson and her friend, Mrs. Grange.

“Miss Dodson told me that she was not thinking of her brother or his wife at this time, as her mind was absorbed by certain other matters. But the brother was an object of special concern to her, as her mother on her death bed, in 1871, had specially charged her—and she had promised—to take care of the other children, especially this brother, who was then 5 years old. He had married in April 1885, and she had not seen him since, though she had heard of the birth of his first child, a little girl, in January 1886; and she had never seen his wife, nor heard of the birth of the second child.

“She is as sure as she can be that she was awake at the time of the experience. She knew the time by a clock in the room and also a clock outside. She heard this latter strike 12 afterwards, and the apparition must have occurred after 11, because lights were out in front of the public-house. The children seemed to be with her a long time; indeed they seemed to be still with her when the clock struck 12. The room was usually light enough to see things in—*e.g.*, to get a glass of water, &c.—owing to the lamp in the street, but the distinctness with which the vision was seen is not explicable by the real light. The children were of ages corresponding to those of her sister-in-law’s children: *i.e.*, they seemed to be a little girl and a baby newly born: the sex was not distinguished. She was not at all alarmed.

“ She heard from Mrs. Grange by letter, and afterwards orally from her brother, that her sister-in-law died between 8 and 9 the same night.

“ She never had any experience of the kind, or any hallucination at all before : but *since* she has occasionally felt a hand on her head in trouble.

“ Mrs. Grange told me that she was with the sister-in-law about an hour and a half before her death. She left her about 7 o'clock, without any particular alarm about her ; though she was suffering from inflammation after childbirth, and Mrs. Grange did not quite like her look ; still her state was not considered alarming by those who were attending on her. Then about 8.30 news came to Mrs. Grange in her own house that something had happened at the sister-in-law's. As it was only in the next street, Mrs. Grange put on her bonnet and went round to the house, and found she was dead. She then wrote and told Miss Dodson.”

There are some phantasms of the dead which by their appropriateness suggest that the deceased are taking a continued interest in mundane affairs. The case just given is one of these, and is perhaps the strongest in the present collection. It is, however, seldom possible in such cases to eliminate other possible causes and thus prove the agency of the dead. In the case just given, for instance, a telepathic impulse from the living brother might conceivably embody itself for the percipient in the form of their mother. Where no information is given by means of the phantasm, and its appropriateness depends solely on the circumstances of the percipient at the time, it is, of course, easy to suppose that the whole experience was purely subjective. For instance, in the following experience of the percipient of a well-evidenced death-coincidence (see p. 211) his aunt plays the part of a guardian angel pointing out to him the way to escape from danger. But it is not improbable that the suggestion came solely from his own mind, assuming a hallucinatory form owing to his emotional condition, as in the cases quoted in Chapter IX., pp. 169—170.

(425. 12.) From Mr. S. Walker Anderson.

[The account was given verbally to Professor Sidgwick, who writes from notes taken at the time of his interview :—]

December 19th, 1891.

“ Mr. Anderson has seen an apparition of one of his aunts, who had died many years before, several times in a dream-like and half shadowy way, immediately after waking up from a dream. Once only he saw her more completely externalised. This was seven years ago next January, when he was in danger of his life crossing a river in Queensland. His horse was carried down the stream, unable to swim across : he gave himself up for lost, when he saw his aunt standing on a floating tree ; he felt it to be an indication that he was to leave the horse and seize hold of the tree, which he did, and was carried safe to the bank.”

In the case we have next to quote—unless we accept the hypothesis of chance-coincidence—the evidence for the agency of the dead is certainly strong, because any other explanation compatible with the veracity of the narrators requires a very complicated and improbable hypothesis as regards the sub-conscious action of Senhor Cabral's mind. The case came into our collection merely as a tactile hallucination: but the main interest of it depends on the coincident experience of Donna Feliciana Fortes. It seems doubtful from the account given whether she had a hallucinatory vision, or merely a mental vision, but for our present purpose this is unimportant.

(726. 14.) From Senhor Ulysses J. C. Cabral.

Rua Escobar 48, Rio de Janeiro, *March 12th*, 1892.

[After relating his first meeting in June, 1886, with "Deolinda," a child whom he had found in great poverty and had taken charge of, and her death from consumption shortly afterwards, Senhor Cabral continues:—]

"Some months passed, and my family (which now included my wife's other sister Amelia) went to stay at a plantation belonging to friends. I escorted them thither, and returned to attend to my obligations in the city. In order not to be alone, I accepted the invitation of my friend, Barboza de Andrade, and went to live with him in S. Christovam. One month afterwards, a sister of Barboza's, who was ill, came into his house. She grew daily worse, and after the lapse of a few months had sunk so low that we had to sit up with her at night.

"One night, when I had taken my turn at nursing, I felt sleepy, and went to lie down. Two sisters, Donnas Anna Iñez Dias Fortes and Feliciano Dias (now deceased), took my place. I had made their acquaintance but a few days before. After stretching myself on the bed, I was filled with a feeling of unbounded joy. I was happy, and could not imagine what was the cause of my happiness. I had a sensation as if some one were holding my head and placing something round it.

"Astonished at my experience, I called to the ladies who were watching in the next room, and Donna Feliciano, though from the place where she was seated she could not see me, answered me back, 'I see at your bedside a spirit child clothed in white. She places on your head a crown of roses. She says her name is Deolinda, and she comes to thank you for the kindness and charity with which you behaved to her.' I was amazed at such a declaration, for that very day was the anniversary of Deolinda's death, and neither I nor any other person in the house had recollected this.¹ Besides, I had never spoken on the subject.

"The two ladies were worthy of the highest respect. As for Donna Anna Fortes, who is still alive, our friendship is now of long standing, and I render her all the homage which her virtue and goodness merit.

"ULYSSES CABRAL

"(Director of the 'Atheneu Brazileiro')."

¹ Note by the collector, Professor Alexander:—"According to the other statements, no other person in the house knew anything about Deolinda.—A. A."

The following corroborative statements were obtained by Professor Alexander :—

Rio de Janeiro, *March 16th*, 1892.

“The part of the above narrative which respects me is exact. I am sure that neither my sister nor I knew of the story of Deolinda before she was seen by the side of Senhor Ulysses Cabral on the night mentioned.

“ANNA IGNEZ DIAS FORTES.”

Rio de Janeiro, *March 17th*, 1892

“The above narrative coincides with our recollection of what happened in our house.¹ We are certain that our friend, Senhor Ulysses Cabral, told us the story of Deolinda only after the latter had been seen by Donna Feliciano Fortes.

“MANUEL JM. BARBOZA DE ANDRADE.

“EMILIA BARBOZA DE ANDRADE.”

Professor Alexander writes :—

Rio de Janeiro, *March 17th*, 1892.

“In reply to further questions, Senhor Ulysses Cabral said the sensation on the head was that of a slight but distinct compression. He supposed at first that a towel had in some way wound itself round his head. He did not speak of this sensation to the ladies in the next room. The ecstatic feeling would not allow him to sleep when he lay down. It was on the *night* of the anniversary of the child's death, about 12 o'clock, that this occurred. Senhor Cabral believed that he had not spoken of Deolinda to the people of the house, and this is confirmed, if there are no lapses of memory, by the statements of the other persons concerned. He thought that the lustre of his deed of charity would be somewhat tarnished if told even to friends. Though at my request he has made the whole incident public, he does so, I am well assured, with the intention of helping us in a quest which he holds to be all-important. Both he and Donna Anna Fortes affirm that they came together in that house for the first time on that night, although they had met once or twice before at Spiritist sittings. The lady says they were conversing about Spiritism at the time of Senhor Cabral's experience.

“Donna Feliciano Fortes, now dead, was a remarkable sensitive, according to the accounts I have received of her by surviving friends.

“The witnesses to the above case are all Spiritists; but they are people in whose veracity I can trust implicitly.

“ALFRED ALEXANDER.”

If we are to exclude Deolinda's agency here, we must suppose that Senhor Cabral was sub-consciously aware that it was the anniversary of her death, and that this subconscious recollection produced by association the feeling of happiness and the tactile hallucination, without even then influencing his conscious memory; and, further, that the other witnesses were affected by telepathic influence from his uncon-

¹ “They were sleeping at the time, and only heard of it the next day.—A. A.”

scious memory. This is certainly a highly strained hypothesis ; and a few more well-evidenced cases of this sort would go far to establish the agency of the dead.

In the following case, the interest lies in the simultaneous appearance to two percipients who were not together,—a coincidence which it is difficult to regard as fortuitous, however it may be explained.

(402. 19.)

From Baron B. von Driesen.

The account was written in November, 1890, and has been translated from the Russian by the collector, Mr. M. Petrovo Solovovo.

“ [Baron von Driesen begins by saying that he has never believed and does not believe in the supernatural, and that he is more inclined to attribute the apparition he saw to his ‘excited fancy’ than to anything else. After these preliminary remarks he proceeds as follows :—]

“ I must tell you that my father-in-law, M. N. J. Ponomareff, died in the country. This did not happen at once, but after a long and painful illness, whose sharp phases had obliged my wife and myself to join him long before his death. I had not been on good terms with M. Ponomareff. Different circumstances which are out of place in this narrative had estranged us from each other, and these relations did not change until his death. He died very quietly, after having given his blessing to all his family, including myself. A liturgy for the rest of his soul was to be celebrated on the ninth day. I remember very well how I went to bed between one and two o’clock on the eve of that day and how I read the Gospel before falling asleep. My wife was sleeping in the same room. It was perfectly quiet. I had just put out the candle when footsteps were heard in the adjacent room—a sound of slippers shuffling, I might say—which ceased before the door of our bedroom. I called out, ‘Who is there?’ No answer. I struck one match, then another, and when after the stifling smell of the sulphur the fire had lighted up the room, I saw M. Ponomareff standing before the closed door. Yes, it was he, in his blue dressing-gown, lined with squirrel furs and only half-buttoned, so that I could see his white waistcoat and his black trousers. It was he undoubtedly. I was not frightened. They say that, as a rule, one is *not* frightened when seeing a ghost, as ghosts possess the quality of paralysing fear.

“ ‘What do you want?’ I asked my father-in-law. M. Ponomareff made two steps forward, stopped before my bed, and said, ‘Basil Feodorovitch, I have acted wrongly towards you. Forgive me! Without this I do not feel at rest there.’ He was pointing to the ceiling with his left hand whilst holding out his right to me. I seized this hand, which was long and cold, shook it and answered, ‘Nicholas Ivanovitch, God is my witness that I have never had anything against you.’

“ [The ghost of] my father-in-law bowed [or bent down], moved away and went through the opposite door into the billiard-room, where he disappeared. I looked after him for a moment, crossed myself, put out the candle, and fell asleep with the sense of joy which a man who has done his duty must feel. The morning came. My wife’s brothers, as well as our neighbours and the peasants, assembled, and the liturgy was celebrated by our con-

fessor, the Rev. Father Basil. But when all was over, the same Father Basil led me aside and said to me mysteriously, 'Basil Feodorovitch, I have got something to say to you in private.' My wife having come near us at this moment, the clergyman repeated his wish. I answered, 'Father Basil, I have no secrets from my wife; please tell us what you wished to tell me alone.'

"Then Father Basil, who is living till now in the Koi parish of the district of Kashin [Gov. of Tver], said to me in a rather solemn voice, 'This night at three o'clock Nicholas Ivanovitch [Ponomareff] appeared to me and begged of me to reconcile him to you.'

"(Signed) BARON BASIL DRIESEN."

Mr. Solovovo adds :—

"The Baroness von Driesen is now dead, so that her evidence cannot be obtained. . . .

"I also saw Baron Basil von Driesen himself, and spoke with him about M. Ponomareff's ghost. He stated to me that if he were going to die to-morrow he should still be ready to swear to the fact of his having seen the apparition, or something to this effect. I asked him to obtain for me the clergyman's account, to whom I had already written before seeing Baron von Driesen (though not knowing him), but without receiving an answer—which is but natural, after all. Baron von Driesen kindly promised to procure for me the account in question, as it was then his intention to visit different estates in Central Russia, including the one that had belonged to M. Ponomareff.

"Baron Nicholas von Driesen—Baron Basil's son—called on me a few days ago. He stated, with regard to the case in question, that it was necessary to see the clergyman in order to induce him to write an account of what had happened to him."

Baron N. von Driesen afterwards sent a note to Mr. Solovovo, stating that his grandfather [M. Ponomareff] died on November 21st, 1860; and the testimony of the priest was obtained later. Mr. Solovovo, who had already ascertained independently that the Rev. Basil Bajenoff had been a priest at Koi in the year 1861, and was there still, writes :—

"The following is the translation of the Rev. Basil Bajenoff's statement :—

'Koi, July 23rd [August 4th], 1891.

"To the account I heard from Baron B. F. Driesen in the presence of his wife's brothers, MM. N. N., A. N., and I. N. Ponomareff, as to how M. Nicholas I. Ponomareff appeared to him in the night of November 29-30th, 1860, having died nine days before, and begged of the Baron to be reconciled to him, I may add that to me also did he appear *at the same time* and with the same request, which fact, before hearing the Baron's narrative, I communicated to all those present at the Liturgy for the rest of the soul of the late M. N. I. Ponomareff.

"(Signed) BASIL BAJENOFF,

"Priest of Trinity Church, at Koi, District of Kashin,
Government of Tver."

Baron von Driesen had previously, in 1855, had another apparently veridical experience. At the hour of the death of a brother-in-law, who

was living in another place, and whom he believed to be in good health, he heard a voice saying ; “ Pray ; your brother-in-law is dead.”

We may conclude our examination of phantasms of the dead with another Russian case, apparently carefully observed, and presenting several points of interest, among which is a incident somewhat resembling the one just discussed.

(422. 22.)

From Mr. E. Mamtchitch.

St. Petersburg, *April 29th*, 1891.

“ Comme il s’agira des apparitions de Palladia, je dois dire auparavant quelques mots sur sa personne. Elle était la fille d’un riche propriétaire russe, mort un mois avant sa naissance. Sa mère, dans son désespoir, voua son enfant futur au couvent. De là son nom, usité parmi les religieuses. Deux ans après, sa mère mourut, et l’orpheline, jusqu’ à l’âge de 14 ans, fut élevée dans un couvent de Moscou par sa tante, qui en était la supérieure.

“ En 1870, étant encore étudiant à l’université de Moscou, je fis la connaissance du frère de Palladia, étudiant comme moi, et il fut souvent question entre nous de rendre à la société la nonne malgré soi ; mais ce plan ne fut réalisé qu’en 1872. J’étais venu en été à Moscou, pour voir l’exposition, et j’y rencontrai par hasard le frère de Palladia. J’appris qu’il était en train de l’envoyer en Crimée pour cause de santé, et je le secondai de mon mieux. C’est alors que je vis Palladia pour la première fois ; elle avait 14 ans ; quoique haute de taille, elle était fort chétive et déjà poitrinaire. A la prière de son frère, j’accompagnai Palladia et sa sœur, Mme. P. S., en Crimée, où elles restèrent pour passer l’hiver, et moi, deux semaines après, je revins à Kieff.

“ En été 1873 je rencontrai par hasard Palladia et sa sœur à Odessa, où elles étaient venues pour consulter les médecins, quoique Palladia avait l’air de se porter assez bien. Le 27 Août, pendant que je faisais la lecture aux deux dames, Palladia mourut subitement d’un anévrisme, à l’âge de 15 ans.

“ Deux ans après la mort de Palladia, en 1875, me trouvant à Kieff, il m’arriva, par une soirée du mois de Décembre, d’assister pour la première fois à une séance spiritique ; j’entendis des coups dans la table ; cela ne m’étonna nullement, car j’étais sûr que c’était une plaisanterie. De retour chez moi, je voulus voir si les mêmes coups se produiraient chez moi ; je me mis dans la même pose, les mains sur la table. Bientôt des coups se firent entendre. Imitant le procédé dont j’avais été le témoin, je commençai à réciter l’alphabet ; le nom de Palladia me fut indiqué. Je fus étonné, presque effrayé ; ne pouvant me tranquilliser, je me mis de nouveau à la table, et je demandai à Palladia, qu’avait-elle à me dire ? La réponse fut : ‘ *Replacer l’ange, il tombe.* ’ Je ne compris pas de suite de quoi il s’agissait. Le fait est qu’elle est enterrée à Kieff, et j’avais entendu dire qu’on voulait mettre un monument sur sa tombe, mais je n’y avais jamais été, et je ne savais pas de quel genre était le monument. Après cette réponse, je ne me couchai plus, et dès que le jour parut je me rendis au cimetière. Non sans peine, avec l’aide du gardien, je découvris enfin la tombe enfouie sous la

ncige. Je m'arrêtai stupéfié: la statue en marbre de l'ange avec une croix était tout à fait de côté.

“Depuis ce moment, il me fut prouvé à l'évidence qu'il y a un autre monde avec lequel, je ne sais comment, nous pouvons entrer en rapport, et dont les habitants peuvent nous donner de telles preuves de leur existence qu'elles désarment le scepticisme le plus tenace.

“En Octobre, 1876, je me trouvais à Kieff, et j'étais en train de m'installer dans un nouveau logement (rue Prorésnaya) avec mon camarade de service au Ministère de la Justice, M. Potolof. On venait de m'apporter un pianino. Il fut placé dans la salle, et je me mis à jouer; il était à peu près 8 h. du soir; la salle où je jouais était éclairée par une lampe pendue au mur. À côté se trouvait mon cabinet de travail, éclairé aussi par une lampe. Je me rappelle très bien que j'étais de fort bonne humeur. Mon camarade, M. Potolof, était occupé à sa table, à l'autre bout du logis. Toutes les portes étaient ouvertes, et de sa place il pouvait voir très bien le cabinet et la salle où je jouais.¹ Jetant un regard vers la porte de mon cabinet de travail, je vis tout à coup Palladia. Elle se tenait au milieu de la porte, un peu de côté, avec le visage tourné vers moi. Elle me regardait tranquillement. Elle avait la même robe foncée qu'elle portait lorsqu'elle mourut en ma présence. Sa main droite pendait librement. Je voyais distinctement ses épaules et sa taille, mais ne me rappelle pas du bas de son habit, et avais-je vu les pieds?—peut-être, parce que tout le temps je lui regardais dans les yeux. En la voyant, j'avais tout à fait oublié que je voyais devant moi non une personne vivante, mais morte, tellement je la voyais distinctement; elle était éclairée de deux côtés; et d'autant plus j'ai la vue très bonne. Ma première sensation fut un frisson dans le dos. Je fus comme pétrifié et ma respiration fut suspendue; mais ce n'était pas un effet causé par la frayeur ou l'excitation,—c'était quelque chose d'autre. Je puis comparer cela à la sensation que j'éprouve quand je regarde en bas d'une grande hauteur; je sens alors une terrible anxiété et en même temps je ne puis me retenir de regarder, quelque chose m'attire invinciblement. Combien de temps Palladia resta devant moi, je ne saurais le dire, mais je me rappelle qu'elle fit un mouvement à droite et disparut derrière la porte du cabinet de travail. Je me précipitai vers elle, mais dans la porte je m'arrêtai, car alors seulement je me rappelai qu'elle était déjà morte, et je craignai d'entrer, étant sûr de la revoir. Dans ce moment mon camarade vint à moi et me demanda qu'est-ce que j'avais? Je lui dis ce qui venait de se passer; alors nous entrâmes au cabinet, où nous ne trouvâmes personne. Mon camarade, ayant entendu la brusque interruption de mon jeu, avait levé la tête et, tant que je me rappelle, disait avoir vu aussi quelqu'un passer devant la porte de mon cabinet; mais, voyant mon excitation, il me dit, pour me tranquilliser, que probablement c'était Nikita, mon domestique, qui était venu arranger la lampe. Nous allâmes immédiatement dans sa chambre, il n'y était pas; il était en bas, dans la cuisine, où il préparait le samovar. Voilà comment je vis Palladia pour la première fois, trois ans après sa mort.

¹ A plan enclosed shows a suite of four rooms, M. Potolof's study, the ante-room, the drawing-room, and M. Mamtchitch's study, all opening into one another, the three doors between them being in one straight line.

“Après la première apparition de Palladia, en Octobre, 1876, et jusqu'à présent, je la vois souvent. Il arrive que je la vois trois fois par semaine, ou deux fois le même jour, ou bien un mois se passe sans la voir. En résumé, voilà les traits principaux de ces apparitions.

“(1.) Palladia apparaît toujours d'une façon inattendue, me prenant comme par surprise, juste au moment quand j'y pense le moins.

“(2.) Quand je veux la voir moi-même, j'ai beau y penser ou le vouloir—elle n'apparaît pas.

“(3.) A de rares exceptions, son apparition n'a aucun rapport avec le courant de ma vie, comme présage ou avertissement de quelque événement insolite.

“(4.) Jamais je ne la vois en songe.

“(5.) Je la vois également quand je suis seul, ou en grande compagnie.

“(6.) Elle m'apparaît toujours avec la même expression sereine des yeux; quelques fois avec un faible sourire. Elle ne m'a jamais parlé, à l'exception de deux fois, que je vais raconter plus loin.

“(7.) Je la vois toujours dans la robe foncée qu'elle portait lorsqu'elle mourut sous mes yeux. Je vois distinctement son visage, sa tête, les épaules et les bras, mais je ne vois pas ses pieds, ou plutôt je n'ai pas le temps de les examiner.

“(8.) Chaque fois, en voyant Palladia inopinément, je perds la parole, je sens du froid dans le dos, je pâlis, je m'écrie faiblement, et ma respiration s'arrête (c'est ce que me disent ceux qui par hasard m'ont observé pendant ce moment).

“(9.) L'apparition de Palladia se prolonge une, deux, trois minutes, puis graduellement elle s'efface et se dissout dans l'espace.

“A présent je vais décrire trois cas d'apparitions de Palladia dont je me souviens bien.

“(1.) En 1879, à la fin de Novembre, à Kieff, j'étais assis à mon bureau à écrire un acte d'accusation; il était 8½ du soir, la montre était devant moi sur la table. Je me hâtai de finir mon travail, car à 9h. je devais me rendre à une soirée. Tout à coup, en face de moi, assise sur un fauteuil, je vis Palladia; elle avait le coude du bras droit sur la table et la tête appuyée sur la main. M'étant remis de mon saisissement, je regardai la montre et je suivis le mouvement de l'aiguille à seconde, puis je relevai les yeux sur Palladia; je vis qu'elle n'avait pas changé de pose et son coude se dessinait clairement sur la table. Ses yeux me regardaient avec joie et sérénité; alors pour la première fois je me décidai de lui parler: ‘Que sentez-vous à présent?’ lui demandai-je. Son visage resta impassible, ses lèvres, tant que je me rappelle, restèrent immobiles, mais j'entendis distinctement sa voix prononcer le mot, ‘Quiétude.’ ‘Je comprends,’ lui répondis-je, et effectivement, en ce moment, je comprenais toute la signification qu'elle avait mise dans ce mot. Encore une fois, pour être sûr que je ne rêvai pas, je regardai de nouveau la montre et je suivis les mouvements de l'aiguille à seconde; je voyais clairement comme elle se mouvait. Ayant rapporté mon regard sur Palladia, je remarquai qu'elle commençait déjà à s'effacer et disparaître. Si je m'étais avisé de noter immédiatement la signification du mot ‘Quiétude,’ ma mémoire aurait retenu tout ce qu'il y avait de nouveau

et d'étrange. Mais à peine avais-je quitté la table pour monter en haut, chez mon camarade Apouktine, avec lequel nous devions aller ensemble, que je ne pus lui dire autre chose que ce que je viens d'écrire.

“(2.) En 1885, je demeurais chez mes parents, à une campagne du gouvernement de Poltava. Une dame de notre connaissance était venue passer chez nous quelques jours avec ses deux demoiselles. Quelque temps après leur arrivée, m'étant réveillé à l'aube du jour, je vis Palladia (je dormais dans une aile séparée où j'étais tout seul). Elle se tenait devant moi, à cinq pas à peu près, et me regardait avec un sourire joyeux. S'étant approchée de moi, elle me dit deux mots : ‘J'ai été, j'ai vu,’ et tout en souriant disparut. Que voulaient dire ces mots, je ne pus le comprendre. Dans ma chambre dormait avec moi mon setter. Dès que j'aperçus Palladia, le chien hérissa le poil et avec glapissement sauta sur mon lit ; se pressant vers moi, il regardait dans la direction où je voyais Palladia. Le chien n'aboyait pas, tandis que, ordinairement, il ne laissait personne entrer dans la chambre sans aboyer et grogner. Et toutes les fois, quand mon chien voyait Palladia, il se pressait auprès de moi, comme cherchant un refuge. Quand Palladia disparut et je vins dans la maison, je ne dis rien à personne de cette incident. Le soir du même jour, la fille aînée de la dame qui se trouvait chez nous me raconta qu'une chose étrange lui était arrivée ce matin : ‘M'étant réveillée de grand matin,’ me dit-elle, ‘j'ai senti comme si quelqu'un se tenait au chevet de mon lit, et j'entendis distinctement une voix me disant : “Ne me crains pas, je suis bonne et aimante.” Je tournai la tête, mais je ne vis rien ; ma mère et ma sœur dormaient tranquillement ; cela m'a fort étonnée, car jamais rien de pareil ne m'est arrivé.’ Sur quoi je répondis que bien des choses inexplicables nous arrivent ; mais je ne lui dit rien de ce que j'avais vu le matin. Seulement un an plus tard, quand j'étais déjà son fiancé, je lui fis part de l'apparition et des paroles de Palladia le même jour. N'était-ce pas elle qui était venue la voir aussi ? Je dois ajouter que j'avais vu alors cette demoiselle pour la première fois et que je ne pensais pas du tout que j'allais l'épouser.

“(3.) En Octobre, 1890, je me trouvais avec ma femme et mon fils, âgé de deux ans, chez mes anciens amis, les Strijewsky, à leur campagne du gouvernement de Woronège. Un jour, vers les 7h. du soir, rentrant de la chasse, je passai dans l'aile que nous habitions pour changer de toilette ; j'étais assis dans une chambre éclairée par une grande lampe. La porte s'ouvrit et mon fils Olég accourut ; il se tenait auprès de mon fauteuil, quand Palladia apparut tout à coup devant moi. Jetant sur lui un coup d'œil, je remarquai qu'il ne détachait pas les yeux de Palladia ; se tournant vers moi et montrant Palladia du doigt, il prononça : ‘La tante.’ Je le pris sur les genoux et jetai un regard sur Palladia, mais elle n'était plus. Le visage d'Olég était tout à fait tranquille et joyeux ; il commençait seulement à parler, ce qui explique la dénomination qu'il donna à Palladia.

“EUGÈNE MAMTCHITCH.”

Mrs. Mamtehitche writes :—

5 Mai, 1891.

“Je me rappelle très bien que le 10 Juillet, 1885, lorsque nous étions en visite chez les parents de M. E. Mamtehitche, je m'étais réveillée à l'aube du jour, car il avait été convenu entre moi et ma sœur que nous irions faire

une promenade matinale. M'étant soulevée sur le lit, je vis que maman et ma sœur dormaient, et en ce moment je sentis comme si quelqu'un se tenait à mon chevet. M'étant tournée à demi—car je craignais de bien regarder—je ne vis personne ; m'étant recouchée, j'entendis immédiatement, derrière et au dessus de ma tête, une voix de femme me disant doucement, mais distinctement : 'Ne me crains pas, je suis bonne et aimante,' et encore toute une phrase que j'oubliai à l'instant même. Immédiatement après je m'habillai et j'allai me promener. C'est étrange que ces paroles ne m'effrayèrent pas du tout. De retour, je n'en dis rien ni à ma mère, ni à ma sœur, car elles n'aimaient pas de telles choses et n'y croyaient pas ; mais le soir du même jour, comme la conversation tourna sur le spiritisme, je racontai à M. M. ce qui venait de m'arriver le matin ; il ne me répondit rien de particulier.

“Je n'ai jamais eu aucune hallucination, ni avant, ni après cet incident, à l'exception d'un cas tout récent, quand je me suis vue moi-même, de quoi je parlerai une autre fois.

“SOPHIE MAMTCHITCH.”

Mr. Potolof writes to the collector, Mr. Aksakoff :—

Rue Schpalernaya, 26. S. Pétersbourg, *le 10 Mai*, 1891.

“MONSIEUR,—En réponse à votre lettre du 8 Mai et les questions que vous me posez relativement à l'incident avec M. E. Mamtchitch, lorsque dans les années 1876-1877 nous habitâmes ensemble Kieff, rue Proesnaya, maison Barsky, je puis vous communiquer ce qui suit. Effectivement, je fus alors témoin comme M. M., pendant qu'il jouait un soir du piano quelque air mélancolique, s'interrompit brusquement (comme si après avoir fortement attaqué le clavier, ses mains s'étaient subitement affaïssées), et lorsque je vins lui demander ce qui lui était arrivé, il me répondit qu'il venait de voir apparaître le fantôme de Palladia, se tenant derrière la draperie de la porte de la chambre contigue à celle où se trouvait le piano. Je dois ajouter que notre appartement commun formait une enfilade de trois chambres, sans compter celle de l'entrée, qui occupait le milieu ; je travaillais dans ma chambre, qui était à droite de celle de l'entrée, et je pouvais voir toute l'enfilade bien éclairée. Ce qui me regarde personnellement, je ne vis en ce moment aucune figure humaine passer par les chambres de M. M., mais je ne nie pas que pour le tranquilliser j'essayai d'expliquer cet incident par l'entrée de notre domestique Nikita ; il se peut aussi que, ne l'ayant pas trouvé dans nos appartements, nous allâmes le chercher en bas, dans la cuisine. Voilà tout ce que je puis vous dire relativement à cet incident.

“W. POTOLOF.”

Note by the collector :—

S. Pétersbourg, *Le 16/28 Mai*, 1891.

“Traduit des manuscrits russes de M. et Madame Mamtchitch, et de M. Potolof. La première partie du manuscrit de M. Mamtchitch, jusqu'à la première apparition de Palladia, est abrégée.

“J'avais rencontré M. Mamtchitch plusieurs fois, mais je n'avais aucune idée de ces apparitions constantes de Palladia. M. Mamtchitch a vu aussi d'autres figures que celle de Palladia, mais je n'ai pas eu le temps d'en faire un memorandum circonstanciel.

“A. AKSAKOFF.”

The evidence for *post mortem* agency in this case depends mainly on the communication received through raps at the *séance*, before any apparition was seen at all, and the explanation of this belongs to a branch of psychical research with which we are not concerned in the present report. The simultaneous hallucinations, however, of Mr. Mantchitch and his future wife in different parts of the house also suggest an agency external to both of them, just as the joint experiences of Baron von Driesen and the priest do, and for the same reason, though it is possible to explain the circumstance telepathically. The occasionally collective character of Mr. Mantchitch's hallucinations we have already noticed in Chapter XV. One somewhat peculiar feature of his experiences will have been observed, namely, that the apparitions seem always to have been accompanied by a slightly abnormal physical condition, noticeable by the percipient and his friends. This is unusual among the hallucinations reported to us, and must, in so far as there is any reason to think that the physical state may be a cause of the hallucination and not its consequence, be held to support the view that the apparition is purely subjective.

