

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

"WHATEVER DOTH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT."—Paul.

"LIGHT MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 526.—VOL. XI. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1891. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way	49	Letters on "LIGHT."	55
The Mark of Death	50	Premonition of Death	56
Objections to Hypnotism	50	Pains and Joys of Future Life	57
Runjheet Singh's Experiment	51	Electro-Homoeopathy	57
Moral Excellence	53	Sacrifice of Living Animals	58
Mr. Podmore on Psychical Research	54	Fatal Months	58
Sacrificial Blood-shedding	54	Key and the Bible	59
Premonition of Danger	55	The "Double"	59
		Candlemas Day. By Mrs. Penny	60

NOTES BY THE WAY.

Contributed by "M.A. (Oxon.)"

A correspondent writes to me that he offered to the Sheffield Free Libraries three copies of "LIGHT" for the Reading Rooms of the Central, Athercliffe, and Highfield Libraries. The offer was declined by the committee. I imagine "Ally Sloper" is more to their taste. My correspondent wonders whether another attempt on his part should be made. Certainly not. I do not desire that anybody should have what he does not want, for it would be bound to disagree with him. It would do me no good, and it would make him sick.

"Impatience and its Cure," a sermon by the Rev. C. Voysey, is sent to me. Mr. Voysey is (as he says) in a perfect rage. The rage is certainly very perfect. He scolds like a blaspheming pagan, and for what? He is "suffering from a severe attack of impatience," because, amongst other things, "a Theosophical Society exalts superstition into a science and makes lying an art." Also because he has read a sermon of Dr. Lyman Abbott, "successor to the famous Henry Ward Beecher," in which he can find not "a grain of truth." That is probably not the only sermon against which that charge might be brought. But cannot the preacher see that this transition age is bound to produce transient phases of thought that are not to be treated seriously? Men hardly know now what to believe, and they certainly do not seem disposed to accept any dogma that pretends to be authoritative, even when uttered in the strident tones of Mr. Voysey. To speak of "The Perfect Way" as a book which is an insult to our understanding and deeply corrupting to our spiritual feelings—a fair sample of the argument contained in the discourse—is to talk sheer nonsense. To borrow Mr. Voysey's own quotation, "These are the powers of darkness." And then Mr. Voysey thanks God that he has "never condemned or judged anyone"! Well, I have seen many samples of unconscious self-deception, but none to beat that.

As a sample of many letters that reach me I print the following. I can only say in reply that "patience is a virtue." It is essential in this quest: nothing can be done without it. May it be that my correspondent is a little too positive? His wife, he tells me, is a Spiritualist. Perhaps, if he would sit with her until some indications of spirit presence showed themselves, and then seek direction, he might be guided. We know very little about these things, and it is well to ask advice. My object in printing the letter is to show a sample of what is constantly reaching me. Inquiry is abroad.

SIR,—As a subscriber to "LIGHT," I take the liberty of addressing you, although I feel some delicacy about trespassing on your valuable time. I have for the last three years been interested in Spiritualism, and confess, after reading a good deal on the subject and seeing some so-called phenomena, I am a good deal puzzled, but am willing to rest my present faith, such as it is, on the testimony of others, for I think it is very strong, if human testimony is worth anything at all. Among other books I have read "Spirit Teachings" with much interest and delight.

I have been told by those who pretend to see into such matters that I should sit for automatic writing. I lack patience, however, and have only sat a few times, with no satisfactory results. I am a secretary, and have a good deal of writing to do, so that I naturally tire of it at times; but for the last year or two I have been experiencing a good deal of difficulty in business writing, owing to a sensation in my arm as if it is being held. For a time I said it was writer's cramp, or rheumatism, or some muscular trouble, and possibly it is so, owing to its constant use in writing. At times, however, I have ceased my usual writing and taken up another sheet of paper at the moment, when the pen felt (meaning my hand) an inclination to run over the paper, making all kinds of undecipherable writing.

The origin, source, or cause of it, I cannot begin to say. I am only anxious to know the truth, which, however, I suppose no one is so competent to find out as myself.

At the same time, I feel impressed to write you, thinking you may be able to volunteer some advice; if so it will be gratefully received, either through the columns of LIGHT or by letter. I am told automatic or inspirational writing is not uncommon. I know Hellenbach says so in "Birth and Death," a very remarkable book. I have also read Zöllner's "Transcendental Physics," Alfred R. Wallace's books, Mrs. Britten's "Nineteenth Century Miracles," "The Perfect Way," "The Scientific Basis" of Epes Sargent, and Crooke's "Investigations." I have seen some phenomena in Boston, but not being under test conditions there may have been fraud, and, consequently, I would not volunteer any opinion about them; at the same time it is impossible that all can be fraud or delusion. I daresay that there are some minds able to penetrate behind the veil and understand something of these mysteries which the general mind cannot understand, and hence there is no use making them known, for we cannot bear them now; but the earnest, thoughtful few may grow into a better comprehension of them, as I have myself grown to believe and hope things which had never dawned on my mind five years ago, and which I then scouted with scorn as fraud and delusion; hence I know not how much more I may have to believe in the future, and am therefore willing to keep my mind open to new and higher views. The views of life, both before and after death, with which Spiritualism is allied, commend themselves to my mind as not only rational, but in accord with the noblest ideal of a religion founded on justice and truth. The ordinary theological "plan of salvation" with its co-dogmas I have abandoned as irrational and absurd, but I cannot eradicate the influence it has had on my mind for twenty years. I would not, however, deny that its influence may have been beneficial in some ways, for on the whole it seems to be a working religion—I mean, it appears to take with and influence the masses, no doubt for good, lacking something better, and at present I have not much hope of seeing the masses take my view. The Unitarian and "Universalist Societies" are the only ones, I think, which would sympathise with our views. We have a church of the latter body here, and I attend it, having left the "English Church."

39, Tobin-street,
Halifax, Nova Scotia.

D. N. MACGARVEY.

Is there any sort of truth in these things such as are printed below? Can incantations attract a low order of spirits? Is it possible to evoke them by ceremonies? I know well enough that it is said so, and I have seen too much to dismiss any such hypothesis off the reel. But, outside of romances like Lord Lytton's, what have we to

depend on? There is, no doubt, the mass of old writers who allege these things to be true, but I doubt whether any evidence that they offer is worth much consideration. The best evidence I have got at is the universal belief that the world does not consist merely of human beings and that the lower beings can be made subservient to their will—if it is strong enough. It may also be worth considering whether, as we know nothing about them, it is worth while to invoke the attention of these beings? These are the extracts to which I refer:—

MORE FROM THE MERCURI.

"THE MAGIC TORCH."

To Produce the Appearance of Serpents.

"Take the skin of a serpent when first killed and twist it up like catgut; then take the blood and fat thereof and mix with some hard tallow to make it a substance; then take a mould such as candles are made in and fix the skin of the serpent as the wick and pour in the fat, &c., as above prepared, which composition will thus form a candle. But the whole of this experiment must be performed under the ascension of the sign Scorpio. This candle must be lighted in the hour of Saturn, and whenever it is thus lit in a close room, the place will appear filled with innumerable quantities of serpents in all parts thereof, to the great horror of the spectators, and so perfect will be the appearances that even the operator himself will be scarcely able to withstand the force of imagination. Probably the greater part of the magical feats recorded in the Scriptures, as practised by the Egyptians, were the result of natural magic, although some were certainly of a more mysterious class."

"THE MAGIC TORCH."

To Produce the Appearance of Flies.

Take a quantity of flies and boil them with a sufficient quantity of wax or tallow, making the same into a torch or candle in manner as shown above, which experiment must be performed under the ascension of Aquarius and lit in the hour of Saturn. When lighted, the room where it is will appear swarming with thousands of these insects, and the illusion will be so perfect, that, to a spectator, they will appear the effect of enchantment.—"The Astrologers of the Nineteenth Century," pp. 493-4.

THE MARK OF DEATH.

For this we owe thanks to the "Religio-Philosophical Journal":—

A small number of men carry the unmistakable mark of the near approach of death awaiting them. They are not themselves conscious of it, and the number of those who read these mysterious signs is limited. Sometimes in camp I have tried to describe the mark to officers around me. I do not remember ever having convinced any one of the truth of my theory.

One rainy day I was conversing in my tent with Captain Wilson, Assistant Adjutant General of my brigade. We were then marching on Fredericksburg. Lieut.-Colonel Giluly, commanding the 5th Michigan, entered. He came simply on some detail of service which was arranged in five minutes. When he had gone out, "Now," said I to my incredulous Captain, "here's a chance to make a trial of my theory—Colonel Giluly is marked."

The Captain evidently thought nothing of it. But in the first battle Colonel Giluly was killed near Fredericksburg while bravely leading his regiment in a charge.

Of all those on whom I have recognised the mark—and they are many—one only may have escaped death.

If you ask me in what consists this mark I would find it difficult to reply. This fatal seal is imprinted rather on the general manner than on the features. It appears sometimes in the looks, at the bottom of which one divines the trembling of the soul soon about to depart; sometimes in a smile, in which appear the fleeting shadows of a cloud which does not belong to the earth; sometimes in certain movements as if worn out; in certain languid acts in which is betrayed the symptoms of a task which reaches its end. Sometimes, on the contrary, the finger of death is shown by a feverish energy without reason, forced laughter, jerky movements.—"General de Trobriand's Reminiscences."

PROTESTANTS have levelled everything. They have denied all they could not understand, and they hardly understand what they affirm, but Revelation does not retreat."—
ELIPHAS LEVI.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO HYPNOTISM.

[From "Body and Soul."—The other side of a question which we have discussed.—Ed. "LIGHT."]

