

Light:

A Journal of Psychological, Occult, and Mystical Research.

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

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 408.—VOL. VIII.

[Registered as a
Newspaper.]

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1888.

[Registered as a
Newspaper.]

PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

The Salpêtrière Experiments	525	An Interview with Mahomet	531
Theosophical Change of Front	526	"Kabbalists"	533
Federation of London Spiritualists	527	Spiritualism v. Theosophy	534
Jottings	527	Altruism	535
The Beautiful Path	528	Visions of Faces	535
History and Allegory	529 and 532	Spirits as Detectives	536
Mr. Alfred R. Wallace on		Hypnotism of Animals	536
Materialisations	530	Society Work	536

NOTES BY THE WAY.

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

The *Spectator* (October 13th), in a review of Binet and Féré's *Animal Magnetism*, long since noticed in "LIGHT," commences by an odd statement, and goes on to something more pertinent:—

"The quasi-magic of the *od*-mongers and electro-biologists has been stripped of its mystery, and reduced to science and sense, and the apparent freaks of hysterical women have been made to throw a new and searching light upon some of the profoundest problems involved in the mental processes of man. Phenomena which to our remoter forefathers seemed so strange and terrible that they were constrained to seek their explanation in Satanic agencies, and which, with the discredit of these agencies, came to be regarded in later times with incredulity and contempt, have been, so to speak, rehabilitated, and brought under scientific observation and experiment. Not only has their reality been established, but their explanation has been attempted, in accordance with known psychological and physiological principles, with great, if not yet complete, success. Finally, hypnotism—to use Braid's own term, in favour of which the expression 'animal magnetism,' as involving an utterly false and even absurd theory, should be banished from scientific nomenclature—has converted the higher psychology from a science of observation and introspection into one of experiment, a change of which the far-reaching consequences can as yet be only dimly perceived."

I never came across an "*od*-monger," whatever that term may connote, but we have not got to the bottom of phenomena when we have studied the "apparent freaks of hysterical women." (Why "apparent": and what does *that* mean?) It is more important to note that the reality of the Salpêtrière experiments is admitted, which is some gain over the days when Elliotson was ruined because he believed in and preached Mesmerism. The world *does* move.

The light thrown on the somnambulant states by Dr. Charcot and his colleagues is most useful. If it had not been for the ignorant and ill-advised persecution which put the clock back two generations, we should not now be commencing to learn the alphabet of "the higher psychology." The following is the *Spectator's* brief summary of what the Salpêtrière experiments have led to:—

"The Salpêtrière investigators recognise three hypnotic states, markedly distinct from each other in typical cases, but generally more or less intermingled. The first result of the hypnotic process is, probably, always a condition of catalepsy; but this is often of extremely short duration, passing at once into the second of the states, that of lethargy. By raising the eyelids, which are closed in lethargy, and so exposing the eyes to light, the cataleptic condition can be restored. During either the cataleptic or the lethargic state, the third, or somnambulistic stage, can be induced by slight pressure on the cranium, or friction of the scalp. Finally, the patient can usually be awakened at any stage by simply blowing upon the face. Of the cataleptic condition, automatism is the dominant character. The subject's *ego* is gone, and the mind becomes as plastic to the will of the operator as the body. The

whole gamut of the emotions may be played upon by inducing appropriate gestures or modes of facial expression. It is a sort of combined life and death rather fearful to witness; body and mind are there, but volition, individuality, spontaneity, are suspended or abolished. In lethargy, on the other hand, all the faculties are nearly or completely dormant; neither spontaneous nor induced action is possible; in a word, the state is one of psychic coma, the whole organism being in a condition of mere vegetable life. The stage of somnambulism presents very different characters. The *ego* is not lost, but is more or less perfectly replaced by a new *ego*. It is often as if one part of the cortex were in a condition enabling the subject to view, as a spectator, the operations of the remaining portion of the cortex,—the result being an extremely curious duplication of personality."

The Reviewer makes one point in criticism which is important. He notices that some of the recorded experiments were not conducted with such care as to exclude error. He adds:—

"The 'æsthesiogenic' agency of the magnet, despite the special study Drs. Binet and Féré have made of this part of their subject, must still remain a matter of some doubt. They relate numerous instances of the power of a magnet, by touch or mere proximity, not only to modify or transfer from one side of the body to the other all sorts of sensory impressions and perceptions, but to modify or abolish a variety of purely mental states as well. The experiments, however, do not seem to have been conducted with the care necessary to establish such extraordinary results, and the theory that the magnet operates as a faint electric current upon the nervous system is a mere guess. No proofs are cited of the existence of any such current, or that such a current could produce the effects supposed to be produced by the magnet."

Now it is a fact that these experiments have been repeated with success without any magnet. A pencil or a penknife, a toothpick or a match, will prove equally successful. The authors are apparently materialists and incline to reject any spiritual hypotheses, unless we must include telepathy under that category. They give a needed caution against hypnotic exhibitions, and promiscuous hypnotisation, but defend experimentation in skilled hands. These experiments, indeed, belong to the category of moral vivisection. If they are justifiable at all, that can only be under conditions carefully guarded and in the hands of skilled and morally trustworthy persons. Is it right ever to induce artificial insanity? That is a crucial question. If it is allowable for the purpose of advancing knowledge, then how carefully should the experiment be conducted!

The *British Medical Journal* (October 20th) has a note on "Christian Science-healing which is a glorified form of Faith-healing." It notices the fact that the "drawing-room of Shelley House was for several weeks filled by a fashionable crowd to listen to Miss Lord." (That lady's powers of endurance, to say nothing of the crowd's patience, must have been phenomenal!) Miss Lord's book is not seriously treated, as might be expected. "An old monastic chronicle tells how a good brother who had lost an eye prayed for a new one at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury. In the course of time he received a new eye, but the chronicler quaintly adds that 'it was a verrey littel one,' Christian Science has not even got to that

yet." From all which it appears that orthodox medicine does not like Christian Science.

Lucifer comes this month with an announcement that the senior Editor is alone responsible for its contents. I regret to learn in this way that the illness of Mabel Collins is not a thing of the past. The contents of the number are of the usual varied character. "A Sufi's Mystical Apologue," by A. J. C., familiar initials in connection with Lucerne, draws from the Editor a denunciation of the Sophias, Lillies, Katies of modern days, as compared with the mystical "brides" of Gichtel and the Mediævalists. The subject is one respecting which it is difficult to discourse, but it is one that needs care; and none the less because attention has been directed to it lately in some of its aspects by T. Lake Harris and Laurence Oliphant. There is a gross side of the subject, which would be repellent to both those writers, but which has its risks in an unspiritual generation. All attempts to drag spirit and things of spirit down to the plane of matter are dangerous.

The oddly named novel, *Hartas Maturin*,* is a striking instance of the way, to which we have so often to refer, that modern fiction is pervaded with a knowledge of the occult. Here Re-incarnation is the *pièce de résistance*: but we have also dreams and visions whereby a murderer is tracked to his doom. The plot is both ingenious and powerful. There are some improbabilities in construction, and some feebleness in the conversations, but, on the whole, the book is very readable, and the interest is sustained to the last. The author has studied the teachings of Spiritualism intelligently, and his use of his materials in that respect leaves nothing to be desired. He has written nothing that is glaringly absurd, as some authors do, when they meddle with what they do not understand. Bastian, the East End recluse, philanthropist, seer, and prophet, is a well-drawn character; but the man who stands out most prominently is Dr. Maturin himself, polished man of the world, benefactor of his town, member of Parliament, suave gentleman, and thorough-paced villain. The book will be found in our library at Craven-street.