Summing up the results of this chapter, we have found that the distribution of recognised apparitions before, at, and after the death of the person seen affords some argument for the continuity of psychical life and the possibility of communication from the dead. We have found further that the Census affords some remarkable cases which *primâ facie* are not purely subjective, and which suggest the action of the dead. The amount of evidence, however, does not appear to us in itself sufficient to constitute anything like a conclusive case for *post mortem* agency.

CONCLUSION.

With the discussion of Phantasms of the Dead we may regard our task as terminated. For the extent to which we have taxed the patience of our readers we must plead as an excuse our wish not only to inform them of the views to which we have been led by the examination of our voluminous returns, but also to lay before them, adequately if not completely, the evidence on which those views have been founded. Before concluding, it may be convenient that we should retrace briefly the plan and course of our protracted discussion. We began by explaining the point of view and method of our enquiry, and estimating as impartially as we could the effects of possible

sources of error in its tabulated results. Then, in what we may call the second part of the Report—Chapters IV. to XI. inclusive—we have examined the light thrown by our returns on the main characteristics of spontaneous sensory hallucinations, and on the mental and physical conditions favourable to their occurrence.

The remainder of our Report has been occupied with those among the hallucinations reported to us whose characteristics may be thought to suggest an origin not purely subjective; and especially those which afford evidence for telepathy. Among these the most important class is dealt with in Chapters XII. and XIII.,—namely, apparitions which coincide in time with the death of the person seen. These are the most important, because they are the most numerous, and because they afford the means of estimating precisely the improbability of explanation by chance. We have shown that—after making the most ample allowance for all ascertainable sources of error—the number of these experiences remains far greater than the hypothesis of chance-coincidence will account for; thus confirming the conclusions already arrived at by Mr. Gurney in *Phantasms of the Living* (Chapter XIII.).

In Chapter XII. we have given a selection of the cases on which our calculation is based, in order to enable the reader to judge of their evidential quality. At the same time, we have been careful to explain that this quality is very various, as inevitably follows from the method of collection; since the answers to a comprehensive statistical enquiry into these experiences naturally includes, along with coincidences carefully observed, a number of cases of real or alleged coincidence in which the observation has been less careful and the report accordingly less conclusive.

In Chapter XIV. we have presented the further evidence for telepathy afforded by cases in which the improbability of chance coincidence does not admit of the same exact calculation as that discussed in Chapter XII.; although their cumulative force, in any fair estimate of the whole evidence, must be regarded as considerable.

In Chapter XV. we have discussed a class of experiences difficult to explain but of great theoretical interest—collective hallucinations. We do not present these as adding material support to the evidence for telepathy; but we think that, if telepathy be admitted as a *vera causa*, it affords in many cases the most probable explanation of them.

Then, in Chapter XVI., we have entered on still more dubious ground. After briefly dealing with the comparatively slight amount of evidence for premonitory hallucinations which our Census affords, we passed to consider the more numerous cases of so-called “hauntings.” We have endeavoured to estimate impartially, and illustrate by the most noteworthy cases in the Census, the evidence tending to connect the seeing of apparitions with certain localities; but we have not

found any strong reasons for attributing phenomena of this kind to the agency of the dead.

Stronger arguments, however, for accepting the possibility of communication from the dead to the living may be drawn from other cases included in our returns; accordingly, in the final Chapter (XVII.) we have given careful consideration to these arguments, although we do not regard them as in themselves conclusive. We have endeavoured to estimate the kind and degree of support that the hypothesis of such communication appears to us to obtain from our statistics as to the grouping of hallucinations about the crisis of death: and we have further laid before the reader the isolated cases which suggest the conveyance of information from the dead.

In conclusion, we hope that our report will afford information of some value on several questions relating to the casual hallucinations of sane and healthy persons. But undoubtedly the most important part of our work lies in the corroboration (in Chapters XII. and XIII.), on a much wider basis, of the conclusion already drawn by Mr. Gurney from his Census in 1885. *Between deaths and apparitions of the dying person a connexion exists which is not due to chance alone.* This we hold as a proved fact. The discussion of its full implications cannot be attempted in this paper;—nor perhaps, exhausted in this age.

HENRY SIDGWICK.

ALICE JOHNSON.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.¹

FRANK PODMORE.

ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK.

The lamented death of the remaining member of the Committee—Dr. A. T. Myers—deprived us of his help in the composition of the report; but he had been present at all the early meetings of the Committee, and had been able to consider in particular the evidence furnished by the Census as to the possible influence of ill-health in causing hallucinations, and to give advice with regard to the treatment of this subject in the Report.

¹ See *A proposed scheme of Apparitions*, by Mr. Myers, *Appendix G.*, p. 415.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—*Introductory.* The enquiry, begun in 1889, was approved by the Paris International Congress of Experimental Psychology, which entrusted it to Professor Sidgwick's direction. Explanation of plan of Report. Previous evidence for telepathy collected by the S.P.R. of two kinds,—experimental and spontaneous cases: a link between these types is furnished by experimental apparitions. Since "non-coincidental" as well as "coincidental" or "veridical" apparitions occur, it is necessary to find the proportion of one kind of case to the other, in order to test whether the number of coincidences is more than chance would produce. The attempt was first made by Mr. Gurney: the present enquiry is a development of his. Distribution of the work among different members of the Committee. 25—32

CHAPTER II.—*Method of Conducting the Enquiry, and General Results.* Enquiry limited to sensory hallucinations of certain kinds; carried on by collecting answers to the "Census question." Collectors 410 in number; most of the informants are educated persons,—17,000 in number. Affirmative answers in some cases have to be counted as negative. Tables. Explanation of headings of Tables and of method of counting the hallucinations. Explanation of estimates in Table XI. 33—53

CHAPTER III.—*Discussion of the Trustworthiness of our Results.* Possibility of deception. Whether refusals to answer the Census question will have affected the proportion of affirmative answers recorded. Danger of selection of informants by collectors. Collectors instructed to mark the names of persons whose answers they knew beforehand. Collections of answers from complete unselected groups and comparison of these with the whole collection. Proportion of collectors who have had hallucinations. Whether the proportion of affirmative answers is diminished by experiences having been forgotten. Superficial forgetfulness: this has affected auditory and tactile hallucinations more than visual. Permanent forgetfulness shown by the numbers of visual hallucinations reported for recent periods being greater than for remote periods, the numbers decreasing systematically as the periods become more remote. The numbers of doubtfully hallucinatory experiences are comparatively much larger in the recent periods. Inference that to obtain the true number of visual hallucinations experienced since the age of 10, the number reported must be multiplied by some number between 4 and $6\frac{1}{2}$. Auditory and tactile hallucinations are forgotten more rapidly than visual ones. What kinds of hallucinations are best remembered, and most often known beforehand to others. 54—69

CHAPTER IV.—*Hallucinations and Pseudo-Hallucinations.* Definition of sensory hallucinations; the distinction between them and dreams. Examples of dream-images persisting into the waking state. Distinction between hallucinations and mental images. Examples of fully externalised hallucina-

tions. Pseudo-hallucinations, and incompletely externalised hallucinations; examples. Examples of apparitions seen in the dark; difference between them and pseudo-hallucinations, and further examples of the latter. Apparent illumination of real objects. Examples of "visions," incompletely and completely externalised. The "sense of presence," sometimes accompanied by non-externalised visual images. Auditory and tactile pseudo-hallucinations; examples. Further examples of "visions." The power of visualising in relation to hallucinations and pseudo-hallucinations. 70—93

CHAPTER V.—*The Relation of Illusions to Hallucinations.* Instances of illusions. Possibility of mistaking illusions for hallucinations. Illusions relatively frequent out of doors—where also mistakes of identity may occur—and in a bad light. Examples of apparitions seen repeatedly in the same place, which may have been illusions. Apparitions recurring in the same place which were probably hallucinatory. Cases transitional between illusions and hallucinations. A case of visions seen in a carafe of water. *Point de repère.* Mr. Dixey's experiments on the effects of lenses on crystal-visions. Mrs. Sidgwick's experiments with a hypnotised subject on *points de repère* in moving hallucinations. Many hallucinations are entirely independent of *points de repère.* Example of a moving apparition. Auditory illusions frequent; more difficult to decide whether an experience is an illusion or a hallucination in auditory than in visual cases. Tactile illusions; possible instances. In some bisensory cases, illusions may be combined with hallucinations. 94—112

CHAPTER VI.—*Form and Development of Hallucinations.* Hallucinations tend to take familiar forms; the great majority of visual hallucinations represent human beings, and more than two-fifths of these are living persons known to the percipient. The dress and movements of apparitions are also generally such as the percipient is accustomed to see. Modes of appearance and disappearance of phantoms, with examples; examples of metamorphoses; of development from a cloud-like form to a clearly-defined figure; of a figure becoming transparent as it gradually disappears. Description, with instances, of "incompletely developed apparitions":—a transparent figure; shrouded and veiled figures; a figure with an indistinct face. A case of piecemeal development. Examples of fragmentary figures; hallucinations projected on flat surfaces, like pictures; indefinite forms; lights. Symbolic forms of hallucinations. Apparitions of animals, and of inanimate objects. Religious phantasms. Deferred recognition. A case of double recognition. Auditory and tactile hallucinations more rarely reported than visual, but partly, at least, because they are more forgotten. They are much less impressive; e.g., many cases of hearing name called; but sometimes an apparition is combined with a voice. Instances of tactile hallucinations. 113—133

CHAPTER VII.—*Physiology of Hallucinations.* No attempt made to discuss the physiological processes involved in veridical hallucinations as such. Hallucinations may sometimes be initiated by the condition of

the sense-organs ; *e.g.*, the very rare ones that move with the eyes ; and those that occur during diseases of the sense-organs ; no evidence of such an origin in the great majority of our cases, which are probably cerebral in origin. It has been suggested that, in the case of hallucinations centrally initiated, there may be a downward sensory impulse, through which the sense-organs are involved. The view rests chiefly on cases where hallucinations resemble retinal after-images,—positive or negative. Examples of hallucinations resembling positive after-images. When the hallucination occurs some time after the object which it reproduces was seen, it is especially improbable that the retina is concerned. Examples of hallucinations reproducing objects seen many years before and almost or quite forgotten. Hallucinations resembling negative after-images. Binet and Féré's experiments in induced hallucinations of colour, followed spontaneously by hallucinations of the complementary colour. Dream-images persisting with complementary colours. Gorham's experiments show that effects which appear to be produced on the retina may be purely cerebral. This is confirmed by "Miss X.'s" crystal-visions, where one picture was followed by another, of a complementary colour but different form ; or a mere desire for change was followed by the appearance of the complementary colour. The physiological action involved in most hallucinations is probably exclusively cerebral. 134—148

CHAPTER VIII.—*Age, Sex, Heredity, Nationality, and Health. Recurrent Hallucinations.* Hallucinations may occur at any age ; seem to be relatively most frequent between 20 and 30. Hallucinations of grotesque or fanciful objects rare with adults, not unfrequent with children. Examples of cases experienced by children. Women experience more hallucinations than men, or at all events remember them better. The disproportion is less in the veridical cases. Galton's results as to variations of visualising power in different sexes and ages. Evidence that hallucinations tend to run in families, and then sometimes tend to take similar forms ; examples. Foreign informants report larger proportion of hallucinations than English, also larger proportion of bisensory cases. Reports as to health of percipients at time of their experiences. A certain degree of ill-health reported in rather over 7 per cent. of the cases included in the Tables. Examples of hallucinations occurring during ill-health. Number of persons who have had more than one hallucination. Recurring hallucinations, in which the same form is repeated several times. 149—165

CHAPTER IX.—*Mental and Nervous Conditions in connection with Hallucinations.* Hallucinations sometimes occur during a state of nervous overstrain ; examples. Effect of emotion. Anxiety, grief, or trouble reported in nearly 14 per cent. of the cases ; but not easy to separate from other possible causes. Some instances given of hallucinations occurring during emotional conditions with which they are obviously connected. Repose and abstraction favour hallucinations ; a large proportion occur in bed, and many soon after waking,—sometimes apparently caused by preceding dream-impressions ; examples. Hallucinations occur more in solitude than in company. 166—173

CHAPTER X.—*Expectancy and Suggestion.* Example of apparition of person whose arrival was expected. Cases where the expectation has been aroused through *séances*. Suggestions by word or gesture from the other persons present ; examples. Effect of noises in producing hallucinations ; examples of probable and possible cases. In some cases where apparitions are preceded by sounds supposed to be hallucinatory, the sounds, which may cause the sights by creating expectancy, may be real—especially when they are heard by more than one person ; example. Reference to experiences of “coloured audition” which sometimes assume a hallucinatory form. Examples of other slight impressions leading to hallucinations. The operation of suggestion in the working out of hallucinations ; examples of reflection in mirrors ; of apparitions casting shadows. Hallucinatory vision generally affected by physical conditions which affect real vision ; example. Comparison with cases of hypnotic hallucinations. Apparent effects on real objects produced by apparitions ; instances. Hallucinations affecting more than one sense, one percept leading on to another ; example. Sometimes the appeal to other senses is observed to fail ; example. In some bisensory cases, the connection between the two elements of the perception is not very close. Example of verbal suggestion from an apparition producing a second visual hallucination. Example of suggestion from an apparition as to the ceasing of a persistent hallucination. Example of sequent hallucinations. 174—197

CHAPTER XI.—*Organic Effects accompanying Hallucinations.* Operation of suggestion has to be borne in mind in considering these. Examples and discussion of cases where a “cold shudder” is reported to precede or accompany hallucinations. Example of hallucination accompanied by sensations as of electric shocks. Cases where fainting occurs. Pain resulting from hallucinatory touches ; examples. Other physical effects. Marks produced on percipient resembling those that would have been produced by pressure of fingers ; example : compared with effects of hypnotic suggestion. 198—206

CHAPTER XII.—*Death-Coincidences.* In this chapter we enter on the consideration of the evidence for telepathy afforded by the Census. The main object of the enquiry was to decide whether the number of hallucinations *primâ facie* telepathic is more than chance will account for or not. Evidence for veridicality may be of three kinds : coincidence, conveyance of unknown information, and collectivity. The discussion in this chapter is confined to “death-coincidences,” *i.e.*, cases of recognised apparitions occurring within 12 hours of the death of the person represented, the death being unknown to the percipient at the time. There are 80 first-hand cases reported as death-coincidences in the Census ; by excluding certain types, these are reduced to 65. Of these, 19 were known beforehand to the collectors, and there is reason to suspect that 3 of the 19 were specially selected. Deducting these 3, 62 alleged death-coincidences remain. Twenty-six examples of these are given. The number of cases, veridical and other, in which it is reported that notes were made and the proportion of notes preserved are discussed. Evidence that in some of the 62 cases the closeness of coincidence has been

exaggerated is shown to be afforded by the cases reported for remoter periods being too numerous in proportion to the recent ones. From this we infer that the whole number may more safely be estimated at 40 (instead of 62), and an allowance for possibly undetected selection further reduces to 32 the number which we decide to count in the calculation of the next Chapter. The extent to which members of the Committee have had personal interviews with the percipients is explained. 207—244

CHAPTER XIII.—*Chance Coincidence.* The probability that any one will die on a given day,—*e.g.*, that on which his apparition is seen,—is 1 in 19,000. The number of apparitions of living persons reported in the Census is 381; by excluding cases of a type already excluded from death-coincidences, these are reduced to 350. Since there is no evidence that death-coincidences are forgotten, we do not apply the correction for oblivion, as calculated in Chapter III., to them. Applying it to the whole number of apparitions of living persons, and deducting from both sides cases whose hallucinatory character is doubtful, we have 30 death-coincidences in about 1,300 cases, or 1 in 43,—that is, 440 times the number that chance would produce. Or, if reported cases whose hallucinatory character is doubtful are included, 1 in 65. But the interval between death and apparition is, in most cases, much less than 12 hours, which greatly increases the improbability of chance coincidence. The evidence for the death-coincidences must break down in a wholesale way in order to destroy this argument; and it is shown that neither selection nor a state of the percipient produced by his knowledge of the dying person's condition can account for their number. Anxiety may facilitate telepathic communication, but cannot by itself account for the death-coincidences. 245—251

CHAPTER XIV.—*Veridical Hallucinations Continued: Further Coincidental Cases.* The three death-coincidences excluded from Chapters XII. and XIII. because they were selected. Other cases coinciding with deaths: examples of recognised voices; example of touch and mental impulse; cases of apparitions of relatives of the dying person; cases of unrecognised apparitions; example of an indefinite figure; and of an unrecognised voice. Hallucinations coinciding with other events than death. Examples of apparitions, and of an auditory hallucination, experimentally produced. Examples of apparitions coinciding with sudden or serious illness of person represented. Example of case which may have been a death-coincidence. Examples of voices coinciding with sudden attacks of illness. Examples of hallucinations coinciding with emotional states or thoughts of the agents. Example of a possibly reciprocal telepathic impression. Greater force and insistency of telepathic hallucinations. 252—302

CHAPTER XV.—*Collective Hallucinations.* Ninety-five out of 1,087 visual cases, and 34 out of 493 auditory cases are reported to have been collective; also two tactile cases. But assumption of collectivity is easily made on insufficient grounds; also the hallucinatory character of many cases is doubtful. Examples of apparitions seen collectively: of a cat; of recognised living and of a recognised dead person; of an unrecognised figure seen out of

doors ; of an indefinite figure ; of a shadowy form seen a few hours before a death. Examples of collective auditory hallucinations : of the voice of a dead person ; of a voice coinciding with a death. Two examples—one coincidental—where the two percipients have simultaneous but dissimilar impressions. Reference to other cases of collective hallucinations given in *Phantasms of the Living*, or since printed in the *Journal S.P.R.* The different kinds of hallucinations are fairly represented among collective cases in the Census. Discussion of explanations. Hypothesis of a basis of common illusion can only cover a small proportion of cases. The hypothesis that both percipients are directly and independently affected by an external agent,—the latter either being or not being reciprocally affected himself,—is discussed, and reasons given why it can at most be of restricted application, and why, even when applicable, the experiences of the two percipients can seldom be independent of each other. The phenomenon is in many respects most easily explained by attributing it to the influence of one percipient on the other. This may be by word or gesture, or telepathically. There is more evidence that hallucinations may be induced by telepathic than by verbal suggestion in the normal condition ; but it is difficult to exclude the agency of ordinary suggestion in collective cases, and probably both kinds of suggestion are then operative, assisting each other. The supposed sharing of hallucinations by animals is occasionally reported ; from the nature of the case this must be doubtful. Examples where hallucinations may have been produced in human percipients by suggestion through the action of dogs. Other examples of animals supposed to see apparitions. . 303—330

CHAPTER XVI.—*Premonitions and Local Apparitions.* Cases of apparitions seen a short time before the death of the person represented are rare, and of doubtful interpretation. Example of an apparently premonitory vision. Example of a partially fulfilled prophecy. Example of an unrecognised apparition seen shortly before unexpected illness of percipient's son. Example of a hallucination saving the percipient from danger. Unrecognised local apparitions. Arguments for their not being purely subjective rest on apparitions being seen independently by more than one person, and on reasons for associating the apparitions with some deceased former inhabitant. Special sources of error and weakness in evidence. About 30 cases in Census afford *primâ facie* some such evidence of being more than subjective ; in half, the apparition was supposed to represent some dead person. Constantly recurring noises form a frequent part of the phenomena ; they may sometimes be ordinary noises, misinterpreted, which lead to the seeing of the apparitions. Example where noises were often heard before apparition was seen. Two similar examples where apparitions were seen by more than one person. Case where the apparition was first seen collectively. Recognised local apparitions. Example of phantom of a dead person seen after unrecognised figure had been seen by another percipient in the same room. Example of apparition of a dead person seen independently several times by several percipients, one of whom had another similar series of experiences. Example of apparition associated with a dead person seen by several persons. Example of apparitions of the same living person seen independently by

two percipients. Example of similar apparitions, afterwards associated with a living person, seen in the same house by three percipients. . . . 331—363

CHAPTER XVII.—*Phantasms of the Dead.* This class is less numerous than that of phantasms of the living, and on the whole more impressive to the percipient than other phantasms. They usually appear in familiar dress, etc. To prove the possibility of communication from the dead to the living would have important influence on our view of telepathy between the living. But the recognition of telepathy between the living makes it more difficult to prove the possibility of communication from the dead. Evidence from coincidence is only possible in cases such as those where the death has taken place, but has not been heard of by the percipient; while information given by the phantasm may be due to telepathy from a living person, or to clairvoyance. In considering the cases in which the evidence for veridicality is coincidence, the “death-coincidences” previously considered must be taken into account. Of the 80 death-coincidences, 10 are known to have occurred after the death; and are, therefore, strictly speaking, coincidental phantasms of the dead. Five examples of apparitions of dead persons, seen more than 12 hours after the death, but before the percipient knew of it; in three there are veridical features besides the coincidence. Taking phantasms of the living and of the dead together, there is a marked accumulation of cases about the time of the death, gradually diminishing on each side of it; this suggests that there is no discontinuity at death. The cases where the percipient was unaware of the state of the person represented show that these numbers cannot be accounted for either by anxiety about illness or by grief for death. Promises to try to appear after death are reported in ten cases; 3 of these were death-coincidences, and 2 occurred during fatal illness or after the death,—the state of the person seen being unknown to the percipient; example of such a case, in which there was no coincidence. Two cases in which information unknown to the percipient was conveyed to him by the apparition. Example of an apparition appropriate to the circumstances of the percipient. Example of corresponding impressions, suggesting agency of a dead person, simultaneously experienced by two percipients. Example of an apparition seen on the same night by two persons in different places. A case in which the percipient saw repeatedly apparitions of a certain dead person, with some evidence of veridicality. 364—392

CONCLUSION. 392—394

APPENDIX. 402—422

* * The careful and comprehensive work of Herr Edmund Parish, *Ueber die Trugwahrnehmung (Hallucination und Illusion) mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Internationalen Enquête über Wachhallucination bei Gesunden*,¹ reached us while this Report was passing through the Press, and therefore too late for us to be able to make any use of it here. We hope to notice it in the next Part of the *Proceedings*.

¹ *Schriften der Gesellschaft für psychologische Forschung. Heft 7—8.* Leipzig, 1894.

APPENDIX A.

For explanations and instructions see back.

A *International Congress of Experimental Psychology.*

QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COLLECTOR TO TWENTY-FIVE PERSONS OVER 21 YEARS OF AGE—THEIR ANSWERS BEING ENTERED BELOW.

HAVE you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing, or being touched by a living being or inanimate object, or of hearing a voice ; which impression, so far as you could discover, was not due to any external physical cause ?

	Answer (yes or no)	Name and Address of person answering.	Sex.	Occupation.
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Date of first answer entered

Signature of Collector

Date of last answer entered

Address ,,

* * * No names or addresses will be published without special permission.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

SESSION OF 1889.

SIR OR MADAM,

The International Congress of Experimental Psychology, which met in Paris for the first time August 6—10, 1889, resolved, on the Report of a Committee specially appointed to consider the question, that a Census such as that below described should be carried out in as many countries of Europe as possible, and in the United States of America. Having been requested by the Congress to take charge of this enquiry in the United Kingdom, I beg to ask for your aid in this important task.

The experiences to which the question on the other side relates are what Psychologists generally would describe as casual hallucinations of sane persons: but it is desired to include in this collection phantasmal appearances which some percipients would deny to be hallucinations because they regard them as presentations of spiritual reality.

The object of our enquiry is (1) to ascertain approximately the *proportion of persons* who have such experiences, and (2) to obtain details as to the experiences with a view to examining into their cause and meaning.

For the first object it is IMPORTANT THAT THE QUESTION SHOULD BE VERY WIDELY ASKED AND OF ALL SORTS OF PEOPLE—NOT ONLY OF THOSE WHO ARE THOUGHT LIKELY TO HAVE HAD SUCH AN EXPERIENCE OR OF THOSE WHO ARE THOUGHT LIKELY NOT TO HAVE HAD IT. THE ANSWER “NO” AND THE ANSWER “YES” ARE EQUALLY IMPORTANT. The question should not, however, be asked of persons who are known to have been at any time insane, and it is not intended to include experiences of delirium.

It is important not to put down second hand answers—not to state on the authority of *B* that *A* has or has not had an experience of the kind enquired into, but to ask *A* himself. The name, address, sex and occupation of those answering can be filled in by yourself (the collector) and we shall be glad if you will also put a cross against any answer known to you before asking the question. The question should not be put to persons under 21 years of age, though remembered experiences which have occurred at any age should be included. In the case of affirmative answers the age at the time of the experience should be given.

The experiences in question are believed to be rather rare, so that you will probably get few and perhaps no answers “Yes” among the 25. It will, however, greatly assist us in the second part of our work—namely, examining into the nature of the experiences—if, should you receive the answer “Yes,” you will induce the person answering to fill in schedule B, of which three copies are sent with this, and of which more can be obtained from me. A separate copy of schedule B should be used for each person answering “Yes.”

Should you find it impossible to collect 25 answers, please return the paper filled up as far as you can. But it is much desired to obtain the answers in batches of 25 if possible.

I shall be happy to give any further information that may seem to you necessary ; and if you can undertake to collect any further batches of 25 answers, or know of any one who would do so, I shall be glad to forward the necessary forms.

I am, yours faithfully,

HENRY SIDGWICK.

☞ Please return this paper when filled up to

PROFESSOR SIDGWICK,

Cambridge.

B *International Congress of Experimental Psychology.*

FURTHER QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED TO ANY PERSON ANSWERING YES TO THE QUESTION OF SCHEDULE A. Namely :—Have you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing, or being touched by a living being, or inanimate object, or of hearing a voice ; which impression, so far as you could discover, was not due to any external physical cause ?

1. Please state what you saw or heard or felt, and give the place, date and hour of the experience as nearly as you can.
2. How were you occupied at the time, and were you out of health or in grief or anxiety ? What was your age ?
3. Was the impression that of some one whom you were in the habit of seeing, and do you know what he or she was doing at the time ?
4. Were there other persons present with you at the time, and if so did they in any way share the experience ?
5. Please state whether you have had such an experience more than once, and if so give particulars of the different occasions.
6. Any notes taken at the time, or other information about the experiences will be gratefully received.

Signature _____

Address _____

Date _____

APPENDIX B.¹

Table showing through what means the Collectors were obtained.

	Number of Collectors.	Number of answers obtained by them.
Belonging to the Society for Psychical Research	130 ²	
Obtained through Members of the Society ...	70	
Obtained through articles in periodicals and } lectures given on the Census }	36	1480
Miss Porter and her sub-collectors	35	1285
Mrs. Dent and her sub-collectors	12	1185
Obtained through schedules distributed by the } <i>Review of Reviews</i> }	40	936
Obtained in various other ways	87	
	410	

Among collectors to whom we are specially indebted, we must mention Mrs. Dent, of Sudeley Castle, Wineheombe, Gloucestershire, who obtained personally very nearly 900 answers (a larger number than was obtained by any other individual collector), besides those added by her sub-collectors; and Miss Bertha Porter, whose previous experience in working for Mr. Gurney's Census, together with her familiarity with the work of the S. P. R. in general, has made her assistance of special value, both as regards her own contributions and the sub-collectors who were carefully instructed by her.

The answers obtained from Russians (see Table IX., p. 48) were chiefly collected by Mr. A. Aksakoff and friends working under him, whose collections he superintended. He also translated the original accounts—mostly given in Russian—into French. All the Brazilian answers were obtained personally by Professor Alexander, and in this case also a good deal of extra labour was involved in the translation of the original accounts into English. In these foreign cases, we were, of course, unable to make the personal enquiries that were often possible with English informants; but our two chief collectors, having a special acquaintance with the questions at issue, obtained additional information and corroboration as far as possible.

Status and Professions of the Collectors.

As already stated, about nine-tenths of the 410 collectors are persons educated up to the standard of the professional classes. Fourteen of them have had systematic training in psychology. Those whose occupations are known to us include: medical (22); clerical (20); engaged in University or educational work (82); elementary school teachers (3); Army and Navy (10); Civil Service,—Upper Divisions (10); Civil Service,—Lower Divisions (9); other clerks (12); Law (6); artistic (7); social work (7); engaged in literature and journalism (11); merchants and manufacturers, etc. (13); retail traders (8); coastguards (5).

¹ See pp. 34-35.

² Besides these, 8 members of the S.P.R. are included under some of the other headings.

APPENDIX C.¹

Classification of cases where persons answering "yes" to the Census question have been counted as answering "no."

(i) Experiences which clearly do not come within the scope of the question.

Kind of Experiences.	Number of percipients.		
	Men.	Women	Total.
Noises not suggestive of human voices ...	66	148	214
Hallucinations of smell	1	2	3
Dreams... ..	8	9	17
Experiences in a half waking state... ..	10	5	15
Sense of an invisible presence	6	18	24
Non-sensory mental impressions or motor } impulses }	21	20	41
Information received from a medium ...	1	1	2
Physical phenomena at spiritistic <i>séances</i> ...	6	3	9
Real events, regarded as omens; or move- } ments of real objects, unaccounted for }	10	12	22
Experiences of friends of the person } answering }	1	5	6
	130	223	353

(ii) Experiences of doubtful kinds, which we have excluded from the Tables.

Kind of Experiences.	Number of percipients.		
	Men.	Women.	Total.
Hallucinations occurring during illness ...	8	10	18
Persistent dream-images and night-mares	2	5	7
Voices awakening the percipient from sleep	4	10	14
Touches " " " " " " " " " " " "	2	5	7
Visions seen with closed eyes	2	1	3
<i>Illusions hypnagogiques</i>	1	3	4
Apparent illumination of real objects ...	6	5	11
Sounds as of human voices, but inarticulate	9	15	24
Indefinite tactile impressions, not in- } volving a sense of contact ... }	5	5	10
Lights seen out of doors	2	7	9
Visions of objects outside the field of } distinct vision }	3	2	5
Visual impressions not fully externalised	5	6	11
Auditory " " " " " " " " " " " "	1	3	4
Illusions	8	6	14
Cases probably of mistaken identity ...	7	11	18
Experiences described as too vague to be } defined }	3	7	10
	68	101	169

¹ See pp. 36—37.

APPENDIX D.

Account given by Mrs. D. of her hallucinatory experiences.

Mrs. D. writes :—

January 7th, 1891.