For the sake of simplicity these will be considered under two heads: first, medical objections; and, secondly, popular objections. By medical objections we mean the objections urged by the faculty, and by popular objections, those urged more especially by the laity. As to the first class of objections the principal one of all appears to be a fear that it induces in the subject more or less serious injury of the nervous system, and that, therefore, it makes matters worse rather than better. Thus Dr. Norman Kerr, at the annual meeting of the British Medical Association held in Birmingham in July last, used this amongst other arguments against Hypnotism, and illustrated his meaning by saying "that even if temporary good accrued, anyone could obtain relief from pain by becoming drunk, but that state afterwards exaggerated the diseased condition." Now, this at first sight looks very plausible, but on closer examination the argument loses its weight. And for this reason: that even if "becoming drunk" will procure relief from pain the after-effects of drunkenness are universally admitted to be injurious, whereas that Hypnotism leaves baneful results is persistently denied. We don't know what Dr. Kerr's actual practical experience of Hypnotism is, but for ourselves this argument of his has no weight at all. Although we have but recently commenced to practise it as a method of treatment for disease, we have seen at one time and another some hundreds of people in the hypnotic state—many of them day after day for weeks—and yet never seen any bad result. In fact, one young lady who was put into this state day after day for years, on the many occasions on which we saw her we always found perfectly healthy. We do not blame Dr. Kerr and those who agree with him, for *a priori* we must admit that injury would seem extremely likely. Indeed, we thought so ourselves at one time, but after repeated experiments on others, and on ourselves too—for we ourselves are able and frequently do induce this state for certain purposes—we are convinced that *properly* used on *suitable** subjects the after-effects are beneficial rather than otherwise. At all events we have found this so in our own case—nearly always feeling better after a séance—and have not so far found it different in others.

Dr. Kerr, however, had other indictments to lay. He accepted practically all the alleged hypnotic phenomena as facts, but "after close watching he saw only a disordered cerebral state, an abnormal psychical condition with exaltation of receptivity and energy." To this it may be answered that the same objection applies to the treatment by drugs: if one is unnatural so is the other. Then again, as to "an abnormal psychical condition with exaltation of receptivity and energy," why that is the very thing that is required. Take a case, say, of inebriety, or craving for drugs, is not the very essence of the treatment and the scientific basis of success the fact that the brain receives the "suggestions" with double the force they have in the normal state? It may be said that this is all very well, but with the return to the normal state the so-called "suggestions" will lose their force. In some cases, perhaps so, but not in all. In most they come with the force of command, and long after the patients come out of the hypnotic state ring in their ears: "You can't drink, you mustn't drink, you won't be able to drink," &c., or, "The pain is quite gone." "There is no pain there now." "Quite well now." "Nothing the matter now," and so forth, according to what the suggestion was. Dr. Kerr, continuing his indictment, next went on to say that "he employed, as did every intelligent physician, non-hypnotic healthy suggestion. In a trusting and receptive patient desirous to be cured of any ailment the directions and prescriptions of a medical adviser with decided opinions were true suggestions of a safe, straightforward, reliable, and scientific character, an intellectual interchange of thought with a conscious and thinking being, not, as in hypnosis, a mechanical impression on an unconscious, soulless mass."

All this is very good, and with a great deal of it we cordially agree. Supposing, however, non-hypnotic healthy suggestion fails, as doctors well know is but too often the case,

*We have drawn attention to those very appropriate qualifications.—Ed. "LIGHT."

what then? Better than not produce any impression at all is it not justifiable in order to effect our end to make our patient, if you like to adopt the expression, a "soulless mass"? This is often done for surgical purposes by means of chloroform, why not then for medical purposes by Hypnotism? Then lastly, for we are now coming to the end of this memorable medical indictment, as Dr. Kerr said, "The few cases he had seen apparently benefited would probably have yielded to ordinary treatment, but the patients resisted or were passive to that, whilst they looked forward to, believed in, and gave themselves up to the mesmeriser."

Now is not this very weak reasoning? Is it not in plain words nothing more nor less than a clear confession, however reluctantly extracted, that Hypnotism has succeeded where drugs failed? And this leads us to remark that from the way doctors talk the laity must think that they are so well-satisfied with their present therapeutic resources, and the effects they produce, that they don't want any improvement; in other words, that medicine has at last become perfect. Our patients know otherwise, and so, too, do doctors in reality, for if not, how is it that they so readily give a trial to a new drug? And then, as if his indictment were not strong enough already, Dr. Kerr concluded by saying that "the dangers of Hypnotism were very great. Each séance might bring the hypnotee more under the control of the hypnotist, ending often in complete submission of the former to the will of the latter. A jelly-fish slavery without mental or moral back-bone was infinitely worse than days of pain and nights of agony." To this eloquent tornade we can only reply that even if Dr. Kerr should prefer thus to suffer most people would not, and as for the dangers of Hypnotism they are not only not great, but in capable and scrupulous hands have not even an existence. And this brings us up to what we have denominated the popular objections; in fact, what has just been mentioned is one of them. Now what are the others? Well, briefly, they are as follows: (1) *That it is unnatural.* Well, is not treatment by drugs equally unnatural? Has not, too, the very same objection been urged against almost every medical innovation? Look at the reception of Dr. Jenner's discovery, for instance! Why vaccination, when first introduced, brought about a regular storm of indignation from almost all classes of the community, and in nearly every part of the land. (2) *That it is too mysterious.* So is every process to people to whom the *modus operandi* is strange. What do patients, for instance, know, as a rule, about the drugs they take in a prescription—how they act, &c.; and yet do not refuse on this ground to take the medicine? (3) *That the power can be and has been abused.* Well, what is there that cannot, and what has not been thus diverted? Chloroform is a most beneficent agent, but it has on many occasions been made the handmaid of crime. As well, therefore, refuse to accept the good services of chloroform as on such grounds as this to condemn Hypnotism. Of course certain precautions should be adopted, and no respectable practitioner of the science would think of attempting to put a patient into this condition unless a third party were present, and the patient's own and friends' permission had first been asked and obtained. (4) *That it engenders unholy feelings between the hypnotist and the hypnotee.* All that we can say of this objection is that, as far as our own knowledge and observation goes, it is not true. Of course, if the hypnotic practitioner, by this new method of treatment, is successful in relieving a patient who has previously tried everything else in vain, there is naturally a feeling of gratitude both towards the man and his science, but that feeling in our experience at least is no more than the feeling which a grateful patient would cherish towards a doctor in ordinary practice who had brought him through, say, a long and serious illness. But after all, serious as they may appear on the surface, these last two objections vanish altogether if only the character of the practitioner is assured, and as people do not usually entrust an important lawsuit to an unprincipled lawyer, nor think of admitting a physician of bad repute into their houses, so they are not likely, supposing this method of treatment is called for, to entrust their own or their friends' cases into the hands of any practitioner of Hypnotism of whose skill and *bona fides* they are not equally well assured. With this ordinary precaution, then, this objection loses almost all its weight.

[The italics are ours.—Ed. "LIGHT."]

RUNJHEET SINGH'S EXPERIMENT.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE CHRISTO-THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,
JANUARY 22ND, 1891.

By GILBERT ELLIOT.

If it were asserted here that European psychological knowledge is emerging into a state conscious of its ignorance, it might be asked, Is there anywhere anything worth calling a science of psychology? An answer is, that during many hundreds of years there have been in India observers of phenomena manifesting the inner nature of man, that countless facts concerning this quality have been collected and classified, and thereby precise scientific generalisation has been achieved.

Verifying this assertion, a huge Sanscrit literature treats of the systems under which these inquiries have been made and discussed; and it is for the purpose of this sketch only necessary to name Sankaracharya, Kapila, Patanjali, as great writers on the subject, and anybody who wants to read something of these matters can get from the Theosophical Society's press a good translation into English of Patanjali's work, "The Yoga Philosophy," by Tukeram Tatia.

But to prepare your readers for the narrative, which is the object of this writing, I must explain that the schools in the main agree in an analytic grouping of the nature of man under seven principles thus:—

Classification derived from ancient Brahminism and Buddhism.	Vedantic Classification.	Classification of Taraka Raja Yoga
1. Stula Sarira = the body.	Annamaya Kosa = the sheath of all the principles Pranamaya Kosa = the sheath of No. 2	Stulopadhi, the vehicle of the body.
2. Prana or Jiwa = vitality.		
3. Linga Sarira = the vehicle of No. 2	Manomaya Kosa = the sheath of the mind of the lower soul Vignanamaya Kosa = the sheath of the higher soul Anandamaya Kosa = the sheath of the spiritual soul	Suksmopadhi, the vehicle of the soul, animal and human.
4. Kama rupa = will animal (a) volitions feelings of the animal nature.		
5. Manas = mind (b) appertaining to the human soul		
6. Budhi = spiritual soul		Karanopadhi, the vehicle of the higher soul. Atma, the spirit.
7. Atma = spirit.	Spirit	

Piles of books have been written about these principles and their relation to one another and to the spirit. I have merely to state that I present the classifications in order to explain how the philosophic Indian mind would regard the phenomenon of a human being surviving, say, a two months' burial, under conditions of total deprivation of air and food, including water and any sort of sustenance whatever.

The explanation would be, that extraordinary natural aptitude had been developed by the practice of Yoga, being the steady systematic application and direction of the will towards the universal spirit to such a pitch that the fifth principle in its aspect of the higher mind had so dominated the fourth principle, the will, that it had become absolutely purified from all sort of animal desire, and had fallen completely into attraction of the fifth and sixth principles, attaining partly to their subtlety, and thereby gaining a potentiality by which, for a period of time, the higher principles, being the real man, had been able to leave its bodily sheath in such a condition that, though it had become senseless, it still retained so much of low vitality as might be necessary to keep it fit to perform its ordinary functions when the real man returned to its custody again.

The accompanying narrative so far explains itself that it relates how Wade witnessed the resuscitation of the Fakir. But it is silent as to the length of time during which the body was in the vault. Nor can I do more than offer hearsay evidence on that point, and, indeed, as to other matters of importance, in order to prove the truth of the account.

This much I will say. At Bombay, in January, 1884, Lord Elphinstone, Governor of the Presidency, told me of this extraordinary burial and resuscitation. He said that the final preparation of the Fakir was done in the presence of Runjheet Singh, then ruler of the Panjab, famous for sagacity, who constituted himself chairman of a mixed committee of Europeans and natives of India, a member or members of which of the former Nationality were duly accredited

medical men; that the man being cold, except for a slight warmth in the region of the pineal gland, and in a state of complete insensibility, his tongue being bent back in his mouth, which was filled with clay or wax, as were also all the orifices of the body, was put into a bag, and so left in the vault, the committee being present at the time. That Runjheet Singh's seal was placed on the entrance of the vault after it had been closed by masonry; that the vault was then covered by earth, and sentries were placed to secure inviolability; that seed was sown in the earth covering the vault, and that the resuscitation took place after the seed had come up and matured to ripeness; that Runjheet Singh was present, and his committee too, when the vault was opened and the resuscitation occurred, and Lord Elphinstone said that the committee drew up a report of the whole affair, which is exactly what an Indian committee would have done— all of us who have served in India would agree to that.