The Theosophical Publishing Society sends me a reprint of *The Hebrew Talisman*, with an introduction by Mr. R. Harte. It is a verbatim copy of a rare pamphlet (circ. 1836) which deals with a puzzling problem—the future of the Jewish race and of the Holy Land. It is the Wandering Jew who is to restore Israel according to this strange pamphlet. Its pages read like those of a veiled political allegory. No one ever discovered who the author was, and the pamphlet never passed into a second edition. Some expressions contained in it might have been toned down with advantage; but the whole text is decidedly curious, and it was, perhaps, well to reprint it verbatim.

THE VOYAGE TO INFINITUDE.

(Dedicated to LAURENCE OLIPHANT and the like discoverers of this present age.)

When "Cortes stood on Darien's peak and gazed"
Upon the far Pacific's widening roll
Of ocean wastes, doubtless he dreamed the whole
Of earth might never be by man appraised,
Or when Columbus knelt in prayer, amazed
Upon America's great sands, his soul
Scarce grasped how near was East to West and Pole
To Pole, on how small scale our earth was based.

Some years revealed that puny finite tale.
But what shall dim the glory of this band
Who now their spirit's ship do boldly sail
Across Earth's limits, past its trodden strand
To other worlds, to hear angelic lore
And worship God on some vast cosmic shore?

J. M. T. (ARTIST.)

* Three vols., by H. F. Lester (Richard Bentley and Sons).

THE THEOSOPHICAL CHANGE OF FRONT.

In "LIGHT" (October 13th) I pointed out the huge and portentous immorality of the main tenet of the Theosophists. Taking the case of Peace, the burglar, for illustration, I showed how all the deterrent influences from an evil deed were cut away by the supposition that a minute after a character like Peace had escaped from the hands of the common hangman he would be transported to a paradise called Devachan with all the evil of his nature completely eliminated. This would mean that he would at once appear in that blissful abode possessed of an excellence surpassing that of the angel Gabriel, for without evil Peace, the burglar, would be absolute perfection. I further pointed out that the destiny mapped out for the other half of Peace was more sinister still. That half of Peace would be absolute evil. And yet it is held by Theosophists that the sole link between the seen and the unseen world is an army of such beings, in comparison with whom Mephistopheles would be an angel of light.

My paper has plainly had a great effect in the Theosophical camp; for lo and behold the countermarch which I detected last week in some of the rank and file has spread to the General. The surprising paper of Mr. Sinnett ("LIGHT," October 20th) took me completely aback. "Consciousness," it says, "is not separable." The split half of Peace does not "go off at once to Devachan." There is a struggle between the bad half of Peace and the good half of Peace of "infinitely elastic" duration. And at last the bad half of Peace instead of going to séances to personate Julius Cæsar disappears innocuously, or, as Mr. Sinnett puts it, the "lower affinities are vanquished by exhaustion." This I admit completely demolishes the charge of immorality that I have put forward, but it demolishes the main tenet of Theosophy with equal completeness.

Let me confront a moment Mr. Sinnett, the thinker, with Mr. Sinnett, the amanuensis of Koot Hoomi. *Esoteric Buddhism* (p. 91) states distinctly that what I venture to call the two halves of Peace are separated "at death," or "what is loosely called the separation of the soul from the body"; and amongst the headings of Chapter V. we find "Division of the Principles at Death." The good half of Peace (p. 92) after this separation is at once "assuredly in Devachan." And the bad half of Peace is likened to a "person who, carried into a strange room in a state of insensibility during illness, wakes up feeble, confused in mind," &c., "who recovers life for a time" (p. 94). This bad half of Peace is chiefly employed at séances; and it delivers "through trance speakers orations of no contemptible kind" (p. 99). If he is dethroned now in favour of the good half of Peace, we must recollect that in the old days of Theosophy it was the good half that was flabby and vague. "The Devachan existence is a rosy sleep," says Mr. Sinnett (p. 84).

But will not a Theosophist of the good old stamp be somewhat aghast at Mr. Sinnett's paper? Month after month, in the days of its vigour, the Indian organ girded at the Spiritualists for being a prey to spirits that were of necessity all evil. But if the good half and the bad half of a man after death may continue together for a period infinitely elastic in duration, how can we be sure that the spirits which communicate with mortals are all bad? Mr. Clissold last week, in an interesting letter, showed that Elijah (2 Chron. xxi. 12) is recorded, four years after death, to have written to Jehoram. How can we be certain that even he was a shell? Theosophists have been gazing on the rainbow hues of the Devachanic sphere, and suddenly Mr. Sinnett uses it in the light of a cricket ball and bursts it.

EOTHEN.

There appeared in "LIGHT" (April 23rd, 1887) a letter signed "E.M.," which has a strong bearing on the subject which "Eothen" and other correspondents are discussing. We

reproduce the letter to enable our readers to see the bearing of the arguments therein advanced, and of the statements there made, on the question of spirit identity involved in the present discussion.

The "Strange Case" of Mapleton Lefroy.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—The psychological phenomena presented in this case appear to me susceptible of an explanation other than that Lefroy was simply a medium under obsession of some extraneous spirit. This is, that the "third man," by whom he evidently was haunted, was no other than one of his own former astral selves, most probably that which had been evolved by him in his last previous incarnation, and which had been shed, therefore, at his last previous dissolution.

Summarising the various intimations clairvoyantly received concerning Lefroy—some of them prior and some subsequent to his execution—which have come under my cognisance, I find his history indicated as follows:—

1. He was a murderer, not only in his last life but in previous lives, being so through a radical defect of character, due either to his having receded from his true human grade, or to his having never fully reached that grade, the human form having been attained by him before putting off the character of carnivore. This theory is supported by the fact that in one of the views obtained of him as he was at the time of the murder, his external form only was that of a human being and his interior personality that of a tiger, which would hardly have been the case had he not been either a tiger in process of becoming a man, or a man in process of degenerating into a tiger; perhaps in a future incarnation to assume that form.

2. Having been, for murder or murders committed in his previous life, compelled to close that life by a premature and violent death, not only was his astral envelope necessarily full of vigour at the time of his death, but he himself was under compulsion again to re-incarnate after an interval too brief to allow of his astral being sufficiently attenuated and weakened to be powerless to affect him. Hence, on re-entering into life on the last occasion, after a sojourn in the purgatorial sphere all too short for his soul's needs, he found himself confronted by his own bad past in the shape of this still-animated and energetic relic of himself, and able to resist and escape it only by the steadfast renunciation of his past tendencies, and cultivation of those of a contrary character. This, however, he failed to accomplish, and repeated in his last life the faults of his previous one, by encouraging precisely the dispositions which had before brought him to grief and his indulgences in which gave his astral power over him. By doing this he attracted the phantom to him and re-inforced its vitality and power, until from being—as befits a phantom—but a faint, feeble, and decaying reflect of his past, it became his master, stronger in instigation than he in resistance, and under its promptings he once more became a murderer.

It was, thus, not the man's *double*, properly so-called, that appeared to him as the "third man" who impelled him to his crime. Detached from his double he would have lacked the physical force wherewith to make the requisite effort, since the withdrawal of the double leaves the subject in a state of exhaustion and collapse. Nor was it the astral itself that committed the crime, since the astral of itself has no physical force and can but influence the mind. The criminal was the man himself under impulsion of his former astral self, which he had discerned as separate from himself, and therefore took to be a "third man," but failed to recognise as his own former self.

According to *The Perfect Way* (Appendix II.), "a soul may have as many of these former selves in the astral sphere as a man may have changes of raiment." E.M.

FEDERATION OF LONDON SPIRITUALISTS.