“ From a very early age I have been subject to hallucinations of both sight and sound. I first became aware that my eyes and ears could deceive me when about 18 ; up to that time, and in childhood, I no doubt suffered a great deal from ignorance of this fact. Since the age of 18 I have carefully watched myself and these illusions, so that I can give an exact account of several. I have been able to make clear to myself that, in my case, there is a distinct connection between them and trouble of some sort at the nervous centres ; that they are most vivid when physical exhaustion is accompanied by nervous excitement ; and that the will can—when once attention is aroused—have a great deal to say in controlling or increasing these hallucinations. The visual illusions have been of animals, human beings—servants and friends,—and in one instance a hideous apparition of monstrous size ; [the auditory] of hearing voices and musical sounds.”

The following complete account, sent in answer to our request for further details, was enclosed in a letter dated February 19th, 1891.

“(1) The first hallucination of which I can give an exact account occurred to me at the age of five or six. I woke, shortly after going to sleep, in a dark room, and saw a great patch of brilliant light, and in the light the figures of two or more angels bending towards me. The vision was a great delight to me, I being a very devout child. The incredulity with which my account of it was received by my elders I tried to meet by giving details,—such as that ‘the angels wore blue boots,’—which, of course, provoked a ridicule which taught me to keep silence ; but such details serve to show that the vision was perfectly distinct in all its parts.

“As I grew up, every now and then I made statements as to servants or friends having done things, or having been in places, the truth of which they denied. I was punished for ‘lying’ or ‘inventing,’ as I believed, unjustly. In the light of later experiences, I have now no doubt that I was frequently the subject of hallucinations.

“(2) The first which I was in a position clearly to recognise as such occurred during the Indian Mutiny. Several members of our family were in danger. One night, on which we had all been talking late of them, after we had parted and gone upstairs to bed, I stood before my dressing-table plaiting my hair, when my attention was arrested by a faint spot in the centre of the mirror ; this to my amazement gradually enlarged (as a grease spot spreads with heat) till the whole surface was covered, and then,—in the centre of this veil,—came through the face of one of the near relatives above mentioned, as plain as might have been his living reflexion. To a moment of spell-bound fascination succeeded frantic terror, and I rushed out of my room. There was, however, no one I dared tell. My father would have admonished me not to be a fool ; as for my mother, then in delicate health, I could not venture to name such a matter to her—the appearance having been

that of her only son. I noted, however, the day and hour, and ascertained, six weeks later, that the relative seen had incurred no sort of danger at that date, but was in comfortable quarters, in conditions of ordinary safety, far from the scenes of disturbance.

“(3) From the next instance to which I will refer dates the period since which I have observed myself and these hallucinations. I was about nineteen or twenty. I had been overworking, it was late, and I was dressing for dinner both tired and hungry. I stooped to take my slippers from the floor, and as I did so, a large gray rat jumped from the folds of my petticoats and ran across the room. I had no doubt at the moment of its reality, and maintained its actual existence in spite of all the household; but a little while afterwards I saw my gray rat again, and after pursuing him into a corner put a stick through him, for which he was none the worse. This circumstance caused me to watch carefully for any repetition of a similar illusion. At various intervals, for the next three or four years, the same apparition,—varied by the apparition of a cat, sometimes gray and more rarely black,—continued to trouble me. At this period, 1864, I began to be more or less subject to neuralgia in the right side of the head.

“(4) In the winter of 1866 I was still suffering in this way. One Sunday evening, I had given special permission to a man-servant to absent himself out of his turn; going into the dining-room to fetch a biscuit, I stood at the sideboard with my back to the fire, which was blazing brilliantly, when I was startled to hear some one poking it violently, as I had seen no one when I entered the room; turning round I found that the servant to whom I had given leave of absence was standing on the hearthrug, having the poker still in his hand. At my movement he turned, and I thought looked rather surprised. It occurred to me that some small tyranny had deprived him of his outing, so I made enquiry, from which it was established that at the time at which I saw him in the dining-room, he was in his seat in church, his presence there being fully attested by other members of the family. No one was in the house at the time of his apparition except myself and a woman servant. The appearance on this occasion being perfectly natural, there was nothing which at the time led me to examine it closely.

“(5) About a month later, the neuralgia, from which I continued to suffer frequently, became occasionally severe. I was writing alone in the library late in the afternoon, the lamps were lighted, and every corner of the room and of a further room, the door into which stood open, was perfectly clear. The pain becoming acute, I got up and began to pace up and down from door to door. I had done this several times, when, as I turned and faced the open door of the further room, I saw standing against it a figure of supernatural height, entirely draped in white; the face only was fully exposed, and was covered with blood which dripped on the garments. The shock for the instant was horrible. Then I determined to be clear about this thing. First I shut my eyes and observed—what I had promised a doctor to observe—namely, whether or no I saw the apparition when my eyes were shut; he had believed that I should, but I am quite certain I did not. Next, I opened them and looked; it was fully over six feet, and leaned, rather than stood, against the door, the colour of which (though white) was dark against the whiteness of its draperies. The draperies were

cotton, or linen, and one hand, the left, muffled in them, rested on the top of the door. The face, smeared with blood, had an expression of great agony. I shut my eyes again, opened them, saw it much less distinctly as a man of white streaked with scarlet, resolved to walk to it, but in two steps it was gone as instantaneously as it had come. In this instance, again, I failed to trace any sort of connection between the form I saw and anything which I had read, or heard, or seen at any time previous.

“Here I should mention that a careful examination, later in the year, showed that the neuralgia, from which I had been suffering for so many years, had been provoked in the part of the head in which it showed itself by the enlargement of a tooth which pressed on a nerve. This matter was duly attended to and I ceased to suffer from acute pain in the temple, but when overworked was frequently liable to attacks of a less acute kind in the knee and hip, which invariably indicated over-fatigue of mind or body.

“(6) At a later period I was nursing a member of my family suffering from an infectious disease, the course of which had already taken a favourable turn, when, on going to the bedroom, early one morning, I saw a large half-bred black retriever sitting in an angle of the stairs. I sent a servant down and ascertained there was no dog there, but continued to see it, and at last it became a fear to me to pass the landing from which I saw it, and I avoided going down the stairs. During the visitations of the black dog, it was always visible in the corner of the stairs whenever I looked at the place. It never changed its position; and in the end, one night, feeling very ill, I fainted on the stairs, having sickened with the same disease.

“I had noted the day on which the apparition of the dog began; it was between four and five days after, according to the usual calculation, I had begun to sicken with the malady. The duration of this hallucination distinguishes it from others which I have had when seriously ill, and which may have been of the nature of delirium, and which I will not, therefore, recapitulate here.

“(7) I will go on to mention the only apparition which I have seen out of doors and in full day. I was in the Highlands for my health; the whole party (of which I was one) had decided at breakfast on making an expedition which was to occupy the day. I remained at home resting, till, after lunch, I started on a long solitary ride, in the opposite direction to that by which the others would return. About five o'clock, in an August afternoon, I turned back along the Pitlochry road. I was walking my horse slowly, I had lifted my veil in order to look at the moors, and I was not thinking of any human being: I wanted to enjoy being alone. To my annoyance, therefore, at a sudden turn in the road, I saw one of my friends, a man, sitting on a heap of stones under a little fir on the left of the road about 50 yards from me. Believing that he had gone to Rannoch with the rest, I stared hard at him, and recognised his suit, his wideawake, fishing tackle and basket, and noticed that he looked greatly absorbed by something he was doing with his fly-book, which he held in his hand, so much so that he paid no attention to my approach. When at last I was come so close that I could distinguish the smallest details of his clothes, and even the expression of his face, I called out, and, getting no answer, whipped up my horse intending to pull

up in front of where he was sitting. As I did so, he moved slightly and a curious change occurred; the whole figure—I then being within a couple of yards or so—shivered, as it were, and vanished. I jumped off my horse, I walked round the tree, I looked over the bank: there was nobody. In spite of my firm desire not to let myself be impressed by these hallucinations I rode back uneasy. Half an hour after my return, my friend drove up with the rest of the party in a break from Rannoch. According to all the rules of second sight he should have died within the year; he did not, nor did any trouble or misfortune befall him.

“I have mentioned in connection with the above hallucinations the neuralgia in the head, which was connected with trouble of [a] nerve. I should therefore note that there was no such trouble prior to 1864 nor after 1867. At the time when I saw the apparition in Scotland, I was told that the neuralgia in the hip and knee was caused by some pressure on a nerve centre near the spine low down in the back. Before I close what I have to say on the subject of these visual hallucinations, I have, however, two other points to mention in this connexion: (1) That I have strong visual memory, which for years I cultivated to the point of being able,—having looked with that intention at pictures, or other works of art,—to recall them, by an effort of will, many weeks after, with such distinctness that I could set down from the visualised image full and accurate details of composition and colour. (2) That I have eyes of different focus, the right eyesight shorter than the left. Also [there is a tendency on the part of the right eye to diverge outwards, so that I have to make an effort in order to keep both eyes fixed on an object.] If I am not wearing glasses, there is a moment of consciousness when I look to the left as the effort is made to bring the two sights together. I am now almost sure that *the leap* given by the apparitions of cats, rats, etc., which has been invariably from right to left, is connected with this trouble of the sight.

“(8) Auditory hallucinations have been less frequent in my case than the visual ones. Occasionally voices calling—always voices I could recognise, but more often musical sounds. One example will suffice. I woke in the night, during a period of convalescence after a serious illness. It is unusual for me to wake, as children say, ‘broad awake’; on this occasion I did so, and with a curious sense of alert attention. Within half a minute or so I heard a perfectly pure note in mid-air; the sound was extremely low at first, but went on swelling by imperceptible degrees until it reached a climax at which the volume was such that I wondered the house was not roused; at its full, when it had become almost painful to listen, it snapped off short in ringing stillness.

“You ask me to explain what I mean when I say that the will can affect these hallucinations. I do not mean that at the instant of their occurrence the will can do anything beyond keep the brain steady, and that in spite of fear, which sometimes (I confess) accompanies their presence. I have, however (you must take it for what it is worth), an intimate conviction and consciousness that there was a period when physical weakness, coupled with the moral dispositions which accompany a strongly mystic and speculative bias of mind, might have caused me (let me confess further, were near causing me) to take passive satisfaction in my own hallucinations instead of treating

them as a matter for investigation. I am conscious that in that state they were tending to become more frequent.

“Remember they have had always a powerful, unconscious ally in the strong visual memory which I cultivated for purposes of my own convenience.

“In conclusion, I have to say that for five years past I have almost entirely ceased to be disturbed by any such apparitions or auditory hallucinations, and that during these five years I have been steadily gaining in health, and in what is called ‘tone.’”

APPENDIX E.

The following account is given by a medical man of the hallucinatory experiences, occurring during ill-health, of a patient¹ of his own, who writes to confirm the accuracy of the account.

March, 1892.

“Mrs. S., aged 40, has been married 6½ years. Has no children. Since girlhood has been subject to intense neuralgic headaches, for the time completely incapacitating her. Up to marriage lived a busy, indeed, arduous life as an artist.

“In 1875 had first optical hallucination. Three months after her father’s death, she was thinking deeply of him, when she suddenly saw his face, without body, in front of her. She was startled, but the face lacked solidity, and she knew it was a hallucination. In 1890, in India, she had in May an attack of bronchitis, followed by a long neurotic attack, characterised by insomnia, tremblings, complete prostration, &c., &c. This lasted till September, when she was completely convalescent. Between May and September she had frequent and varied optical hallucinations. Of these she gives instances : (1) an Afghan who persistently stood mute at the foot of her bed ; (2) a man on a velocipede travelling rapidly from left to right ; a peculiarity of this man was that he always appeared with a ‘rainbow edge,’ as if a little out of focus ; (3) an ayah and child, with the peculiarity that they were always as if made of plaster of Paris : in this case there was also auditory hallucination, as the child appeared to cry and was heard to cry ; (4) innumerable hallucinations of animals and insects.

“The human appearances never deceived the intelligence, but Mrs. S. was constantly taken in by the small animals, and especially the insects, which she would try to brush off the walls or the bedclothes.

“By the end of September all these appearances had disappeared with the establishment of complete convalescence. In November, 1890, she first saw an appearance, which has since many times recurred. She was in her house in India when a black cat flashed past her from behind, on the right side, as if chivied by something. She jumped up to stop or protect it, when it disappeared. It did not fade away, or disappear behind furniture. It was simply gone. Between November, 1890, and July, 1891, she saw it at irregular intervals, and quite causelessly and suddenly ; it always came from behind, and on the right side.

“Between July, 1891, and March, 1892, she has seen it, she thinks, about five times. Sometimes she is still momentarily taken in, and jumps up, but not always. She notices that the outline is a little blurred, but otherwise the appearance is absolutely natural. On two occasions she has seen the cat in a different way. She suddenly saw it standing with its back and tail raised, as if about to rub itself against her skirts. She was about to stoop to caress it when it disappeared with absolute suddenness. On the first of these two occasions she was deceived by the appearance ; not on the second, as she recognised the animal which had previously deceived her.

“H. R. F.”

¹ See p. 162.

Mrs. S. adds :—

“During May, June, and July, 1890, when my illness was at its worst, I was surrounded by a circular ring-like line, and any one passing through this imaginary boundary gave me intense pain at the top of my head. I mention this because the line was a *visible* one, whitish in colour, and slightly quivering, very like the phosphorescent mark left on a match-box when a match has been drawn across it. This line was not always there, but was, I think, present during part of every day and night. I could not be called light-headed when I saw it, as I had sense enough never to mention it, knowing that my husband's distress would be increased if he knew that each time he came to my side I went through some moments of severe pain. When people left my bedside and repassed the circle I suffered no inconvenience. I have never seen this since July, 1890.

“It is not literally true that seeing my father's face was my first optical illusion, though it was the first after I grew up. When I was a child between nine and ten years old I had some odd experiences, which perhaps I had better explain. About that time I showed an unnatural quickness about learning, and it was thought well to separate me for a time from my brothers and sisters,—who were all much older than I was, and whose society was thought by my father too stimulating for me,—and to send me to live in a farmhouse where my chief companions were two little girls about my own age, who were not interested in algebraical or any other problems. Among other subjects which occupied my mind to an unusual extent was that of religion, and when waiting for my companions while they did their lessons I usually spent my time in a big meadow, praying and doing mental arithmetic in about equal parts. During my prayers I saw (I think with eyes shut) the most beautiful faces, which I believed to be those of angels. But one day to my great joy and awe I saw with my eyes open a great and misty figure which I thought to be that of God himself. I do not remember much about the figure except that it blotted out the trees at the end of the field, and that the face vaguely resembled that of God in the picture of the Creation of Man on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, with which I may possibly have been already familiar from engravings. The angels of my prayers certainly bore a very strong family likeness to those I had seen in pictures in the National Gallery and elsewhere. There were at other times during my childhood visions of a like kind, but I attempt no account of them, as I cannot be sure of the truth of my memory regarding them.

“During that portion of my life which was most exclusively devoted to painting, I constantly noticed a visual phenomenon which may be extremely common, but which may be possibly connected with this tendency of mine to see optical illusions. If by any chance after a day's painting I entered a darkened room, I frequently saw at a distance of about eighteen inches from my face an exact representation, brightly illuminated, of whatever part of my picture I had been engaged upon during the day. These appearances were always unconnected with my thoughts at the moment, and were quite different from those visualizations which one can get at any time by closing one's eyes and thinking of the objects one wishes to visualise.”

APPENDIX F.

Collective Visual Hallucinations, divided according to conditions of perception.

	Percip- ients in bed.	Percip- ients up and in- doors.	Seen out of doors.	Totals.
Realistic human apparitions of living persons	3	10	14	27
" " of dead persons	—	6	2	8
" " unrecognised	2	13	17	32
Incompletely developed apparitions ...	4	4	4	12
Visions	—	—	—	—
Angels and religious apparitions or visions	—	—	—	—
Apparitions, grotesque, horrible, or monstrous	1	—	2	3
" of animals	—	3	1	4
" of definite inanimate objects	—	1	—	1
" of lights	1	—	1	2
" of indefinite objects	—	5	1	6
Totals ...	11	42	42	95

NOTE.—This Table contains only cases reported to us at first-hand by at least one percipient. The numbers given in the Table refer to cases of hallucination, not to percipients; whereas in the general Tables each percipient in the Census is reckoned separately. The number of percipients included in the Census, whose collective experiences are here tabulated, is 120.

APPENDIX G.

A PROPOSED SCHEME OF APPARITIONS.

My personal share in the work of the Committee on the Census of Hallucinations has been quite too small to entitle me to interpose opinions of my own among the concordant opinions of colleagues far more familiar with the actual evidence here under discussion. It has, however, been thought desirable that a view, somewhat divergent from that taken in the Report itself, should be offered to the reader ; and I proceed briefly to state certain suggestions as to the nature and classification of hallucinations, the meaning of collective percipience, etc., without expending space either on controversial argument, or on the repetition of my own deep sense—here expressed once for all—of the disputable and provisional character of all that I can say.

I must premise that with the evidential criticisms and conclusions of this Report I am in full accord. I admit also the force of the theoretical arguments, as deduced from the range of facts here lying under immediate survey. But I feel impelled, in forming a judgment on some of the problems involved, to take account of certain groups of cognate phenomena which it has hardly been possible to compare or to consider at length in a Report, like the present, of definite and limited scope.

The spontaneous sensory hallucinations of sane persons, with which this Report is concerned, have been compared in Chapter I. with the experiments in telepathy, which at certain points closely resemble them. I desire here to set forth these hallucinations as members of a still wider class of phenomena—a class comprising all “ messages,” to give them the most generalised title, whether sensory or motor, whether spontaneous or experimental, which rise from beneath the level of ordinary consciousness to externalise themselves in some form cognisable by the every-day supraliminal self. Some of these messages apparently spring from the percipient’s own mind alone, and are in that sense subjective ; others seem to be the result of some external influence exercised subliminally upon the percipient’s mind ; but both the self-generated and the telepathic phantasms or messages may be in some sort *veridical*, as conveying to the percipient’s supraliminal self some knowledge of which only his subliminal self was previously possessed. I believe indeed that in certain rare cases these messages involve, or are accompanied by, effects produced upon the material world ; and such effects are of course observable by onlookers in an ordinary or supraliminal manner. But the essentially subliminal character of the message itself, as received by its primary percipient, is not altered. Even those physical phenomena,—whatever their ultimate source,—are in the percipient subliminally initiated, and depend upon intimate processes which never rise above the conscious threshold.

The recollection of this close parallelism between sensory hallucinations and other forms of subliminal message will influence, I think, in various ways our estimate of the sources, and of the true nature, of the phantasms with which we have in this Report to deal.

In the first place, and as a matter of evidential statistics, this wider com-

parison suggests that one assumption made throughout this Report,—and rightly made, as telling *against* the argument for telepathy,—is probably to some unknown extent in excess of the truth. The calculations above given do not assume that *non-coincidental* hallucinations are ever due to telepathy. When A., the agent, is seen by P., the percipient, at a moment when nothing particular is happening to A, this is counted as a purely subjective or falsidical apparition. Rightly so, I repeat, for we cannot prove that there was any telepathy in the matter. But now consider the eognate phenomena of automatic script and crystal vision. Through either of these methods suitably gifted percipients can externalise subliminal messages coming either from incarnate or from discarnate agents. Such messages compare with apparitions much as casual talks with a friend compare with telegrams from him. The spontaneous apparition, or subliminal telegram, represents, we may suppose, the greater energy of communication, and is likely to find its special function in conveying the news of some immediate and important fact. But we can no more say beforehand to what occasions this flashing message will be restricted than we can be sure how many telegrams a friend may think it worth while to send out about a play or a dinner party. The vague or unverifiable messages which make the bulk of automatic script and crystal vision may rise sometimes into the intenser, but briefer and less intelligible, form of a phantasmal picture of the living or departed friend who happens, though under the stress of no crisis, to have his thoughts turned to us at the time.

How many of these non-coincidental phantasms may be thus in reality telepathic, we cannot tell. We positively know that they are not *all* so ; for we know that in various conditions of body phantasms appear which are removed by mere bodily treatment, and which as yet we have no sufficient power of discriminating, by anything in their own aspect, from telepathic apparitions. But the caution, nevertheless, is of importance throughout all this enquiry ; and its importance is greater for that class of apparitions whose evidential value it is the most difficult to appraise. The dead, for the most part, are beyond coincidence. If a departed spirit appears, he must, I suppose, appear when best he can ; he cannot show us his diary and mark his hour ; and if we have accustomed ourselves too strictly to attending only to phantasms which bear witness to an immediate fact we may sweep into the limbo of subjective hallucinations certain phenomena which really indicate an extra-terrene source.

This point premised, as one to be kept in mind throughout, let us now endeavour, in a very brief review of the main classes of hallucinations,—or subliminally generated visual and auditory quasi-perepts, to give them a more closely-fitting although a more eumbrous name,—to learn by analogies something of their more intimate nature, something of what is really taking place when a figure is seen, or voice heard, by one or more percipients, which figure or sound has, so far as we can discover, no material counterpart.

CLASS I.—The simplest form of hallucination seems to be that which follows upon a conscious, supraliminal suggestion given by A. to P., which suggestion P. at once or after an interval works up, so to say, into a hallucination, with details of his own. This is indeed a mere exaggeration of the pro-

cesses of ordinary life. In common life, if A. says to P. "I saw an elephant," P., if a good visualiser, will at once see an elephant "in his mind's eye." Let P. be specially suggestible, and, in the hypnotic trance, or even wide awake, he will visualise the elephant with such intensity that it actually seems to stand before him. A little practice, and he will be able to carry out a deferred suggestion, and if told on Monday in the hypnotic trance to see the elephant on Tuesday, he will so see it.

In this familiar case A. has done nothing in any way transcendental. He has but spoken ordinary words; he can have no other than ordinary means of foretelling or of observing their effect. The hallucination which he starts may of course be shared by several persons, if he makes the suggestion to several persons together; but each of these will have his own independent hallucination; there will be no true "collectivity."

CLASS II.—Our next—and widest—step is to the case where A., at a distance from P., endeavours to transfer to him a hallucinatory image. In experiments such as these, we can rarely say whether the subliminal operation, so to call it, is mainly A.'s or P.'s. It may resemble an impression of the picture by A. upon P.'s mind, or an extraction of the picture by P. out of A.'s mind. Assuming for the present that A. really is subliminally active in the matter, it is plain that his action is now very different from the mere task of forming syllables and expelling air which was all that he needed to perform in Class I. Then his action was motor and molar; now it is telepathic, and possibly molecular. Possibly molecular, I say; for if his "telepathic impact" consists in a direct impingement upon P.'s brain-cells, than we cannot feel confident that any merely molar operation can effect a result so complex. There may be need of a selective action upon specific *molecules* in P.'s brain;—such an action as the living energy, whatever it be, in each of us is wont itself to exercise upon the brain through which it finds manifestation.

This question presents itself in a striking form when the transferred impression is an idea of sleep, or command to sleep; for thus the impact, so to say, of the agent's telergic impulse becomes at once and conspicuously visible in the percipient's sudden trance.

Be this as it may, A. is now getting, by whatever means, directly at the subliminal part of P.; and such action we must at any rate call *transcendental*, for it lies entirely outside the synthesis of the forces that we know. We can now no longer guess whether A. may himself experience any effect from the effort; whether he may have any subliminal knowledge or memory of the success of such an experiment. There are some faint indications that this is sometimes the case. Here, too, it is that the possibility of genuine collectivity of percipience begins. The first trace of it is an occasional experiment where the transferred picture or impression is caught up by more than one person present—persons probably all of them on the alert to catch the image. In such a case it does not seem as though there were any real *contagion* of the hallucination from one to another percipient; for sometimes an unintended percipient will catch the image when the person intended to catch it fails. The influence of proximity—however that is to be explained—seems potent here. Only in one case that I remember—the experiment of Wesermann's mentioned in Chapter I. as "unique"—do we

find any image conveyed by telepathic experiment to an unintended, as well as to the intended, percipient at a distance : with the exception of one special form of image alone.

CLASS III.—The one exception of which I speak,—the one experimental telepathic image which seems to have a fair chance of being perceived by unintended percipients at a distance,—is that of the agent's self. The references given in Chapter I. of the Report to experiments of this type will enable the reader to judge to what extent these self-projections differ in this and in other characteristics from the commoner projections of a mere image or idea. As this volume passes through the press an account reaches me of a fresh experiment of this kind, made between two ladies well known to me, whom I will call Miss Danvers and Mrs. Fleetwood, which I here quote as well illustrating some of the points to which I wish to call attention. I asked Miss Danvers to endeavour to appear to Mrs. Fleetwood, without forewarning that lady, and to send me a *letter-card* (the best vehicle for such communications, as it carries the postal date impressed on what remains, nevertheless, a private letter),—to tell me of the attempt before she knew whether it had succeeded or no.

On June 20th, 1894, I received the following letter, dated June 19th, from Miss Danvers, with two enclosures :—

“ On Sunday night at 12 p.m. I tried to appear to Mrs. Fleetwood [at a distance of about nine miles] and succeeded in feeling as if I were really in her room. I had *previously* written my statement, which I enclose, together with Mrs. Fleetwood's, which she has just sent me. She wrote it also *at the time*, not knowing I was trying to appear. I was lying down, not kneeling, but the other details are correct.”

A memorandum, signed by Miss Danvers, was enclosed, as follows :—
“ June 17th, 1894, 12 p.m. I write this just before trying to appear to Mrs. Fleetwood. My hair is down, and I am going to lie down and try to appear with my eyes closed.”

Also a memorandum, signed by Mrs. Fleetwood, as follows :—“ Sunday night, June 17th, 1894.—I woke from my first sleep to see Edith Danvers apparently kneeling on an easy chair by my bedside, her profile turned towards me, her hair flowing, and eyes closed, or looking quite down. I felt startled at first, as I always do, on seeing visions in waking moments, but determined to keep quiet ; and after I was fully awake, and able to reason with myself the figure still remained, and then gradually faded like a dissolving view. I got up and looked at the clock. It was just twelve. I was alone in the room. As I now write, it is about two minutes after twelve.”

In conversation on June 23rd Miss Danvers told me that she had seen, in a sort of flash, Mrs. Fleetwood start up in bed, rest on her elbow, and look towards her. She had not been clearly aware of her own attitude in Mrs. Fleetwood's room, although she seemed aware of her *position*, which corresponded to the place towards which Mrs. Fleetwood gazed. Miss Danvers had never previously made notes of an experiment, and had not seen the importance of writing down this point at once, nor had she felt confident that Mrs. Fleetwood really saw her. Mrs. Fleetwood also sent me a letter of Miss Danvers to herself, dated June 18th, in which, among various other matters, Miss Danvers asks, “ Have I appeared to you at all ?

I tried last night, but you may not have been alone." There is, of course, therefore, no proof that Miss Danvers' sense of invasion of the room was more than subjective; but the point is worth mention in connexion with the experiment presently to follow. As regards Mrs. Fleetwood's "visions in waking moments," that lady herself believes them to have been all in some sense veridical, but they have not been recorded. They included two visions of Miss Danvers, at moments when Miss Danvers on her part was strongly directing her attention to Mrs. Fleetwood. So, at least, both ladies believe; but the visions were not recorded at the time.

Miss Danvers then made a second experiment, in which, through some misunderstanding of the due conditions, she informed Mrs. Fleetwood beforehand of her intended invasion. It turned out, however, that Mrs. Fleetwood saw nothing whatever;—so that we have at least the negative assurance that mere expectation on her part does not necessarily produce a vision. Miss Danvers then made a third (unannounced) experiment of a rather different kind, which she describes to me as follows in a letter dated June 27th, 1894.

"On Monday, June 25th, at 12.15 a.m., I thought I would try to go to Mrs. Fleetwood's room, but did not think she could see me. I succeeded in seeing her room, and saw the third volume of *Marcella*, lying on a chair by the bedside. I did not know she was reading it, as I thought she had finished it long ago, so I was surprised. Mrs. Fleetwood did not appear to see me, or make any sign. The room was otherwise much as usual. On the same day I saw Mrs. Fleetwood, and asked her if what I saw was correct, and she said it was perfectly so. She also said she was suffering from toothache and could not see me, but felt a presence in the room."

Mrs. Fleetwood writes, June 27th:—"When Miss Danvers came to lunch with me, on Monday last, she asked me if I had taken the third volume of *Marcella* up to my room the night before (the 24th); as she had been there in the spirit, and had seen it lying on a chair by my bed. This was precisely what had happened. I had taken up the book to read in the early morning, but I am sure Miss Danvers did not know of my often doing so [*i.e.*, taking a book to her bedroom], as it is not my usual habit." On June 30th, Mrs. Fleetwood adds: "Miss Danvers did know we had had *Marcella* in the house, for she read it when here; but she quite thought it had been sent away long before she saw it in my room. She did not know that I had laid it aside, being busy, and had kept back the third volume."

This case, I think, strengthens the view which other experimental cases have suggested, namely, that in these deliberate projections of personality there is something more than a thought which travels; that there is an invading presence which in some sense changes its own relation to space, while not permanently quitting the agent's organism.

CLASS IV.—We pass next, by a gradual transition, from the experimental to the spontaneous projection of the agent's apparition. There is, I say, no marked line; for it seems always to be from the subliminal region that the telepathic impulse proceeds; and it perhaps makes little difference to the operation whether the supraliminal self was aware that it was to be attempted or no. In most of these cases, unfortunately, we can ask no

question of the subliminal self. His apparition indicated his removal from our world ; and we can never say how far he was himself conscious of the impression which at that moment he produced, or of the desire to produce it. The rarity of the testimony to such reciprocal action need not therefore, I think, prevent us from regarding the reciprocal type as theoretically the most complete ; or from hoping that experimenters—through the kind assistance of their subliminal selves !—may be more and more often able to realise this ideal.

CLASS V.—Thus far we have been tracing the action of the so-called *agent* alone. But this view as to the probability of some kind of latent *reciprocity* in these appearances is strengthened by the growing number of the cases where the so-called *percipient* appears to have really played the active *rôle*. He seems to have *invaded* the so-called agent's presence, and carried back with him a knowledge of the distant scene. Dwelling upon these cases in the "Note on a Suggested Mode of Psychical Interaction" in which, in *Phantasms of the Living*, I discussed these present problems at somewhat greater length, I remarked (Vol. II., p. 287) that I hoped soon to set forth further evidence for this type of telepathic communication. The projected task has since been performed by Mrs. Sidgwick, whose two papers on "The Evidence for Clairvoyance" (S.P.R. *Proceedings*, Vol. VII.) include a collection of cases strong enough, I think, to have borne a heavier stress, in the way of corroborative and illustrative analogy, than she has thought fit to lay upon them in the present Report.

I will add that the two experiences of Miss Danvers, given above,—the first being one of apparent reciprocity, the second of telepathic clairvoyance,—exemplify the kind of relation between these phenomena which I am suggesting here.