However, though I inquired for this report, I could not obtain it while I was in India; and it was not till after the year 1870 that I read the paper I am now presenting, in the "Melbourne Leader," from which I cut it out.

Curiously enough, at that time I was writing for the "Leader" an article which I called "Modern Miracles," but neither the editor of the paper nor any of its staff could tell me how the account found its way into print.

I have read other accounts of the occurrence; but though they differed as to details, still there is complete agreement that a Fakir was buried by Runjheet Singh, in presence of a committee, and that he was resuscitated again in the presence of the same or nearly the same committee.

The account of the resuscitation which follows I extract from a pamphlet of Sir Claude Wade, Resident at Lahore, published in 1837:—

"I was present," he writes, "at the Court of Runjeet Singh when the Fakir, mentioned by the Hon. Captain Osborne, was buried alive for six weeks; and, although I arrived a few hours after his actual interment, and did not, consequently, witness that part of the phenomenon, I had the testimony of Runjeet Singh himself and others of the most credible witnesses of his Court, to the truth of the Fakir having been buried before them; and, from my having been myself present when he was disinterred, and restored to a state of perfect vitality, in a position so close to him as to render any deception impossible, it is my firm belief that there was no collusion in producing the extraordinary sight which I have to relate. I will briefly state what I saw, to enable others to judge of the weight due to my evidence, and whether any proof of collusion can, in their opinion, be detected. On the approach of the appointed time, according to invitation, I accompanied Runjeet Singh to the spot where the Fakir had been buried. It was in a square building called a *burra durra*, in the middle of one of the gardens adjoining the palace at Lahore, with an open verandah all round, having an enclosed room in the centre. On arriving there Runjeet Singh, who was attended on the occasion by the whole of his Court, dismounted from his elephant, and asked me to join him in examining the building to satisfy himself that it was closed as he had left it. After our examination we seated ourselves in the verandah opposite the door, while some of Runjeet Singh's people dug away the mud wall, and one of his officers broke the seal and opened the padlock. When the door was thrown open nothing but a dark room was to be seen. Runjeet Singh and myself then entered it, in company with the servant of the Fakir, and, a light being brought, we descended about three feet below the floor of the room, into a sort of cell, where was a wooden box about four feet long by three feet broad, with a sloping roof, containing the Fakir, the door had also a padlock and seal similar to that on the outside. On opening it we saw a figure enclosed in a bag of white linen, fastened by a string over the head, on the exposure of which a grand salute was fired, and the surrounding multitude came crowding to the door to see the spectacle. After they had gratified their curiosity, the Fakir's servant, putting his arms into the box, took the figure out, and, closing the door, placed it with its back against it, exactly as the Fakir had been squatting (like a Hindoo idol) in the box itself. Runjeet Singh and myself descended into the cell, which was so small we were only able to sit on the ground in front of the body, and so close to it as to touch it with our hands and knees. The servant then began pouring warm water over the figure, but as my object was to see if any fraudulent practices could be detected, I proposed to Runjeet Singh to tear open the bag, and have a perfect view of the body before any means of resuscitation were employed. I accordingly did so, and may here remark that the bag, when first seen by us, looked mildewed, as if it had been buried some time. The legs and arms of the body were shrivelled and stiff, the face full, the head reclined on the shoulder like that of a corpse. I then called to the medical gentleman who was attending me to come down and inspect the body, which he did, but could discover no pulsation in the heart, the temples or the

arms. There was, however, a heat about the region of the brain, which no other part exhibited. The servant then commenced bathing him with hot water, and gradually relaxing his arms and legs from the rigid state in which they were contracted, Runjeet Singh taking his right and I his left leg, to aid by friction in restoring them to their proper action, during which time the servant placed a hot wheaten cake, about an inch thick, on the top of the head—a process which he twice or thrice repeated. He then pulled out of his nostrils and ears the wax and cotton with which they had been stopped, and, after great exertion, opened his mouth by inserting the point of a knife between his teeth, and, while holding his jaw open with his left hand, drew the tongue forward with his right, in the course of which the tongue flew back several times to its curved position upward, in which it had originally been, so as to close the gullet. He then rubbed his eyes with ghee (or clarified butter) for some seconds, till he succeeded in opening them, when the eyes appeared quite motionless and glazed. After the cake had been applied for the third time to the top of the head the body was violently convulsed, the nostrils became inflated, when respiration ensued, and the limbs began to assume a natural fulness; but the pulsation was still faintly perceptible. The servant then put some of the ghee on his tongue and made him swallow it. A few minutes afterward the eyeball became dilated, when the Fakir recognised Runjeet Singh, sitting close to him, and articulated in a low sepulchral tone, scarcely audible, 'Do you believe me now?' Runjeet Singh replied in the affirmative, and invested the Fakir with a pearl necklace and a superb pair of gold bracelets, and pieces of silk and muslin and shawls, forming what is called a *khelat*, such as is usually conferred by the Princes of India on persons of distinction. I share entirely in the apparent incredibility of the fact of a man being buried alive and surviving the trial without food or drink for various periods of duration; but however incompatible with our knowledge of physiology, in the absence of any visible proof to the contrary, I am bound to declare my belief in the facts which I have represented, however impossible their existence may appear to others."

I gather from this account, and from others which I have collected, that the Hon. Captain Osborne, mentioned at the beginning of Sir Claude Wade's narrative, was certainly present at Lahore, when the Fakir was buried, and was probably a member of the committee in whose presence the burial took place. But I must quote from a paper I have as follows:—

One of these Indian stories not easily accessible, but of considerable interest on account of the known veracity of the witnesses, will probably be read with interest at the present time, and is inserted here. The author of it was one Hon. Captain Osborne, and the notes made of his statements here subjoined came from an almost unique copy printed for private circulation. Runjeet Singh had heard from a Seyd or Fakir who lived in the mountains that the latter could allow himself to be buried when in a condition of apparent death, without really ceasing to live, seeing that he understood the art of being brought back to life on being exhumed after several months had passed. To the Maharajah this appeared to be a rank impossibility. In order, however, that he should be convinced one way or the other, he ordered the Fakir to be summoned to the court, and caused him to undertake the singular experiment, under a threat that no means of precaution would be wanting toward the discovery of fraud. The Fakir consequently caused himself to appear in a state of apparent death. When every spark of life had seemingly vanished he was, in the presence of the Maharajah and the nobles who surrounded him, wrapped up in the linen on which he had been sitting and on which the seal of Runjeet Singh was placed. The body was then deposited in a chest, on which Runjeet Singh, with his own hand, fixed a heavy padlock. The chest was carried outside the town and buried in a garden belonging to the Minister. Barley was sown over the spot, a wall was erected around it, and the sentinels posted. On the fortieth day, when the chest containing the Fakir was dug up and opened, the man was found cold and stark in precisely the same condition as that in which he had been left. With much trouble he was restored to life by means of heat applied to the head, afflation in the ears and mouth, rubbing the body, &c. The Minister, Rajah Dhyani Singh, assured a friend that he had this Fakir, whose name was Haridas, for a period of four months under the earth at Jummo, in the mountains. On the day of the burial he had caused his beard to be shaved off, and when he was taken up again his chin was just as smooth as on the day he was consigned to the earth—a proof, as would seem, of suspended animation. However wonderful and perhaps laughable these operations appear to many, it is plain that these people have a singular control over the different organs of the body, and more especially over their muscular contractions. When all the necessary preparations have been accomplished, the Fakir lays his tongue away back in his throat, crosses his hands on his breast, and suspends animation by means of holding his breath. On his being brought back to life, one of the first operations is, by means of the fingers, to draw the tongue away from the back of the throat; a warm and aromatic paste of meal is then placed on his head, and air is blown into his lungs and into the earholes, from which the wax stoppers have been removed, the stoppers

in the nostrils being then forced out with an explosive noise. This is said to be the first signs of a return to life. He then gradually commences to breathe, opens the eyes, and recovers consciousness—continuous friction of the body being carried on all the time.

This account differs mainly from Wade's because it states that "The chest was carried outside the town and buried in a garden belonging to the minister. Barley was sown over the spot, a wall was erected around it, and the sentinels posted." This agrees with what Lord Elphinstone told me; and the story is usually told in India so as to include the sowing of seed in the earth covering the buried man, who was dug up when the seed had grown and ripened, which would be after a period of about forty days.

Now, considering the versions of Runjheet Singh's experiment which I have heard and read of, it seems to me that more than one of these burials have happened; and that differences in the descriptions of the Runjheet Singh affair may be accounted for by reason that what may have happened in other cases is said to have happened in the most celebrated case.

For instance, the second extract which I have just read does not purport to be an original document written by the Hon. Captain Osborne; it states that he was the author of an account, and that "the notes made of his statement here subjoined came from an almost unique copy printed for private circulation." And these notes state that "The minister, Rajah Dhyani Singh, assured a friend (presumably a friend of Captain Osborne) that he, the minister, had this Fakir, whose name was Haridas, for a period of four months under the earth at Jummoo, in the mountains."

Therefore, notwithstanding the discrepancies in the details of the accounts of the experiment, I, for one, have no doubt that Runjheet Singh did make such an experiment, by burying a man for many days, as convinced him of the *bona fides* of the test, and it is certainly proved that Sir Claude Wade and other officers with him were quite certain that there was no collusion betwixt Runjheet Singh and others in the matter, and that the Fakir had really been buried for, say, forty days.

I will add that the Sanscrit word Samadhi explains the condition of the buried man while undergoing the test; but if I were asked to translate Samadhi I should have to repeat the explanatory remarks I made when I was speaking of the seven principles under which Hindoo philosophy contemplates human nature.

All the highly instructed Indian devotees aim at this state of Samadhi; but few, very few, attain to it, and some perish in course of their attempts. Sir James Peile, now a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, told me a short time ago that while he was political agent in Kattiawar a man attempting the burial feat died while entombed.

Finally, because it concerns the subject of this paper, I quote a note to be found in the chapter headed "Of Death" from Carpenter's "Principles of Human Physiology."