The Conference of Spiritualist workers, held at Copenhagen Hall on Thursday, the 18th inst., was largely attended by representatives from almost every quarter of the London postal district. Among them were Messrs. Emms (Hackney), F. T. A. Davis (Leyton), Hopcroft (Kilburn), Downing (St. George's, E.), Veitch (Camberwell), Drake (Notting Hill), W. E. Long (Peckham), Rodger (Islington), U. W. Goddard (Clapham Junction), Towns (Kentish Town), Hawkins (Euston-road), Cannon (Hoxton), Marsh (East End), Weedemeyer (Canning Town), Mackenzie (Barnsbury), Wallace (King's Cross), Dale (Camden Town), Swindin (Euston-road), Wallis, Vale, Corner, White, and many more. Mrs. Simpson, of Camberwell, and other ladies were also present. The best guarantee that the Federation is likely to be a success was that, after friendly discussion, individuals relinquished their own pet ideas in favour of the general opinion of the meeting, and thus enabled all the propositions to be carried unanimously. A working council was elected (*pro tem.*) to meet and prepare a plan and propositions to be laid before a general conference, and to make arrangements for holding this public meeting in some central hall in London as early as possible. Particulars will shortly be announced. The joint hon. secretaries (*pro tem.*), W. E. Long, 99, Hill-street, Peckham, S.E., and U. W. Goddard, 6, Strath-terrace, St. John's Hill, Clapham Junction, S.W., will be pleased to give further information to inquiring friends.—U. W. GODDARD (Clapham Junction), Sec., *pro tem.*

JOTTINGS.

The *Harbinger of Light* reproduces the report of the Committee of the American Spiritualist Alliance on "The Proper Methods of Scientifically Investigating Spiritualism," and commends it to the study of its readers.

In the same paper our remarks upon the address of Professor Elliott Coues, called "Signs of the Times," are reproduced as thoroughly expressing the sentiments of the editor.

The *Harbinger* promises to introduce to its readers Mrs. Britten's address before the London Spiritualist Alliance, and commends the comments on modern religious teaching, in which two Australian preachers were noticed in "LIGHT."

The *Theosophist* for October has two articles, called respectively "Two Curious Experiences" and "The Experiences of a Student of Occultism," which deserve attention, but our space forbids us to attempt to reproduce them. We have placed the magazine on the table of the London Spiritualist Alliance.

Art Magic has the following. We have heard before that those who have been in the East hold the same opinion.

"The universal prevalence of image worship throughout the East, is due to the idea that the spirits of stars, planets, angels, seraphs, cherubs, and elementary spirits, could be attracted to their images, when consecrated under magical formulæ, and not only fix the worshippers' minds upon the spirits represented in the images, but actually draw them into those material receptacles. The strange and grotesque forms of consecrated images may thus be accounted for."

The idols in India are consecrated with rites of a mesmeric character and separately dedicated. It is thought that they thereby acquire an influence which is akin to that which obtains, no doubt, in the house that an earth-bound spirit can haunt. We take it that the influence communicated to the idol is unprovable.

The *Carrier Dove* is responsible for this story, verified by the American Society for Psychical Research:—

"A Lowell physician was called to see a patient about ten o'clock one night. It was extremely dark, and in alighting from his conveyance he made a mis-step and sprained his ankle severely. His wife, who was at home in bed asleep, suddenly awoke with the vivid impression that an accident had occurred to her husband. She arose, awakened the servant, and communicated her fears to her. Nothing could induce her to return to bed. At one o'clock the doctor returned, and it was found that the moment of the accident and of his wife's awakening were simultaneous. He was three miles away from home at the time."

The story is not unlike that given to the English Society by Mrs. Severn.

The *Phrenological Magazine* (L. N. Fowler, Imperial Buildings, Ludgate Circus) reproduces, from the *Glasgow Herald*, papers there printed called "Curiosities of Mesmerism." It also contains an article on "Phrenology and Moral Culture," which is well worth reading, as indeed the whole magazine is. The paper on "Criminal Physiognomy," which unkindly gibbets Napoleon III. beside two types of criminals, and suggests that he had the homicidal type of eyes and nose, is very interesting. We do not study these matters sufficiently. Fortunately we have our Galton, and he is educating us.

The body is the expression of the spirit that has grown it for its own purposes of development in this material world. Spirit expresses itself in acts, and these acts leave a permanent record on the body. Is not that a justification of a close study of physiognomy and phrenology?

This is interesting, if true:—

"*Apropos* of Mr. Herkomer's observation as to painting of portraits, it may be interesting to aspirants in this line that the Slade Professor was once an earnest student of phrenology. It would be interesting to know if he attributes any of his success as a portrait painter to his knowledge of this science (?). His portrait appears—the work of his own hand—in the first volume of the *Phrenological Magazine*, and in the biographical notice accompanying it appears the following: 'A biographical sketch of Mr. Herkomer would not be complete without mention being made of his power of healing by the so-called mesmeric power; a gift which has enabled him to restore many to health, but by the too free use of which he injured his own constitution.'—*Star*."

Sir William McCormac, in a recent address to the Medical Society of London, used these words: "I often think we are

too apt, in the pre-occupation of the present, to forget what a great amount of work was done by our predecessors, and how completely, in many instances, they fashioned the pathway which has led to many of our modern achievements." Yes. What do we not owe to Elliotson and Ashburner, to Hare and Mapes, Epes Sargent and Dale Owen, to Wilkinson, Howitt, and Coleman, to say nothing of many another honoured name "of whom the world was not worthy"?

Lucifer contains a joint note from Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky disavowing the stories as to their disagreement which have been freely circulated. They are "absolutely of one mind as to their work . . . united in purpose and zeal, and ready to sacrifice all, even life" for it.

From the *Star* :—

"The first edition of Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* has been already bought up, and a second edition is being printed as fast as possible to meet the continued demand. This is curious, considering that the book is of a more occult and difficult character than any that has preceded it."

Also from the *Star* :

"Miss Mabel Collins' *Light on the Path* has been translated into Sanskrit, and will be placed by the Hindû Pundits as one of the Sanskrit classics. Translation into Sanskrit is a thing which has not been done for at least 100 years past; but the book is sufficiently Buddhistic and occult to satisfy even the learned Hindûs."

This from the *Echo*. Ah me! Thus is what we know as Spiritualism represented, or rather misrepresented.

"SPIRITUAL SCIENCE.—Thought is spiritual science. The touch is sacred to the love; love is life. Sensitive people feel thoughts, and the first law of science is that our senses do not deceive. As in days of gesture-sign, our thoughts are far in advance of modes for their expression; consequently, no two individuals attach the same meaning or value to the same two words. We call that which is material 'natural' and the latter, again, 'spiritual.' Matter and spirit are beautifully blended, giving degrees, as dark and light give dawn and dusk; but Spiritualism is purely religious, as its teachings conclusively prove, and its message might be summed up in one word—'morality.'—A. F. G."

This is in the column devoted to the information of inquirers!

The new number of the White Cross Library is entitled, *The Uses of Sickness*, to which is added, *Museum and Menagerie Horrors*.

Mr. Prentice Mulford thinks that to cage birds and beasts used to freedom is an act of cruelty perpetrated to gratify human curiosity. Is it worth the misery it costs? Is it justifiable?

The Uses of Sickness gives us some worthy thoughts. "Your spirit is one thing, and your body quite another. Your spirit is an ever-increasing power, the growth of ages, and your body is only its temporary instrument for use in this one phase of existence."

"There are in this world many people who are half dead. . . . The spirit is unable to carry the half-dead body any longer. It frees itself from an encumbrance. You call that death. It is only the dropping of a load too heavy longer to be carried."

"In many cases, through natural birth, the spirit is given a body with which it is at total variance. . . . The spirit may only influence what may be called a fragment of that body. . . . The lower mind—the 'carnal mind'—may rule the body for its whole physical lifetime. . . . For the whole thought-current of the lower mind rules on this stratum of life, and meets the higher mind with obstacles or temptation at every point."

We have received from the publisher, Mr. Prentice Mulford's *Swamp Angel*, to which we propose to recur at leisure.