CLASS VI.—We have briefly followed the main types of telepathic experience for agent and percipient, assumed as persons incarnate like ourselves. But we must needs consider now another class of apparitions—a class of which both Mr. Gurney and I felt bound, in *Phantasms of the Living*, to speak with extreme reserve, and which is still in the present Report treated with caution ; but the evidence for which, nevertheless, has so increased since the publication of Mr. Gurney's book that no discussion can now afford to neglect its difficult lessons. I speak, of course, of phantasmal appearances in which the agent appears to be a disembodied intelligence. I have no wish to press or hurry any man's belief ; but I think that if the testimony which points in this direction continues to flow in as our *Proceedings* and *Journal* show it to have flowed in during the eight years since *Phantasms of the Living* appeared, it will soon become a rare exception for a student who attaches importance to any part of our evidence to refuse to admit the occasional occurrence of various forms of posthumous communication. But if this be once thoroughly admitted—if the significance of this prodigious hypothesis sink deep into the mind—it is plain that all theories as to the nature of telepathy between living men,—nay, as to the nature of earthly life itself—must pause in suspense while the character of this telepathy *in excelsis*, of this transcendent life, is studied as far as human powers allow. Such a task, of course, lies outside the scope of this Report ; but the mere knowledge that it has yet to be performed may well check our

confidence in any explanation of telepathic phenomena on earth which claims credit on the score of simplicity. Simple, as we esteem simplicity, no explanation can be which has to make allowance for this inexplicable bridging, this inconceivable fusion between the material and the transcendent worlds.

CLASS VII.—And indeed if this new evidence be looked into, it is found to suggest at every turn aspects of those more familiar phenomena never suggested before. Take first the question of the *symbolism* of phantasmal pictures. In earlier discussions we had assumed, as almost self-evident, that the symbolism of a telepathic message,—the details of the vision, the phrases of the utterance—must needs emanate either from the agent's or from the percipient's mind. If they came from the percipient's mind, we assumed that, like the incidents of ordinary dream, they were due to a working-up and re-mixing of earthly, though perhaps latent, memories.

But these suppositions are now becoming in many cases altogether uncertain. As automatic script is analysed, as crystal visions are observed, especially as the evidence of retrocognition and precognition—the presentation of scenes past and future—multiplies and is studied anew, it is found that there are phantasmal presentations of many kinds in which no real clue points us to any individual source. We seem in contact with a knowledge of whose origin or whose limits we have no indication. More than this it would be premature to say; but the possibilities thus shadowed must not be forgotten in the discussion of subliminal messages even of an apparently much simpler type.

CLASS VIII.—Once more. Intermingled with all these phenomena at which we can manage to look from the mental side alone, we find another group, itself widely ramifying, in which, besides many phenomena on whose subjectivity or objectivity it is hard to pronounce, there seem to be included certain definite and permanent changes in the material, ponderable world. Collective percipience, on such a view as this, might often be the mere result of an actual change in that part of the universe where the percipients were assembled. Such a change might be perceived either subliminally and *electively*, by some among the group who were specially gifted; or, if the change were sufficiently gross and palpable, it might be perceived supraliminally in the ordinary sensory fashion by all persons present. The step here taken seems a great one; but it is perhaps less sudden than it seems. For every case of telepathy involves, on any hypothesis, a modification of one small part of the material world—namely, the cells of the percipient's brain. How that modification is effected—whether directly by the agent, or by the percipient himself,—in obedience to a stimulus how received?—we cannot tell. It is the very secret of life which confronts us here; the fundamental antinomy between Mind and Matter. But such confrontations with metaphysical problems reduced to concrete form are a speciality of our research; and I here say only that since this problem does already exist,—since the cells are in fact altered either by the thought or along with it,—we have no right to take for granted that the problem, when more closely approached, will keep within its ancient limits, or that Mind, whose far-darting energy we are now realising, must needs be always powerless upon aught but the grey matter of the brain.

This brief review of the various classes of telepathic phantasm, or subliminal message, which I think that the enquirer will ere long have to attempt to colligate and explain, may indicate the expansions which the theory adopted in this Report seems to me likely ultimately to receive.

The Census itself, I admit, has added but little to our evidence of those rarer phenomena on which I may be thought to dwell with undue insistence. But my general argument is little affected by any question as to the weight of the cases garnered in the immediate past, or in the immediate present. A little sooner or a little later the main questions here raised must inevitably confront us all. Like all influences which touch and modify man's living, material brain, telepathy must needs have a physical side to it as well as a psychical. It is, indeed, inconceivable that any one new physical law,—a fresh ethereal radiation or the like,—can cover manifestations so far-reaching and so diversified, and of which the very alphabet is as yet scarcely known. But, in however complex and latent a form, there must somewhere be a physical structure, a physical concomitance for all these things; and our successors will have to bring out those potentialities, and to translate these cosmic mysteries into the two languages of spirit and of matter. Let the speculations of this note, then, be accepted as a mere warning of difficulties yet to be encountered;—questions ready to spring upon us when a few more steps of our progress shall have been achieved. *Centauri in foribus stabulant*; and he who would follow the Sibyl's guiding must prepare his mind for many a wrestle with seemingly incompatible natures, incommensurable worlds.

F. W. H. M.

SUPPLEMENT.

REVIEW.

Cock Lane and Common Sense. By ANDREW LANG. Longmans, 1894.

Though Mr. Lang does not wear the uniform of the Society for Psychological Research, he is an effective ally whom we are glad to welcome in his capacity of *franc-tireur*; and if he has on former occasions had a playful habit of firing a chance shot or two into the ranks of his friends, we have pardoned this light-heartedness in consideration of his services as a skirmisher. And we notice with satisfaction that in his last volume he has cured himself even of this awkward tendency, and no longer rebukes us for ignorance of the history of our own subject. It is only fair therefore that we should frankly acknowledge the material addition which a study of *Cock Lane and Common Sense* is likely to make to the knowledge of our members concerning so much of Psychological Research as lies outside civilisation and the last twenty years.

That psychical phenomena are *semper* and *ubique*, that they are not confined either to modern times or civilised races: these are Mr. Lang's main themes; and they lead him to enquire how far this wide dispersion in time and place may be taken to confirm the reality of the phenomena themselves. His general position is already familiar to the readers of the *Proceedings* from the essay entitled *Comparative Psychological Research*, reprinted in this volume, with large additions, from the *Contemporary Review*, and noticed at some length in the *Proceedings*, Part XXV. We will therefore only take for consideration a few points while passing the volume rapidly in review.

After an introductory chapter, we start on "Savage Spiritualism" and "Ancient Spiritualism." On p. 81 Mr. Lang gives a curious table, on the model of that published by Mr. Myers in *Proceedings* XXV., p. 336, which conveniently summarises this part of his argument. He here compares the classes of phenomena experienced by Mr. Stainton Moses with those which are to be found in ancient authors and in the performances of savage magicians. Out of the twelve principal classes of Mr. Moses' phenomena as given by Mr. Myers, he matches eight. The most universal of them is levitation, which is known to Iamblichus, and is exhibited by the Eskimo and the Australians. St. Joseph of Cupertino was actually canonized, it appears, for his remarkable proficiency in the same experience which, in the case of Simon Magus, was held to be undeniable proof of demoniac assistance. The evidence for St. Joseph, whose date is 1603-1663, is from the *Acta Sanctorum*. It should be added that he, like Mr. Moses, was distinguished also by the supernormal production of fragrant scent. Mr. Lang adds that Iamblichus was also acquainted with the phenomenon of alteration in the bulk of the medium;

this, though not exhibited by Mr. Moses, is attested in the case of D. D. Home.

The chapters on "Comparative Psychical Research" and on "Haunted Houses" we must pass over: the former because it has already been noticed, and the latter as based almost entirely on the published work of the Society, with little fresh matter of Mr. Lang's own. The next chapter, with the same title as the whole book, has been communicated to the Society as a paper read at one of the meetings, but has not before been published. In it Mr. Lang examines some of the attempts to give rationalistic "Common-sense" explanations of certain tales, including that of the famous Cock Lane ghost, and shews how miserably inadequate they are to account for the phenomena as recorded even by the sceptics themselves. He then passes on to "Apparitions, Ghosts, and Hallucinations," and discusses the theory of ghosts, strongly inclining to the conclusion that a ghost is not a mere hallucination, but an entity actually present in space and capable of moving material objects. But here he does not seem clearly to distinguish the cases where the supposed action on the material object may itself be part of the hallucination. For instance, on p. 205 he quotes a ghost which lifted a mosquito curtain. On this he triumphantly asks, "Could a hallucination lift a mosquito curtain, or even produce the impression that it did so, while the curtain was really unmoved?" One would have thought that the obvious answer was "Yes. When once the hallucination was generated, it might be expected to be consistent, by doing whatever the living body which it simulated was likely to do." What is needed is some evidence other than that of the hallucinated subject that the curtain really was moved: and this, oddly enough, does not seem to occur to Mr. Lang. Even in cases where a ghost has been seen to open the door of a room and has been followed through the door, it is not a very violent supposition that the person who, *ex hypothesi*, is hallucinated may unconsciously have opened the door and passed through it. At all events such evidence is not enough to establish a theory of material ghosts without more decisive evidence; and Mr. Lang, though he mentions it, does not dispose of the old difficulty of the ghosts of clothes.

The next chapters, on "Scrying or Crystal Gazing," "Second Sight," "Ghosts before the Law," "A Modern Trial for Witchcraft" (a French case tried in February, 1851, which, by the way, was not quite in the time of the Third Empire, as Mr. Lang says) and "Presbyterian Ghost Hunters," we must again pass over, though they all contain good reading. We may complain perhaps that Mr. Lang lays himself open to the accusation which he brings against Dr. Hibbert and his *Philosophy of Apparitions* (1825), of going back two centuries and neglecting the evidence which lies near at hand; for in the chapter on "Ghosts before the Law" he merely mentions in a note at second hand a case both more recent and nearer home than any which he gives: a trial which took place in Dublin in 1885, and which ended, if my memory serves me, in a verdict for Cock Lane, or at least against any possible common-sense explanation of the strange noises and more tangible phenomena which troubled the tenant of the Dublin house.

In the chapter on "The Logic of Table-turning" Mr. Lang effectively exposes the methods of M. de Gasparin on the one hand, and of Dr. Car-

penter on the other. M. de Gasparin, who wrote on table-turning about 1853, was a believer, not in spirits, but in a "magnetic fluid," or will-force, whatever one chooses to call it; Dr. Carpenter, as we know, would explain all the phenomena by unconscious cerebration and muscular action. Mr. Lang shews how each antagonist calmly ignores everything which does not fit in with his own theory. M. de Gasparin will have it that there are no genuine phenomena, in spite of statements to the contrary, but those which occur in the presence of a chain of people formed to collect the animal magnetism. Dr. Carpenter, while professing to refute M. de Gasparin, coolly ignores his statements, which were of the essence of the argument, that he had seen the table move without the contact of the hands of the chain. The moral is that we are only slowly beginning to learn what evidence means, and that till we have got a clearer idea on this head, we shall all be, probably for a long time, fighting to a great extent in the air.

The last chapter, on "The Ghost Theory of the Origin of Religion," is perhaps the most interesting in the book. But here on one or two points we must join issue with Mr. Lang. He seems anxious to make out, while seeing the difficulties in the way, that the savage and ancient evidence for abnormal phenomena tends to establish their reality. In this we must entirely differ from him. In the first place, the evidence here is in no way cumulative. So large a proportion of striking stories breaks down on the application of strict criticism that no accumulation of untested material can strengthen the evidence. The presumption in each individual case of an apparently supernormal occurrence is that it is untrue, until it has been examined in a way in which we cannot examine any occurrence far removed in time, and in which I venture to think that no occurrence among savages has yet been examined. The whole question must stand or fall solely on such testimony as is well within our reach: when we have once settled the reality of supernormal occurrences for ourselves we can approach the question of supernormal occurrences among the ancients and uncivilised; meantime, we must be very careful that we do not attempt to reverse the process.

But, says Mr. Lang, "the anthropological test of evidence for the abnormal and rejected phenomena is thus amply satisfied. Unless we say that these phenomena are 'impossible,' whereas totemism, the couvade, cannibalism, are possible, the testimony to clairvoyance, and the other peculiar occurrences is as good in its way as the evidence for odd and scarcely credible customs and institutions." Surely the words "belief in" ought to be inserted before "clairvoyance." The evidence is ample to shew that the *belief* exists; but it can no more shew that the *facts* are real than the evidence for the couvade can prove that it is the husband and not the wife who is in fact the chief sufferer in childbirth, or than that for totemism can convince us that certain kins are descended from certain beasts or vegetables. If the anthropological evidence is to have any effect, the classification of clairvoyance with the couvade and totemism does not seem to tend in the direction at which Mr. Lang is aiming. Anthropology, as represented by Mr. Tylor, very properly confines itself to establishing only the psychological facts on which the history of institutions is based; the physical facts on which the psychological may themselves

rest must be studied in a different way altogether. The physical study may, and doubtless will, throw light on the psychological; telepathy and clairvoyance, when finally proved, would make clear a great deal of what we are told of biraarks, peaimen and angekuts. We may even—who knows?—find in sympathetic transference of pain a physical basis for the couvade, and Darwinism may have done something for totemism by proving the existence of a great monkey kinship. But totemism can hardly be quoted as evidence for Darwinism, or Iamblichus and biraarks for Mr. Stainton Moses.

WALTER LEAF.

EDMUND GURNEY LIBRARY.

SUPPLEMENTARY CATALOGUE, 1894.

Additions since the list in "Proceedings," Vol. IX.

ENGLISH.

- BELL (Dr.), Animal Electricity and Magnetism London, 1792
- COURMELLES (Dr. Foveau de), Hypnotism. From the French, by Laura ENSOR London, 1891
- FELKIN (R.W., M.D.), Hypnotism or Psycho-Therapeutics (2 copies) London, 1890
- FERRIER (David, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S.), The Functions of the Brain (2nd Edition) London, 1886
- HORSLEY (Victor, B.S., M.B.Lond., and F.R.C.S.), On Substitution as a means of restoring Nerve Function considered with reference to Cerebral Localisation. Reprinted from the *Lancet*, July 5th, 1884 London, 1884
- The Motor Centres of the Brain and the Mechanism of the Will London, 1885
- HUDSON (Thomson Jay), The Law of Psychic Phenomena. A Working Hypothesis for the Systematic Study of Hypnotism, Spiritism, Mental Therapeutics, &c. London, 1893
- JACKSON (J. Hughlings, M.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.P.), The Croonian Lectures on the Evolution and Dissolution of the Nervous System. Reprinted from the *British Medical Journal*, March 29th and April 5th and 12th, 1884..... London, 1884
- KERR (Norman, M.D., F.L.S.), Should Hypnotism have a recognised place in ordinary Therapeutics? London, 1890
- KINGSBURY (Geo., M.D.), The Practice of Hypnotic Suggestion London, 1891
- LADD (Prof. G. T.), Elements of Physiological Psychology London, 1887
- LANGLEY (J.N., F.R.S.), The Physiological Aspect of Mesmerism. A Lecture at the Royal Institution 1884
- LODGE (Prof. Oliver, F.R.S.), Thought Transference : An Application of Modern Thought to Ancient Superstitions..... 1892
- MOLL (Albert, M.D.), Hypnotism. From the German. London, 1890
- MYERS (A. T., M.D.), Hypnotism at Home and Abroad. Reprinted from the *Practitioner*, March, 1890..... London, 1890
- James Esdaile. Reprinted from the National Dictionary of Biography. (2 copies) N.D.
- NEWNHAM (W.), Essay on Superstition ; being an Enquiry into the effects of Physical Influence on the Mind in the production of Dreams, Visions, Ghosts, and other Supernatural appearances London, 1830
- NICOLL (Augustus, M.B. and C.M. Edin.), Hypnotism, London, 1890
- OCHOROWICZ (Dr. J.), Mental Suggestion. With a preface by Professor Ch. Richet. From the French by J. Fitzgerald, M.A. New York, [1891]

- PURDON (John Edward, A.B., M.D.), The Psychological Import of Variable Achromatopsia. Reprinted from the Transactions of the Medical Association of Alabama, U.S.A. N.D.
- RIBOT (Th.), Diseases of Memory..... *London*, 1882
- SEXTUS (Carl), Hypnotism. Its Facts, Theories, and related Phenomena..... *Chicago*, 1893
- TUCKEY (C. Lloyd, M.D.), The Value of Hypnotism in Chronic Alcoholism..... *London*, 1892
- TUKE (D. Hack, M.D., LL.D.), A Dictionary of Psychological Medicine. 2 Vols..... *London*, 1892
- VAN NORDEN (Charles, D.D., LL.D.), The Psychic Factor. An Outline of Psychology.....*New York*, 1894
- YEO (Professor Gerald Francis, M.D., F.R.C.S.), The Nervous Mechanism of Hypnotism.....*London*, 1884

FRENCH.

- AZAM (Dr.), Hypnotisme. Double Conscience et Altérations de la Personnalité*Paris*, 1887
- BARÉTY (Dr. A.), Le Magnétisme Animal*Paris*, 1887
- BEAUNIS (Prof. H.), Recherches Expérimentales sur les Conditions de L'Activité Cérébrale et sur la Physiologie des Nerfs*Paris*, 1886
- Le Somnambulisme provoqué : Études Physiologiques et Psychologiques*Paris*, 1886
- BÉRILLON (Dr. Edgar), Hypnotisme Expérimental. La Dualité Cérébrale et l'indépendance fonctionnelle des deux Hémisphères Cérébraux*Paris*, 1884
- BERNHEIM (Dr.), De la Suggestion et de ses applications à la Thérapeutique. (2 copies)*Paris*, 1884
- BOURRU (Prof. H. et Prof. P. Burot), Action à Distance des Substances Toxiques et Médicamenteuses ; suivie d'une Communication par M. Ch. Richet*Paris*, 1886
- La Suggestion Mentale, et l'Action à Distance des Substances Toxiques et Médicamenteuses.....*Paris*, 1887
- Variations de la Personnalité*Paris*, 1888
- BRULLARD (Dr. Joseph), Considérations Générales sur l'État Hypnotique*Nancy*, 1886
- CHARCOT (J. M.), Hémorragie et Ramollissement du Cerveau ; Métallothérapie et Hypnotisme ; Électrothérapie*Paris*, 1890
- CROCQ (Dr., Fils), L'Hypnotisme et le Crime..... *Brussels*, 1894
- DELBŒUF (Prof. J.), De l'Origine des Effets curatifs de l'Hypnotisme..... *Paris*, 1887
- DICHAS (Dr. A.), Étude de la Mémoire dans ses Rapports avec le Sommeil Hypnotique (2 copies)..... *Paris*, 1887
- DURAND (J. P.), Le Merveilleux Scientifique*Paris*, 1894
- ESPINAS (Prof. A.), Du Sommeil provoqué chez les Hystériques*Bordeaux*, 1884
- FÉRÉ (Dr. Ch.) La Pathologie des Émotions : Études Physiologiques et Cliniques.....*Paris*, 1892
- JANET (Prof. Pierre), État mental des Hystériques ; les Stigmates mentaux. Préface de M. le Prof. Charcot...*Paris*, 1892
- État Mental des Hystériques ; les Accidents Mentaux *Paris*, 1894
- LAFONTAINE (Ch.), L'Art de Magnétiser ou le Magnétisme Vital (5th Edition)*Paris*, 1886

- LIÉBEAULT (Dr. A. A.), Étude sur le Zoomagnétisme..... *Paris*, 1883
 LIÉGEOIS (Prof. J.), De la Suggestion Hypnotique dans ses
 Rapports avec le Droit Civil et le Droit Criminel..... *Paris*, 1884
 LUY'S (Dr. J.), Les Émotions chez les Sujets en État d'Hypno-
 tisme..... *Paris*, 1887
 MESNET (Dr. E.), Le Somnambulisme Provoqué et la Fascination
Paris, 1894
 PITRES (Prof. A.), Des Suggestions Hypnotiques ...*Bordeaux*, 1884
 RICHER (Dr. Paul) Études Cliniques sur la grande Hystérie
 2nd Edition. *Paris*, 1885
 TOURETTE (Dr. Gilles de la) L'Hypnotisme et Les États Ana-
 logues au point de vue Médico-Légal*Paris*, 1887
 VAN RENTERGHEM (Dr. A. W. et Dr. F. Van Eeden), Psycho-
 Thérapie Suggestive. Compte Rendu des résultats obtenus
 pendant la première période bisannuelle, 1887—9...*Brussels*, 1889
 YUNG (Dr. Émile) Le Sommeil Normal et le Sommeil Patho-
 logique*Paris*, 1883

GERMAN.

- BAIERLACHER (Dr. E.), Die Suggestions-Therapie und ihre
 Technik*Stuttgart*, 1889
 DU PREL (Dr. Carl), Studien aus dem Gebiete der Geheimwissen-
 schaften. Erster Theil : Thatsache und Probleme ...*Leipzig*, 1890
 — Experimentalpsychologie und Experimentalmetaphysik
Leipzig, 1891
 GROSSMANN (Dr. J.), Die Bedeutung der hypnotischen Suggestion
 als Heilmittel*Berlin*, 1894
 LIÉBEAULT (Dr. A. A.), Hypnotismus und Suggestionstherapie.
 Aus der Zeitschrift für Hypnotismus. Heft I. 1892
 MOLL (Dr. Albert), Der Hypnotismus.....*Berlin*, 1889
 — 2nd Edition (2 copies).....*Berlin*, 1890
 OBERSTEINER (Prof. Dr. H.), Der Hypnotismus aus der klinische
 Zeit- und Streitfragen. Heft II.....*Vienna*, 1887
 PARISH (Edmund), Ueber die Trugwahrnehmung (Hallucination
 und Illusion) mit besonderer Berücksichtigung über Wach-
 hallucination bei Gesunden. (Schriften der Gesellschaft für
 Psychologische Forschung. Heft 7 u. 8.).....*Leipzig*, 1894
 SCHRENCK-NOTZING (Dr. Freiherr von) Die gerichtliche Bedeu-
 tung und missbrauchliche Anwendung des Hypnotismus
Munich, 1889
 — Ein Beitrag zur therapeutischen Verwerthung des Hypno-
 tismus*Leipzig*, 1888

A full Catalogue of the books in the Edmund Gurney Library was printed at the end of Vol. V. of the Proceedings. Supplementary Catalogues were printed at the end of Vols. VI., VII., VIII., and IX. Separate copies of these Catalogues are still on hand, and can be obtained from the Secretary.

LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

(August, 1894.)

PRESIDENT.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES, Harvard, U.S.A.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR, M.P., F.R.S.

PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT, Royal College of Science, Dublin.

THE MARQUIS OF BUTE, K.T., Mount Stuart, Rothesay, Isle of Bute.

JOHN R. HOLLOND, Esq., 1, Upper Berkeley-street, Portman-square, W.

RICHARD H. HUTTON, Esq., Crossdeep Lodge, Twickenham.

PROFESSOR S. P. LANGLEY, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A.

LORD RAYLEIGH, F.R.S., Terling Place, Witham, Essex.

THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF RIPON, The Palace, Ripon,

PROFESSOR HENRY SIDGWICK, Cambridge.

COUNCIL FOR 1894.

G. W. BALFOUR, M.P.

THOMAS BARKWORTH.

A. W. BARRETT, M.B.

PROFESSOR W. F. BARRETT.

G. P. BIDDER, Q.C.

J. MILNE BRAMWELL, M.B.

THE EARL OF CRAWFORD AND
BALCARRES, K.T., F.R.S.

WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S.

LIEUT.-COL. J. HARTLEY.

WALTER LEAF, Litt.D.

PROFESSOR OLIVER J. LODGE, F.R.S.

PROFESSOR MACALISTER, M.D., F.R.S.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.

FRANK PODMORE.

PROFESSOR W. RAMSAY, Ph.D., F.R.S.

LORD RAYLEIGH, F.R.S.

C. LOCKHART ROBERTSON, M.D.

SYDNEY C. SCOTT.

PROFESSOR HENRY SIDGWICK.

H. ARTHUR SMITH.

H. BABINGTON SMITH.

R. PEARSALL SMITH.

PROFESSOR J. J. THOMSON, F.R.S.

J. VENN, D.Sc., F.R.S.

HON. TREASURER.

H. ARTHUR SMITH, 1, New-square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.

HON. SECRETARIES.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, Leckhampton House, Cambridge.

FRANK PODMORE, 32, Well-walk, Hampstead, London, N.W.

SECRETARY FOR THE UNITED STATES.

RICHARD HODGSON, 5, Boylston-place, Boston, Mass.

ASSISTANT-SECRETARY.

EDWARD T. BENNETT, 19, Buckingham-street, Adelphi, London, W.C.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

- WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S., 7, Kensington Park-gardens, London, W.
 THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., Hawarden Castle, Chester.
 SIR FREDERICK LEIGHTON, BART., P.R.A., 2, Holland Park-road, W.
 JOHN RUSKIN, LL.D., D.C.L., Brantwood, Coniston, Lancashire.
 ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, F.R.S., Corfe View, Parkstone, Dorset.
 G. F. WATTS, R.A., Little Holland House, London, W.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

- ALEXANDER N. AKSAKOF, 6, Nevsky Prospect, St. Petersburg.
 PROFESSOR A. ALEXANDER, Caixa, 906, Rio Janeiro.
 PROFESSOR H. BEAUNIS, Villa Josephine, Boute d'Antibes, Cannes,
 Alpes Maritimes, France.
 PROFESSOR BERNHEIM, Hôpital Civil, Nancy.
 PROFESSOR H. P. BOWDITCH, M.D., Harvard Medical School, Cambridge,
 Mass., U.S.A.
 PROFESSOR NICHOLAS M. BUTLER, Columbia College, New York, U.S.A.
 DR. DARIEX, 6, Rue du Bellay, Paris.
 DR. MAX DESSOIR, 27, Köthener Strasse, Berlin, W.
 DR. FÉRÉ, 37, Boulevard St. Michel, Paris.
 PROFESSOR STANLEY HALL, Clark University, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.
 DR. EDUARD VON HARTMANN, Gross-Lichterfelde, Germany.
 PROFESSOR PIERRE JANET, 22, Rue de Bellechasse, Paris.
 PROFESSOR KOVALEVSKY, The University, Kharkof, Russia.
 DR. A. A. LIÉBEAULT, Nancy, France.
 PROFESSOR J. LIÉGEOIS, Nancy, France.
 PROFESSOR C. LOMBROSO, 43, Corso Oporto, Turin, Italy.
 HANS NATGE, Berlin-Tempelhof, Berlin.
 PROFESSOR E. C. PICKERING, The Observatory, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
 DR. F. FREIHERR GOELER VON RAVENSBURG, 4, Nettelbeckstrasse,
 Berlin, W.
 TH. RIBOT, Office of the *Revue Philosophique*, Paris.
 PROFESSOR CHARLES RICHTER, 15, Rue de l'Université, Paris.
 PROFESSOR SABATIER, Montpellier, France.
 DR. FREIHERR VON SCHIRENCK-NOTZING, 29, Herzog-Wilhelmstrasse,
 Munich.
 PROFESSOR N. WAGNER, Imperial University, St. Petersburg.

MEMBERS, HONORARY ASSOCIATES, AND ASSOCIATES.

*Names of Members are printed in **Black Type.***

Names of Honorary Associates are prefixed by an Asterisk.

Names of Associates are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.

- ADAIR, MRS., Glenavon, Cookstown, co. Tyrone.
ADAMS, MRS., 4, Brookside, Cambridge.
AINSLIE, AINSLIE DOUGLAS, 15, Lower Grosvenor-place, S.W.
ALCOCK, RICHARD, M.B., Burlington-crescent, Goole.
ALEXANDER, S., M.A., The Owens College, Manchester.
ALLEN, FREDERIC, Sidmouth-road, Newcastle, Staffordshire.
ALLEN, HENRY J., 14, Ailesbury-road, Donnybrook, co. Dublin.
ALLEN, MISS MARY GRAY, 14, Queen's-square, W.C.
ALLEN, REV. W. O. B., M.A., 83, St. George's-road, London, S.W.
AMERY, W. C., 34A, Corporation-street, Birmingham.
ANDERSON, JAMES ARBUTHNOT, 46, Warwick-gardens, Kensington, W.
ANDERSON, MISS M. 25, Lansdowne-crescent, Kensington Park, W.
APSLEY-SMITH, MRS., Halifax, Nova Scotia.
ARGLES, MISS EDITH M., The Deanery, Peterborough.
ARKWRIGHT, WALTER GEORGE, Adbury House, Newbury.
ARNOTT, T. DAVIDSON, Port of Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I.
Ashbourne, The Lady, 23, Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin.
Ashburton, The Lady, Kent House, Knightsbridge, London, S.W.
ATKINSON, MISS E. A., 44, Percy-gardens, Tynemouth.
BACCHUS, MRS., The Manor House, Lillington, near Leamington.
BACON, REV. JOHN MACKENZIE, M.A., Coldash, Newbury.
BADELIER, EMILE, Rangoon, British Burmah.
BAILEY, MRS., H. H., 50, Clarendon-road, Holland Park, W.
BAILLIE, EDMUND J., F.L.S., Woodbine, Eaton-road, Chester.
BAINES, MISS W., 40, Sussex-square, Brighton.
Baker, Mrs. Charles, 47, Russell-road, West Kensington, W.
Balfour, The Right Hon. A. J., M.P., F.R.S., 4, Carlton-gdns., S.W.
Balfour, G. W., M.P., 67, Addison-road, London, W.
Balfour, Miss, 4, Carlton-gardens, London, S.W.
BALL, THOMAS STANLEY, Spring Bank, Fulwood, near Preston.
Banister, Major Fitzgerald M., R.A., Jun. Army and Navy Club, W.
BANNERMAN, COLONEL P. W., 8, Somers-place, Hyde Park, London, W.
Barber, Mrs. J. W., Ferndene, Abbeydale, near Sheffield.
BARCLAY, REV. CHAS. W., M.A., The Vicarage, Hertford Heath, Hertford.
Barkworth, Thomas, J. P., West Hatch, Chigwell, Essex.
BARKWORTH, LIEUT. JOHN R., R.E., R.A. and R.E. Mess, Malta.
BARMBY, REV. JAMES, B.D., Pitlington Vicarage, Durham.