See a collection of these cases, directly obtained from British officers who had been eye-witnesses of them in India, by Mr. Braid in his "Observations on Trance or Human Hybernation, 1850." In one of these vouched for by Sir Claude M. Wade (formerly political agent at the Court of Runjheet Singh) the Fakir was buried in an underground cell, under strict guardianship for six weeks; the body had been twice dug up by Runjheet Singh during the period of interment, and had been found in the same position as when first buried. In another case narrated by Lieutenant A. Boileau, in his "Narrative of a Journey to Rajwarra in 1835," the man had been buried for ten days in a grave lined with masonry, and covered with large slabs of stone, and strictly guarded; and he assured Boileau that he was ready to submit to an interment of twelve months' duration, if desired. In a third case, narrated by Mr. Braid, the trial was made under the direct superintendence of a British officer, a period of nine days having been stipulated for on the part of the devotee. But this was shortened to three days at the desire of the officer, who feared lest he should incur blame if the result were fatal. The appearance of the body when first disinterred is described in all the instances as having been quite corpse like and no pulsation could be detected at the heart or in the arteries; the means of restoration employed were chiefly warmth to the vertex and friction to the body and limbs.

This note states that Runjheet Singh had the Fakir dug up twice during the interment, and it also quotes Wade as its authority. But I have read to you Wade's own account in which he says nothing about twice digging up, and the note ends as follows:—

It may be remarked that the possibility of the protraction of such a state (supposing that no deception vitiates the authenticity of the narratives referred to) can be much better compre-

hended as occurring in India than as taking place in this country, since the warmth of the tropical atmosphere and soil would prevent any serious loss of heat, such as would soon occur in a colder climate when the processes whereby it is generated are brought to a stand.

No doubt this is an acute remark; but would it not have been better to have refrained altogether from assigning a cause for a matter which Carpenter so little understands, that he talks of "Human Hybernation," and then takes refuge in the refreshing heat of the tropics to disguise his ignorance of the real nature and cause of the phenomenon he writes of so glibly?

MORAL EXCELLENCE.

"He received gifts for men, even for the rebellious also."

There are two main lines along which man has travelled to his present station of partial excellence, apart from his purely physical development, viz., the moral and the intellectual.

Under some circumstances he makes progress in the first; under others in the second; and there have been rare periods—such were the Elizabethan and early Victorian eras—when great advances have been made both towards goodness and towards knowledge.

As a rule, few men are symmetrical in character, and most of us lean to the side of amiability or to that of cleverness. Occasionally one arises overtopping his fellows in uprightness of conduct and in comprehensiveness of reasoning faculties. A true king such—let us ever hail him with loyalty, and stand by him with faith.

The race in its entirety flies onward like a hastily drawn chariot over uneven ground, now on one wheel, now on another. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light, nor do we begrudge the encomium of the Master on the unjust steward, for there would be more poverty and misery in the world than there is, were it not for thrift and forethought.

As Balaam was a prophet though a wicked one, so the thievish gipsy can probably see further into the future than the Archbishop of Canterbury; nor can we forget that Byron and Shelley have added golden rounds to the ladder of English literature, albeit their lives were such as to make us put finger to lip in blushing silence. Truly, gifts have been received, "even for the rebellious also."

Things being so ordained by the All Wise, let us not expect unvarying truthfulness from those gifted and sensitive creatures called mediums,—their quality is that of the plastic rather than the strong—and the clay model if more mobile, must in the nature of things be less hard than the marble bust.

Is it possible that what is rare, morbid, and uncertain in our generation, may become common, healthy, and reliable in the next? Anyhow, the sign-post may direct the traveller truly, though the thing itself may totter in the blast. If wheat and tares grow together even in that enclosed field we call the Church, shall they not also in that wider domain of spiritual science? Pluck out the tares we may not, but we may at least discriminate as to which seed we gather into our own bosoms.

The best proof that occult attainment is compatible with moral excellence is the great example of Him who though King of Magi, and receiving their homage even when a babe, yet was the same humble village carpenter, who leaving his bench and saw, "went about" emphatically "doing good." On one occasion He chose not His own carefully-taught twelve, but seventy others, less instructed and less faultless probably, and gave them also supernormal powers. At another time He foretells that His followers should remove mountains and cast them into the sea. Alas, when shall we light on that faith which, though small as a grain of mustard seed, yet encloses a mysterious stimulating warmth, and holds at its heart a germinating principle of life, of untold possibilities? Can it be that "will power" is a synonym for miracle-working "faith"? M. W. G.

He that is most practical in divine things hath the purest and sincerest knowledge of them, and not he that is most dogmatical.

We live by revelation when we live deeply; we live by faith when we live wholly. He who only lives with his understanding, lives upon a little sharp point when he might have the freedom of the universe.

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"
2, DUKE STREET,
ADELPHI, W.C.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post-free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 10s. 10d. per annum, forwarded to our office in advance.
The Annual Subscription, post-free, to South America, South Africa, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, is 13s. prepaid.
The Annual Subscription to India, Ceylon, China, Japan, is 15s. 2d. prepaid.
Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed "— & Co."
All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and not to the Editor.

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

Five lines and under, 3s. One inch, 4s. 6d. Column, £2 2s. Page, £4. A reduction made for a series of insertions.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may also be obtained from E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria-lane, London and all Booksellers.

Light:

EDITED BY "M. A. (OXON.)"

SATURDAY, JANUARY 31st, 1891.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. It will much facilitate the insertion of suitable articles if they are under two columns in length. Long communications are always in danger of being delayed, and are frequently declined on account of want of space, though in other respects good and desirable. Letters should be confined to the space of half a column to ensure insertion.

Business communications should in all cases be addressed to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, W.C., and not to the Editor.

MR. PODMORE ON PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

In last month's "Time" Mr. Podmore writes:—"A vast tract of neglected and obscure phenomena lying on the border land between science and superstition—grouped popularly under such categories as mesmerism, Spiritualism, clairvoyance, ghosts, wraiths, and prophecies." A bizarre classification!

Again:—"A happy hunting ground for spirit-mediums, Theosophists, electro-biologists, charlatans, and cranks generally." Surely the writer who pens that remarkable utterance is a greater crank than those whom he criticises.

And then we are told that till April, 1882, when the Society for Psychical Research was founded, there "had been neither organised effort nor the methodical building up of knowledge." One rubs one's eyes and wonders at the ignorance that such a statement must imply. All the facts that the Society for Psychical Research have accumulated were perfectly well-known to Spiritualists long years before, on the motion of the Editor of this journal, that society was founded. We have had them in masses; our literature is full of them, and we had made no inconsiderable efforts (perhaps premature) to classify and arrange them. We had also endeavoured to draw deductions from them; and we venture to prophesy that, when a future age comes to study the history of this subject, our conclusions will stand comparison with those of the Society which Mr. Podmore represents. They are about on the level of "the criticisms of such an organ as the 'Saturday Review'" of which Mr. Podmore speaks with contempt.

We have never refused to recognise the work—the painstaking work, perhaps the too painstaking work—done by the Society in question. But it is possible to trifle over the outside of a subject of importance and never reach its core. This is what this Society has done. Some of its work has been admirable, but it has not yet got to the real point. Was it not Carlyle who said to William Black when the then great novelist was introduced to him at his house, "When are you going to do any serious work?" We do not ask that categorically imperative question of the Society for Psychical Research, but some people might.

The vulgar are either wolves or sheep; it is servitude alone that saves them.—ELIPHAS LEVI.

SACRIFICIAL BLOOD-SHEDDING.

I do not share the fashionable horror at records of blood-shedding as a religious rite, for the simple reason that I am a Spiritualist, and view all things from the elevated standpoint which this creed affords.

I do not believe in physical suffering, the seat of pain in all sentient creatures being not even the nerves, which constitute probably an elaborate telegraphic system, connecting the real Ego with the outward and phenomenal one.

It is this real pervading spiritual being which I believe suffers pain, whether the occasion of it be of a carnal or spiritual origin. An enemy may deal me a blow with his hand on my breast, or he may smite a more deadly thrust with accents from his tongue; in one case the pectoral nerves report the occurrence, in the other the nerves of the ear send the message; but the pains, though different in nature, are, I contend, felt by the indwelling spirit. Dismissing therefore all thought of suffering as material, it follows that the vast herds and flocks, whose blood has reeked on the altars of antiquity, were really spiritual sacrifices, nor is it conceivable that so much of meek-eyed innocent anguish can have weighed nothing in those mysterious balances of destiny, whereof the scale of goodness can only rise as the scale of suffering is depressed, and thus a peaceful at-onement is attained when both hang equally poised in the hand of that blinded maiden we call Justice.

The sight of suffering, though hardening to the hard, has a melting influence on the merciful, and may we not reasonably hope, that many an ancient sacrifice was witnessed (especially by women and children) with mingled feelings of gratitude and awe? The oft-repeated words, "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth," prove that when they were penned, animal sacrifices had been tenderly noted; hence we may judge the time was drawing to a close when there would be a necessity for them, and the epoch marked by the willing sacrifice of man, was about to be inaugurated on Mount Calvary.

Even when the occasion of pain is purely spiritual, it is impossible but the carnal nature should also sympathise. Hence, had the agony of the garden been mortal, the mystic Lamb would as surely have been slain as He was subsequently on Calvary. But the gross herd seek a sign, hence the publicity of the death and the sight of blood are requisite object lessons to the ignorant for all time.

The origin of bleeding and smoking sacrifices was, I conclude, the idea that primitive man had, that his deities required food, and received it in shape of uprising savoury steam. But is there not even here a saving element, for if the gods were degraded in idea by feasting with men, were not men really elevated by feasting in idea with gods? Even so the libation of wine which the Greek poured on the earth was a beautiful symbol of gratitude to the Mother who had borne the vine, as well as an acknowledgment of at-onement in her subtle economies and glorious generousities.

Among the Hebrew and other rituals, I take it, sacrifices gradually passed from the low groping stages to others of partial refinement and enlightenment, but the real day-dawn showed its golden streaks over that "green hill far away, without a city wall." Among the dwellers in Syria to this day, the necessity of substitution in death is so strongly impressed, that I am told by Miss Rogers (author of "Domestic Life in Palestine") that if you have the misfortune to lose a horse or a camel by death, the common remark made to you is, "May he prove your salvation!"

Oddly enough, I found the same idea among the poor in London. On one occasion both a mother and her child had been very ill, and on the death of the child, the mother said to me, "One of us had to go; had the child lived I should have died."

The reason why, as a rule, the Western mind is so averse to the idea of vicarious sacrifices is that we do not realise the *Unity of Humanity*, but are shut up in our own individuality, like selfish Cain, who did not think the safety of Abel any business of his. We have need to learn something of the solidarity of man and how each individual is but a "living corpuscle of the living whole," so that it is but natural that one unit should suffer for the rest.