"CONCEIT and presumption have not been any more fatal to the world than the waste which comes of great men failing in their hearts to recognise how great they are. Many a man whose affectations and assumptions are a proverb has lost the magnificent virtue of simplicity, for no other reason than that he needed courage to take his own measure, and so finally confirm himself to the reality of his pretensions."—JOHN MORLEY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Beautiful Path.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—In these days it is the custom to talk much about the "all-pain" of this world. Seldom, if ever, do we hear of the "all-pleasure." The present writer's purpose is to show that it exists (although the majority of human beings are still unaware of it), and that it will eventually become a material reality, as it is even now a spiritual truth. Sensitive persons may imagine that they are fully conscious of the suffering at present endured on earth. They can, however, feel but a comparatively infinitesimal portion of it, without losing their reason. Those who have tried most to realise the "all-pain" must acknowledge to themselves that "that way madness lies." Nevertheless, there are many who peer into astral, as well as earthly, misery. The consequence is a marked accession of gloom and depression, and pessimism reigns triumphant. Now, the very word "pleasure" has been so misused and perverted that it conjures before the mind visions of a Mahometan paradise. Of intellectual pleasure we have but a very faint idea, of spiritual pleasure none at all. The human race has yet to learn how to be happy. Let it be said at once that the sort of happiness of which I speak is neither Devachan nor Nirvana. Neither is it the ecstasy of a Saint Theresa or a Margaret Mary Alacoque, while the orthodox notion of harps, golden crowns, damp clouds, and hymns may also be dismissed. I think the true idea of the beautiful path is best expressed in the words of the *Fama Fraternalis*:—"Unto him" (the true Rosicrucian) "the whole nature is detected; he doth not rejoice that he can make gold, and that, as saith Christ, the devils are obedient unto him, but is glad that he seeth the heavens open, the angels of God ascending and descending, and his name written in the Book of Life." A very simple experiment with numbers will demonstrate the act that the "Book of Life" is no empty phrase. Space will not admit of the method of working this experiment being given. It suffices to say that it consists of three columns of figures, the middle one being the total of the right hand and left hand columns added together. Each number used in this experiment has a mystic meaning, to unravel which would lead us too far afield at present.

The "beautiful path" refers to Tiphereth, the Sixth Sephira of the Kabbala, represented on the physical plane by the Sun. It will be obvious to those readers of "LIGHT" who are Christian Spiritualists, that, whatever Occultists may take the meaning of the Kabbala to be, its symbolism may be applied to the Founder of Christianity. Starting from this point we shall find that occult mysteries become clear in a very surprising manner; and this without twisting and turning the simple narrative of our Lord's life in an unjustifiable way. There are some so-called "Christian" mystics who enact again the part of the betrayer with his Judas kiss. They have missed the right way, and it is for those who have found it to lead them back again if possible, or at all events to prevent others from following in their footsteps. Does this mean, then, that we are to turn away from the splendid possibilities of occult science, to make the Bible a fetish, or bend our necks to the yoke of an unyielding Church? No, it means that the time is near at hand when the "new wine," which has been kept to the last, will be poured out, and in the light of the spiritual sun a golden age will begin. It is extremely difficult to convey to those whose psychic experiences have not led in the same direction the impression of absolute delight which dawns upon the truth-seeker when he first emerges from the terrible outer darkness into the light of the beautiful path. To realise that the dismal web enveloping mankind is woven by mankind alone, and that all the sorrow and pain and discomfort are a ghastly mistake—this is the first thought. Then comes the sense of the exceeding innocence and purity of the new world; not the icy deadness which we are accustomed to associate with the word purity, but the most intense happy life. Words are powerless to describe what is indescribable, and that which is, moreover, only experienced for a few moments now and then amid the unfavourable conditions of daily existence. The actual participation in spiritual happiness is necessarily evanescent for the time being. It leaves an unmistakable evidence of its truth in a wonderfully increased power of enjoyment, and an intense pleasure in all intellectual pursuits. Reading, especially, is

quite a different thing after the illumination, of which I have given but a feeble and inadequate sketch. Perhaps others, who know it well, will understand me when I say,

"Is it not indeed a Beautiful Path?"

LEO.

History and Allegory.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I believe it to be impossible to attain any real insight into the mystery of religion, which is its philosophy, without an unitary conception of mankind. Mr. Maitland, quite rightly of course, repudiates the simple literal view of Adam and Eve as a man and a woman, though he concedes an historical element to the story of them as representing "the history of an ancient Church"—Swedenborg's "most ancient Church." But the story may be *transcendently* historical if we conceive man universally, and Adam and Eve as representing an essentially organised humanity, which could include any number of individuals. This would undoubtedly carry with it the account given by Mr. Maitland, as also by Mr. Oliphant, of "the exterior and interior natures of every individual, the 'man' and the soul, which are respectively as masculine and feminine to each other." But it would have this reference only as the greater contains the less, the whole the part; as what is true of the integral universal is correspondingly true of the constituent and microcosmic individual; the theme being *universal man, with organic unity of consciousness*, anterior to a disorganisation denoted by the "Fall." The account of that fall would be history, but transcendental history, because man's origin on earth, in his present gross embodiment, would be just the completion of his fall, the term of the downward process, probably one of incalculable ages of our time, during which man passed through the dominion of the "astral" into the elementary condition—the making of his "coats of skin." Nay, if it is necessary to satisfy the biological evolutionists, I do not see why we should not be at liberty to carry the supposition much further, and recognising the animals as representative of qualities inherent in, or taken on by, man, suppose that the human form and consciousness became for a period sunk and latent in these representative embodiments—an apt consequence of a disorganisation reaching well nigh to dissolution. Needless to say, the idea that individual man might, even under later conditions, "fall" into animal forms is of great antiquity; it was countenanced by Plato, and in the East still extensively prevails. The astral body is governed by the imagination—a plastic power of the soul—and by a nature thus acquired; and for my part, I can accept the old belief in "were-wolves" without requiring stronger positive evidence than we have for that curious mediæval phenomenon. Thus by the potential convertibility to any object or nature on which imagination seizes, we may explain the materialisation of man. The revival of a latent humanity, passed into the bestial image, would speedily develop the organic materiality of the latter into more appropriate forms—a somewhat similar conception being very ingeniously expounded in the account of evolution by "Rounds," in Mr. Sinnett's *Esoteric Buddhism*. Mr. Maitland has not himself adduced the scientific theory of biological evolution in opposition to the "fall" of man, historically conceived; but his ally (*pro hac vice*), Mr. Oxley, has done so, and I submit the above remarks as partly a reply to that objection. Nor do I imagine that Mr. Maitland will take exception to what I have called "transcendental history," for he knows that there is far more than this outer veil, our world, between us and the noumenal empyrean for which time and process are not, and upon no metaphysical grounds can he deny man a history anterior to his appearance or embodiment here—a history which, if there is one, must be the antecedents conducing to that result. And I am nearly sure that Mr. Maitland, if he holds the doctrine of organic evolution, does so only on the presupposition of a prior *involution*; in other words, that he belongs to the school of teleological, and not to that of fortuitous, evolution. We cannot work teleology without the conception of the immanence of ideal forms, and how did they get there? How did the superior become buried in the inferior, if not by a *devolution* which anteceded evolution? And does it not properly belong to the province of sacred tradition to tell us something, to give us an intimation, of that earlier process, whereby we may know that our present tendency and task is recovery of an essential and original perfection? That Old "Testament" seems worth having; now as to the New.