- Barrett, Ashley William, M.B. (Lond.)**, 42, Finsbury-square, E.C.
 BARRETT, REV. CANON, M.A., St. Margaret's Vicarage, Lincoln.
- Barrett, Professor W. F., F.R.S.E.**, Kingstown, co. Dublin.
- Barrington, Hon. Eric**, 62, Cadogan-place, London, S.W.
- BARTHOLOMEW, COLONEL, Bantry Lodge, Glengariff, co. Cork.
- BATES, COLONEL C. E., 60, Gloucester-place, Portman-square, W.
- BATES, MISS, c/o London and County Bank, Maidstone.
- Battersea, The Lady**, Aston Clinton, Tring.
- BAYFIELD, REV. MATTHEW A., M.A., Christ's College, Brecon.
- BAZLEY, SIR THOMAS S., BART., J.P., M.A., Hatherop Castle, Fairford, Gloucestershire.
- BEATTY, OCTAVIUS, Killevey, Darleston-road, Wimbledon, Surrey.
- BEAZLEY, LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GEORGE G., 74, Redcliffe-sq., S.W.
- Bective, The Countess of**, 42, Cadogan-square, W.
- BEER, MRS., 7, Chesterfield-gardens, London, W.
- BELL, BAINBRIDGE R., The Rectory, Cheltenham.
- BELL, CHARLES W., J.P., D.L., Yewhurst, East Grinstead, Sussex.
- Bell, Major Wm. Morrison**, Thor, Birchington, Thanet, Kent.
- BELLASIS, MAJOR G. M., c/o H. S. King and Co., 45, Pall Mall, S.W.
- Bennett, Edward T.**, Devonshire House, Richmond, near London.
- BENNETT, ERNEST N., M.A., Hertford College, Oxford.
- Benson, Mrs.**, Lambeth Palace, London, S.E.
- BENSON, R. HUGH, 1, Landscape-place, Llandaff.
- Berens, Rev. Randolph, M.A.**, 14, Prince's-gardens, London, S. W.
- BERGEN, AXEL VON, Harewood Hill, Darlington.
- BERGEN, DR. CARL VON, 32, Karlavågen, Stockholm.
- BERNARD, JOHN, CAPTAIN, R.M.L.I., H.M.S. "Nelson," Portsmouth.
- Berry Mrs., F. M. Dickinson**, M. D., 60, Welbeck-st., Cavendish-sq., W.
- BEST, MRS. J. RYCROFT, c/o Messrs. Coutts & Co., 59, Strand, W.C.
- BEVAN, HON. MRS. R. YORKE, 9, Rutland-gate, London, W.
- BEVAN, MRS. ROBERT, 131, Gloucester-road, London, S.W.
- Beveridge, Erskine**, St. Leonard's Hill, Dunfermline, N.B.
- Bibby, Charles Hesketh**, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- BICKFORD-SMITH, R. A. H., B.A., 19, Endymion-road, Brixton Rise, S.W.
- BICKNELL, REV. CLARENCE, M.A., Villa Rose, Bordighera, Italy.
- BICKNELL, NORMAN L., Foxgrove, Beckenham, Kent.
- Bidder, George P., Q.C.**, Ravensbury Park, Mitcham, Surrey.
- Bidder, Mrs. G. P.**, Ravensbury Park, Mitcham, Surrey.
- BIDDER, GEORGE P., JUNR., Ravensbury Park, Mitcham, Surrey.
- Biddulph, The Lady Elizabeth P.**, 19, Ennismore-gardens, S.W.
- BIELBY, HORACE C. V., 67, Lord-street, Liverpool, W.
- Bigg, Miss Louisa**, Lyndhurst, Luton.
- BIRKS, REV. EDWARD B., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
- BIRRELL, MRS., Placilla, Down View-road, Worthing.

- BLACKBURN, ERNEST M., 38, Egerton-gardens, London, S.W.
BLACKWELL, ELIZABETH, M.D., Rock House, Hastings.
Blackwood, Mrs., Norton Court, Sittingbourne, Kent.
Blakelock, Rev. R., M.A., Horbury Bridge Vicarage, Wakefield.
Blaquiere, Mrs. Charles de, 1, Hyde Park Mansions, London, N.W.
BOGER, MRS. H. M., Elvington, Ryde, Isle of Wight.
BOIS, HERBERT G., 4, Clarendon-place, Hyde Park-square, W.
BOLDERO, LIEUT.-GENERAL G. N., 20, Westbourne-gardens, Folkestone.
BOLLAND, MRS., 7, Cranbury-terrace, Southampton.
BONUS, ARTHUR R., Dharwar, India.
BOORNE, HERBERT H., 55 and 56, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.
BOSCQ DE BEAUMONT, G. DU, Bayeux, (Calvados), France.
BOUCHER, MRS., c/o Miss Lutley, West-street, Wiveliscombe, Somerset.
BOULNOIS, H. PERCY, M.Inst.C.E., 7, Devonshire-road, Liverpool.
BOUVERIE, EDWARD O. P., M.A., 93, Park-street, Grosvenor-square, W.
BOWDEN-SMITH, MRS., Highclere Rectory, Newbury.
BOWELL, ERNEST W. W., Sissinghurst Vicarage, Staplehurst, Kent.
BOWLBY, ARTHUR S., Trinity College, Cambridge.
BOWNESS, WILLIAM WILSON, 26, Campden-grove, Kensington, London, W.
BOYD, C. W., 7, Abbotsford-crescent, St. Andrews, N.B.
BOYD, WILLIAM HENRY, Ballymacool, Letterkenny.
BRAMSTON, MISS A. R., Witham-close, Winchester.
BRAMSTON, MISS M., Suntrap, Radcliffe-road, Croydon.
Bramwell, John M., M.B., 2, Henrietta-street, Cavendish-square, W.
BRANDRETH, HENRY S., Fairholme, Weybridge.
BRAYSHAW, JOHN L., Settle, Yorkshire.
BRETT, GEORGE, The College, Weston-super-Mare.
BREWSTER, MRS. F., 21, Park-valley, Nottingham.
BRIGGS, MRS., Rawdon Hall, near Leeds.
BRILL, ALICE B., M.D., New York, U.S.A.
BRITEN, JAMES, F.L.S., 18, West-square, Southwark, S.E.
Brooke, Lady, Ranee of Sarawak, 12, Hans-place, London, S.W.
BROOKE, REV. STOPFORD A., M.A., 1, Manchester-square, London, W.
BROWN, MRS., 21, South-street, Park-lane, W.
BROWN, MISS JOHNSON, 26, Carisbrooke-road, St. Leonards-on-Sea.
BROWNE, EDWARD G., M.A., M.B., Pembroke College, Cambridge.
BROWNE, MRS. WALTER P., Bidston, Alieyn-road, West Dulwich, S.E.
BROWNING, OSCAR, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
BRUHNS, THEODORE, Simferopol, Russia.
BRYANT, CAPTAIN G. E., R.A., c/o J. M. Edwards, The Elms, Ramsgate.
Bryce, J. P., J.P., Bystock, near Exmouth, Devon.
BRYCE, MISS KATHLEEN, 15, Campden Hill-square, W.
BUCHANAN, H. B. M., B.A., 9, Upper Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood, S.E.
BUCKLER, W. H., Trinity College, Cambridge.

- BULLOCK, MRS., Cedars Lodge, Miteham, Surrey.
 BULMER, MRS., Field House, Sleights, R.S.O., York.
 BUNNETT, A., JUNR., 10, Station-road, South Norwood, S.E.
 BUNSHAW, N.F., Med. Off., B.G.J.P. Railway, Ghadechi, Kathiawar, India.
 BURT, PERCIVAL J., 16, Leadenhall-street, London, E.C.
 BURTON, MRS., Longner Hall, Shrewsbury.
 BURTON, MRS., 1, Idlesleigh Mansions, Victoria-street, S.W.
Bushell, Rev. W. D., M.A., Harrow-on-the-Hill.
 BUTCHER, MISS, Nurses Home, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, E.C.
Bute, The Marquis of, K. T., Mount Stuart, Rothesay, Isle of Bute.
 BUTLER, G. W., B.A., F.G.S., Sandham, Chertsey, Surrey.
 BUTT, LADY, 8, Petersham-terrace, Gloucester-road, S.W.
 BUTTEMER, ROBERT WILLIAM, St. Mary's, Godalming.
Caillard, Vincent, Constantinople.
 CAIRD, MRS., 3, Lyndhurst-gardens, South Hampstead, London.
Caithness, The Countess of, Duchesse de Pomar, 124,
 Avenue de Wagram, Paris.
 CALDECOTT, REV. ALFRED, M.A., 45, Chesterton-road, Cambridge.
 CALLAWAY, CHARLES, D.Se., M.A., Sandon, Wellington, Salop.
 CAMPBELL, JAMES A., Barbreck, *viâ* Lochgilphead, Argyll, N.B.
 CAMPBELL, MRS. BURNLEY, Ballimore, Tigh-na-bruaich, Argyllshire, N.B.
 CAMPBELL, COLIN E., B.A., 22, Market Hill, Cambridge.
Campbell, Mrs. Napier, 81, Ashley-gardens, London, S.W.
 CANNON, MRS., Hillcot, Sharples, near Bolton.
Carey, Arthur, B.Sc., Browsieh, Gateacre, near Liverpool.
 CARLETON, HON. MRS. LEIR, Greywell Hall, Winchfield.
 *CARLILE, W. A., 101, Whitehead-road, Aston, Birmingham.
Carnarvon, The Earl of, 13, Berkeley-square, London, W.
 CAUDEE, MISS, c/o Messrs. Brown, Shipley and Co., London, E.C.
Cave, Charles, J. P., 13, Lowndes-square, London, S.W.
 CAVE-BROWNE-CAVE, MRS. T., Burnage, Streatham Common, S.W.
 CAZALET, MRS., Grenehurst, Dorking.
 CECIL, LADY FRANCIS, Stocken Hall, Stretton, Oakham.
 CHAMPNESS, ALFRED, Sedbergh, Yorks.
 CHANDLER, REV. H. C. D., M.A., Waterbeach Vicarage, Cambridge.
 CHASE, CAPT. W. ST. L., V.C., care of Messrs. William Watson and
 Co., 28, Apollo-street, Bombay.
 CHATTOCK, ARTHUR P., University College, Bristol.
 CHILDERS, MISS F. I., 46, Gunter's-grove, London, S.W.
 CLARK, W. W., Denehurst, Dorking.
 CLARK, MISS, Suffield Park, Cromer.
 CLARKE, JOHN HENRY, M.D., 30, Clarges-street, London, W.
 CLARKE, ROBERT H., M.A., M.B., M.R.C.S., Clarence Lodge, Redhill.
 CLAVEQUIN, EDWARD, Munster Lodge, Monkstown, Dublin.

- CLAYTON, CHARLES E., Hillcote, Highcroft Villas, Brighton.
- CLEMENS, S. L., Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.
- Clive, The Hon. Henrietta Windsor**, Oakly Park, Bromfield, Salop.
- Close, Rev. Maxwell H., M.A.**, University Club, Dublin.
- COATES, ANDREW, Pitcullen House, Perth, N.B.
- Coffin, Walter H., F.L.S.**, 94, Cornwall-gardens, London, S.W.
- COGHILL, COLONEL KENDAL, C.B., Cosheen, Castle Townshend, co. Cork.
- COLCHESTER, REV. H. B., M.A., 7, Bennett-street, St. James's, S.W.
- COLE, ALFRED C., M.A., 64, Portland-place, W.
- COLERIDGE, MISS CHRISTABEL R., Cheyne, Torquay.
- Coles, D. A., M. D.**, Sydney House, Sutton Court-road, Chiswick, W.
- COLLINS, SIR ROBERT H., K.C.B., Broom Hill, Claremont, Esher.
- Collison, Mrs. Henry C.**, Newlands, Weybridge, Surrey.
- COLT, FREDERICK E., 9, Old-square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.
- COLTHURST, LADY, 47, Hill-street, Berkeley-square, London, W.
- COLVILLE, COLONEL HENRY E., C.B., 24, Chapel-st., Belgrave-square, S.W.
- COONEY, REV. STEWART E., M.A., 73, Botanic-avenue, Belfast.
- COPE, REV. C. H., M.A., 15, Räcknitz-strasse, Dresden, A.
- CORT VAN DER LINDEN, PROFESSOR P. W. A., Amsterdam, Holland.
- COUES, DR. ELLIOTT, 1,726, N-street, N.W. Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- COUSENS, CHARLES H., Star Chambers, 30, Moorgate-st., London, E.C.
- COWAN, MRS., Valleyfield, Penicuik, N.B.
- COWPER, THE HON. MRS. SPENCER, 38, Rue Jean Goujon, Paris.
- Crawford and Balcarres, The Earl of, K.T., F.R.S.**, 2, Cavendish-square, London, W.
- Crawford, F. Marion**, Villa Crawford, Sant' Agnello di Sorrento, Italy.
- CRAWFORD, W. C., 1, Lockharton-gardens, Slateford, Midlothian, N.B.
- Crawshay, Robert**, 16, Berkeley-square, London, W.
- CRESPO, J. CHARTERS, Rio Maior, Portugal.
- CREWDSON, MISS GWENDOLEN, St. Regulus, St. Andrews, Fife, N.B.
- Crommelin, Miss Constance de la C.**, 29, Sussex-square, Brighton.
- CROSSLEY, MRS. C. R., 103, Gloucester-place, Portman-square, London, W.
- CROWE, W. LEADHAM, 15, Great St. Helens, London, E.C.
- CROWTHER, W. FEARNE, Mayfield, Sussex.
- CRUISE, F. R., M.D., 93, Merrion-square, W., Dublin.
- CRUMP, HAROLD E., M.A., The Chestnuts, St. Margaret's, Twickenham.
- CUNNINGHAM, G., D.M.D. (Harvard, U.S.A.), 2, King's-parade, Cambridge.
- CUNNINGHAM, REV. W., D.D., 2, St. Paul's-road, Cambridge.
- *CURTIS, MISS MARY, Laugharne, St. Clears, South Wales.
- D'Abbadie, Antoine**, 120, Rue de Bac, Paris.
- Dakin, Rev. Edward**, Selsley, Stroud, Gloucestershire.
- Dakyns, Henry Graham, M.A.**, Higher Coombe, Haslemere, Surrey.
- DALLAS, MISS H. S. A., Clifford House, Wellington, Somerset.
- Damania, Surgeon-Major, P. J.**, National Liberal Club, London.

- DANVERS, MRS., 4, Cranley Mansion, Gloucester-road, S.W.
 DARELL-BROWN, MRS., 1, Douro-villas, Cheltenham.
 DARLEY, LADY, Quambi, Woollohra, New South Wales.
 DARWIN, MRS. FRANCIS, Wychfield, Huntingdon-road, Cambridge.
 DAVIES, BENJAMIN, 50, Marlborough-road, Tue Brook, Liverpool.
 DAVIS, A. E., L.R.C.S. (Ed.), L.R.C.P.I., 20, Great George-sq., Liverpool.
 DAVIS, JOSEPH T., Holly Bush, Snaresbrook, Essex.
 DAVIS, THOMAS HENRY, 23, Manor-park, Lee, Kent.
Davison, Miss Annie, 1, Stanford-road, Kensington, W.
Dawkin, William, 61, Clifton-street, Larkhall-lane, S.W.
De Brath, Stanley, c/o H. S. King & Co., 45, Pall Mall, London, S.W.
De Grey, The Countess, 1, Carlton-gardens, London, S.W.
 *DESPARD, MISS, 77, Chesterton-road, North Kensington, London, W.
Dewar, Rev. Peter, M.A., The Manse, North Bute, Rothesay, N.B.
 DICKINSON, GOLDSWORTHY L., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
 DICKSEE, FRANK, A.R.A., 80, Peel-street, Campden Hill, London, W.
 DILL, J. F. GORDON, M.A., M.B., 6, Brunswick-place, Brighton.
Dixon, Edward T., 4, Cranmer-road, Cambridge.
 DIXON, HUGH N., M.A., F.L.S., East Park Parade Northampton.
 DOBBIE, A. W., Gawler-place, Adelaide, South Australia.
Dodgson, Rev. Charles Lutwidge, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
 DONNELLY, MRS., Kendall-street, Cowra, New South Wales.
 DOUBLEDAY, MRS. FRANCES G., c/o Drexel, Harris and Co., 37, Boulevard Haussmann, Paris.
 DOUGLAS, GEORGE WILLIAM, 473, Fifth Avenue, New York, U.S.A.
 DOVETON, F. B., Eastcliffe, Babbacombe, South Devon.
 DOWSON, MRS., L.K.Q.C.P., L.R.C.S.I., 20, Westgate-terrace, Redcliffe-square, London, S.W.
Doyle, A. Conan, M.D., 12, Tennison-road, South Norwood, S.E.
 DUFF, CHARLES E., M.B., 122, High-street, Deptford.
 DULLEY, REV. B., M.A., St. Peter's Clergy House, London Docks, E.
 DUNCAN, MRS. A.M.A., Victoria Club, 30A, Sackville-st., London, W.
 DUTT, R. C., C.I.E., Burdwan, Bengal, India.
 DYCE, CAPTAIN CECIL, (Retired) Bengal Staff Corps, 3, St. Stephen's-road, Westbourne Park, W.
 EAGLE, FREDERICK, Barum House, Queen-street, Henley-on-Thames.
 EARDLEY, LADY, 4, Lancaster-street, Hyde Park, London, W.
 EARLE, MRS. C. W., 5, Bryanston-square, London, W.
 EDELSTEN, JOHN A., 31, Bold-street, Warrington.
 EGERTON, MISS MARY L., Whitwell Hall, York.
Elder, Frederick, 21, Cleveland-gardens, Hyde Park, London, W.
Elder, Mrs., 38, Hyde Park Gardens, London, W.
 ELLIOT, GILBERT, 10, Hanover-square, London, W.
 ELLIOT, MRS. MINTO, 7, George-street, Hanover-square, W.

- ELLIOTT, SIR CHARLES ALFRED, K.C.S.I., LL.B., Calcutta.
ELLIOTT, REV. W.A., 2, Clarence-villas, Westbourne-gardens, Trowbridge.
ELLIS, JOHN EDWARD, M.P., 40, Pont-street, London, S.W.
ELLISON, REV. JOHN H., M.A., 4, Warwick-square, London, S.W.
ELTON, OLIVER, M.A., 58, Flanders-road, Bedford Park, W.
ELVEY, MISS MARY M., Finborough-road, West Brompton, London, S.W.
Elworthy, Arthur K., Foxdown, Wellington, Somerset.
Elwyn, Rev. Canon, M.A., Master's Lodge, Charterhouse, London.
Eno, J. C., Wood Hall, Dulwich, London, S.E.
ERMACORA, DR., G.B., Padua, Italy.
ESTERHASY, COUNT MICHEL, Cseklesz, Pressburg County, Hungary.
EUSTACE, MISS GRACE, Castlemore, Tullow, co. Carlow, Ireland.
EVANS, KIRKHAM, Adelaide, South Australia.
EVES, MRS. CHARLES T., Brook's Lodge, The Park, Cheltenham.
Ewing, Lieut.-Colonel, A., The Lawn, Taunton.
FAGAN, MRS. L. M., 56, Russell-square, London, W.C.
Falcke, Dudley C., 5, Pump-court, Temple, London, E.C.
FALCOMER, PROFESSOR M. T., Technical Institute, Teramo, Italy.
FARNCOMBE, GEORGE RICHARD, B.A., 40, Belgrave-street, Birmingham.
Feilding, The Lady Louisa, 23, Princes-gate, London, S.W.
FEILDING, HON. EVERARD, Newman House, Kennington-road, S.E.
FELTON, ALFRED, Melbourne, Australia.
FIELDING, MRS., 19, Wilton-place, London, S.W.
FIELDING, MRS. T. M., 25, Cardigan-road, Richmond, near London.
FINCH, H. WYNNE, JUNR., B.A., 5, Alfred-place West, Thurloe-sq., S.W.
*FINZI, DR. GEORGE, 11, Monte di Pietà, Milan.
FISHER, REV. J. HARTMAN, Nassau, N.P., Bahamas.
FITZGERALD, DESMOND G., M.S.T.E., 46, Loughborough-rd., Brixton, S.W.
Florence, Ernest B., 33, Redcliffe-square, South Kensington, S.W.
FLYNT, WILLIAM GARNETT, 7, Walmer-road, Birkdale Park, Southport.
FORD, MRS. GERARD, 7, Mandeville-place, London, W.
FORRESTER, MRS., Gavell House, Kilsyth, N.B.
FORT, CHARLES LEYLAND, B.A., Alderbury House, Salisbury.
Foster, Gerald H., 5, Cleveland-terrace, Hyde Park, W.
Fountain, Alfred, The Elms, Cornwall-road, Uxbridge.
FOX, ST. GEORGE LANE, 4, Grosvenor-gardens, London, S.W.
FRASER, COL. A. T., R.E., Bellary, Madras Presidency.
FREEMAN, MISS ADELAIDE C., Belgrave Mansions, Grosvenor-gdns., S.W.
Fry, Lewis George, 13, Thurlow-road, Hampstead, N.W.
FRY, OLIVER A., M.A., 141, Portsdown-road, Maida-vale, London, W.
FRY, R. E., B.A., 1, Palace Houses, Bayswater Hill, London, W.
*FRYER, REV. A. T., 13, Dumfries-place, Cardiff.
FURNIVALL, PERCY, Belgrave Hospital for Children, London, S.W.
GALLOWAY, THE COUNTESS OF, 17, Upper Grosvenor-street, W.

- GARDINER, REV. EDWARD R., M.A., Fawley Vicarage, Wantage.
Gardner, Right Hon. H., M.P., 48, Charles-street, Berkeley-sq., W.
 GARDNER, THE LADY WINIFRED, 48, Charles-street, Berkeley-square, W.
 GARDNER, MRS. ERNEST, c/o Miss Wilson, 33, Ladbroke-square, W.
 GARNER, EDWIN T., Glendale, Alexandra-road, Selhurst, Surrey.
 GARTH, HENRY, M.B., C.M. (Edin.), Morden, near Mitcham, Surrey.
Gausson, Mrs. L.D., Marton, Basechurch, Salop.
 GEACH, MRS. GUICHARD, 2, Edinburgh-ter., Victoria-rd., Kensington, W.
 GESSMANN, GUSTAV, JUNR., Zwölfers Gasthof, Altmansdorf, Vienna.
 GIBOTTEAU, AIMÉ, M.D., Villa Béarnaise, Biarritz.
 GIBSON, MISS M. E., 23, Northumberland-street, Edinburgh.
 GILCRIEST, W. F., A.I.C.E. (Ireland), Sligo.
 GITTERMANN, RUDOLPH C., Odessa, Russia.
 GLARDON, REV. AUGUSTE, Tour de Peilz, Vaud, Switzerland.
 GLOVER, JOHN J. T., 124, Stephen's Green, W., Dublin.
 GODFREY, THOMAS H., M.B., Van Mildert House, Stockton-on-Tees.
 GODFREY, MRS., c/o Col. C.W. Godfrey, Bombay Staff Corps, Poona, India.
Goodhart, Rev. Charles A., M.A., Lambourne Rectory, Romford.
 GOODIER, MISS B. M., Edinscate, Disley, Cheshire.
Goodman, Louis H., Bertram House, 170, Earl's Court-road, S.W.
 *GOODRICH-FREER, MISS, 2, Westbourne Park-road, London, W.
 GORDIGIANI, EDWARD, 50, Via Degli Alfani, Florence.
 GORING, LADY, Strettington, Chichester.
 GOVER, JOHN M., LL.D., 5, New-square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.
 GOVET, THE VEN. ARCHDEACON, M.A., Gibraltar.
 GRAHAM, HENRY R., 8, Marble Arch, London, W.
 GRAHAM, J. W., B.A., Meadowside, Heald-place, Rusholme, Manchester.
Graham, William W., 4, Elm-court, Temple, London, E.C.
 GRAY, REV. A., M.A., Malvern House, East Liss, Hants.
 GRAY, EDWARD W., SURGEON-CAPTAIN, The Citadel, Cairo, Egypt.
 GREEN, C. T., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. (Lond.), 33, Grange-mt., Birkenhead.
 GREEN, MISS MARIAN, The High School, Spring Mount, Blackburn.
Greener, W. O., 2, Kent Villas, Ealing.
 GREIG, REV. DAVID, M.A., Cottenham Rectory, Cambridge.
 GRIER, CAPTAIN GEORGE R., Leonardstone House, Neyland, Wales.
 GRIFFITH, MISS E. C., 37, York-street, Portman-square, London, W.
 GRIFFITH, MRS. ROBERT W., The Old House, Llandaff.
 GRIGNON, REV. WILLIAM S., M.A., Essenden, Hatfield, Herts.
 GROGAN, MISS, 18, Ridgmount-gardens, London, W.C.
 GROOM, ERNEST, Dothill Park, Wellington, Salop.
 *GRUBB, EDWARD, M.A., 5, Royal-avenue, Scarborough.
 GRUBBE, HUBERT H., Shallow, Ongar, Essex.
 GUDGEON, JAMES, Stowmarket.
Guest, A. H., L.R.C.P.E., Westbourne, Whalley-range, Manchester.

- GUNTON, REV. CHARLES F., M.A., Farlam Vicarage, Milton, Carlisle.
 GUNTON, REV. F., M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Gurney, Rev. Alfred, M.A., St. Barnabas' Parsonage, Pimlico, S.W.
 GURNEY, REV. F., M.A., St. John's Cottage, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot.
Gurney, Henry G., 3, Regent-street, London, W.
Gurney, Mrs. Russell, 3, Orme-square, London, W.
 HACKETT, JAMES F., B.A., 71, King William-street, Adelaide, Australia.
Haggard, John G., H.B.M. Consul, Trieste, Austria.
Haig, Mrs. C. E., Orchardwood, Ascot Heath, Berks.
 HALKETT, MISS KATHERINE E., 3, Pitt-street, Campden Hill, W.
 HALL, CHARLES S., The Borough Chambers, Bournemouth.
 HALL, GEORGE, M.D., C.M. Edin., Wyndham Lodge, Milford, Surrey.
 HAMILTON, COLONEL G. ROWAN, Killyleagh Castle, co. Down, Ireland.
Hannah, Robert, 82, Addison-road, Kensington, W.
 HANSFORD, CHARLES, 3, Alexandra-terrace, Dorchester.
 HARGRAVE, JOSEPH G., The Grange, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Manchester.
 HARGREAVES, MISS, 69, Alexandra-road, Southport.
 HARPUR, REV. GEORGE, B.A., Clifton Vicarage, Newark.
 HARRIS, J. C., *Bruce Herald* Office, Union-st., Milton, Otago, N.Z.
 HARTLEY, LIEUT.-COLONEL J., LL.D., D.L., The Old Downs, Hartley,
 near Fawkham, *viâ* Dartford.
 HARTSHORN, MISS C., c/o Messrs. Brown, Shipley and Co., London, E.C.
 HASLAM, PROF., M.A., St. Barbe, Riccarton, Christchurch, New Zealand.
 HASTIE, MISS, 11, Ashburn-place, Cromwell-road, S.W.
 HAY, THE HON. MRS. ALISTAIR, 8, Upper Belgrave-street, London, S.W.
 HAYES, FREDERICK W., 12, Westcroft-square, Ravenscourt Park, W.
 *HAYES, JOSEPH W., 1, George's-street, Enniscorthy.
Hayward, M. Cecil, Caius College, Cambridge.
 HEAPE, FRED. W., Toorak, Oxtou, Cheshire.
 HEARD, RICHARD, 90, Wigmore-street, London, W.
 HEATON, CHARLES, M.R.C.S., Watford, Herts.
 HENDERSON, MISS LILIAN, 55, Sutherland-avenue, Maida-vale, W.
Henley, Hon. Ernest, Watford Court, Rugby.
 HENNIKER-MAJOR, THE HON. MARY, 4, Berkeley-street, Piccadilly, W.
 HENRY, MISS EVA, 1, Argyll-villas, Cheltenham.
 HERBERT, HON. AUBERON, M.A., Burley, Ringwood, Hants.
 HERRINGHAM, MRS., 22, Bedford-square, London, W.C.
Hewetson, H. Bendelack, F.L.S., M.R.C.S., 11, Hanover-sq., Leeds.
 HIBBS, REGINALD R., 13, St. Lawrence-road, North Kensington, W.
Hichens, Rev. Thomas S., Guilsborough Vicarage, Northampton.
 HIGGIN, F. C., Killiney Castle, Killiney, co. Dublin.
 HILDYARD, F. W., St. Nicholas Club, 81A, Queen Victoria-st., London, E.C.
 HILL, CLEMENT HUGH, 63, Church-road, St. Leonards-on-Sea.
 HILL, MISS E. D., Instowe, Malvern-road, Cheltenham.

- HILL, HENRY, The Park, Nottingham.
- HILL, W. SCOTT, 47, Manor-place, Edinburgh.
- HILL-TOUT, CHARLES, Trinity College, Vancouver, B.C.
- HILLS, MRS., Corby Castle, Carlisle.
- HODDING, MISS, Selwood House, Barnard's Cross, Salisbury.
- Hodgson, Richard, LL.D.**, 5, Boylston-place, Boston, Mass., U.S.A
- HOGG, MISS A. M. M., Berry Head House, Brixham.
- Hogg, Henry R., M.A.**, Melbourne Club, Melbourne, Australia.
- HOLE, REV. DONALD, A.K.C., 2, Busby-place, Camden-road, N.W.
- Holland, Hon. Lionel R., B.A.**, 58, Conduit-street, W.
- HOLLAND, J. F. R., M.D., Kulm Hotel, St. Moritz, Switzerland.
- HOLLAND, MISS, Nidry Lodge, Campden Hill, London, W.
- Hollond, John R., M.A.**, 1, Upper Berkeley-street, Portman-sq., W.
- HOLSTEIN, MADAME ALEXANDRA DE, 29, Avenue de Wagram, Paris.
- Holt, H. Sherwin**, Wave Cottage, Chelmsford.
- Hood, H. J., M.A.**, 115, St. George's-road, London, S.W.
- HOOK, REV. CECIL, M.A., Hook Memorial Vicarage, Leeds.
- HOOPER, GORDON, L.D.S.R.C.S., 21, New Cavendish-st., Harley-st., W.
- Hooper, Mrs. Pitman**, 11, Bulstrode-street, Manchester-square, W.
- HOPKINSON, PROFESSOR A., M.A., B.C.L., The Lodge, 32, Herne Hill, S.E.
- HOPPS, JOHN PAGE, Oak Tree House, South Norwood Hill, London, S.E.
- HORNE, ALDERSON, Ditton-place, Balcombe, Sussex.
- HORTON, WILLIAM T., Millside, Hatchlands-road, Redhill, Surrey.
- HOWARD, THE LADY MABEL, Greystoke Castle, Penrith.
- Howard, Robert Henry**, Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham.
- HOWE, E. R. J. GAMBIER, 7, New-square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.
- HOWORTH, HENRY H., M.P., Derby House, Eccles, near Manchester.
- HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN, DR. J. U., Steglitz, near Berlin.
- HUDDLESTON, MRS., Llwynderw, Welshpool, Montgomeryshire.
- HUGHES, MAJOR H. M., F.R.G.S., Rose Bank, Marden Park, Caterham Valley, Surrey.
- Hughes, Mrs.**, Gwynnondale, Llanarthney, R.S.O., Carmarthenshire.
- HUME-ROTHERY, J. H., B.Sc. (Lond.), The Pines, Worcester Pk., Surrey.
- HUMFREY, MISS L. R., 8, Hyde Park Mansions, London, W.
- HUMPHREYS, ARTHUR LEE, Half-Timbered Cottage, Pangbourne.
- Hunter, Thomas**, Arnold House, Rugby.
- HUTCHINS, D. E., Conservator of Forests, Cape Town.
- Hutchinson, Frederick W. H., B.A.**, 1, Emmanuel-rd., Cambridge.
- Hutchison, Rev. R.P., M.A.**, Martyr Worthy Rectory, Winchester.
- INFIELD, H. I., 130, North-street, Brighton.
- INGLIS, REV. D., Douglas, Isle of Man.
- INNES, LADY, Winslow, Darling Point, Sydney, New South Wales.
- IRVING, LEWIS A., Surgeon-Major, Govt. House, Ganesh Khind, Bombay.
- ISAACHSEN, REV. THORVELD E., 44, Boompjes, Rotterdam.