I think it will be conceded that the minute directions of the Jewish Ceremonial Law in respect to sacrifice, helped to limit the savage instincts, and restrict the barbarous destruc-

tion of life, while the instructions connected with the slaughter of animal food, has tended to the healthful conservation of a remarkable race. Who are we, who daily sacrifice such thousands of innocent beasts for our own carnal enjoyment with no priestly sanction and but poor sanitary laws; who are we, to look back on the pious acts of our forefathers with horror, and to turn aside from the "hole of the pit whence we were digged"? And why should we spurn as unholy the husks of a living faith, which shed them years ago, as the ripe corn casts the glume from her grain, to drift as messengers of the past on the wings of the autumn wind?

Were it not at once more wise and more dignified to look calmly at facts we cannot alter, and records we cannot blot, remembering that what was once sacred to man, should in some sense ever remain so?

In conclusion, I would draw attention to the very remarkable manner in which public interest in Africa has clustered round that poor innocent girl, whose cruel death was witnessed by Mr. Jameson. May we not safely predict that sufferings borne so sweetly will do more to forward the well-being of the Dark Continent than all the boasted filibustering expeditions in the world, marred by cruelty, ambition, and tyranny, for "without shedding blood there is no remission of sins"?

M. W. G.

PREMONITION OF DANGER.

"Coming events cast their shadows before" is a worthy proverb, of which the following narrative is an instance:—

Miss D. and her father had lately gone to occupy an old Jacobean house in Scotland, which they rented, not knowing all its history or contents, only that it had been occupied by some Jacobites at the time of the Rebellion.

Miss D. says that one night, soon after settling into the house, she had an alarming dream, which gave her such a shock that she woke up with the fear of some terrible danger about the house, to which she felt all the inmates were exposed. With growing consciousness, the details and cause of danger faded from her mind, and she calmed herself, as it was but a dream. A night or two later, she woke up with the same horrible dream of an immediate catastrophe impending to the house. Again she calmed herself, and was able to rest till next morning, when she told her horrible dream.

But a third night she had a similar dream of horror and of immediate danger in the house, but on waking could not recall what, or where, was the source of danger. Acting on the moment's impulse and the third dream, she arose and called her father from his slumbers, imploring him to help her search the house.

They both forthwith went all over the rambling old mansion, searching high and low, till they came to an old lumber-room of which they were ignorant, where they perceived a smell of smoke. Here they found some old wood on the floor was smouldering, and close by, under the same ceiling, were casks stowed away, which they quickly found contained gunpowder. They called up the household and quickly extinguished the smouldering wood ere it burst into flames; and dragged away the casks with speed.

By this prompt search in consequence of a dream, the whole house was saved from explosion and conflagration.

So much for the facts. Can anyone explain how material events are foreseen and revealed before they occur? Are they represented on the atmosphere of the psychic world, and seen thus by the clairvoyante?

O. T. G.

SUSTENTATION FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Amount already acknowledged	318	7	8
"Amigo"	6	15	0
T. Grant	5	0	0
A. J. Carden... ..	2	2	0
F. W. Percival	1	1	0
Hon. Mrs. Forbes	1	1	0
Miss Spencer	1	1	0
Miss F. Lord	0	10	0

Further contributions are respectfully invited, addressed to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, W.C. Cheques should be made payable to Mr. H. Withall (treasurer), and be crossed "..... and Co."

LETTERS ON "LIGHT."

No. II.

CAN SPIRITUALISTS ORGANISE?

This question is exciting interest, and has called forth more than one proposed basis, discussed in England, France, Spain, America, Australia, &c.

Some say: "Organise on the basis that a member shall be a person who believes that the Unseen can communicate with us on earth." Then come the objections to this. Editor and correspondents express them freely.

What is the use of an association which has no choice but to include people who cheat about intercourse with the Unseen, provided they say it could go on and is within Nature's possibilities? What good can we do with a man who believes that a once-cherished wife might come and speak to him, yet frequents company which every good woman or man would shun?

Yet experienced students know that cheating and sensuality may be no constant bar to communication; and will positively promote it on the plane where fraud, licentiousness, and drink prevail. Nay, more; cruelty attracts some spirits, as witness the Aissouas of Tangiers. Clearly, then, membership of an organisation based on mere belief in Seen and Unseen might be deemed to include any practitioners of "devil-worship," including these Aissouas, the Yezidis, Haytian cannibals, Louisiana Voudoos, and Black Magicians everywhere. Imagine the horror of the innocent Spiritualists with their Summerland, and dear ones gone before!

This brings us to the centre of our question. A Spiritualist, as understood ever since the term has been in current use, is a person who believes that communication with the Unseen began with the movement of the past forty years; that it is all an undiscovered country; that its purpose is to enable respectable middle-class families to converse with their dead relatives; that persons like murderers will turn up occasionally, and disturb things; so will sceptics; but on the whole it is nice to know your friends are not dead, and to have them rap out the same things they said on earth, or pleasant additions about Summerland, &c.

When you get past this level of inquiry, you get into domains which have long been known and by other names. First, go down a step; call spirits; they say, "If you want me to obey, you must perform such and such an act; kill or torture animal or human being"; you do the horrid deed; they demand others; you have further commands for them; they propose further terms; you are obliged to comply or they threaten to kill you instead of your proposed victim; you continue; so do they; you become an accomplished devil-worshipper or Black Magician of a low type.

It is not necessary to go to a savage country in order to be a savage; London will do; a cellar is as suitable as a desert; or if you prefer causing refined agony, to what is merely ugly, modern science is full of opportunities. You become a Black Magician all the same.

The average Spiritualist is a person who is ignorant of all this. Directly he gets to know it, he enters upon a recognition of the before and after of things, the world of causes, agencies, the organised enemies of the race, how they work and how to fight them.

Now go a step higher than the Spiritualist. You find in the Unseen not merely amiable relatives with their narrow ideas, bolstering up the creed in which they complacently worshipped at church or chapel, but spirits who have learned more. In short, you come to the Unseen Teacher whom Mystics and Alchemists hint at in such bewildering terms. This kind of teacher can only reach a person's heart who wants to learn; and, if a solitary person, only when psychic sensibility amounts to clairvoyance, clairaudience, automatic writing, &c., and when the mind is strong enough to go through all the timid approaches, foolish checks, bitter disappointments, insolent interferences, obscenities, and attempts to hypnotise and falsify which figure so largely in the records of Mystics; and are made into such horrible trials by the pen of Lord Lytton in "Zanoni," and by mediæval saints and mystics. Some temperaments encounter even such terrors as that, or worse.

The Spiritualist knows nothing of all this. It is no part of what he wants, or understands; "it is not in the bond," he says; by which he means, "If I had known forty years ago it would have come to this" (learning anything or having

any trouble), "I would no more have given in to it than Sir David Brewster would to its being 'spirit,' which does the table turning."

I wish the term Spiritualist could be restricted to people who stipulate that communication with the Unseen shall amount to no more than "our dear ones," Summerland, and undisturbed beliefs. A name which has acquired such a connotation is not suitable for people who take trouble and want to learn. "Students of Occultism" has been selected by some. But it is too low for the purpose; too limited in its connotation. My point is that before Spiritualists organise, they must face the questions, whether they expect to learn anything from the Unseen or not, and whether they regard themselves as a new departure, only forty years old, or recognise their untraceable antiquity. Do they want to be a sect? or conterminous only with humanity in all lands?

OUR FATHER AND OUR MOTHER.

Some Spiritualists, in proposing a basis for organisation, wish to state their creed, not in its lowest terms: "Communication is possible between Dead and Living"; but in its highest terms; and their idea of doing this is to introduce into their basis a statement of belief in "God." And then they proceed to speak of "God" as "He."

Do they intend to speak conventionally, using a current term because they have no interior light as to its correctness, one way or the other? or do they intend to convey the idea that "God" is "male"? I will assume they are not speaking conventionally or using an expression which conveys a wrong idea because they dare not utter the one they know to be right. I will assume, therefore, that they describe "God" as "He" because they know not the Motherhood in "God."

Whence this ignorance?

The Bible, it is true, suppresses the womanly principle. (Rumours exist that it does not in the original Hebrew as interpreted by tradition never entrusted to paper; but it is thus outside the domain of present discussion.) Personal "guides" of those who continue to describe "God" as "He" may be responsible for it. At any rate, the stating it thus without comment, as though it were certain, shows their mystical standard to be below that of the best in every age, and far below what he who runs may read in life, to-day. A Divine Mother exists as well as a Divine Father, and ought to be mentioned if we describe "God" at all. Is this idea at all known in the world of spirits nowadays? or is it something only traceable in the thinking of a Mystic here and there? in a garbled or shameful antique rite, and so on? Some high spirits teach it; so do some foolish and wicked ones, selecting as their mouthpiece the unworthiest men and women. It is such an old idea that no one can claim to be the first person commissioned to reveal it, either in this or any other age. To know it is no proof of being very remarkable; but not to know it is a proof that a person is quite behind the times. Our believing it should be due to our own spirit finding it true, either by having struck upon it in the course of thinking or on hearing it propounded.

Half the reason why people do not believe in God is due to their vaguely knowing there is something the matter with the idea of God as presented to them; they know it is not correct, but they are not developed enough to think out what is the matter with current teaching, and many of them are too "closed" and self complacent to receive a truer statement even if offered them.

But there are some who have formulated their nascent belief thus: Duality runs throughout all nature; there is no one point at which I see it stop; I cannot, therefore, assume its stopping at any one point; least of all at the source which we call "God." Others, again, formulate it thus: I am a woman; no man understands me; no man made me; I cannot look up to a God called "He," because it is not true; it cannot be true; I am as much an expression of an idea as my brother is; I cannot be left out at the Source of Life; I know I am represented there; I know I am there.

"He who runs may read" the proclamation of all this in everyday life; on that plane telegrams are sent for the sake of those who can learn best from what is visible and material; among these telegrams are "An equal standard of morality for man and woman"; "Do away with Indian child-marriages, and enforced widowhood"; "Equal political rights for women and men."

* Yes: with all emphasis.—Ed. "LIGHT."

I call these claims "telegrams," because they come from a source; are brief in form, sudden, and penetrating in effect, and say less than they really convey in words; the wise heart sees their meaning.

To sum up, I would say Spiritualists who expect to organise on any narrow, ignorant, or conventional basis are bound to fail; they will not even form a sect; because the time for such unreality is gone by; trifling frauds and conventionalities may and will succeed, no doubt; but no new deep wave of humanity's life can be rendered turbid or turned aside now. We have not only our Father, but our Mother.