When Mr. Maitland tells us that the Jesus of the Gospels is typical of the regenerate self-hood, I certainly agree, because the regenerate self-hood is just the Divine Humanity individualised and come to consciousness in each. But that is, so to speak the microcosmic aspect of the subject, and even thus is unintelligible except by reference to the integral unity, and the Centre, or Head, which makes that unity possible, the very consciousness in question being the consciousness of that relation. Christ is called "the new Adam" in the sense of the *universal* man regenerate. As long as we see only individuals, and fail to recognise the higher reality of the integral unity comprehending and vitalising them, the phrase "regenerate self-hood" is without meaning, because it directs us to no source, and therefore to no content of consciousness. There is no ethical content in the individual divinity thus postulated. And here I would remark that the ethic of every *organism* is necessarily self-regarding, except so far as there may exist for it the ideal of a yet higher integration, or principle of unity, to which it can aim at attachment. The ethic of the individual constituent, on the other hand, is always the well-being of the organism to which it belongs. There can thus be no individual divinity out of reference to what, in immediate relation to itself, is universal, though *absolutely* this higher principle may be far from universal. The "divinity" of an individual constituent is the life and spontaneous will (superseding ethical "obligation") of the organism in him. But that life and that will have a central focus and directive, failing which there would be an immediate relapse into the self-centred individuality, which is disorganisation.

The interpretation which would substitute the Man Regenerate for the spiritual Head of Humanity seems, therefore, not to be allowable. Nor is it reconcilable, I submit, with the constant purport of the Gospels, in which the conception of organic reintegration of mankind, by assimilation to a centre of integral consciousness, is as prominent as are the incidents typical of individual regeneration. The form in which attachment to a Mediator is throughout insisted on precludes the interpretation that this mediator is to be regarded as the individual soul, or an outbirth from the individual soul, in each. Such expressions as, "I am the tree, ye are the branches," &c., are inapplicable to that view, and, indeed, are only applicable to the personification of a total Humanity, from which the distinct individualities are derivative and dependent.

So, if "Jesus" is a name implying "Liberator," I should draw a different conclusion from Mr. Maitland's from that fact. He says that the name refers to a function of the regenerate self-hood by means of which man is liberated from the bonds of his material nature. Is there not some confusion here? Surely the regenerate self is the (now) man in us—born of the Soul, the "Virgin"—and in *that* event, that birth, consists our "liberation from the bonds of our material nature," not in some subsequent function of this new man, who has only to grow to maturity. I should suppose the "Liberator" to be one who brought the embryo to birth, as the sun, by its warmth combining with the moisture of the earth, excites germinal life, enabling it to burst the integument of the husk. This analogy is the more important, as suggesting the necessity of an external or peripheral action on the pregnant soul, that is, from the earthly plane. For although the impregnation is a purely spiritual or divine operation from within, the opening of consciousness, which is atonement, must take place in each degree of man's nature, and the "ultimation" of the Agent in this process, His assumption of earthly conditions, may be a more rigorous consequence for spiritual science than perhaps can yet be clearly defined. But the advances made in psychical science are helping us to some extent; for by it we see how *rapport*, extending deeper than we can trace it in superficial consciousness, is externally mediated. It seems to me that the sudden vitality, and tremendous impulse, of early Christianity are insufficiently accounted for by a Gnostic revelation in the form of parable; whereas I find in Mr. Oliphant's *Scientific Religion* a conception of the ultimation of spiritual forces, deserving more benevolent consideration than Mr. Maitland seems to have bestowed upon it. But I am so greatly indebted to both these masters, that an attitude of controversy towards either of them depresses me with a sense of presumption. Moreover, I must again confess that my own faith, if faith it can at all be called, in the historical verity of the Gospels, is still too undecided to justify controversy from a boldly affirmative position. But I do venture to dispute a negative based on a mystical interpretation with which I mainly agree.

Let me conclude by expressing my gratitude to your correspondent "Lily," for her kind encouragement in a recent number of "LIGHT."

C. C. M.

(For continuation of Correspondence see p. 552.)

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"
16, CRAVEN STREET,
CHARING CROSS, 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*.

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

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

All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and *not* to the Editor.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed "— & Co."

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, OCTOBER 27th, 1888.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor. 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.

MATERIALIZATION : EVIDENCE OF MR. ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE.

The *Journal of the Society for Psychological Research* for October contains an interesting correspondence between Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace and Mr. Vaughan Jenkins on the subject of a recent American experience of the former gentleman. Mr. Wallace had communicated to the June number of the *Journal* an account of the case of "Nellie Morris," and it is not important to recall the facts further than to illustrate the letters. Mr. Vaughan Jenkins opens the correspondence with a letter in which he canvasses some statements of General Lippitt as to this materialised young lady, who seems to have comported herself in a very mundane manner.

"There is nothing" (says Mr. Vaughan Jenkins of these beings) "in their actions or conduct that differs from any ordinary human beings : they conversed freely on all mundane subjects, they answered all ordinary questions, they sang when requested, and Nellie even stood to compare measurements. She conversed for a long time, two or three members of the circle taking part therein. She actually shivered at the recollection of her having died on a cold day 'in January.' She was sensitive to flattery. She modestly shook hands, and to crown all—to prove her identity and her identification with her own former earthly self. . . . Nellie, with her own 'hand, before retiring,' (?) 'cut off for me a lock of her hair, which I have carefully preserved.' . . . Materialised Nellie does not altogether vanish, or retire ! She leaves a permanent sample portion of her corporeal entity behind her. . . . Still the anomalous fact remains that Nellie's mortal body, her hair included, was at the time of her alleged materialisation, and for four years previously, slowly being resolved into its original elements to unite with and form new physical combinations."

Mr. Wallace's reply, slightly condensed, is as follows :—

"Frith Hill, Godalming.

"E. Vaughan Jenkins, Esq.

"June 26th, 1888.

"DEAR SIR,—You have evidently formed erroneous ideas of what 'materialisation' is. No Spiritualist believes it to be 'the real body' of the individual, or even 'a real body' in one sense of the term. It is *something* temporarily material for purposes of identification ; but what exactly no one can tell. All the information we can get shows that it is formed partly (often chiefly) from the body of the medium, partly from the bodies of the persons present, or from their 'atmosphere' or emanations, and that the likeness to any individual is produced by an *effort* which is not always successful, since, during the same evening, the same spirit-form sometimes appears in very different degrees of likeness to his mortal body ; sometimes more like the medium, hence many of the accusations of impos-

ture. The *permanent materialisation* of hair and portions of garment is very extraordinary. Sometimes such things *do* vanish away, either rapidly or gradually, but in other cases both remain. The *hair* I had here, but have now returned it to General Lippitt. All we can at present do is to make sure of *the facts*. The laws of the phenomena we may never know till we are spirits ourselves, and not, perhaps, even then. Can we, tell, *really*, how we move our hands and fingers to write and express our thoughts? Spirits do not appear to be able to tell us *how* they materialise. It is a faculty exercised by the will-power of *some* spirits, and is probably quite as rare and remarkable and inexplicable among them as physical mediumship is among us.—Believe me, yours faithfully,

"ALFRED R. WALLACE."

"P.S.—The appearance of the double of any living person, sometimes to two or more witnesses, seems analogous to materialisation, and the person whose double appears has no conception *how it is done*. Neither have the spirits who materialise, except that it seems to be more directly a matter of *will* with them. See *Phantasms of the Living*.—A R. W."

Mrs. Sidgwick, who has given a good deal of attention to the subject of materialisation, having seen the letters of these gentlemen, wrote to express her opinion that proof of these phenomena was inadequate. Mr. Wallace then expresses *his* opinion that Mrs. Sidgwick "is not fair in passing over the evidence of facts, and especially the evidence of the genuineness of the mediums as opposed to the mere accusations and assertions against them." That, formulated as a general proposition, is what Spiritualists generally—I believe universally—have felt in respect of the action taken by the Society of which Mrs. Sidgwick is a leader. Mr. Wallace desires that we should "make sure of the facts." He complains, as Spiritualists do, that the facts to which the Society chiefly attends are those of least importance, and that the really important facts receive attention only from an unsympathetic and harshly critical point of view. As an instance of this, Mr. Wallace cites the commendation bestowed on the report of the Seybert Commission by Mr. Myers "as valuable and conclusive." To this may be added the strange belief that the tricks of Mr. S. J. Davey have exposed what are assumed to be the tricks of mediums. But this is a matter of little import except so far as the public mind is under a delusion. Mr. Davey has apparently vanished into space, leaving behind him nothing but some unsatisfactory pretensions, and some very curious letters written in the early stages of his "development" which are interesting in connection with his later performances.