- JACKSON, REV. F., The Vicarge, Newton-upon-Rawcliffe, Pickering.
JACKSON, WILLIAM H., M.A., F.L.S., Pen Wartha, Weston-super-Mare.
JACKSON, MISS E. R., S. Hilda's School, Clifton-road, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Jameson, F., 6, Westbourne Park-villas, London, W.
JEAFFRESON, REV. H. H., M.A., 115, Clifton Hill, St. John's Wood, N.W.
JEBB, REV. H. GLADWYN, M.A., Firbeck Hall, Rotherham.
Jebb, J. Gladwyn, 11, Chester-place, Hyde Park-square, London, W.
JEBB, MRS., Springfield, Newnham, Cambridge.
JEBB, MISS S. G., Myn-yr-Afon, Ruabon.
Jeffreys, Mrs., Glandyfi Castle, Glandovey, R.S.O., North Wales.
*JENKINS, E. VAUGHAN, Energlyn, 38, St. Margaret's-road, Oxford.
JENKINSON, MRS. F. R. G., 112, Sloane-street, London, S.W.
JENNINGS, MRS., 16, Lower Sloane-street, S.W.
Jeune, Lady, 37, Wimpole-street, London, W.
JOHNSON, REV. WAYLAND, LL.D., 709, Ferry-street, Easton, Penn., U.S.A.
JOHNSON, WILLIAM ERNEST, M.A., Llandaff House, Cambridge.
JOHNSTON, MISS M. F., 16, Gunterstone-road, West Kensington, W.
JONES, SIR LAWRENCE J., BART., Cranmer Hall, Fakenham, Norfolk.
JONES, MISS CONSTANCE, Girton College, Cambridge.
JONES, P., 16, Via Massimiliana, Trieste, Austria.
JONES, T.R., M.R.C.S.Lond., L.R.C.P.I., L.M.I., 26, Lorne-rd., Birkenhead.
Joyce, Samuel, 113, Richmond-road, Dalston, London, N.E.
KANE, J. G. AURIOL, Sloperton Lodge, Kingstown, co. Dublin.
Kay, H. A., 71, Maida-vale, London, W.
KEENE, REV. JAMES B., M.A., The Rectory, Navan, co. Meath.
KEEP, A. P. PERCEVAL, M.A., 2, Lloyd-place, Blackheath, London, S.E.
Kelso, Commander, R.N., Horkesby Park, Colchester.
KENMARE, THE COUNTESS OF, Killarney House, Killarney.
KER, C. B., M.D., Hadley House, Cheltenham.
Kerr, George, M.A., M.B., 6, St. Colme-street, Edinburgh.
*KEULEMANS, J. G., 13, York-terrace, Brewery-road, Southend.
KINGSBURY, GEORGE C., M.D., 3, Brighton-parade, Blackpool.
KINGSTON, H. D. R., M.B., Stormont Lodge, Willesden, N.W.
*KIRK, JOSEPH, 2, Ripon-villas, Upper Ripon-road, Plumstead, Kent.
Knowles, Ernest, Inglehurst Park-road, Bolton-le-Moors.
KNOX, NATHANIEL A., Adelaide Club, Adelaide, South Australia.
LACH-SZYRMA, REV. W.S., M.A., F.R.H.S., Barkingside Vicarage, Ilford.
Lafone, Alfred W., Springfield, Oatlands Park, Walton-on-Thames.
LAING, R.M., M.A., B.Sc., Boys' High School, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Lamplugh, Rev. David, M.A., Yalding Vicarage, Maidstone.
LANCASTER, ERNEST LE C., M. B., Winchester House, Swansea.
LAURIE, PROF. H., LL.D., President of the Victorian Society for
Psychical Research, Melbourne.
LEADAM, ISAAC S., 117, St. George's-square, S. W.

- LEAF, ARTHUR H., 9, St. Paul's Churchyard, London, E.C.
 LEAF, MRS., The Green, Marlborough.
Leaf, Walter, Litt. D., 6, Sussex-place, Regent's Park, London, N.W.
 LEAF, MRS. WALTER, 6, Sussex-place, Regent's Park, London, N.W.
 LEES, LIEUT. W. E., Royal Engineers, R.A. and R.E. Mess, Malta.
 LEETE, MISS, 2, Earl's Court-gardens, London, S.W.
 LEETE, MISS L., 2, Earl's Court-gardens, London, S.W.
 LEGGE, THE LADY FRANCES, Woodsome, Huddersfield.
 LEIGH, W. AUSTEN, M.A., 2, Norfolk-crescent, Hyde Park, London, W.
 LEWIS, C. W. MANSEL, Stradey Castle, Llanelly, Carmarthenshire.
Leycester, Mrs., 6, Cheyne-walk, Chelsea, London, S.W.
 LEYMARIE, P. G., 5, Rue des Petits Champs, Paris.
Leyson, Miss Kate, Penseynnor, Neath, South Wales.
 LIBRARIAN OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY, Adelaide, South Australia.
 LIBRARIAN, School of Arts, Brisbane, Queensland.
 LIBRARIAN OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY, Melbourne, Australia.
 LIBRARIAN, General Assembly Library, Wellington, New Zealand.
 LIMOND, MISS CATHERINE, 15, Eaton-terrace, London, S.W.
 LINDSAY, MISS BEATRICE, Bohemia, Port St. Mary, Isle of Man.
 LINDSAY, ROBERT, L.R.C.S., M.B., 59, Caversham-road, London, N.W.
 LLOYD, FRANCIS, Grenadier Guards, 43, Rutland-gate, London, S.W.
 LLOYD, OTHO HOLLAND, 16, Tite-street, Chelsea, S.W.
Lodge, Professor O. J., D.Sc., F.R.S., 2, Grove-park, Liverpool.
 LODGE, ROBERT, Loxford Grove Park, Wanstead.
 LOEWE, HUGO L., 3, Southampton-street, London, W.C.
 LORD, MRS. ROBERT, Newstead, Albert-road, Bolton, Lancashire.
 LOVELL, REGINALD H., 449, Collins-street, Melbourne.
 LOW, LADY, 23, De Vere-gardens, Kensington, W.
Lucas, Mrs. E A., Clareville, co. Galway.
 LYTTTELTON, SYBELLA LADY, 9, Bryanston-square, London, W.
 MACALISTER, PROFESSOR A., M.D., F.R.S., Torrisdale, Cambridge.
MacColl, Rev. Canon Malcolm, M.A., Devonshire Club, St. James's, S.W.
 *MACDONALD, REV. J. A., Heswall, Cheshire.
 MACKAY, GEORGE D., Inverahmond, Cramond, Midlothian, N.B.
 MACKY, DR., 4, Curzon-street, Mayfair, W.
Mackenzie, J. Kenneth D., Broadway Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
 MACNAUGHTON, REV. SAMUEL, M.A., Rose Bank, Addison-road, Preston.
 MAITLAND, EDWARD, B.A., 1, Studio-buildings, Thurloe-square, S.W.
 MAJOR, ALBERT, 77, Clapham-road, London, S.W.
 MALDEN, WILLIAM E. P., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Manders, H., F.R.C.S., Agincourt House, Yorktown, Farnborough.
 MANGIN, MARCET, 130, Boulevard Haussmann, Paris.
 MANN, REV. FREDERIC, M.A., Woodford Bridge, Essex.

- MANTELL, MISS BERTHA, 5, South Bank-terrace, Surbiton.
MARJORIBANKS, LADY, Tillmouth Park, Cornhill-on-Tweed, Northumberland.
MARSHALL, ARTHUR, 13, Belsize-avenue, London, N.W.
MARSHALL, HENRY WILLIAM, Quorn, South Australia.
MARSHALL, THOMAS, Leeds Library, Commercial-street, Leeds.
MARSHALL, WILLIAM CECIL, M.A., 28, Bedford-square, London, W.C.
Marten, Miss A. R., 78, Vanbrugh-park, Blackheath, S.E.
Martin, Miss A. E., 34, Elvaston-place, Queen's Gate, S.W.
MARTIN, MRS. E. G., 42, Rue Gambetta, Honfleur (Calvados), France.
MARTIN, MRS. J. BIDDULPH, 17, Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.
MARTINEAU, ALFRED EDWARD, Chief Court, Lahore, India.
MASON, MISS M. H., Morton Hall, Retford, Notts.
Massey, Charles C., 124, Victoria-street, London, S.W.
MASTERMAN, MISS LOUISA, Cawood Lodge, Haslemere.
MATHEWS, G.B., B.A., 9, Menai View-terrace, Upper Bangor, North Wales.
MATTHEWS, FRANK H., 22, Wentworth-street, Bolton, Lancashire.
MAYOR, R. G., King's College, Cambridge.
MCALPINE, MRS., Ardenconnel-row, near Helensburgh, N.B.
MCCAUL, MISS, Creggandarroch, Chislehurst.
MCHUGH, P. A., M.P., Sligo.
MCKERLIE, MISS HELEN G., Monkstown, co. Dublin.
MCLAREN, MRS. C., 45, Harrington-gardens, London, S.W.
MCLAUGHLIN, E. N., Trinity Villa, Spanish Town, Jamaica.
MCREILY, A. J. W., Q.C., Supreme Court, St. John's, Newfoundland.
MELVILLE, ANDREW P., 5, West Castle-road, Merchiston, Edinburgh.
MERRILEES, J. F., M.D., Auburn, Victoria.
Micklethwait, Richard K., Ardsley House, Barnsley.
Milford, The Lady, 16, Hill-street, Berkeley-square, W.
MILLER, MRS. W. PITT, Merlewood, Grange-over-Sands, Lancashire.
MILMAN, MRS. W. H., 17, Southwell-gardens, London, S.W.
MITCHELL, MRS. C. W., 195, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.
MOLESWORTH, SIR GUILFORD L., K.C.I.E., Simla, India.
Money, Colonel Gerard Noel, C.B., F.R.G.S.
Money-Coutts, Francis Burdett, Walsingham House, Piccadilly, W.
MONTEAGLE, THE LORD, K.P., Mount Trenchard, Foynes, co. Limerick.
MONTGOMERY, MRS., 9, Hartley-road, Exmouth.
MOORE, LIEUT.-GENERAL MONTGOMERY, Bellevue, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
MORDAN, MISS C. E., 15, Queen-square, W.C.
MORGAN, REV. EDWARD, B.A., Penmark Vicarage, Cowbridge.
MORISON, MRS. MILLER, 3, Douglas-crescent, Edinburgh.
MORISON, THEODORE, M.A., Aligarh, N.W.P., India.
MOUL, MRS., 3, Prince's Mansions, Victoria-street, S.W.
MOULTON, MRS. F. A., c/o Messrs. Munro & Co., 7, Rue Scribe, Paris.

- Mount-Temple, The Lady**, Shelley House, Chelsea, S.W.
 MOYNIHAN, B. G. A., M.B. (Lond.), The General Infirmary, Leeds.
 MUNRO, HENRY ACLAND, B.A., Guy's Hospital, S.E.
 MUNTHER, DR., Rome.
 MURRAY, PROFESSOR GEO. G. AIMÉ, B.A., The University, Glasgow, N.B.
 MURRAY, MRS. G. A., 10, Hyde Park Mansions, London, N.W.
 MURRAY, COLONEL HUGH H., R.A., 28, Gower-street, London, W.C.
 MURRAY, R. M., M.A., M.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.), 10, Hope-st., Edinburgh.
 MURRAY, SYDNEY J., 70, Cecile-park, Crouch Hill, London, N.
 MURRAY, T. DOUGLAS, Clewer Lodge, Windsor.
Murray-Aynsley, Mrs., Great Brampton, near Hereford.
 MUSE, MRS. EVA S., Santa Fé, New Mexico, U.S.A.
 MUSK, MISS AGNES, Market-place, Mildenhall, Suffolk.
 MYERS, MRS., Brandon House, Cheltenham.
Myers, Frederic W. H., M.A., Leckhampton House, Cambridge.
 MYERS, MRS. F. W. H., Leckhampton House, Cambridge.
 MYLNE, MRS., 122, Gloucester-terrace, Hyde Park, London, W.
 NATHAN, S. H., Trinity College, Cambridge.
 NEATE, PERCY JOHN, F.G.S., M.M.E., Medway Iron Works, Rochester.
 NELSON, REV. GEORGE, LL.D., St. Michael's Vicarage, Bromley, Poplar, E.
 NELSON, MRS. R. A., The Rookery, Nungumbaukum, Madras.
 NEVILLE, FRANCIS HENRY, M.A., Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.
 NEWBOLD, MISS A., 4, Artillery-buildings, Victoria-street, S.W.
Newmann, Oscar P., 84, Newman-street, London, W.
 NEWSOM, JOHN, The American Trading Company, Yokohama, Japan.
 NEWTON, REV. R. HEBER, 781, Madison-avenue, New York, U.S.A.
 NICHOLL, ILTYD B., The Ham, Cowbridge, South Wales.
 NICHOLLS, REV. T. B., M.A., St. Oswald's College, Tynemouth.
 NICHOLSON, SIR CHARLES, BART., D.C.L., LL.D., M.D., The Grange,
 Totteridge, Herts.
 NICOLSON, SIR A., K.C.I.E., C.M.G., British Embassy, Constantinople.
 *NISBET, E. T., 17, Latimer-street, Tynemouth.
 NOAKES, D. W., 23, Nelson-street, Greenwich, S.E.
Noel-Cox, Herbert L. N., 2, Edinburgh Mansions, Victoria-st., S.W.
 NORRIS, WILLIAM ALFRED, Holmwood Lodge, Laton-road, Hastings.
 NUTTER, MRS., Fairseat, Wrotham, Kent.
 OAKELEY, MISS H. D., 97, Warwick-road, Earl's Court, S.W.
 OGILVIE, G. M., c/o Messrs. H. S. King and Co., 45, Pall Mall, S.W.
 OMAN, MRS., St. Philip's Lodge, Painswick-road, Cheltenham.
 OMAN, CHARLES W. C., M.A., All Souls' College, Oxford.
 O'NEILL, GREGORY L., M.B., 140, Elizabeth-st., Sydney, New South Wales.
 OPIE, EDWARD A. D., J.P., Pirie-street, Adelaide.
 OSBORNE, JAMES, Ph.C., Hershams, near Walton-on-Thames.
 OZANNE, MAJOR CHARLES H., 8, Victoria-road, Old Charlton, S.E.

- PACK-BERESFORD, DENIS R., Fenagh House, Bagnalstown, Co. Carlow.
PAGAN, MISS C., Marston Lodge, Harrow.
PAGET, LADY, Villa Bellosguardo, Florence.
PALMER, LIEUT. H.R., R.A., The Grand Dépôt Barracks, Woolwich.
PANTON, D. MORRIESON, Melrose, Porus P.O., Jamaica, W.I.
PARK, MISS MARGARET L. M., 23, Mecklenburgh-square, W.C.
PARKER, EDWARD W., Little Rock, Arkansas, U.S.A.
PARKES, R. J., 2, Church-street, Southport, Lancashire.
PARRY, REV. WILLIAM EDWARDS, B.A., 1, Bell-terrace, Clewer, Windsor.
PASSINGHAM, MRS., Fermoy, Castle Gregory, Co. Kerry.
PEAKE, C. W., B.A., c/o Mr. Wood, High-street, Newport, Salop.
PENNINGTON, MRS., c/o William Watson & Co., 28, Apollo-st., Bombay.
Perez, Dr. Jorge, Puerto de Orotava, Teneriffe, Canary Islands.
PERRY, E. C., M.D., M.A., Superintendent's House, Guy's Hospital, S.E.
PETHYBRIDGE, WALTER, 29, Methley-street, Kennington Cross, S.E.
Petrovo-Solovovo, Michael, 38, Serghievskaja, St. Petersburg.
PHILLMORE, R. C., 86, Eaton-place, London, S.W.
PHILLIPS, REV. J. T., 147, Beaufort-hill, Beaufort, Mon.
Phillips, Mrs. March, Edmonstone House, Cheltenham.
Phipps, Miss, Knebworth House, Stevenage, Herts.
PICKERING, JAMES R., A.I.E.E., 5, Carew-road, Thornton Heath.
Pilcher, Giles T., 29, Dawson-place, London, W.
PLENDERLEITH, WILLIAM, 60, Stroud Green-road, Finsbury Park, N.
Podmore, Frank, M.A., 32, Well-walk, Hampstead, N.W.
POLLEXFEN, F. H., 3, Chetwynd-road, Oxton, Cheshire.
POLLOCK, MISS, 50, Weymouth-street, London, W.
PONSONBY, HON. MRS., 2, Wilton-terrace, Belgrave-square, S.W.
PONSONBY, MISS, Glensouthwell, Rathfarnham, co. Dublin.
PONTIFEX, MISS, 72, Cornwall-gardens, London, S.W.
POPE, GEORGE H., M.A., B.C.L., Merchants' Hall, Bristol.
PORTER, MRS., Highbury Grange, Portarlington-road, Bournemouth, W.
Porter, Miss, 16, Russell-square, London, W.C.
PORTSMOUTH, THE COUNTESS OF, 2, Abbey-gardens, Westminster, S.W.
POSTGATE, PROFESSOR J. P., Litt.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
POWELL, MISS CONSTANCE M., 5, Campden Hill-square, London, W.
POWELL, GEORGE THOMPSON, Rotherwood, Sydenham Hill, S.E.
POWLES, LEWIS CHARLES, M.A., 9, Queen's Gate-place, London, S.W.
POWYS, HON. MRS. FOX, 29, Albion-street, Hyde Park, London, W.
PRAED, MRS. CAMPBELL, 16, Talbot-square, Hyde Park, London, W.
PREBLE, W. P., JUNR., 237, Broadway, New York, U.S.A.
PRIBITKOF, V., 23, Troitzky Péréoulok, St. Petersburg.
PRICKETT, MISS L. M., Ross Cottage, Fortune Gate-road, Harlesden.
PROTHERO, MRS., 63, Trumpington-street, Cambridge.
PULLEN, MISS, Milton View, Elsecar, Barnsley, Yorkshire.

- PUMPHREY, MRS., Shotley Bridge, co. Durham.
 PURDIE, MRS., 27, Palace-court, London, W.
Pye, William A., 25, Mark-lane, London, E.C.
 PYM, MRS. ANGELA, Bankside, Lunham-road, Upper Norwood, S.E.
 RAALTE, CHARLES VAN, Aldenham Abbey, Watford.
 RADNOR, THE COUNTESS OF, 52, Grosvenor-street, London, W.
 RALEIGH, WALTER A., M.A., 27, Ladbroke-road, London, W.
 RANSAY, PROFESSOR WILLIAM, Ph.D., F.R.S., 12, Arundel-gardens, W.
 RAMSAY, LADY, The Old House Wimbledon, S.W.
 RAPER, R. W., M.A., Trinity College, Oxford.
Raphael, Mrs. Walter, 7, Bramham-gardens, S. Kensington, S.W.
 RAUPERT, REV. H. G., 24, Queen Ann's-grove, Bedford Park, London, W.
Rayleigh, Clara Lady, 90, Onslow-gardens, London, S.W.
 READE, HERBERT V., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
 REICHEL, PRINCIPAL H. R., M.A., University College, Bangor.
 REYNOLDS, COLONEL H. C., Thorncliffe, Cheltenham.
 REYNOLDS, MRS., Millington House, Thelwall, near Warrington.
 RICHARDSON, FREDERIC WILLIAM, F.C.S., 2, Fareliffe-place, Bradford.
 RICHARDSON, ROBERT E., Trinity College, Cambridge.
 RIDDIFORD, MRS. W. H., Brookfield, Hucclecote, near Gloucester.
 RIDLEY, FRANK C., 17, Margaret-street, London, W.
Ridley, Henry N., M.A., F.L.S., Botanic Gardens, Singapore.
 RIDLEY, MISS, Stagshaw, Daleham-gardens, London, N.W.
 RIGG, THOMAS S. J., B.A., General Post Office, Sydney, New South Wales.
 ROBERTS, WILLIAM JOHNSON, 146, Pembroke-road, Dublin.
 ROBERTS, REV. W. W., 39, Addison-gardens, Kensington, W.
Robertson, C. Lockhart, M.D., Guns Green, The Drive, Wimbledon.
 ROBERTSON, GEORGE M., M.B., Royal Asylum, Morningside, Edinburgh.
 ROBERTSON, MRS., Nether Scale Hall, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.
Robertson, Miss N., 1, Oakley-street, Chelsea, S.W.
 ROBIN, PERCY A., B.A., George-street, Parkside, Adelaide, Australia.
 ROBINSON, DR. WILLIAM NEWMAN, Kadina, South Australia.
 ROGER, W. WALLACE, 31, Tavistock-square, London, W.C.
 *ROGERS, E. DAWSON, Rose Villa, Church End, Finchley, N.
Rogers, Rev. E. H., M.A., Thames Ditton, Kingston-on-Thames.
Rogers, George F., M.D., London Hospital, Whitechapel-road, E.
Ross, A. Galt, 7, Edinburgh-terrace, Victoria-road, London, W.
Rothschild, Mrs. Leopold de, 5, Hamilton-place, London, W.
 ROXBURGH, R., M.B., F.R.C.S.E., 1, Victoria-bdgs., Weston-super-Mare.
Rücker, Professor A. W., F.R.S., Errington, Clapham Park, S.W.
Russell, The Earl, Amberley Cottage, Maidenhead.
 RUSSELL, MRS. CAMPBELL, Golden Mead, Chislehurst.
 RUSSELL, JOHN, B.A., University Hall, Gordon-square, London, W.C.

Rylands, Thomas G., F.L.S., F.G.S., Highfields, Thelwall, near Warrington.

SAJOUS, CHARLES E., M.D., 28, Rue de Madrid, Paris.

SALMOND, PERCY N., Captain 3rd Royal Scots, Eldermere, Ilkley.

SAMALDAS, LALUBHAI, Chief Revenue Officer, Bhavnager, Bombay Presidency, India.

SAMPSON, COLONEL DUDLEY, Buxshalls, Lindfield, Hayward's Heath.

SAMS, REV. GEORGE F., M.A., Emberton Rectory, Newport Pagnell.

Sands, Mrs. Mahlon, 40, Portland-place, London, W.

SAUNDERS, LATIMER HENRY, Trevone House, Padstow.

SCHRAM, MISS LILIAN M.E., 178, Earl's Court-road, S.W.

SCHREIBER, MAJOR, 27, Fopstone-road, Earl's Court, S.W.

SCHUSTER, MISS, Cannizaro, Wimbledon, S.W.

SCHWABE, MRS. G. S., 3, Upper Belgrave-road, Clifton, Bristol.

Scott, Sydney C., Hatherleigh, 28, The Avenue, Gipsy Hill, London.

SCRIPPS, T. CECIL, Adelphi Chambers, London, W.C.

*SCUDAMORE, MRS., 3, Tollington-park, Holloway, London, N.

SEILERN, COUNT CHARLES, 23, Wolmersley-road, Stroud Green, N.

SELLIN, PROFESSOR C. W., 5, Wrangelstrasse, Hoheluft, Hamburg.

SELOUS, EDMUND, Barton Mills, near Mildenhall, Suffolk.

SEYMOUR, CAPTAIN EDWARD H., R.N., 9, Ovington-square, S.W.

SHADWELL, MISS BLANCHE, Trewollack, Bodmin.

SHAND, ALEXANDER F., 1, Edwardes-place, Kensington, W.

Sharpe, J. W., M.A., Woodroffe, Portarlington-road, Bournemouth.

SHEAVYN, ROBERT F., Long-street, Atherstone.

SHEPPARD, W. F., M.A., 2, Temple-gardens, E.C.

SHERIDAN, MRS. DUDLEY, Russell House, 4, West Kensington-gardens, W.

*SHIELD, MRS., Bowers Gifford Rectory, Essex.

SHOVE, MISS E., K.Q.C.P.L., M.B., 25, St. Mark's-cres., Regent's Pk., N.W.

SHROFF, M. M., R. H. Bhaya's House, Bora Bazar-st., Fort Bombay, India.

*SHUFELDT, DR. R. W., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

SHUTTLEWORTH, JOHN, Kenmare Bridge, by New Galloway, Kirkcudbrightshire, N.B.

Sidgwick, Arthur, M.A., 64, Woodstock-road, Oxford.

SIDGWICK, MRS. EDWARD, 29, Gloucester-square, London, W.

Sidgwick, Professor Henry, Newnham College, Cambridge.

Sidgwick, Mrs. H., Newnham College, Cambridge.

SIMPSON, REGINALD WYNNE, B.A., 14, Cornwall-gardens, S.W.

Sims, F. Manley, F.R.C.S., 12, Hertford-street, Mayfair, W.

Sisley, Richard, M.B., Park-row, Knightsbridge, London, W.

SKEFFINGTON, JOSEPH B., M.A., LL.B., Downpatrick, co. Down, Ireland.

SKENE, MISS F. M. F., 13, New Inn Hall-street, Oxford.

SLOMAN, REV. ARTHUR, M.A., The School House, Birkenhead.

SLOMAN, SAMUEL GEORGE, JUNR., 39, West-street, Farnham.

- SMART, J. NAISH, Sydney House, Burnham.
 SMITH, G. ALBERT, St. Ann's Well, Brighton.
 SMITH, GEORGE M., Custom House, Amble, Northumberland.
 SMITH, REV. CANON H. B., M.A., Grange over Sands, Lancashire.
 SMITH, HENRY, M.D. (Jena) Cravensea, Cockington, Torquay.
Smith, Henry Arthur, 1, New-square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.
 SMITH, H. BABINGTON, B.A., Government House, Calcutta.
 SMITH, JOHN GEORGE, 29, Cadogan-terrace, London, S.W.
 SMITH, MISS J. M., Hyde Park Court, Albert Gate, London, W.
Smith, Philip Sherwood, 46, Johnson-place, Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.
 SMITH, R. MORRIS, 3, 715, Chestnut-street, W. Philadelphia, U.S.A.
Smith, R. Pearsall, 44, Grosvenor-road, London, S.W.
 SMITH, REV. CANON R. TRAVERS, B.D., Vicarage, Clyde-road, Dublin.
 SMITH, WALLACE A., 34, Devonshire-street, Portland-place, London, W.
 SMITH, MRS., Barnes Hall, Sheffield.
 SNAPE, MRS. Markland Hill, Heaton, Bolton.
 SNOW, CHESTER A., 712, Eighth-street, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Solovioff, Wsevolod,
Soltykoff, Prince Alexis,
Somerset, Lady Henry, The Priory, Reigate.
Somerset, H. Somers, The Priory, Reigate.
Speer, Mrs. Stanhope, Ashley Villa, Ventnor, Isle of Wight.
Speer, Charlton T., Glenhurst, The Common, Sutton, Surrey.
 SPENCER, MISS GEORGIANA M., 25, York-street, Portman-square, W.
 SPERLING, ARTHUR, J.P., Lattenbury Hill, St. Ives, Hunts.
 SPINKS, JUDGE, Vernon, British Columbia.
 ST. GEORGE, MRS., 2, Jervis-place, Clonmel, Ireland.
 STACKHOUSE, MRS. M. F., Stackhouse, Settle.
Stainforth, Miss Emily, 15, Matheson-road, West Kensington, W.
Stanley, Henry M., D.C.L., LL.D., 2, Richmond-terrace, S.W.
 STANWAY, MISS EMILY, 17, Park-street, Taunton.
 STAPLEY, ALFRED M., St. John's College, Cambridge.
 STAPLEY, RICHARD, 33, Bloomsbury-square, London, W.C.
 STAPLEY, MRS., 33, Bloomsbury-square, London, W.C.
Stead, William T., Cambridge House, Wimbledon S.W.
Stearn, H. T., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Stephenson, Sir Augustus K., K.C.B., Q.C., 46, Ennismore-gdns, S.W.
 STEPNEY, HON. LADY, 3, Chesham-street, London, S.W.
 STEVENSON, GEORGE, c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., Hastings-st., Calcutta.
 STEVENSON, R. L., Vailinia Plantation, Upolu, Samoan Islands.
 STEWART, MRS. CHARLOTTE A., Largham, Coupar Angus, N.B.
 STEWART, MISS SUSAN, 89, Philbeach-gardens, London, S.W.
 STILLMAN, W. J., 3, Challoner-street, West Kensington, W.
 STIRLING, J. M. MORRIES, Gogar House, Stirling, N.B.

- STONE, MISS EDITH L., Shute Hay, Walditch, Bridport.
STOUT, GEORGE F., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
STURGES, MRS. WILLIAM, 32, Charles-street, Berkeley-sq., London, W.
Sturgis, Julian, M.A., 2, Gloucester-place, Portman-sq., London, W.
*SUGDEN, REV. E. H., B.A., B.Sc., Bradford, Yorkshire.
SUMMERSON, SAMUEL J., Haughton-le-Skerne, Darlington.
SWAN, C. A., 10, Delamere-street, London, S.W.
SWANWICK, MISS ANNA, 23, Cumberland-terrace, London, N.W.
SWEETING, RICHARD, D.H., B.A., D.P.H., 6, Hereford Mansions, Hereford-road, Bayswater, W.
SWIRE, HENRY, CAPTAIN, 2, Nightingale-place, Woolwich.
SYMONS, MISS JESSIE H., 91, Wigmore-street, London, W.
SYNGE REV. F., M.A., 1, Daleham-gardens, South Hampstead, N.W.
TANCRED, MRS. CLEMENT, 2, Princes' Mansions, Victoria-street, S.W.
Talbot, The Lady Edmund, 26, Curzon-street, Mayfair, London, W.
TANNER, ERNEST, Hazlehurst, Penarth.
Tanner, Slingsby, 104B, Mount-street, Berkeley-square, W.
TATTERSALL, JAMES GRANVILLE, Hanover-square Club, London, W.
Tattersall, Robert W., 31, New Inn Hall-street, Oxford.
TATTERSALL, WM., 90, High-street, Oxford.
TAUNTON, MRS. R. H., Brook Vale, Witton, near Birmingham.
TAXIS, THE PRINCESS, Grosse Mohrengasse, Vienna.
TAYLOR, REV. ARNOLD D., B.A., Churchstanton Rectory, Honiton, Devon.
Taylor, Rev. Charles J., M.A., The Larches, Banstead, Surrey.
Taylor, Miss Edith, 9, Milner-square, London, W.
Taylor, Lieut.-Colonel G. L. Le M., Lismore, Guildford.
TEBB, ALBERT E., M.D., 173, Finchley Road, Hampstead, N.W.
TEBB, MRS., Rede Hall, near Burstow, by Horley, Surrey.
THACKERAY, MRS. W. G., 32, Kidbrooke Park-road, Blackheath, S.E.
THATCHER, MISS, 36, Devonshire-street, Portland-place, London, W.
THEOBALD, MORELL, 62, Granville-park, Lewisham, S.E.
THOMAS, A. C., Korumburra, Gippsland, Victoria, Australia.
Thomas, Joseph William, F.I.C., F.C.S., Drumpellier, Gloucester.
THOMPSON, I. C., F.L.S., F.R.M.S., Woodstock, Waverley-rd., Liverpool.
Thomson, Prof. J. J., M.A., F.R.S., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Thorpe, Mrs. Mary, Lenton House, Lenton, Nottingham.
THURSTAN, FREDERIC, W., M.A., c/o The Nawab Fakhr-ul-Mulk, Bahadur, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.
TODD, MRS., Maclean, Clarence River, New South Wales.
TOOTH, REV. ARTHUR, M.A., Woodside, Croydon.
TOWNLEY, MISS F. M., 47, Brunswick-place, Brighton.
TRAHERNE, MRS., Coedriglan Park, Cardiff.
TRENCH, J. TOWNSEND, J.P., Kenmare, Ireland.
TREVOR, REV. THOMAS WARREN, M.A., Penmon Vicarage, Beaumaris.