I could explain, in subsequent papers, how our idea of "God" ever came to be stated in "male" terms; how it is that comparatively few spirits learn the mistake involved; this explanation would show also why spirits give such conflicting teachings; and would throw a light on the Origin of Evil, of Religions, and Customs; on Necessity and Freewill, Hypnotism and all the points raised in "LIGHT," often discussed so learnedly and (to the writers) settled so conclusively, yet leaving an "aching void" so far as all other thinkers are concerned. No one can make bricks without straw; everybody tries. May I send in a bundle of straw occasionally?*

F. R. A.

PREMONITION OF DEATH.

BY A CLAIRVOYANTE.

Communicated by a personal friend.

My friend, Mrs. L—y, told me the two following facts, which I recorded after she narrated them, we being both believers in the visits of disembodied spirits.

The first fact was that Mrs. L—y, was making a call on a very old friend, the widow of Bishop North. On entering the room she saw Mrs. North in her usual high-backed chair, dressed in her own quaint style of white dimity dressing gown, muslin cap, with crimped border, and her thin hands crossed together. She was unusually pale, with blue shadows under her dark, kindly-looking eyes. They did not light up with pleasure as usual at her approach. Before Mrs. L—y reached the lady's chair another lady, who lived as companion to Mrs. North, stepped forward to shake hands. Mrs. L—y said to her, "I will speak to my old friend first," while moving onwards to her. "But you cannot, I am sorry to say, as Mrs. North keeps to her bed, sees no one, nor can take anything to maintain life," replied the companion. "But she sits here," persisted Mrs. L—y, trying to reach Mrs. North's hand. But under her close gaze, the well-known form in the chair faded into nothing. That day week Mrs. North died.

The other incident was of Mrs. L—y's own husband. On going to his study one morning quite early, she was surprised to see Mr. L—y leaning over the fender, putting on his slippers, the blazing fire flickering over his face, which looked white and drawn. "How came you here, dear", she asked, "when I left you but a minute ago in the dressing-room?" He, still bending down, rather moved than spoke. She asked again a second and third time, but not a word came in reply. Then, when she turned away, she saw him standing by another door. "Why wouldn't you speak just now?" she inquired in bewilderment. "I'm this moment come down," he said, "so how could I?" "Then your ghost was here, and I've seen it," she replied. As she said this a startled, horrified look came over his features. He turned round and gazed to where the form (his own likeness) had been. Dejected and spiritless he wearied through the day, sighing often and speaking little. At evening he arranged his papers and burnt many. Then with a lingering look about his well-loved study, he took a silent adieu of all within, and went to his bed, from which he never rose again. A few mornings after, the faint winter rays of sunlight lit up the features of Mr. L—y for the last time. His body lay dead.

FANATICS are sick, but still they are living; the indifferent are dead.—ELIPHAS LEVI.

MEN invoke superior spirits, but they can only evoke inferior spirits. Superior spirits whom men invoke attract them upwards; inferior spirits whom men evoke draw them downwards.—ELIPHAS LEVI.

* By all means.—Ed. "LIGHT."

PAINS AND JOYS OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

"I do not know how we can adopt physical theories of another life, or attempt to explain in such a manner as to be even to human comprehension, wherein the joys or pains of such future existence may consist. Yet it seems to me that we have a very definite revelation of what are the essential points of that happiness. Your unsatisfied power of enjoyment has its object clearly propounded; human nature is imperfect, insufficient to bring satisfaction to itself. Now, we read in the Bible that the cause of this unsatisfaction is our separation and alienation from God, to be remedied by a union so close that it is described as a partaking of the Divine nature. Well, here is the joy of the future state; can it be wrong to speculate upon this? But revelation does not leave us here; it talks of palaces, and gold, and emeralds, and, most physical of all, of actual bodies. Can it then be wrong for us to imitate our revelation and speculate upon the joys of a future state according to the pattern there set us? But, further, is it possible to imagine that the real joys and pleasures of earth are not *intended* to be to us prophecies and foretastes of the joys and pleasures of the blessed? Our ideas of pleasure, happiness, and enjoyment are derived from these, and we are promised what these give us.

"Earthly happiness is given us to incite us to seek Heavenly; it must, therefore, have some likeness to, or congruity with it, else the promise of future happiness would not mean what the words express. Again, we are told that the joys of Heaven exceed all we can imagine. What then? Are we to say that we may not dream of any definite kind of happiness because that will exceed all we can dream of? Or should we not rather try, by supposing all that gives us most pleasure magnified a hundred-fold, to stir up in ourselves a longing for the place where they shall be realised? I doubt whether the greater part of mankind can ever have a real earnest longing for a state of happiness of which they never attempt to realise a symbolic representation. Our Lord excited the Jews to desire Heaven by comparing it with the rule over ten cities. I am afraid that if you tell men that it is worse than useless for them to strive to picture to themselves the joys of Heaven, you tell them in effect to regard those joys with cool curiosity rather than with warm, earnest longing. I cannot tell why men are so afraid of allowing the bodily nature any share in their ideas of perfection. It is as much God's work, and a part of them, as their intellectual nature, and, perhaps, not essentially more changeable or corporeal. There is great danger of religion becoming an abstraction; indeed, practically the men of the world regard their present nature as occupied properly with earthly things, and think of God and Heaven as incomprehensible, and not proper subjects for any realising meditation. The result is that they seek this world's goods with all their might, and hope that they shall gain Heaven as a sort of bye-end, with which their actual thoughts and pursuits cannot have any strict or immediate relation. If you say that heavenly pleasures are essentially different from anything we have an idea of, you negative the actual idea of their being really pleasant without supplying any other, and this seems dangerously akin to the doctrine that the temporal is certainly good, the eternal doubtfully so. For men know what pleasure is, but there are few who can really long for what they have no idea of. And if all men, especially if carnal and vicious men cannot long for the joys of Heaven then must the whole argument, to induce to a virtuous life from the consideration of its rewards, fall to the ground."—["Memoir of Bishop Steere," p. 124.]

LIVE in the truth, be the house great or small. Walk in the truth, be the path broad or narrow. He who hides the truth sins.

A MAN may devote himself to another, but that is not being his slave; he may pawn his liberty, but he cannot alienate it without a species of moral suicide. A man may devote his life to the triumph of an idea, but always reserving the right of mental expansion and to a devotion to a worthier object. A perpetual vow is an affirmation of the absolute in the relative, of knowledge in ignorance, of the immutable in the transitory, of contradiction in all things. It is, therefore, an engagement null and void because it is rash and absurd, and to repent, and withdraw from it, when one realises its madness, is not merely a right but a duty.—ELIPHAS LEVI.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

The Gift of Healing.—Madame Greck.

SIR,—Since the return of Madame Greck from Russia, to the delight of all who know her, I have had it in my mind to ask the favour of being allowed a few words in "LIGHT," in grateful testimony of the gift of healing possessed by her. I am most anxious to bear witness to the wonderful power vouchsafed to this lady. Some few months prior to her departure from England for Moscow, I accompanied Madame Greck to the residence of a German gentleman, a neighbour and friend, for the purpose of curing a little child of whooping cough. In less than ten minutes, the control, said to be Sir John Forbes, set about his work in a very decided way, prescribing for the little one homœopathically. To the delight and satisfaction of the parents, the malady quietly ceased.

I feel assured our good Spirit-doctor has more than once, by his aid, saved the lives of mother and child, my own friends, and it is in grateful remembrance that I now feel bound to ask publicity for this testimony, for the material as well as Spiritual benefit of suffering humanity.

Eton-place, Plymouth.

CHARLES J. ATKINSON.

January 12th, 1891.

Electro-Homœopathy.

SIR,—I had hoped to be present at the reading of Dr. Theobald's paper on the above subject, but a chill caught some two months ago, which has confined me a good deal to the house and to bed, made it impossible.

I have, however, read Dr. Theobald's paper in "LIGHT" and have found it composed in a moderate and philosophic spirit, and yet I am induced to express my views—on a subject which is at present the hobby especially of "the upper classes in society"—from my own standpoint.

In the first place it should be remembered that it is considered unprofessional to advertise secret or quack remedies, or to advertise oneself as using them, although it is permitted to anyone on scientific grounds to experiment with any substance or any method in attempting to cure disease.

In the second place it should be reflected on that the first object of all secret remedies is to obtain money, and thus we know that the late Mr. Holloway left about one million of money *because* he, regardless of all expense, advertised a *secret* remedy which was ultimately discovered to be composed of the most commonplace drugs, and in this connection we learn from the sensational article in the January number of "The Review of Reviews" that Count Mattei declares that he sells about 2,000,000 bottles of his globules annually, and if we calculate the profit at only threepence on each phial we find that the Count and his friends should thus realise about £25,000 a year. Then the title *Electro-Homœopathy* has no scientific standing, but it has a sound which is calculated to excite human wonder, and hence increase the popularity of the substances advertised.

That these remedies, if taken by hundreds and thousands of people, must frequently be followed by cures, is no proof that all these cures are effected by the substances taken, for every homœopathic practitioner knows that many of his most surprising cures follow his prescribing simple unmedicated sugar globules.

This fact has often been a matter of surprise to the doctors and of regret on the part of unthinking enthusiastic homœopathic practitioners, but there is no mystery in the matter to those who know the power of the imagination over disease, or the extraordinary results in the operations of Faith and Christian Science healing; and still less do we wonder when we know of the miraculous powers of mesmerism and hypnotism, and here I use the word "miraculous" advisedly, signifying by its use the power of the spirit or of spirits over matter.

I agree with Dr. Theobald, who expresses doubt as to the vaunted cures of cancer by Mattei's globules, and, in corroboration of these doubts, I may mention that formerly I was physician for a short time to a cancer hospital, where Mattei's remedy had been used under a specialist for two years, but without the cure of one undoubted case of cancer.

Briefly to conclude—homœopathic medicines have most undoubtedly a very wide sphere of action, and the homœopathic law, or as I should call it, the law of *direct* specific medication, is, in my opinion, of wider application than any other law of drug action, and as Mattei's medicines would

seem to be homœopathic medicines prepared carefully by himself, we have reasons to believe that they may be often excellent remedies, but how far they are better than the ordinary homœopathic medicines remains to be proved.