Mrs. Sidgwick, in reply to Mr. Wallace's allegation that she passes over the evidence for certain facts, and pays heed too much to mere accusations and assertions against mediums, rejoins in a letter which is very interesting, as it throws light on the attitude of mind in which the writer approaches "the evidence for facts." There is, she thinks, a confusion in Mr. Wallace's mind :—

"I will try to explain what I mean. All mankind is for each of us divided into three classes. There is a small class, differing for each of us, about whom we feel that the hypothesis of conscious fraud is absurd. There is another small class about whom we feel sure that they have been guilty of, or might be guilty of, deliberate fraud. There is a third and much larger class, about whom we cannot tell whether if temptation came in their way they would cheat or not. Now, some people think that they have positive evidence placing Mrs. Beste and others of the mediums employed by General Lippitt in the second- or known-to-be-fraudulent class. Mr. Wallace distrusts the facts and assertions brought forward by these witnesses, and does not think the fraud proved. But, supposing his distrust were well-founded, that would not place the mediums in the class above suspicion, as Mr. Wallace, in the sentence I have quoted, seems to imply. It would only place them in the large class about whom we cannot tell whether they would cheat or not, while it is known that they have strong pecuniary inducements to cheat.

"In my letter I was careful to base no argument on the assumption that fraud had been proved against the mediums in

question, only on the assumption that they are not above suspicion.

* * * * *

"I think that Mr. Wallace and General Lippitt do not allow enough for the ease with which one's senses may be deceived, and that, in consequence, they would probably have been equally convinced by the séance for materialisation described in our *Proceedings*, Part IV., pp. 482-485, if they believed Mr. Davey to be a medium; and indeed you may remember that Mr. Wallace was convinced that certain performances, under the auspices of Dr. Lynn (at the Westminster Aquarium, I think), were Spiritualistic.

"ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK."

Now here we are in agreement with Mr. Wallace, and have contended repeatedly that it is the duty of an investigator to protect *himself* against fraud in each case, as we have never ceased to denounce conscious fraud on the part of any medium as even revoltingly base. We have also repeatedly said that we are not satisfied that what seems to us to be fraud is really so at all; and, if so, is really chargeable in all cases on the medium. We believe that so-called frauds are often more apparent than real. And we do not see any connection between mediumship and moral consciousness. A man may be a powerful medium and a great rogue at the same time. It is the business of the investigator to take such precautions as will keep the Jekyll and Hyde separate and distinct. That is the way in which we are forced to transact the ordinary business of life; and, though we may all prefer to deal with honesty, we have unfortunately to take things as we find them, and try to improve them. An ideal state of perfection would be delightful, but we shall have to wait for it till the state of this world is very different from what it is. This we should have thought obvious; almost as much so as that a keen scent for imagined possible fraud is not conducive to impartiality.

Mr. Wallace's reply, addressed to Mr. Vaughan Jenkins, for the material part of which alone we can find space, seems to us cogent and complete:—

"E. Vaughan Jenkins, Esq.

"July 31st, 1881.

"DEAR SIR,—If we assume, to begin with, that mediums are all impostors, and that no fact in Spiritualism has been proved, I admit that Mrs. Sidgwick is right. But she puts forth this arguement *while ignoring the direct evidence* for the facts, and it is of this that I complain. While urging the possibility of imposture in General Lippitt's case she ignored Mr. Lyman's direct evidence of phenomena with one of the mediums concerned (Mrs. Beste), which cannot be explained by imposture, and she ignores the whole mass of test evidence in private houses, where confederates and machinery are excluded, and yet where things occur which only confederates or machinery could produce if there is no reality in the phenomena. Now, we have other evidence in General Lippitt's pamphlet of the genuineness of another medium (Keeler). Yet we are asked to believe that these mediums, who are proved to have *power* to produce genuine phenomena, yet systematically conspire with impostors to produce sham phenomena. This, I urge, is contrary to human nature. The person who possesses exceptional powers of any kind does not enter into elaborate collusion for fraudulent purposes with others who only pretend to have these powers. Their interests are all against it. Why should they risk their reputation, on which their living depends, by entering into elaborate conspiracy with many other mediums, involving constant correspondence and systematic records, on the *chance* of being able to deceive certain persons? And the chance is very slender, for how could any of these seven mediums (except, perhaps, one or two) tell that General Lippitt would ever visit them, or how could they have the necessary preparations made against his chance visit—the presence, for example, of the two girls who are supposed to have represented his daughter and Nellie Morris? And all this to produce by fraud that which they have power to produce by genuine means! Once demonstrate that genuine mediumship exists in any case, and the whole argument of assuming imposture in every case falls to the ground. Again, skilful imposture carried on for years requires facilities of an exceptional kind and long practice. But, almost without exception, mediums begin as *children*

or young persons; their powers are at a maximum in *youth*, and usually diminish with mature years. This is directly opposed to the fact as to skill in jugglery—which is a rather rare faculty, never seen in perfection in youth. Mediums, on the other hand, are often very ignorant, commonplace, and clumsy persons. Their whole lives are often known. They usually begin by exhibiting their powers in other people's houses, where imposture and confederacy would be most difficult, and only when they have thus obtained a reputation find it more profitable to give séances chiefly in their own houses. All these, and many other facts, Mrs. Sidgwick ignores in order to uphold her assumption of the absence of evidence and the extreme probability of imposture. I maintain that the existence of the *power of mediumship* being proved, there is no more special presumption of imposture here than in regard to other faculties.

"ALFRED R. WALLACE."

The instructive part of the correspondence is that which throws light on the attitude taken by Mrs. Sidgwick—in many respects a typical scientific investigator who plainly desires to arrive at the truth—in regard to the phenomena of Spiritualism. It is clear, even from this correspondence, that there is no common platform on which we Spiritualists and those who approach us in this way can stand. We can be of no real use to those who, after many years of investigation, have not been able to make up their minds as to the truth of the vast mass of evidence that they have presumably considered.

AN INTERVIEW WITH MAHOMET!

In one of the numbers of *Le Spiritisme* for September there occurs the following account of a communication from Mahomet. The story is cited not from any inherent excellence in the communication itself, but as typical of a large number, if not of the whole, of such communications.

After the evocation, Mahomet announces himself, "I am here, the spirit of Mahomet."

The questioner having a wholesome doubt about the matter requires Mahomet to take an oath before God that he is what he says he is. He takes the oath without any difficulty, and the questioner is satisfied.

The suggestion is then made to Mahomet that he should talk about Spiritism and its teaching, but Mahomet, who appears to have been *en évidence* previously, declines to say anything about Spiritism, but prefers to talk about himself.

"Let me rather speak about myself," says he. "In once more confessing my sin, I shall doubtless obtain from God some new evidence of His mercy." The wisdom learnt on earth does not seem to have deserted Mahomet, who then goes on:—"Yes, I have taught men false doctrine, doctrine which I knew to be false, but I had a great object in view, which I partly succeeded in gaining, namely, to found a religion which should be intelligible to all, and to bring back the idolatrous populations amongst whom I lived to the belief in one God, good and merciful, the Creator of the heavens and the earth," and so on.