- Tuckey, C. Lloyd, M.D.**, 33, Green-street, Grosvenor-square, W.
TUKER, MISS MILDRED A.R., 4, Oxford and Cambridge Mansions, N.W.
Tweedale, Mrs., Milton Hall, Cambridgeshire.
TWEEDIE, DAVID M., Adelaide.
TYRER, MRS. W., Woodleigh, Prescott.
UNDERWOOD, REV. CANON C. W., M.A., Histon Vicarage, Cambridge.
Vacher, William H., 54, Addison Mansions, Kensington, S.W.
VAILATI, PROFESSOR GIOVANNI, Crema, Italy.
VAN EEDEN, FREDERICK, M.D., Bussum, Holland.
VAN RENTERGHEM, A. W., M.D., 251, Keisersgracht, Amsterdam.
VENMAN, HEZEKIAH, 20, Pimlico-road, London, S.W.
VENN, J., D.Sc., F.R.S., Caius College, Cambridge.
VERRALL, MRS., Selwyn-gardens, Cambridge.
VERRALL, MISS M. E., 26, Gloucester-place, Brighton.
VIAN-WILLIAMS, REV. H., 3, Waterloo-place, North Shields.
VICARS, G. R., M.D., Branston, Lincoln.
VILLAMARINA, THE MARCHESA DI, Palazza Reale, Quirinale, Rome.
VINCENT, MARIA LADY, Villa Flora, Cannes, France.
Vincent, R. Harry, Fernbank, Leytonstone, N.E.
VIVIAN, H., Trinity College, Cambridge.
VORES, ARTHUR, M.R.C.S., 8, Mansfield-street, Cavendish-square, W.
Walford, Col. Neville L., R.A., 1, Ashburn-place, London, S.W.
WALKER, MRS. EMMA, 42, Kingsnorth-gardens, Folkestone.
Walker, Mrs. Stewart, Shrewsbury House, Oxtou, Cheshire.
WALLACE, ABRAHAM, M.D., 64, Harley-street, London, W.
***WALWYN, MRS.**, 9, Sion Hill, Clifton, Bristol.
WARBURTON, REV. W. T., M.A., The Vicarage, Rock Ferry, Birkenhead.
WARD, WILFRID, Molescroft, Eastbourne.
WARD, THE HON. MISS, Castle Ward, Downpatrick.
WARDROP, MRS., 10, Lower Belgrave-street, Eaton-square, S.W.
WARRAND, MRS., Bught, Inverness, N.B.
WARTER, MRS. TATHAM, Longden Manor, Pontesford, Salop.
WASSELL, H. A., F.R.A.S., Addenbrook Villa, Old Swinford, Stourbridge.
WATERHOUSE, C.H., M.D., 56, Karl Ludwig Strasse, Ober-Döbling, Vienna.
WATSON, REV. JOHN, M.A., 18, Sefton Drive, Liverpool.
WATSON, MRS. W. C., 39, Gloucester-square, London, W.
WEBBER-SMITH, COLONEL JAMES, 27, Shaftesbury-avenue, London, W.
Webb, Godfrey, 13, Victoria-street, London, S.W.
WEDD, N., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., M.A., Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex.
WELLS, EDMUND P., C.E., 26, Cambridge-gardens, N. Kensington, W.
WELLS, MISS GRENVILLE, 27, Westbourne-square, London, W.
WEMYSS, MISS A., Washwell House, Painswick, Gloucestershire.
WESTCOTT, WILLIAM WYNN, M.B., D.P.H., 396, Camden-road, London, N.

- Westlake, Ernest, F.G.S.**, 2, Ridgeway-road, Redhill.
WHATELY, MRS. HENRY, 14, Campden House-road, Kensington, W.
WHERRY, G. E., F.R.C.S., Corpus-buildings, Cambridge.
WHISHAW, MRS. BERNHARD, 173, Maida Vale, London, W.
WHITAKER, JOSEPH J. S., Villa Malfitano, Palermo, Sicily.
Whitear, Rev. W., B.A., 107, Florence-road, Finsbury Park, N.
WHITEHEAD, JOHN, Esplanade, Guernsey.
WHITING, J. MARKBY, 58, Tedworth-square, Chelsea, S.W.
WIGAN, W. L., Clare Cottage, East Malling, Maidstone.
Wilde, Mrs. Oscar, 16, Tite-street, Chelsea, S.W.
WILLAN, MISS FLORENCE M., Hanley Castle, near Worcester.
WILLARD, MISS FRANCES E., The Cottage, Reigate.
WILLETT, MRS., Bedales, Lindfield, near Haywards Heath, Sussex.
WILLIAMS, A. C. REDSHAW, 9, Upper Beulah-hill, Upper Norwood, S.E.
WILLIAMS, REV. NELSON G., M.A., Ketteringham, Wymondham, Norfolk.
WILLIAMS, MISS S., The Reservoir, Edgbaston, near Birmingham.
Willmott, Miss R., Warley Place, Great Warley, Essex.
Wilson, David H., M.A., Dunridge, West Hill, St. Leonards-on-Sea.
WILSON, HERBERT W., The Woodlands, Athlone.
WINDEYER, THE HON. W. C. JUSTICE, Supreme Court, Sydney, Australia.
WINGFIELD, MRS. EDWARD, 40, Albion-street, Hyde Park, W.
WINGFIELD, H. E., M.A., 58, Tedworth-square, Chelsea, S.W.
*WINGFIELD, MRS., Belvidere Place, Church-road, Wimbledon.
Wisden, Lieut. Thomas F. M., Broadwater, near Worthing.
WITHERBY, ARTHUR GEORGE, B.A., 117A, Earl's Court-road, S.W.
WITHERS, J. J., B.A., 2, Museum Chambers, Bury-st., Bloomsbury, W.C.
WITTIG, GREGOR C., 2, Körnerstrasse, Leipzig.
WOEIKOW, ALEXIS, Moika 28, St. Petersburg.
WOOD, REV. CANON, M.A., Newent Rectory, Gloucestershire.
Woodhouse, G. H., Heath Bank, Bolton.
WRIGHT, ARTHUR J., M.A., Kensington Palace Mansions, London, W.
WYLD, GEORGE, M.D., Fieldhead, Wimbledon Park, S.W.
WYLLIE, J. EILENROE, Cap d'Antibes, S. France.
Wyndham, Hon. Percy, 44, Belgrave-square, London, S.W.
YEARSLEY, P. MACLEOD, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Chalk-hill House, Kingsbury-Neasden, N.W.
Yorke, Hon. Alexander, 32A, Orchard-street, London, W.
YOUNG, REV. CHARLES JOHN, F.R.A.S., Stafford-place, Halifax.
YOUNG, PROFESSOR W. H., 11, Werder Strasse, Baden Baden, Germany.

N.B.—Members and Associates are requested to send information of any change of address to the Assistant-Secretary, 19, Buckingham-street, Adelphi, London, W.C.

MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES OF THE AMERICAN BRANCH.

(AUGUST 1ST, 1894.)

*Names of Members are printed in **Black Type.***

Names of Honorary Associates are prefixed by an Asterisk.

Names of Associates are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.

All Addresses are "U.S.A." except when another Country is named.

- ALBERY, MRS. H. M. L., Colusa, Colusa Co., Cal.
 ALBREE, JOHN, JUNR., 56, Bedford-street, Boston, Mass.
 ALBREE, JOSEPH, 20, Market-street, Allegheny, Pa.
 ALDEN, F. E., Vandergrift Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 ALEXANDER, DON, 454, Oak-street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 ALEXANDER, W. L., Canton, Ohio.
 *ALEXANDER, MRS. KEZIA E., Birmingham, Mich.
 ALLEN, PROF. J., Univ. of City of N. Y., Washington-sq., New York, N. Y.
 ALLEN, REV. M. THERESA, Liberal, Mo.
 ALMY, FRANCIS, Buffalo, N. Y.
 AMES, MRS. JOSEPH B., 5, Richter-terrace, Brookline, Mass.
 ANDREW, MISS ELIZABETH L., Old Colony Hill, Hingham, Mass.
 ANNES, A. L., Wansan, Wis.
 ARNOLD, J. N., 19, College-street, Providence, R. I.
 AUER, MRS. C., 65, Lefferts-place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 AUSTEN, MRS. GEORGE, Morris Plains, New Jersey.
 AVERY, MISS M. H., 137, Academy-st., Poughkeepsie, New York, N. Y.
 AYER, J. C., 68, West 91st-street, New York, N. Y.
 AYERS, GEORGE D., Malden, Mass.
 BAKER, ALFRED L., 2,729, Prairie-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 BAKER, DR. SMITH, Winston-building, Utica, N. Y.
 BALDWIN, HENRY C., 1729, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
 BANCROFT, MRS. JOHN C., 61, Mount Vernon-street, Boston, Mass.
 BARNES, W. A., New Madrid, Mo.
 BARR, JAMES M., c/o Institute of the City and Guilds of London,
 Central Institute, Exhibition-road, London, S. W.
 BARROWS, C. M., Walnut-street, Brookline, Mass.

- Bartlett, James W.**, 211, Central-avenue, Dover, N.H.
BEALE, C. W., Arden, North Carolina.
BEAM, MRS. JOHN V., JR., 10, West 30th-street, New York, N.Y.
BELDEN, MRS. AMANDA, 4,726, Woodlawn-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Bigelow, Dr. W. S., 60, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
BLACKFORD, A., 322, South Main-street, Findlay, Ohio.
Blackmar, Paul, 406, Lumber Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
Blake, Francis, Keowaydin, Weston, Auburndale, P.O., Mass.
BLODGETT, C., M.D., 238, Maple-street, Holyoke, Mass.
BLODGETT, MRS., 238, Maple-street, Holyoke, Mass.
BOARDMAN, W. F., Department of the Interior, Ottawa, Canada.
BOON, MRS. E. G., Villa de la Grazia, Alassio, Riviera di Ponente, Italy.
BOTH-HENDRIKSEN, MISS LOUISE, 166, Macon-street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Bowditch, C. P., 28, State-street, Boston, Mass.
BOWDITCH, PROFESSOR H. P., Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.
Bradley, Miss A. A., 179, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
BRIGGS, DR. E. C., 125, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
Brimmer, Martin, 47, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
Brimmer, Mrs. Martin, 47, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
BROMBERG, FREDERICK G., Mobile, Alabama.
BROOKS, HENRY, 15, Milk-street, Boston, Mass.
BROWN, ALFRED S., 195, Broadway, New York, N.Y.
BROWN, DELASS S., 309, Main-street, Peoria, Ill.
BROWNE, G. H., 16, Garden-street, Cambridge, Mass.
BROWNE, MRS. L. ANDREWS, 131, Sargent-street, Newton, Mass.
BRYAN, W., c/o Messrs. Bottler Bros., Main-street, Houston, Texas.
BUFFETT, DR. E. P., 520, Bergen-avenue, Jersey City Heights, N. J.
BULLARD, DR. W. N., 89, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
BULLEY, R. H., Canton, Ohio.
BUNDY, MRS. MARY E., Box 1069, So. Evaston, Ill.
BURGE, MISS MARIE L., 132, Montague-street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Butler, C. W., M.D., 35, Fullerton-av., South, Montclair, N.J.
Butler, Miss Virginia, Stockbridge, Mass.
CABOT, CAROLINE A., M.D., 168, W.-48th Street, New York, N.Y.
Carey, A. A., 29, Fairfield-street, Boston, Mass.
CAREY, MRS. A. A., 29, Fairfield-street, Boston, Mass.
Carnochan, Gouverneur M., 46, Exchange-place, New York, N.Y.
CARPENTER, FRANK B., Tiffany Building, 337, 4th-avenue, New York.
CARPENTER FRANKLIN R., M.A., Ph.D., Deadwood, South Dakota.
CARPENTER, MRS. FRANKLIN R., Deadwood, South Dakota.
CARPENTER, W. O., 517, Adams-street, Chicago, Ill.
CARR, LUCIEN, 163, Brattle-street, Cambridge, Mass.
CARR, ROBERT S., Hamilton, Ohio.
Casey, Theodore B., Minneapolis, Minn.

- CATLIN, CAPTAIN R., 1,428, Euclid-place, Washington, D.C.
 CAULKINS, SILAS, Soldiers' Home, San Bernardino, California.
 CHAPIN, F. W., M.D., Hot Springs, Virginia.
 CHAPMAN, MRS. J. J., 327, West 82nd-street, New York, N.Y.
 CHEESMAN, DR. W. S., 22, William-street, Auburn, N.Y.
 CHENEY, DR. FRED. E., Hotel Bristol, Boston, Mass.
Cheney, W. T., 220, Broad-street, Rome, Georgia.
 CHENOWETH, MRS. C. VAN D., Shrewsbury, Worcester Co., Mass.
 CHICK, FRANK W., Madrid, Franklin Co., Maine.
 CLARKE, J. E., Ph.D., 214, South 43rd-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 CLAYPOLE, PROFESSOR E. W., 603, Buchtel-avenue, Akron, Ohio.
 CLEAVES, N. PORTER, 29, India-street, Boston, Mass.
 CLOUGH, ALBERT L., Box 114, Manchester, N.H.
 COBB, MRS. FRANCIS D., Barnstable, Mass.
 COFFIN, CHARLES A., 109, Nahant-street, Lynn, Mass.
Coffin, C. P., 39, Court-street, Boston, Mass.
 COLEMAN, MISS ANNE C., Lebanon, Pennsylvania.
 *COLEMAN, WILLIAM EMMETTE, Chief Quartermaster's Office, San Francisco, Cal.
 COLSON, W. A., Cor. Buckner-avenue and Bluff-street, Peoria, Ill.
 COMPTON, PROF. ELIAS, Wooster University, Wooster, Ohio.
 CONNER, MRS. ELIZA A., American Press Association, 45 & 47, Park-place, New York, N.Y.
Cook, Mrs. Ellen K., 220, Main-street, Davenport, Iowa.
 COONLEY, MRS. JOHN C., 620, Division-street, Chicago, Ill.
 COPE, PROFESSOR EDWARD D., 2,102, Pine-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 CORNING, MRS. M. S., Oxford, Maine.
 CORYELL, V. M., 310, Sixth-avenue, New York, N.Y.
 COTTON, MARY H., M.D., Portsmouth, Ohio.
Cowles, Dr. E., McLean Asylum, Somerville, Mass.
 CRAFTS, JAMES M., 59, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
 CRAFTS, MRS. J. M., 59, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
 CRAIG, JOHN W., Box 291, San Bernardino, Cal.
 CREPIN, ERNEST E., 4,726, Woodlawn-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 CRITCHLOW, E. B., Salt Lake City, Utah.
 CROCKER, MRS. F. E., P. O. Box 59, Columbus Junction, Iowa.
Crosby, Mrs. Eleanor F., Gardner-road, Brookline, Mass.
 CROSBY, PROFESSOR W. O., Society Natural History, Boston, Mass.
 CROSWELL, JAMES G., 17, West 44th-street, New York, N.Y.
 CROTHERS, DR. T. D., Walnut Lodge, Hartford, Conn.
 CURRAN, RICHARD L., 219, Genesee-street, Utica, N.Y.
Curtis, W. E., 1740. M-street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
 CUSHING, MRS. F. W., Highland Park, Ill.
 DAILEY, JUDGE ABRAM H., 16, Court-street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

- DARROW, CLARENCE S., 3,559, Vernon-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Davidson, Thomas, Prof., 239, West 105th-street, New York, N.Y.
DAWBARN, ROBERT H. M., M.D., 105, W. 74th-st., New York, N.Y.
DELABARRE, PROF. G. B., 9, Arlington-avenue, Providence, R.I.
DELAND, MRS. LORIN F., 112, Mount Vernon-street, Boston, Mass.
DEXTER, MRS. GEORGE, Egmont-street, Brookline, Mass.
DICKEY, CALVIN, M.A., Room 22, 94, Washington-street, Chicago, Ill.
DIKE, MISS FLORENCE B., 207, West 57th-street, New York, N.Y.
DIMMOCK, GEORGE, P. O. Box 15, Canobie Lake, N.H.
DOANE, MRS. W. E., Stockbridge, Mass.
Dodge, J. T., 340, West Washington-avenue, Madison, Wis.
DOLE, NATHAN H., "Hedgecote," Glen-road, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
DONALD, REV. DR. E. WINCHESTER, Trinity Church, Boston, Mass.
DORR, MRS. C. H., 18, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
DORR, GEORGE B., 18, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
Dow, Alexander, 331, West 85th-street, New York, N.Y.
DROWN, T. PICKERING, 351, Congress-street, Boston, Mass.
DUNCAN, W. A., Ph.D., Syracuse, N.Y.
Dunham, Miss E. L., 37, East 36th-street, New York, N.Y.
DWIGHT, MRS. JAMES, Stockbridge, Mass.
DYER, WALTER H., Knightsville, Maine.
EDMUNDS, MISS L., c/o R. Hodgson, 5, Boylston-place, Boston, Mass.
Edwards, Mrs. Mary H., 161, Main-street, Keene, N.H.
Ellis, Miss Lucy, 330, Boylston-street, Boston, Mass.
ERRANI, MRS. CHARLOTTE, 118, East 26th-street, New York, N.Y.
ESTERLY, MRS. G. W., 2,027, Kenwood Parkway, Minneapolis, Minn.
ESTY, PROFESSOR WILLIAM C., Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
ETHERIDGE, MISS FANNY S., 91, Round-hill, Northampton, Mass.
EVANS, MISS ELLA K., 186, North-street, Buffalo, N.Y.
EVANS, MRS. GLENDOWER, 12, Otis-place, Boston, Mass.
EVERETT, PROFESSOR C. C., 23, Berkeley-street, Cambridge, Mass.
FARMER, MISS SARAH J., Eliot, Maine.
FAYES, PROF. CHAS., LL.D., 150, East 45th-street, New York, N.Y.
Felton, Thomas C., Hotel Ludlow, Boston, Mass.
FERGUSON, J. H., Talmage, Nebraska.
FIELDS, MRS. JAMES T., 148, Charles-street, Boston, Mass.
FILLEBROWN, THOS., M.D., D.M.D., 157, Newbury-street, Boston, Mass.
FINNIGAN, JOHN, 90, Gold-street, New York, N.Y.
FISKE, REV. RICHMOND, D.D., 251, Lexington-st., East Boston, Mass.
FLUHRER, REV. CHARLES, D.D., Grand Rapids, Michigan.
FORBES, JOHN M., Milton, Mass.
FORBES, W. H., 181, Devonshire-street, Boston, Mass.
Frothingham, O. B., 118, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
Fullerton, C. W., 94, Dearborn-street, Chicago, Ill.

- FULLERTON, PROFESSOR G. S., 4,116, Spruce-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gage, Lyman J., 470, North State-street, Chicago, Ill.
Gale, Harlow S., 43, Bülow-strasse, Berlin.
 GARDINER, DR. EDWARD G., Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
 GARDINER, PROFESSOR H. N., 23, Craft's-avenue, Northampton, Mass.
 GARDINER, J. HAYS, Hawes-street, Longford, Mass.
Gardner, Mrs. John L., 152, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
 GENUNG, PROF. J. FRANKLIN, Ph.D., Amherst, Mass.
Gerrish, Dr. F. H., 675, Congress-street, Portland, Maine.
Gill, Wm. Fearing, 3, East 86th-street, New York, N.Y.
Gilman, Benjamin I., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.
 GLEASON, ADELE A., M.D., The Sanitarium, Elmira, N.Y.
 GODDARD, GEORGE A., 1, Mount Vernon-place, Boston, Mass.
 GODDARD, MRS. MOSES, 25, Brown-street, Providence, R.I.
 GOFF, F. C., Morgan Run Coal and Mining Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
 GOODALE, HENRY STERLING, 400, West 57th-street, New York, N.Y.
 GOODNOW, H. R., 95, Riverside Drive, New York.
 GOODRIDGE, MRS. FREDERICK, 250, Fifth-avenue, New York, N.Y.
 GOODWIN, W. H., JUNR., Sioux City, Iowa.
 GRAY, MISS AGNES W., 1, Berkeley-street, Cambridge, Mass.
 GRAY, MRS. JOHN C., 176, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
 GREELEY, MRS. C. A., Nashua, Iowa.
Green, Mrs. Richmond, Easthampton, Mass.
 GREENE, MISS, Hotel Brunswick, New York, N.Y.
 GRIDLEY, J. N., Virginia, Ill.
 GRIFFIN, REV. R. A., Columbus-avenue, Northampton, Mass.
 GRIFFING, MRS. C. R., 729, Amsterdam-avenue, New York, N.Y.
 GROVER, REV. G. W., 22, Temple-street, Nashua, New Hampshire.
Grower, George G., Ansonia Brass and Copper Co., Ansonia, Conn.
 GULLIVER, PROFESSOR JULIA H., Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
 HALE, GEORGE S., 10, Tremont-street, Boston, Mass.
 HALL, HON. G. E., Consulat Impérial de Turquie, San Francisco, Cal.
 HALL, PROFESSOR JAMES, New York State Museum, Albany, N.Y.
 HALL, DR. T. P., Tabor, Fremont Co., Iowa.
 HAMBLET, EUGENE, P. O. Box 12, Dracut, Mass.
 HAMILTON, C. M., 50, Main-street, Salamanca, N.Y.
 HANSEN, OTTO R., 649, Cass-street, Milwaukee, Wis.
 HARDAWAY, W. A., M.D., 2,710, Olive-street, St. Louis, Mo.
Harden, Judge William D., Savannah, Georgia.
 HARRIS, REV. J.A., D.D., St. Paul's Rectory, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia.
 HARRIS, JOHN J., St. Louis Insane Asylum, St. Louis, Mo.
 HARRIS, WILLIAM T., LL.D., 914, 23rd-street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
 HARTZELL, T. S., 73, Navarre-street, Canton, Ohio.
 HARWOOD, C. H., M.D., 208, Dartmouth-street, Boston, Mass.

- HAWKINS, WILLIAM M., 6, Coit Block, West Swan-street, Buffalo, N.Y.
HAWORTH, GEORGE D., Decatur, Ill.
HAYNES, HENRY W., 239, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
HAYWARD, ALVINZA, 224, California-street, San Francisco, Cal.
HEARD, JOHN, JUNR., c/o Messrs. Baring & Co., London, England.
HEDGES, MRS. SIDNEY M., 76, Highland-street, Roxbury, Mass.
HELLNER, REV. S. A., D.D., 813, South 3rd-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hemenway, Augustus, Readville, Mass.
HEYER, GEORGE W., 619, Main-street, Houston, Texas.
HEYWOOD, CHARLES, Gardner, Mass.
HICKS, BENJ. D., Old Westbury, Queen's Co., N.Y.
HILES, OGDEN, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Hill, Mrs. A. S., 19, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
HODGSON, RICHARD, LL.D., 5, Boylston-place, Boston, Mass.
HOFFMAN, PROFESSOR F. S., Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.
HOLBROOK, LEVI, P. O. Box 536, New York, N.Y.
HOLBROOK, DR. M. L., 46, East 21st-street, New York, N.Y.
HOLLADAY, PROF. WALLER, 400, West 57th-street, New York, N.Y.
HOLMES, MRS. JULIA SADLER, 112, West 118th-st., New York, N.Y.
HOLMES, REV. S. V. V., Westminster Church, Delaware Avenue,
Buffalo, N.Y.
Holt, Henry, 29, West 23rd-street, New York, N.Y.
HOLT, L. EMMETT, M.D., 15, East 54th-street, New York, N.Y.
HOMMEL, P. A., 794, 2nd-avenue, Pittsburg, Pa.
HOOPER, MISS E. R., 141, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
HOTCHKISS, MISS JEANNIE E., M.A., Rathbun House, Elmira, New York.
HOYLE, W., El Toro, Orange County, Cal.
HUBBARD, ROBERT M., 322, Pine-street, St. Louis, Mo.
HUDSON, THOMSON JAY, 10, Ninth-street, S.E., Washington, D.C.
Hudson, Woodward, Concord, Mass.
Hull, Miss P. C., 22, John-street, Providence, R.I.
HUNT, CHAS. R., M.D., 262, Union-street, New Bedford, Mass.
HURLEY, A. M., corner of First and Monmouth-sts., Independence, Oregon.
HUSE, WM., Ponca, Dixon Co., Nebraska.
HUTCHINSON, DR. MAHLON, 100, State-street, Chicago, Ill.
HYSLOP, PROFESSOR J. H., Columbia College, New York, N.Y.
Jackson, Mrs. Flora J., 558, Milwaukee-street, Milwaukee, Wis.
JAMES, MRS. C. E. L., c/o Bleacher Luce, 10th and Chestnut-streets,
Fort Smith, Ark.
James, Dr. F. H., 2,627, Olive-street, St. Louis, Mo.
James, Professor William, 95, Irving-street, Cambridge, Mass.
JANUARY, MRS. J. LINDELL, c/o Messrs. Brown, Shipley & Co., London.
Jayne, H. La Barre, 505, Chestnut-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Jefferson, J., Buzzard's Bay, Mass.

- Jenks, Mrs. P. A.**, 290, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
JEWETT, MISS S. O., South Berwick, Maine.
JOHNSON, CHARLES R., Box 492, 405, Main-street, Worcester, Mass.
JOHNSON, PROFESSOR ROGER B., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
JOHNSON, THOMAS M., Osceola, St. Clair Co., Mo.
JOLINE, MRS. ADRIAN H., 1, West 72nd-street, New York, N.Y.
JONES, GEORGE H., 561, Madison-avenue, New York, N.Y.
JONES, MISS THERESA E., South Evanston, Ill.
JOSLYN, JOHN R., 208, E. Water-street, Elmira, N.Y.
KEHEW, MRS. WILLIAM B., 317, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
KELLY, W. C., Shelbyville, Ill.
KELLY, W. F., 918, Walnut-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
KEMPTON, CHARLES W., 61, Oro Blanco, Pima Co., Arizona.
KIBBE, A. B., M.D., 326, Bailey-building, Seattle, Washington.
KIDD, G. W., 853, Fifth-avenue, New York, N.Y.
KILNER, MRS. S. E., 333, West 78th-street, New York, N.Y.
Kimball, Miss Hannah P., 325, Commonwealth-ave., Boston, Mass.
KING, J. STEBBINS, M.D., Syndicate Block, Decatur, Ill.
KNOWLES, REV. EDWARD R., 30, Institute-road, Worcester, Mass.
KOFTA, MADAME FLORA P., Gut Podmok in Podmok, Post Shüttenhofen, Bohemia.
KREKEL, MRS. M.P., 802, East 11th-street, Kansas City, Mo.
KUHN, HAMILTON, 36, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
KUHN, MRS. HARTMAN, 36, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
LAMONT, ROBERT, 60, St. James's-place, Brooklyn, N.Y.
LANG, B. J., 8, Brimmer-street, Boston, Mass.
LANGLEY, PROFESSOR S. P., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
LATHAM, MISS V. A., B.Sc., N. W. Univ., Woman's Medical College, S. Lincoln-street, Chicago, Ill.
LATHROP, JOHN, 10, Gloucester-street, Boston, Mass.
LAWRENCE, MRS. AMORY A., 59, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
Lawrence, A. E., Junr., Exeter Chambers, Back Bay, Boston, Mass.
Lawton, Miss Elizabeth, 142, East 18th-street, New York, N.Y.
LEDYARD, MRS. R. F. H., Cazenovia, New York, N.Y.
LEE, MRS. M. H., 21, Chauncey-street, Cambridge, Mass.
LEONARD, THOMAS, 628, 22nd-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
LEONHARDT, J. S., M.Sc., M.D., 1,427, O-street, Lincoln, Nebraska.
LEWIS, P. M., M.D., Lecompton, Kansas.
LIBRARIAN, Bowdoin College Library, Brunswick, Maine.
LIBRARIAN, Cassadaga Lake Library Association, Lily Dale, N.Y.
LIBRARIAN, Cutting's Free Library, Lunenburg, Vermont.
LIBRARIAN, Denver Public Library, Denver, Colo.
LIBRARIAN, Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore City, Baltimore.
LIBRARIAN, Hackley Public Library, Muskegon, Mich.