But the most important question remains to be answered, Can we expect that fully developed cancer shall ever be cured? To this question I should reply Yes, for to me it is quite conceivable that medicinal substances may yet be discovered, which may, if taken over a long period, so purify and enrich the blood as to replace the cancer cells gradually by healthy cells and thus gradually throw out the cancerous tumour. But my hope would be rather in the potentiality of spiritual power; and when we know that spiritual beings can dissolve and re-form animal and metallic substances, the marvel is, not so much that cancer may be cured, but that it is not often cured.

Jesus of Nazareth, I have no doubt, could, some eighteen centuries ago, have cured cancer as easily as He cured blindness, and the Christ in us will surely one day become so dominant as to become the One Universal Medicine for all mankind.

January 23rd, 1891.

GEORGE WYLD, M.D.

Count Mattei's Electricities.

SIR,—During a recent discussion on the treatment of cancer between Dr. Herbert Snow, of the Brompton Hospital, and myself, an analysis was made on Dr. Snow's behalf of certain of Count Mattei's Electricities, by Alfred W. Stokes, Esq., a public analyst of no mean order, and as his analysis is open to the gravest objection, and has nevertheless received wide circulation through the Press, may I ask the favour of your inserting the following rejoinder on my part, which has appeared in the correspondence columns of the "National Review" for the current month?

"After what appears to have been a thoroughly exhaustive analysis, Mr. Stokes affirms that 'none of these fluids differ at all from water in any of their properties.' Now, I maintain that this analysis is incomplete, lacking in its main essential. It was conducted '*chemically, physically, microscopically,*' but not *experimentally*. Surely, if the analyst did not regard this to be within his province, the doctor should, in common fairness and common-sense, have recognised the necessity for such a test. In a previous article to which Dr. Snow has replied (and it is to be supposed he had carefully read it), I plainly stated that Count Mattei 'claims by his liquid Electricities to diminish and disperse pain,' and adds, anticipating such a time as this, 'if any captious inquirer asks how can liquid drops, so much like water, influence the course of disease?' and then replies, 'Do they, or do they not?' It is entirely a matter of *experience*! it only needs to be *felt*, not *explained*! I further inquired '*Has Dr. Snow done this?*' as the writer has, and been convinced thereby. A medical man in the Midlands in a large practice has been proving these liquids *experimentally* and he thus writes, 'I have just had my *arthritis* patient in and he says the compress (of Green Electricity) removed his pain at once, and he has had no return.' Now, surely Dr. Snow has had abundant opportunity since September last of making his experiment, and if he had done this I am bold to say he would never have set Mr. Stokes to work in the direction he has done, and would have saved both himself and Mr. Stokes the mortification of feeling that they had both tried how not to do it, and of appearing ridiculous before the world and utterly incapable of investigating a simple problem which was plainly set before them in the paper to which they were formulating their crushing reply.

"I can imagine my setting two clear fluids before these earned investigators, the one *water*, the other *petroleum* (a liquid which I will assume the analyst had never handled before), and asking him to describe to me the properties of the latter. He will soon tell me its *density, smell, colour, taste, and reaction* with wonderful precision and probably announce with confidence 'these are all its known properties,' whereas I know it to be *explosive and inflammable*. If I had known and concealed this from him in the outset I need not be surprised at the defective character of his analysis; but if I had told him that its *main* and in an important sense its *sole* characteristic was its *inflammability* he would most certainly have gone about his work in a simple and more intelligent fashion, and his report would

have read very differently. Here, I must leave the learned doctor and the distinguished analyst to their own reflections, and to settle between them their respective mead of praise or discredit that is due to them."—Yours truly,

SAMUEL KENNEDY, F.R.C.S.E.

22, George-street, Hanover-square, W.

Sacrifice of Living Animals.

SIR,—I observe that your correspondent, "I. O.," in his remarks on "Sacrifices," quotes several Greek words, on which he puts his own gloss, to support his argument that the "most ancient people" did not offer up animals to their gods as a propitiation for sin. I fail to see the relevancy of his citations, as the Greek language is comparatively a modern invention, when used to elucidate the more ancient Egyptian usages. "I. O." has, however, not gone far enough in his examination of Greek terms, or he would have discovered that the primary meaning of *θύω* is *sacrifico*, and if he had looked a little farther he would have found *θύος* translated *victima* (as given in Hederich's Lexicon). These words surely convey the idea of blood-shedding, although "I. O." sees no such idea in the *primitive* meaning. He asserts that the sacrifice of living animals was "a modern corruption," introduced by "materialists" and other grovelling natures. For my part, as far as "materialism" is concerned, I see no difference between sacrificing a herb, a nut, or an ox. In fact, animal sacrifices were considered by the ancients a pious development of their religious ceremonial, and the larger the number of animals sacrificed the greater was supposed to be the piety and acceptability of the offering. What a whole nation adopted as part of their religious services could scarcely be considered by *them* as materialistic and the result of "modern corruptions." What does "I. O." mean by "modern"? Is Homer ancient enough for him? In Homer's works we find plenty of words conveying the idea and also the reality of "bloody sacrifices." Is Socrates spiritually enlightened enough to satisfy "I. O."? And yet this renowned authority on morality and religion, with his dying breath, ordered a cock to be sacrificed to Æsculapius. Poor unfortunate cock, to be slaughtered at the pious command of the greatest Spiritualist of his age!

I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to protest against a fashion which has become provokingly prevalent of treating historical incidents, or quasi-historical incidents, as myths or allegories. The reader is naturally puzzled to know where fact ends and fable begins. This fashion is a bad one, and should be greatly discountenanced, as it leads to innumerable inconclusive controversies, insolvable problems, and questionings which do not tend to edification. To attempt to sail over a sea of parable, with no safer compass than one's "own intuition," is a dangerous system of mental navigation.

NEWTON CROSLAND.

SIR,—Your correspondent "I. O." sets, in his own sure way, the matter of blood sacrifices to rest. A mere sacrificing of the "animal passions to the higher self"—good and to be commended. But if this were all, why not symbolise and illustrate the same by the sacrifice of tigers and other evil beasts instead of innocent lambs, &c.? Perhaps tigers were inconvenient to catch and might resent being immolated for others' good. Evidently there are two sides to this question.

W. S.

Fatal Months.

SIR,—On the 23rd inst., the loyal town of Bruges was electrified by an entirely unexpected announcement of the death of the heir-presumptive to the Belgian crown.

As the exact time of birth was given in "La Patrie" of that day, the following, which I quote from that paper, might interest those of your readers who are studying astrology, and might, perhaps, induce someone among them to inform us through the medium of "LIGHT" whether the position of the heavenly bodies at the time of death pointed to any sinister event as likely to occur to the native at that particular time. The following is the extract to which I refer:—

"Prince Baudouin, son of the Count of Flanders, and heir to the Belgium throne, died on Friday, 23rd, at two a.m. He was born June 3rd, at 6.15 a.m., 1869. The month of January is fatal for our Royal family. We recall the

following: January 22nd, 1869, death of Count Harnaut, son of the King; January 30th, 1889, death of Prince Rodolphe; January 1st, 1890, burning of the palace of Lâcken; January 23rd, 1891, death of Prince Baudouin.

Bruges.

ELIZA BOUCHER.

In the Beginning it was not so.

SIR,—I rejoice that my letter, if it has done nothing else, has called forth the most admirable contribution from my friend Gerald Massey. Some may feel astonished at my thus expressing my pleasure; but I would call the attention of such to the fact that Gerald Massey's statements of fact do not in the least contravene what I laid down that "in the beginning it was not so." All this monumental evidence came in at a period when the spiritual truths first given were "materialised."

I. O.

Mr. Crookes' Theories.

SIR,—There is one sentence in the admirable article which you print in last week's issue on the above which seems to need elucidation. It is the following: "For that it" (the molecule) "is iron and not gold or carbon or zinc is because of the swing backwards and forwards in time of the original meta-elements from the positive to the negative, or from the negative to the positive side of the neutral electrical line."

An explanation in the columns of "LIGHT" of this sentence would add greatly to the value of your most interesting article.

INQUIRER.

The Key and the Bible.

SIR,—I quite agree with your remarks relative to the question, "The Key and the Bible." But the following, if tried by mediumistic persons, has been given to me as the correct method: Place the key of a door in the Bible with its bow end outside, giving sufficient room to hold the book upon the forefinger of two persons. The key ward end should be placed on the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the first chapter of Ruth. Then tie or strap round the lengthway of the book with the left garter of one of those who hold the key. They will find it turn as they repeat the two verses named. Someone is supposed to desire or wish. You are supposed to gain your wish if the book and key turn off from the finger. There is no doubt or difficulty of its doing so if these instructions are carried out.

W. T. R.

SIR,—With reference to the "Key and the Bible," my friend finds the proper verses to be read are from the Song of Solomon, eighth chapter, and sixth and seventh verses. The position of the key inside the Bible is for the ward to be at right angles to the cover and divided leaves of the book.

M. W. G.

A Response and a Complaint.

SIR,—The letter and pamphlet of Mr. Theobald have greatly surprised me. I have repeatedly heard this gentleman quoted (sometimes denounced) by Spiritualists as a man professing the Christian belief as shown by the Athanasian creed, and at the same time teaching and believing the phenomena of Spiritualism. It was this curious mixing of old theology and modern fact that I wished explained.

I have now carefully read the letter, and must frankly say that I have little to offer against this form of Christianity. It is nearly identical with the teaching of the Rev. H. R. Haweis, who has been called a Christian Agnostic for holding similar views. There is a breadth and liberality of thought here that is refreshing after the narrow, cruel creeds of the old religion from which so many of us recoiled in horror.

My thanks are due to several other friends, who kindly endeavoured to assist me, each one in a manner differing from the others, which is rather confusing, and, having no desire to enter into any controversy, I conclude by expressing my obligation to Mr. Theobald for his kind answer and wishes.

I may also say I quite agree with his estimate of the meetings held by London Spiritualists. I have attended a very large number of these during the past year, and disappointing is a mild description of them. I have some curious notes of these meetings. Here is one—a clairvoyante (and she is one of the best in London) employed to select a

violin for a boy of fourteen, by spiritual direction, from a number of instruments placed on a table. This happened at a meeting which was advertised in the *Spiritualistic Press*, therefore public. Does not this state of things reflect upon the leading Spiritualists of London? Why do we hear nothing of them outside the columns of "LIGHT"? There is intellect enough shown there; why not a little at the meetings? Mrs. Britten's lectures show the public are not to blame. Her speeches were closely followed and appreciated by a densely-packed audience. Why not give us occasionally some of the higher truths and teaching of Spiritualism in London?