Mahomet then tells his hearer that notwithstanding this purity of motive he fell away into ambition, and moreover failed to understand Christianity. He says, as doubtless his interlocutor expected him to say:—"If I had known it as I knew it when too late—if I had seen in the Gospel what I now see, I should have been the propagator of that sublime teaching among my own people. I did not understand it. Was that my fault alone?" And this somewhat whimpering question is followed up by "It was certainly mostly the fault of those great criminals who have moulded the teaching of Jesus to ends no better than my own."

After this, one is not surprised to find that to the question, "Do you now, at any rate, belong to the ranks of purified spirits?" Mahomet replies, "Make no mistake as to my position. I have not yet arrived at the stage of purification, far from it. . . . Your imagination

cannot picture to itself what profound grief I feel, what shame comes over me, when, all over the Mussulman world, I hear my own name joined to that of God. You cannot understand what this punishment has been for me. But God is merciful, God is pitiful, He has had compassion on my repentance, and now I am happy, for He has pardoned me."

After these somewhat contradictory remarks, the questioner says: "At any rate your state of development will allow you to answer this: What influence, in your opinion, can Spiritism have on Islamism?"

To this Mahomet replies:—"As much influence as God will let it have. If God desires Islamism to fall, Islamism will fall, equally with all the doctrines which pretend to agreement with the teaching of Jesus; and God does wish it! It is the cry which of old the Christians raised against Islamism; it is the cry which Spiritism can hurl with far more reason, against all religions, for not one represents, even in the slightest degree, the teaching of Jesus."

This story is transcribed into the columns of *Le Spiritisme*, from a book called *Spirite et Chrétien*, by Alex. Bellemare. Now *Spirite et Chrétien* might be taken as the motto of those Spiritists who are represented by *Le Spiritisme*. These people are angry beyond measure with that smaller, but more liberal-minded, body of separatists who are represented by *La Vie Posthume*. So the questioner would expect Mahomet to agree with him entirely, as Mahomet evidently did. We get the condemnation of Islamism. We get Mahomet wandering about the earth, in *erraticité* presumably. We get the condemnation of the Churches, especially of Rome; and we get the panacea for all moral evil, Spiritism. And above all we get Mahomet, who was expected by the questioner.

Anything more feeble than the whole silly business can hardly be imagined, and yet there is abundant evidence that this same kind of folly is rife amongst ourselves. A party of Spiritualists in the country raise the spirit of one of the Whitechapel victims, and demonstrate their implicit belief in the presence of that spirit by going to the police office and telling the amazed officials there all about the murder, and the murderer. In another part of the country, just as implicitly it is believed by another party of Spiritualists that *their spirit* has told them the true though totally different story of the same crime.

Is it not time that this should cease?—cease not only with those whose general intelligence is of so low an order that Spiritualism is with them little better than love of the marvellous, but cease also among those whose higher claim to wisdom should show them that the chances are strongly in favour of their so-called "guides" being little if any more than the reflections of their own personalities.

If Spiritualistic philosophy, by which we mean the certainty of intelligent existence outside of and impinging on this, and the equal certainty of life beyond death,—if this philosophy is to have its full effect in the eventual regeneration of the race, it must be purged from the degradation which is expressed in the debasing love of the marvellous with some, and in blind but egregious credulity with others.

π

WE are informed that the *Secret Doctrine*, by Madame Blavatsky, will be published early in November. The subscription price (28s.) will close on November 1st. The book is published at two guineas.

WE have received from the Rosy Cross Publishing Company, San Francisco, a little volume entitled *The Temple of the Rosy Cross: the Soul, its Powers, Migrations, and Transmigrations*, by T. B. Dowd, Hempstead, Texas. A glance shows that the volume is one of much interest, and we shall hope to review it and introduce it to students of the occult in this country.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(Continued from p. 529.)

History and Allegory.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

FRIEND,—I have noticed the correspondence between "C. C. M." and my valued acquaintance E. Maitland, and having laboured much in the field descanted on, I feel pressed to speak.

I have sympathy and unity with "C. C. M.'s" letter of 29th ult., and am glad to be able to feel the same with very much of E. Maitland's that followed. Without taking up anything in this last, either to praise or qualify, I will propound a few general principles, having been in unity with both. I have in the works referred to largely and repeatedly, both didactically and illustratively, expressed the great truths as to the Christ and as to the soul stated by Maitland, albeit allowing all for which "C. C. M." contends. I have been in unity with both. Indeed I can go with E. Maitland cordially, save in what he sometimes *excludes*.

Thesis I. The history and mystery are not irreconcilable, each taken *per se*.

As history may (it is allowed) be symbolic, so allegories may yet be true—even those of Scripture; *i.e.*, as others must concede that their being facts does not prevent the Bible histories from being mystic types, so *we* must allow their being such does not militate against their reality. As might be expected, the Churches cling to one extreme—the literal—and the more interior to the other—the spiritual—too often, denying, each, the counterpart its place, in their zeal. Both dangers need to be carefully shunned. "These ought ye to have done," said Christ when in this flesh, "and not to have left the other undone."

Thesis II. Both these are in the Scriptures, or intended to be read—*i.e.*, by such as can, and as they are made known.

Thesis III. The occult or mystical sense may be more than one and may be manifold. I believe it to be the glory of the Bible and a great mark of its Divine origin that its symbolism is capable of several distinct readings. Angelome in the ninth century thought there were seven to each text. This, I say, discovers its authorship, because it is a miracle—doubtless—that one account should fit several inner meanings equally; and, when we add to this that it fitted also once to fact, or took place on the stage of earth as in drama, we have a prodigy past words. I suppose no greater evidence of inspiration could be given.

E. Maitland and A. Kingsford dwelt on one field, Swedenborg another (very often, at least), Guyon a third, Boehme (Behmen) a fourth, and for all I know the mystical writers of the early Church on others still. Here is the many-tasted Manna of which the Rabbies tell, for it is the Bread of God, *i.e.*, those words of spiritual truth which lie under Moses' and others' veils and are declared to be "spirit" and "life" by which man shall live.

Thus, there are interior significations according to the whole Church, the course of the soul's experience, and the threefold being of man. And the last Maitland, Boehme, and the old "Quakers" treat in different terms or under varied *intellectual* guise. "These all spake of Him," and mean the same in their hearts.

Thesis IV. The truth of Scripture narratives as fact is not always the exact fact as it stands. For that could not always be and then some of them would be untrue. But they are all true, and to be so esteemed with respect to a disability allowing of qualification in the case of some.

This qualification is not negatory, but referring to words employed.

And it applies where ideas and terms have been permitted which we cannot take literally, but which *had to be used*. The reason of this was that Moses had to write (1) what, perhaps, was not understood by him, or seen in the mystery; (2) what he could not duly or rightly express. Hence it was set forth in terms, or ideas, which give the mind the nearest approximation it is capable of having from language to the fact; and this being mystical, is not properly expressible in its speech, as the Lord felt when He strove by trope after trope to make the nameless Seed or Leaven of Life understood, and again when He was called a Rock or a Door and said to give water to drink. This defect is incident to what is spiritual—which must be "compared" with spiritual, as the Apostle said, and thus only can be known. And it is to this that the diversity is owing, when different mystics dissent over terms, since each must choose some, and each has his own, which are different, and none really utter what they intend, or can be accurate.

Thus, all the Bible is true, *yea, as fact*, but not all of it true as commonly read.

Thesis V. Esoteric truth does not get rid of, or (I think) explain, the body and its peculiarities. It is here this *fact* is required.

While we stand in the complex and strange beings we do as men and women—though they be but the tabernacles—the Creation and Fall will have a great importance; and, if we took not our rise from some Adam or in a certain way (according to many), we took it somehow, in short from some other Adam. There must have been a *first* man, however he came.

I hear no explanation of this, though the history given in the Bible is challenged. *Meliorum fac*, give us another more credible after all. Strange and wonderful it must have been any way, and it *did* take place. What is so strange and wonderful will seem incredible too.