- LIBRARIAN, Haverhill Public Library, Haverhill, Mass.
LIBRARIAN, Lowell City Library, Lowell, Mass.
LIBRARIAN, Malden Public Library, Malden, Mass.
LIBRARIAN, Michigan State Library, Lansing, Mich.
LIBRARIAN, University Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
LIBRARIAN, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
LIBRARIAN, Peoria Public Library, Peoria, Ill.
LIBRARIAN, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, New York, N.Y.
LIBRARIAN, San Francisco Free Public Library, San Francisco, Cal.
LIBRARIAN, (Springfield) City Library Association, Springfield, Mass.
LIPPITT, GENERAL FRANCIS J., Onsett, Mass.
LITTLEFIELD, J., c/o S. S. White & Co., 12th & Chestnut-sts., Philadelphia.
LOCKWOOD, COLONEL J. S., 146, Franklin-street, Boston, Mass.
Lodge, Mrs. John E., 31, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
Logan, W. S., 58, William-street, New York, N.Y.
LOMBARDI, C., 1,314, Rusk-avenue, Houston, Texas.
LONG, GEORGE E., Jos. Dixon Crucible Company, Jersey City, N.J.
LOUNSBERRY, C. A., Fargo, N.D.
Lukens, Dr. Anna, 1,068, Lexington-avenue, New York, N.Y.
LYMAN, JOSEPH B., University-bldg., Washington-sq., E., New York.
MACDONOUGH, THOMAS B., West End, Long Branch, N.J.
MACLEOD, MISS GERTRUDE E., 1, Berkeley-street, Cambridge, Mass.
MALLERY, MRS. GARRICK, 1,323, N.-st., N.W., Washington, D.C.
Marshall, Rev. A. A., D.D., Crystal Springs, Georgia.
MARSHALL, HENRY R., Macintyre Bg., 874, Broadway, New York, N.Y.
MARTIN, MRS. EMMA H., Worcester, Mass.
MARVIN, WALTER T., 2,099, Fifth-avenue, New York, N.Y.
MASON, MISS ELLEN F., 1, Walnut-street, Boston, Mass.
MASON, MISS IDA, 1, Walnut-street, Boston, Mass.
Mason, H. L., 39, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
MASON, R. OSGOOD, M.D., 348, West 58th-street, New York, N.Y.
Mather, Enoch, M.D., Ph., D.L.L.D., 124, Hamilton-av, Paterson, N.J.
MAURS, PHILIP, 620, F.-street, Washington, D.C.
MCCLELLAN, MRS. CLARE D., Galena, Ill.
MCCLELLAND, MAJOR G. P., Davenport, Iowa.
MCCUNE, DR. OLIVE F., 53, Orange-street, Brooklyn, New York, N.Y.
MC EWEN, MRS. D. C., 160, Stirling-place, Brooklyn, New York, N.Y.
MCGEE, W. J., U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.
MCHENRY, MISS J. HOWARD, Pikesville, Balto. Co., Maryland.
MCINTOSH, HERBERT, 537, Massachusetts-avenue, Boston, Mass.
McVicker, J. H., McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, Ill.
MENDENHALL, MRS. E. R., Duluth, Minn.
MENDENHALL, NEREUS, M.D., Guilford College, Guilford Co., N.C.
METCALF, MRS. I. H., 133, Angell-street, Providence, R.I.

- MILLER, MRS. G. S., Peterborough, Madison Co., N.Y.
MILLET, JOSIAH B., 150, Charles-street, Boston, Mass.
MILLIKEN, GEORGE, 3,614, Walnut-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
MINOT, PROFESSOR CHARLES S., 22, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
MINTURN, MISS, 109, East 21st-street, New York, N.Y.
MITCHELL, JAMES, Stock Exchange, New York, N.Y.
MORGAN, W. E., M.D., 34, East 29th-street, Chicago, Ill.
MOTH, M. J., M.D., 3438, Indiana-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
MYERS, W. H., M.D., 15, West Wayne-street, Fort Wayne, Ind.
MYRICK, REV. HENRY L., Sing Sing, New York.
NAGLES, MISS MARIA K., 1,214, Walnut-street, Phila., Pa.
NEWBOLD, WM. ROMAINE, Ph.D., Univ., of Penna., Philadelphia, Pa.
NEWCOMB, PROF. SIMON, Washington, D.C.
NEWTON, REV. R. HEBER, 781, Madison-avenue, New York, N.Y.
NEY, G. S., M.D., 27, Adams-avenue East, Detroit, Michigan.
NICHOLS, MISS A. B., 92, La Salle-street, Chicago, Ill.
NILES, HARRY D., M.D., 217, East Brigham-street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Nims, F. A., Muskegon, Mich.
NOBLE, LOUIS SPENCER, Leadville, Colo.
NORBURY, MISS MARY A., c/o L. C. Root, Stamford, Conn.
NORRIS, HON. C. H., Marion, Marion Co., Ohio.
Nunn, Dr. Richard J., 119½, York-street, Savannah, Georgia.
NYE, WILLIAM B., Columbia College, New York, N.Y.
OLDHAM, F. F., Blymyer Building, opp. Post Office, Cincinnati, Ohio.
OLIVER, GEORGE, S. J., Santa Barbara, Cal.
OPENHEIMER, L. M., Austin, Texas.
ORMSBY, GEORGE F., 113, Devonshire-street, Boston, Mass.
Osborn, General F. A., 236, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
PARK, DR. ROSWELL, 510, Delaware-avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.
PARKE, MISS M. P., 117, West 49th-street, New York, N.Y.
PARKER, WILLIAM L., 339, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
PARSONS, A. J., 1,818, N-street, Washington, D.C.
PARSONS, JOHN E., M.D., 6, Grove-street, Ayer, Mass.
PECKHAM, ORVILLE, First National Bank, Chicago, Ill.
PELLEW, MRS. HENRY E., 1,637, Massachusetts-ave., Washington, D.C.
PENDLETON, MISS, 1,522, Locust-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
PENFIELD, SOPHIA, M.D., Danbury, Conn.
PERKINS, MRS. A. T., 112, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
PERKINS, MRS. CHARLES E., 223, Commonwealth-ave., Boston, Mass.
PERKINS, MRS. E. H., 5, East 40th-street, New York, N.Y.
PERKINS, FRANKLIN R., 294, Linwood-avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.
PERRIN, MRS. E. O., Stanton, Florida.
PERRY, JOHN G., M.D., 48, East 34th-street, New York, N.Y.
PERRY, THOS. S., 312, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.

- PERRY, MRS. T. S., 312, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
PETERS, E. T., Box 265, Washington, D.C.
PETERS, MRS. F. A., Forest Hill-street, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
PETERSON, DR. FREDERICK, 201, West 54th-street, New York, N.Y.
PETTIT, MISS EDITH, 2205, Trinity-place, Philadelphia, Pa.
PHILLIPS, MRS. J. C., JUNR., 299, Berkeley-street, Boston, Mass.
PLATT, J. C., 333-335, Fourth-avenue, New York, N.Y.
PLUMB, D. S., 24, Boudinot-street, Newark, N.J.
Plummer, J. W., 200, Randolph-street, Chicago, Ill.
Preston, Mrs. William G., Hotel Berkeley, Boston, Mass.
PRINCE, DR. MORTON, 71, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
Putnam, Dr. Charles P., 63, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
PUTNAM, MISS ANNIE C., 63, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
PUTNAM, GEORGE, 50, State-street, Boston, Mass.
PUTNAM, DR. JAMES J., 106, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
Quinby, Rev. John W., East Bridgewater, Mass.
Quincy, Josiah P., 82, Charles-street, Boston, Mass.
QUIRK, CHARLES H., M.D., c/o Messrs. Payton and Co., 765, Calle
Moreno, Buenos Ayres, South America.
RAINE, R. J., Carleton-place, Ontario, Canada.
RAND, MRS. J. L., 49, Kirkland-street, Cambridge, Mass.
RANDALL, HERBERT, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
RANNEY, E. H., Kalamazoo, Michigan.
RANSOM, FRANK H., Coal and Iron Exchange, Buffalo, N.Y.
RAYMOND, MRS. HENRY E., Carey-road, Brookline, Mass.
RAYSON, MISS AMY, B.A., 34, Gramercy-park, New York, N.Y.
*REES, MRS. JANET E. RUUTZ, Wayside, Scarsdale, New York, N.Y.
REID, MISS ESTELLE, 38, East 30-street, New York, N.Y.
REMER, William A., Deadwood, South Dakota.
REYNOLDS, EDWARD, M.D., 130, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
REYNOLDS, ROTH, Lock Box 32, Gainesville, Florida.
RICE, MRS. DAVID HALL, 2, Wellington-terrace, Brookline, Mass.
RICHARDSON, MRS. ABY S., 256, West 100th-street, New York, N.Y.
RICHARDSON, CHARLES, 608, Chestnut-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
RICHARDSON, M. T., Ridgewood, New Jersey.
RICHARDSON, DR. W. L., 225, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
Robbins, Miss A. M., 7, Pemberton-square, Boston, Mass.
ROBINSON, C. W., 108, Travis-street, Houston, Texas.
ROLFE, ALFRED G., The Hill School, Pottstown, Pa.
Ropes, John C., 99, Mount Vernon-street, Boston, Mass.
ROTCH, MISS JOANNA, Milton, Mass.
ROYCE, MRS. CHARLES H., 258, W. 75-street, New York, N.Y.
Royce, Professor Josiah, 103, Irving-street, Cambridge, Mass.
RUMSEY, MRS. B. C., cor. Delaware-ave. and Tracey-st., Buffalo N.Y.

- RUSSELL, DAVID, Houston, Texas.
 SALTER, W. M., Silver Lake, N.H.
 SARGENT, MRS. WINTHROP, 207, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
Savage, Rev. M. J., Pembroke-street, Boston, Mass.
 SAVAGE, PHILIP H., 28, Holyoke House, Cambridge, Mass.
Sawyer, Hon. Chas. H., Dover, New Hampshire.
 SAWYER, G. C., Utica Academy, Utica, N.Y.
 SCHIENCK, MISS IDA Z., 114, East 19th-street, New York, N.Y.
 SCHIEFFELIN, MRS. W. H., 242, East 15th-street, New York, N.Y.
 SCHILLER, PROF. C., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
 SCHOFIELD, EDWIN, 1,825, Ontario-street, Tioga, Philadelphia, Pa.
 SCULL, MRS. H., 237, Rialto Building, Chicago, Ill.
 SEARS, JOHN D., Upper Sandusky, Ohio.
 SERCOMBE, P. H., 58, Sentinell-building, Milwaukee, Wis.
 SHAW, MRS. F. G., 120, East 30th-street, New York, N.Y.
Shaw, Mrs. G. H., 23, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
 SHAW, MRS. QUINCY A., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
 SHED, Z., Room 3, Masonic Temple, Denver, Colorado.
 SHEETS, JOHN C., Cincinnati Sanatorium, College Hill, Ohio.
 SHERMAN, MRS. B. W., Riverside, Cook County, Ill.
 SHIMMIN, MISS BLANCHE, 229, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
 SHINN, MISS HATTIE A., Room 46, 115, Monroe-street, Chicago, Ill.
 *SHUFELDT, DR. R. W., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
 SHULTZ, REV. N., Box 583, San Antonio, Texas.
 SENTENIS, E. H., P. O. Box 115, Abilene, Texas.
 SMITH, FRANCIS, Muskegon, Mich.
 SMITH, GEORGE R., M.D., Dover, New Hampshire.
 SMITH, HORACE J., 6, East Penn., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
 SMITH, J. HEBER, M.D., 279, Dartmouth-street, Boston, Mass.
Smith, Philip Sherwood, 46, Johnson-place, Buffalo, N.Y.
 SMITH, WILLIAM HAWLEY, Peoria, Ill.
 SMITH, W. LINCOLN, Inst. of Technology, Boston, Mass.
 SMITH, WINFIELD, Duxbury, Mass.
 STANSELL, MRS. E. T., 75, La Casa, Denver, Colo.
Steedman, J. G. W., A.M., M.D., 2,803, Pine-street, St. Louis, Mo.
 STEFFENS, J. L., Credit Lyonnais, Paris, France.
 STERLING, MRS. E. C., 22, Westmoreland-place, St. Louis, Mo.
 STILLMANN, MRS. W. O., 287, State-street, Albany, N.Y.
 STILWELL, MARY H., D.D.S., 1,300, Arch-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 STOCKTON, JOHN P., JUNR., Highwood, Bergen Co., N.J.
Stokes, J. N. P., 229, Madison-avenue, New York, N.Y.
Stone, Charles W., 68, Chestnut-street, Boston, Mass.
 STONE, MRS. RICHARD, JUNR., 18, Chestnut-street, Boston, Mass.
 STONE, COL., W. L., Mount Vernon, New York, N.Y.

- STRAUSS, ALBERT, 124, West 97th-street, New York, N.Y.
STREET, MISS IDA M., 112, South 24th-street, Omaha, Neb.
STRONG, CHARLES A., M.D., 5,516, Woodlawn-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
STURGIS, CHAS. RUSSELL, 63, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
Sumner, Dr. A. M., 336, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
SUTHERLAND, J. G., Salt Lake City, Utah.
SWIFT, WILLIAM H., Wilmington, Delaware.
SYMONDS, BRANDRETH, M.D., 128, W. 59-street, New York, N.Y.
TAPPAN, MISS M. A., 247, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
TAYLOR, EDWARD WYLLYS, M.D., Mont Clair, N.J.
TAYLOR, FREDK., 174, School-street, Lowell, Mass.
Thaw, A. Blair, M.D., Campbell, Santa Clara Co., California.
Thaw, Mrs. A. Blair, Campbell, Santa Clara Co., California.
THOMSON, DR. W., 1,426, Walnut-street, Philadelphia, Pa.
THORNDIKE, S. LOTHROP, 2, Pemberton-square, Boston, Mass.
THORPE, JOSEPH G., JUNR., 115, Brattle-street, Cambridge, Mass.
TIGHE, JUDGE J. G., Germanica Bdg., 375-379, Fulton-st., Brooklyn, N. Y.
TOTTEN, MRS. ENOCH, 1,708, I-street, Washington, D.C.
TOUZALIN, MRS. A. E., P.O. Box 113, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
TOWNER, JUDGE J. W., Santa Ana, California.
TOY, PROFESSOR C. H., 7, Lowell-street, Cambridge, Mass.
TURNBULL, MISS K. E., 113, East 39th-street, New York, N.Y.
TURNER, MISS MARY J., 11, Faxon-avenue, Quincy, Mass.
TUTTON, MRS. SARA, 2,318, Jay-street, Denver, Colorado.
Tweedy, Edmund, Newport, Rhode Island.
TYSON, MRS. GEORGE, 314, Dartmouth-street, Boston, Mass.
UNDERWOOD, B. F., 92, La Salle-street, Chicago, Ill.
VAN HORN, M. L., 104, West 29th-street, New York, N.Y.
Van Norden, Rev. C., D.D., LL.D., Auburn, California.
VAN NORDEN, WARNER M., 16, West 48th-street, New York, N.Y.
VAN SLYKE, J. M., 23, North Pinckney-street, Madison, Wis.
WAIT, MARSHALL, 5,144, Madison-avenue, Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill.
WAKE, C. STANILAND, 4,403, State-street, Chicago, Ill.
Ward, W. E., Port Chester, N.Y.
WARREN, DR. J. W., Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
WASHBURN, OSCAR F., West Acton, Mass.
WATSON, MRS. F. S., 263, Clarendon-street, Boston, Mass.
WATSON, PROFESSOR WILLIAM, 107, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
WATTS, H. M., "The Press," Philadelphia, Pa.
WEBB, MRS., 34, Chestnut-street, Salem, Mass.
WEBSTER, DAVID L., 332, Beacon-street, Boston, Mass.
WHEELER, MRS. STEPHEN, cor-6th and Ash-streets, Fort Smith, Ark.
WHEELER, WILLIAM, Concord, Mass.
WHERRELL, JOHN, M.D., 228, North Mill-street, Kansas City, Kansas.

- WHIPPLE, L. E., 328, Madison-avenue, New York, N.Y.
 WHITE, PROFESSOR C. J., 36, Weld Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
 WHITE, PROFESSOR FRANCES E., 1,717, Master-st., Philadelphia, Pa.
 WHITE, HENRY G., 32, Irving-place, Buffalo, N.Y.
 WHITE, JAMES T., 765, Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 WHITE, J. T., M.D., Room 206, Pioneer-bdg., Seattle, Washington, D.C.
 WHITESIDE, MISS H., c/o A. A. Carey, 29, Fairfield-st., Boston, Mass.
Whitman, Mrs. Henry, 77, Mount Vernon-street, Boston, Mass.
 WHITON, REV. JAMES M., Ph.D., 79, Worth-street, New York, N.Y.
 WILKINS, MISS F. A., c/o G. A. Dewey, 146, Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 WILLIAMS, PROFESSOR H. H., University of N.C., Chapel Hill, N.C.
 WILLIAMS, MRS. S. C., 37, East 50th-street, New York, N.Y.
Wilmarth, Mrs. Mary H., The Auditorium, Chicago, Ill.
 WILSON, MRS. JOHN L., P.O. Box 19, Framingham, Mass.
 WILSON, TOM L., Room 10, Chopin Block, Buffalo, N.Y.
 *WILTSE, DR. A. S., Carl-street, W. Roxbury, Mass.
Wolcott, Mrs. Roger, 173, Commonwealth-avenue, Boston, Mass.
Woodman, Walter, M.D., Hubbard-park, Cambridge, Mass.
 WRIGHT, DR. J. P., 500, North Commercial-street, St. Louis, Mo.
Wyatt, Melvyn H., Sparkill, Rockland County, N.Y.
 WYLLYS, MISS R., 18, Louisburg-square, Boston, Mass.
 WYNNE, MRS. M. Y., 63, Marlborough-street, Boston, Mass.
 YATES, W., 2,937, Indiana-avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 ZUG, C., P.O. Box 1,053, Sable Iron Works, Pittsburgh, Pa.

N.B.—Members and Associates are requested to send information of any change of address to DR. RICHARD HODGSON, 5, BOYLSTON PLACE, BOSTON, MASS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

INDEX TO VOLUME X.

1894.

A.

A., MRS., Case contributed by	139
A., Mrs., Case contributed by	241
A., Mrs. B. de, Case contributed by	233
A., Mr. E., Case contributed by	223
A., Miss E., Case contributed by... ..	115
A., Mr. J. W., Case contributed by	80
A., Mr. T., Case contributed by	117
Amosof, Mr. D., Cases contributed by	192, 227
Animals, Apparitions of	127
Animals, The Sharing of Hallucinations by	326-330
Apparitions, A Proposed Scheme of, by F. W. H. Myers	415
Apparitions Coinciding with the Death of the Person Seen... ..	115, 122, 129, 207-244, 252-254, 281, 288
Apparitions, not of the Dying Person, Coinciding with Death	259-263
Appendix to Report on Census of Hallucinations	402-422
Auditory Death Coincidences	179, 199, 255-258, 316, 318

B.

B., MRS., Case contributed by	122
B., Mrs., Case contributed by	371
B., Mr. A. C., Case contributed by	82
B., Miss C., Case contributed by	194
B., Mr. de, (and Mr. V.) Case contributed by	315
B., Miss E. K., Case contributed by	175
B., Miss E. R., Case contributed by	98

B., Mr. F., Case contributed by	184
B., Miss I., Case contributed by	199
B., Miss K., Case contributed by	341
B., Miss L., Case contributed by	213
B., Mr. P., Case contributed by	318
B., Mr. W., Case contributed by	111
Bakewell, Mr., Experiments of	140
Baldwin, Mrs., Case contributed by	217
Balfour, The Right Hon. A. J., M.P., Address as President	2
Beer, Mr. C. H., Case contributed by	233
Belcher, Mrs., Case contributed by	237
Binet, and Féré, MM., Experiments in Hallucinations produced Hypnotically	144-146, 186, 190
Bramston, Miss M., Case contributed by	81

C.

C., CAPTAIN, Case contributed by	329
C., Lady, Case contributed by	317
C., Mr. and Mrs., Case contributed by	312
C., Mr. C., Experience as to Visualising	92
C., Mr. C., Case contributed by	356
C., Miss A., Case contributed by	349
C., Miss C., Case contributed by	74
C., Miss C. P. M., Case contributed by	83
C., Dr. H., Case contributed by	117
C., Mr. H., Case contributed by	150
C., Mr. G. M., Case contributed by	99
C., Mr. J. L., Case contributed by	169
C., Miss M., Case contributed by	193
C., Mr. W. A., Case contributed by	106
Cabral, Senhor Ulysses J. C., Case contributed by	383
Caldecott, Miss L., Case contributed by	293
Campbell, Miss C. M., Case contributed by	85
Cary, Mr. C. H., Case contributed by	316
Cass, Mr. John, Case contributed by	231
Chance Coincidence, Discussion of	245-251
Children, Hallucinations of	122, 149-152, 156, 181, 240
Clark, Miss C., Case contributed by	291
Clough, Miss A. J., Case collected by	132
Cockman, Mrs, Case contributed by	335
Collective Auditory Hallucinations	315-317
Collective Hallucinations with different Percepts	317, 318, 344, 374, 383
Collective Tactile Hallucination	204
Collective Visual Hallucinations	218, 227, 230, 305-315, 320, 347, 354-355
Collectors of answers in Census	34, 57-60, 405
Complementary Colours in Hallucinations	144-148
Congress, International, of Experimental Psychology	25
Contents of Report on the Census of Hallucinations	395-401

D.

D., MR. A., Case contributed by	91
D., Miss F., Case contributed by	80
D., Miss F. M., Case contributed by	123
D., Mr. L., Case contributed by	327
D., Miss L., Case contributed by	258
D., Miss T., Case contributed by	189
Dean, Mr. H. F., Case contributed by	374
De V., Mr. F., Case contributed by	141
Dixey, Mr. W. A., Experiments in Crystal-visions with "Miss X" and Mrs. Verrall	108
Dodson, Miss L., Case contributed by	380
Driesen, Baron B. von, Case contributed by	385
Drummond, Hon. Mrs., Case contributed by	145

E.

E., MR. A., Case contributed by	110
E., Miss C., Case contributed by	181
E., Miss C. J., Case contributed by	306
E., Mrs. T., Cases contributed by	174, 186, 333
E., Mrs. W., Case contributed by	195
Egerton, Miss, Case contributed by	268
Eggie, Mr., Case contributed by	256
Evans, Rev. C. L., Case contributed by	299

F.

F., MR. H., Case contributed by	181
F., Mrs. L., Case contributed by	349
F., Mr. W. H., Case contributed by	166
Frost, Rev. Matthew, Case contributed by	225

G.

G., MRS., Experience contributed by	88
G., Mrs., Case contributed by	252
G., Miss, Case contributed by	88
G., Professor, Case contributed by	103
G., Dr. B., Case contributed by	237
G., Mr. C. H., Case contributed by	170
G., Mr. C. T., Case contributed by	75
G., Dr. S. da, Case contributed by	309
Galton, F., Researches as to Power of Visualising	153
Girdlestone, Mrs., Case contributed by	161
Goodhall, Mrs., Case contributed by	310
Gorham, Mr. John, Experiments in Colour-vision	146
Greany, Miss Ellen M., Case contributed by	228

Green, Dr. C. T., Experiment in Hypnotic Hallucinations	145
Greiffenberg, Mrs., (and Mrs. Erni-Greiffenberg) Case contributed by ...	305
Gurney, Edmund, his Census of Hallucinations	31, 394
Gurney, Edmund, Library, Supplementary Catalogue	427

H.

H., Mr., Case contributed by	86
H., Dr. A., Case contributed by	167
H., Mme. A., Case contributed by	106
H., Rev. A., Case contributed by... ..	150
H., Dr. C. G., Case contributed by	122
H., Mrs. H., Case contributed by	129
H., Mrs. H., Case contributed by	350
H., Miss H. L., Case contributed by	288
H., Mr. J., Case contributed by	227
H., Mrs. J., Case contributed by... ..	131
H., Mrs. L., Case contributed by... ..	116
H., Miss L., Case contributed by... ..	343
H., Mrs. M., Case contributed by	156
H., Miss M., Case contributed by	104
H., Mr. R. H., Case contributed by	74
H., Miss S., Case contributed by... ..	96
Hall, Mrs., Case contributed by	370
Hallucinations, Coinciding with other events than Deaths ...	85, 175, 278-302
,, Experimentally produced	270-278
,, Report on the Census of	25
,, Unrecognised, Coinciding with Deaths	124, 126, 171, 263-270
Hawkins-Dempster, Miss C. L., Case contributed by	261
Hay, Mr. T. J., Case contributed by	254
Heintze, Mr., Case contributed by	379
Heredity in Relation to Hallucinations	154
Hervey, Miss, Case contributed by	282
Hypnotic Experiments in Hallucinations	108, 144, 145, 178, 186, 189, 190
Hypnotic Suggestion, Organic effects produced by	206

J.

J., Miss E., Case contributed by	179
J., Miss E. M., Case contributed by	79
Jamieson, Dr. W. A., Case contributed by	265
Johnson, Miss Aliee, Report on the Census of Hallucinations by... ..	25
Jones, Mrs. Gordon, Cases contributed by	116, 127

K.

K., Miss A. F., Case contributed by	119
K., Mr. H. B., Case contributed by	134
K., Mr. J., Case contributed by	175

Kapaist, Countess Eugénie, Case contributed by	284
Kearney, Mrs. E. L., Cases contributed by	156, 269
Keulemans, Mr., Experience in visualising Complementary Colours	145
King, Miss M. A., Case contributed by...	289
Kirk, Mr. Joseph, Cases contributed by..	73, 270

L.

L., MRS., Case contributed by	142
L., Mr. A., Case contributed by	169
L., Mr. B. L., Case contributed by	171
L., Mr. G. B., Case contributed by	119
L., Miss J. E., Case contributed by	224
Lang, Andrew. Cock Lane and Common Sense, Review of	423
Leaf, Walter, Litt.D., Review by—				
Cock Lane and Common Sense, By Andrew Lang	423
Lewitt, Miss F., Case contributed by	101
Library, Edmund Gurney. Supplementary Catalogue	427
Lloyd, Mr. James, Case contributed by	216
Local Apparitions, of Recognised Dead Persons	349-356
" " of Recognised Living Persons	356-363
" " Unrecognised	100, 101, 157, 338-349,	352
Lodge, Professor Oliver J., F.R.S.—On the Difficulty of making Crucial Experiments as to the Source of the extra or unusual Intelligence manifested in Trance-Speech, Automatic Writing, and other states of apparent mental inactivity	14

M.

M., GENERAL, Case contributed by	337
M., Mrs., Case contributed by	114
M., Professor, Case contributed by	80
M., Miss C. B., Case contributed by	76
M., Miss E. L., Case contributed by	373
M., Mr. H., Case contributed by	197
M., Miss H., Case contributed by	100
M., Miss K., Case contributed by	198
M., Miss M. H., Case contributed by	71
Malleson, Mrs. W., Case contributed by...	295
Malleson, Mrs. Frank, Case contributed by	368
Mallet, Miss S., Case contributed by	297
Mamitchitch, Mr. E., Case contributed by	387
Maskell, Rev. J., Case contributed by	258
Maughan, Miss Edith, Case contributed by	273
McAlpine, Mrs., Cases contributed by	279, 332
McKechnie, Rev. C. C., Case contributed by	240
Meetings of the Society, General...	1
Members, Associates and Honorary Members, List of	431
" American Branch, List of	454
Money, Miss S., Case contributed by	263

Murray, Mrs., Case contributed by	229
Myers, F. W. H., A Proposed Scheme of Apparitions (Appendix G)	415
,, ,, Report on the Census of Hallucinations by	25

N.

N., Miss R., Case contributed by	353
Noises in "Haunted Houses"	340-349, 353
,, Possible effect of in producing Hallucinations	178-184

O.

O., Miss A., Case contributed by...	286
O., Miss A. B., Case contributed by	74
O., Miss G., Case contributed by...	121
Obalecheff, Madame, Case contributed by	218

P.

P., MR., Case contributed by	126
P., Mrs., Case contributed by	191
P., Miss C. L., Case contributed by	232
P., Dr. J., Case contributed by	72
P., Miss M., Case contributed by...	204
Phantasms of the Dead,						
Corresponding impressions occurring to two percipients simul-						
taneously...	383-391
Information conveyed by	371-375, 378-382
Occurring before the Death is known..	366-377
Podmore, Frank, Report on the Census of Hallucinations by	25
Promises to appear at Death or after	217, 224, 225, 284, 371,	378

Q.

Q., MR. G., Case contributed by...	115
Quin, Mr. T. A., Case contributed by	157

R.

R., MADAME, Case contributed by	196
R., Mrs., Case contributed by	357
R., Miss A. E., Case contributed by	308
R., Mrs. F., Case contributed by	199
R., Mrs. H., Cases contributed by	170, 201
R., Mr. J. S., Case contributed by	162
R., Miss S. R., Case contributed by	234
Raines, Mrs., Case contributed by	277
Report on the Census of Hallucinations	25
Review.—(Cock Lane and Common Sense. By Andrew Lang)	423

S.

S., MRS., Case contributed by	72
S., Mrs., Case contributed by	177
S., Miss, Case contributed by	90
S., Mr. A., Case contributed by	203
S., Miss A., Case contributed by	187
S., Mrs. A. C., Experiences of	205
S., Mrs. C., Case contributed by	239
S., Miss E., Case contributed by	156
S., Mr. H. E., Case contributed by	327
S., Mr. G., Case contributed by	358
S., Mr. J., Case contributed by	152
S., Miss J., Case contributed by	177
S., Mr. W., Case contributed by	105
S., Mr. W. K., Case contributed by	150
Schedules used for collecting answers in Census	402-404
Sherar, Mr. Alexander, Cases contributed by	238
Sidgwick, Professor, Report on the Census of Hallucinations by	25
Sidgwick, Mrs., Report on the Census of Hallucinations by	25
Sidgwick, Mrs., Experience as to Visualising	93
Sidgwick, Mrs., Experiments on <i>points de repère</i>	108
Sims, Mr. H., Case contributed by	230
Smith, H. Babington, Experience as to Visualising	93
Smith, Mrs., Case contributed by...	255
Smith, Mrs. J. P., Case contributed by...	214
Solovioff, Dr. Vladimir, Case contributed by	202
Sorley, Professor W. R., Case contributed by...	94
Stoney, Dr. G. J., Cases recorded by	141, 178

T.

T., MRS., Case contributed by	187
T., Mrs., Case contributed by	328
T., Dr. A., Case contributed by	235
T., Mrs. E., Case contributed by...	172
T., Miss H., Case contributed by...	120
T., Miss E. L., Case contributed by	344
T. Miss E. M., Case contributed by	378

Tables—

Affirmative answers to Census question counted as negative (Appendix C.)	406
Collective Visual Hallucinations (Appendix F.)	414
Collectors for Census, how obtained (Appendix B.)	405
General Results of Census	39-50
Hallucinations about which notes were made	221
Proportion of doubtful cases among recent apparitions of living persons	66
Recurrent Visual Hallucinations	164
Relationship of Percipients in Collective Cases	155
Visual Hallucinations occurring in solitude or in company	173
Tactile Death Coincidences	131, 258

V.

VERRALL, MRS. A. W., Case contributed by	120
Vignoli, Prof. T., Case recorded by	141

W.

W., MRS., Case contributed by	89
W., Mrs., Case contributed by	188
W., Miss, Case contributed by	95
W., Miss, Case contributed by	260
W., Rev. J., Case contributed by	327
W., Miss L., Case contributed by	185
W., Mrs. S , Case contributed by.. ..	199
Walker-Anderson, Mr. S., Cases contributed by	211, 382
Wharton, Miss, Case contributed by	179
Wilde, Mrs., Case contributed by... ..	253
Williams, Miss, Case contributed by	124
Wilson, Mrs., Case contributed by	103
Wilson, Miss H., Cases contributed by	79, 313

X.

X., MISS, Experiments in Crystal Visions of	108, 142, 147
--	---------------

Y.

YEARSLEY, MRS., Case contributed by	34
---	----