THAMES.

The "Double."

SIR,—In answer to your correspondents, T. Hawkins Simpson and Gilbert Elliot, who ask for well-established cases of a "double" seen by persons not under mesmeric influence I beg to submit the following case.

I enclose a letter received by me at Sandown, Isle of Wight, on February 15th, 1873, which it may be interesting for you to examine at first hand. It was written to me by one of the officers of the station where I was officer in medical charge, and between whose family and mine there were close relations of friendship and sympathy.

The part of the letter which bears upon our subject is as follows:—

"19, ———place, Bath.
February 14th.

"MY DEAR PURDON,—My wife has just seen your brother 'Ned' standing by her (1.45 p.m.), and has asked me to write, as we are anxious to know if he is well. I knew somebody was near her, but could not see the figure.—Yours sincerely,"

J. N. B.

When I read the letter I remarked to my wife: "So much for fancy; it is unsatisfactory talking to people about Spiritualism, they are apt to run away with it and imagine anything," or words to that effect. My wife begged me to be silent until I heard the other side: "Yesterday Mrs. D. was going home by the two o'clock p.m. train, and she left the house at a quarter to two o'clock, giving herself her usual time to reach the station. Eddie saw her to the door and turned back into the sitting-room, where I was at the piano, on the top of which was a letter recently received from Mrs. B——, in which she spoke of some curious experiences she had had in an old house. He asked permission to read the letter, which was a long one and which contained much that was of interest to him."

I at once saw that we had the best time test of the appearance of the double on record. Mr. B. fortunately gave the time by his clock, and ours being set to the railway time we may fairly claim coincidence in time between the facts of the reading of the letter at Sandown and the appearance of the reader to the writer at Bath more than 100 miles away. What conclusion can we arrive at other than that a *physical* circuit was completed by the *mental* effort of my brother in reading that letter?

Wherever there is the space factor introduced there is the motion of matter to be considered; and wherever there is the mental factor there exists the molecular motion of the organised nervous system. It is not only unthinkable, but unnecessary, to suppose that either *pure* thought or "a spirit" intervenes between mortals at a distance in such a case as that given above. All that psychic science, practical Spiritualism, and common-sense demand is the acknowledgment of organic connection between the living nervous system and the so-called ether of space. Mortal spirits communicate through the aid of natural or conventional signs.

To argue that extension does not exist for disembodied or free spirits and that they can act and be at any desired object by a mere effort of volition, is beside the question altogether. Whatever they do, we must complete the solution of our problem in terms of matter and motion, even if we have ultimately to absorb the latter in a more comprehensive theory of feelings, subject to definite relations of order and position. Physicists make use of certain properties of an hypothetical substance to account for the action of their forces; let Spiritualists make an equally bold and consistent use of *other* properties of the *same* substance, and we need no longer fear any breach of continuity in the solution of our problems. Let us endow it with vital properties, so that it may be regarded as in organic connection with all nature, animate as well as inanimate,

and we have in it the acknowledged reservoir of the energy of the Universe, the quasi-objective and extensive aspect of the Spirit. This brings us wonderfully close to the dogmatic solution of Spinoza, who endowed God with the two contrasted attributes of thought and extension, alone knowable to us out of an infinite number of other attributes; but our regard is from the side of potentiality.

The absolute need of Spiritualism is a theory of inhibition which enables us to understand how it is that we are tied down to the present time and place in the ordinary moment of consciousness. The answer to that question carries with it the data for a scientific theory of Spiritualism.

I do not argue against the *existence* of spirits, but against the validity of accepted views of our *cognition* of spirits.

Cullman, Ala., U.S.A.

JOHN E. PURDON, M.D.

January 1st, 1891.

SOCIETY WORK.

[Correspondents who send us notices of the work of the Societies with which they are associated will oblige by writing as distinctly as possible and by appending their signatures to their communications. Inattention to these requirements often compels us to reject their contributions.]

23, DEVONSHIRE-ROAD, FOREST HILL, S.E.—On Sunday last Mr. Davies read a short paper, after which the guides of Mrs. Treadwell gave an address, and replied to some questions from the audience. Next Sunday, Mr. Humphries.—GEO. E. GUNN, Hon. Sec.

257, CORNWALL-ROAD, LADBROKE GROVE-ROAD, NOTTING HILL (two minutes' walk from station).—A series of meetings is being held on Wednesday afternoons at three o'clock, when the subject of conversation and discussion is "In Darkest England and the Way Out," from a Spiritualist point of view.—J. M. DALE.

14, ORCHARD-ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH.—We had a good meeting on Sunday when Mr. Mason read an appropriate poem, and Mr. Darby gave a good practical address. The Lyceum session was held as usual, and there was a good attendance; the solos and recitals were well rendered. Our thanks are due to Mr. Everitt for Lyceum banners for the children. Sunday next at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Mr. Hopcroft and Mr. Astbury.—J. H. B.

MARYLEBONE, 24, HARCOURT-STREET, W.—On Sunday morning, Mr. Vango, after treating a child, gave several satisfactory delineations. In the evening, Mrs. Spring's guides gave several clairvoyant descriptions which were recognised. Sunday next, at 11 a.m., healing and clairvoyance, Mr. Vango; at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Buddhist sermon by an accredited representative. Monday, social, at 8 p.m. Thursday, at 7.45 p.m., Mr. Hopcroft. Saturday, at 7.45 p.m., Mr. W. E. Walker.—C. WHITE, Hon. Sec.

WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM, S.E.—On Sunday last a large audience was present to hear an address upon "Buddhism," and was favoured with a capital exposition of Buddhist faith, which will be further developed on Monday, February 2nd, at 8.15 p.m. by the same lecturer, who will then have to submit to the free criticism of his position. We invite all interested in comparative theology to attend and take part. Sunday next, at 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., Mr. R. J. Lees; at 8.30 p.m., annual general meeting. Monday, February 2nd, at 8.15 p.m., discussion on Buddhism.—J. VEITCH, Hon. Sec.

CHEPSTOW HALL, PECKHAM.—We have reports from two antagonistic parties. Differences seem to have arisen in regard to the contributions towards the cost of building a hall for South London. We print neither report, as to do so would simply lead to mutual recriminations, and while the bitter spirit which apparently now exists continues to prevail we shall give no further publicity to the proceedings of this Society. In the meant me the chairman and treasurer of the building fund committee has felt it his duty to return the subscriptions to the contributors with thanks.

CARDIFF.—At the Psychological Hall on Sunday last, Mr. Victor Wyldes delivered able addresses, in the morning on "Religious Revolution," and in the evening, to a crowded hall, on "1891. A Prophetic Oration." He prognosticated that the present year will be fraught with events of deep import to the cause of Spiritualism all through this land; that though there would be greatly increased friction and conflict on the mental plane, with representatives of all religious sects, and an absolute necessity for Spiritualists to look to their armour, the result will be a more widespread recognition of and a profounder respect for the glorious philosophy of Spiritualism. The recent controversy in the "South Wales Echo" is creating much interest in the matter. Mr. Wyldes will deal with objections raised in the course of the debate, on Monday evening, when discussion will be invited, and this will be continued on Tuesday evening if the enthusiasm runs high. Lyceum as usual at 3 p.m. Good attendance.—E. A.

OBITUARY.

Passed to the Higher Life on Monday, January 26th, 1891, James Richard, third and dearly beloved son of Mr. and Mrs. James M. Smith, of 5, Colville-terrace, Beeston Hill, Leeds, in his twentieth year (of consumption). It is less than three months since Mr. and Mrs. Smith lost their third and dearly beloved daughter, Hilda Mary, in her seventeenth year of meningitis.

CANDLEMAS DAY.

This the appointed day on which we throw
Yule berries on the flame; *
While still the bleak wind breathes through blinding snow,
Cold as when Christmas came.
Colder and far more dreary looks the world;
Graver our life within;
But see, the holly sprigs are dim and curled,
Let us our work begin!
Take down each leaf, each dusty, withered spray;
And when the crackling pile
Hisses, and flames, and startling burns away,
We can look on and smile:
And none shall know that in my heart goes on
The same sad work unseen;
Bright things were treasured there when Christmas shone,
And they seemed evergreen.
But oh! how soon they faded and they fell!
Pride kindles—and they die.
Die, happy dreams unhonoured, for your knell
Is but a soft low sigh.

A. J. PENNY. (Written in 1856.)

INSIGHT.

For we stand here, we,
If genuine artists, witnessing for God's
Complete, consummate, undivided work:
That every natural flower which grows on earth,
Implies a flower upon the spiritual side,
Substantial, archetypal, all aglow
With blossoming causes,—not so far away
But we, whose spirit-sense is somewhat cleared,
May catch at something of the bloom and breath—
Too vaguely apprehended, though indeed
Still apprehended, consciously or not,
And still transferred to picture, music, verse,
For thrilling audient and beholding souls
By signs and touches which are known to souls.
How known, they know not,—why, they cannot find,
So straight call out on genius, say, "A man
Produced this," when much rather they should say,
"'Tis insight, and he saw this."

—E. B. BROWNING ("Aurora Leigh").

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for any opinions expressed by his Correspondents. He declines respectfully to enter into correspondence as to rejected MSS., or to answer private letters except where he is able to give specific information. He further begs to say that he cannot undertake to prepare MSS. for the press. Communications sent should be written on one side of the paper and be without interlineations and underlining of words. It is essential that they should be brief in order to secure insertion. Matter previously published can be received only for the information of the Editor. MSS. cannot be returned. All matter for publication and no business letters should be addressed to the Editor at the office of "LIGHT," and not to any other address. Communications for the Manager should be addressed separately. Short records of facts without comment are always welcome.

CHRIST CHURCH, SOUTHWARK, LIBRARY.—Thanks. We are glad to know that you offer an opportunity to your readers to receive illumination.

C. J. B.—Thank you; but do not take the least trouble in the matter. To force unwelcome food down an unwilling mouth is to invoke sickness and not nutrition.

To several correspondents the Editor again expresses regret that he cannot answer them personally, and that he cannot undertake private correspondence about public matters. He is hardly able to do the necessary work involved in the conduct of his paper. He thanks all friends for their kind inquiries.

PEACOCKS' feathers are generally reckoned unlucky, but why? It was stated in a London daily paper that they have been banished from the stage on account of the popular prejudice against them.

* In former days.