It is often the case that, in the end, no hypothesis is more credible and likely *in se* than the one disbelieved. What more monstrous than the hopes or dreams of some sceptics, like the fears and visions of such as deny all ghosts?

There are works in existence which open ancient Scripture in accordance with what is propounded here in the above thesis, though such an interpretation is practically *unknown*. But it is neither out of harmony with, nor hinders that of *The Perfect Way*, as it is not and does not the wonderful series of unfoldings, according to the soul's degrees of experience, in the mystical commentaries of J. M. Guyon.

Thesis VI. Christ when in that prepared body held a dispensational and peculiar personal position as well as a representative one. This prevented not His being representative, as not sinning does not—so a man be tempted, as He was.

This peculiar place and work in relation to past times and the era involves a truly secret meaning, having express reference to Himself in that appearance and ministry and, yet, not therefore out of harmony or use with other esoteric intent.

Indeed, His life—as might be expected—is in all ways an inexhaustible field.

Thesis VII. When we recognise that the dispensational and peculiar personal character of Jesus Christ is, and must ever be, intimately related to our soul's interest, or the knowing Him in His seed and bringing Him forth anew, what opens it profoundly—and no openings are deeper, or more ravishing, or complete—must be held to be esoteric Scripture too.

This is a very different thing from the untrue dogmas of vicarious atonement, "imputation," God's wrath, &c., held by every Church: how different no words can tell.

He came to be the first-born of many brethren, who were to love "as" He loved, and live as He lived (since to "show forth" His "life"), and be also "sons of God without rebuke," having His spirit and being led by it, *yea*, "the mind of Christ."

But He was also, as "C. C. M." phrases it, the Head of Humanity, and more. He was the Light of the world that we might be—acceptable that we might be received in Him.

This brings me to my closing theme, which is that the same doctrine taught so fervently by Maitland now was by the old "Quakers," and—long earlier—not by the sages of the East only, but of the West. Lao Tsze, too, in China, taught it with a clearness never surpassed, in the time of Buddha, and was to Confucius—though adored by every one—as Christ to Moses, therefore less known.

I know not how it is it escapes notice—a notice *due* to the saints from their children, especially after they have been long belied—that this principle, the Virgin, or female of *The Perfect Way* and of Boehme, the *Atman*, &c., &c., of new Orientals, and the Quakers' Light, was known to Anaxagoras as the *Divine Mind*, to Socrates as the *Good Spirit*, to Timæus as the Unborn Principle and Author of all Light, to Hieron as *God in Man*, to Plato as the Eternal, Perfect and Ineffable Principle of Truth, to Pythagoras as the Great Light and Salt of Ages, to Zeno as the Maker and Father of all, and to Plotinus as the *Root of the Soul*, not to speak of Seneca, Antoninus, and others.

The old or true "Quakers," as men called them, held this, and little else, other things flowing thence. They are the only modern Christian body who held it, yet seem never named! "Honour to whom honour is due." I call upon the true children, on their sires' behalf. They taught (as is nowhere taught in Orthodoxy) that Christ was "that holy thing" [N.B.], that we must be saved by It,* identifying it with the Grace of God that brings salvation and hath appeared unto all, the seed

of life, the Word "very nigh thee," and which James testifies is "able to save," the light lightening every man, the leaven and so forth. Hence, they taught the Bible was not *needful*, nor any outward knowledge at all, and that so-called heathen may be and are often saved,—they alone.

As this is remarkably overlooked by those who now see the same from, I fear, sectarian prejudice *due to erroneous accounts*, I may add that they read the Bible mystically—as some now do again, and wrote often so too. As I read in my valued friend Maitland's letter of our being both sons of God and sons of man, when normal, I thought of words identical—nay, paragraphs to that very effect in Job Scott's Essays on Salvation. That approved minister writes in as strong terms and uncommon as he could use of the Virginity and of Christ *within*. So of Penington. *Vox ex Adyto*,
Cardiff. CH. FOX.

10th month, 1888.

[Our "friend" is an old-time Quaker, and we have tried, as far as possible, to print his letter as he wrote it; feeling that to edit it would destroy the flavour of the style. We are glad to hear from a member of that ancient body, to whom "the things of the spirit" were all in all.—ED.]

"Kabbalists."

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I shall be obliged if you will permit me to say a few words in reply to "Eothen's" paper headed "Kabbalists," of October 13th.

First, I must premise that I am glad he is not further displeased with *my* remarks concerning *his*, than by mentioning that I had not said anything exactly complimentary to him! I trust, therefore, he will do me the justice to understand that, in correspondence on these subjects we must, with all due respect for varied or conflicting opinions, at least be straightforward in giving them; therefore, when they do conflict, we must each tranquilly await the period (at all events, *one* of the parties must) when the less advanced student arrives on the same platform; *conflict then ceases*. On these lines my disagreement with "Eothen" will also cease.

I must now remark, in justice to the Theosophical Society, that it would be quite unfair to say that my views are necessarily endorsed in any way by the Society, and, as a society, the idea would be quite disapproved by them. Some of its members entirely occupy themselves with the more especially Oriental side, more decidedly under the auspices of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott. There are others, like myself, whose *temperamental intellects*, if that is not coining a word, lead them to feel more interest and find more subjects akin to their natures, in the Hermetic writings of old, in those of the mystics of mediæval and other times, and especially in modern times the great work, *The Perfect Way*.

Nevertheless, whatever we individually think, perfect freedom is necessarily permitted, and all of us must, and we do, feel a debt of gratitude for such remarkable and unique works as *Esoteric Buddhism*, *Isis Unveiled*, &c.

These latter works deal more especially with the esoteric science of the universe, the mysteries of the cosmos, the great works of the macrocosm; the former with the microcosm. To this class of writings I feel more affinity, and greater capacity, therefore, of judgment in the matter. I know, however, quite sufficient concerning the matter of philosophic Theosophy to be *quite sure* that "Eothen" has not sufficiently studied its tenets. Nowhere will he find any hypothesis which would at all lead him to conclude that "Peace, the burglar, and the Whitechapel woman-killer can attain at death a purity and a degree of excellence never gained on earth by St. Paul or St. John," &c. He will pardon me if I absolutely assert the entire impossibility of his finding *any* Theosophic doctrine that would in the faintest degree give colour to such an assertion!

I will not trouble your readers with going further into the matter; but I would beg "Eothen" kindly to study *any* Theosophic work thoroughly, especially any chapter on Karma, and he will find that he had arrived at a hasty judgment; and I am sure that as he is evidently an earnest student, and is anxiously striving for light and truth, he will certainly obtain both in due time, and he will then be only too glad to correct the errors easily seen with more advanced knowledge.

"Eothen" asks if I believe in a God "who permits fiends alone to influence mortals." I necessarily answer simply No! The apprehension of such a Being being non-thinkable, such a

* *Him* may be thus rendered, *c.g.*, in John i. 7.

Being cannot exist. But if he asks me if I believe in a devil who does so I say, Yes.

I cannot see with regard to his question of my belief or non-belief in such a God that it has anything to do with any process of logic on my part in bestowing praise on Christian Magians. Why should I not? The Christian Magians most assuredly deserved praise (though I would rather not use so unsatisfactory a word), as do all Magians. Their Christianity or otherwise is merely the colouring of their views for outside observation. Fundamental truths and everlasting principles must be the same. Names are useful only for classification and tabulation. I say I prefer, *myself*, the study of Christian mysticism rather than Oriental, not because I think or indeed could judge rightly (*righteous judgment* is a rare gift of the Spirit) which system has most truth!

All esoteric systems hold all truth; only as life is short, and as I said we keep naturally to our temperaments in choice of a line of study, I lean towards that of the West as a Theosophy teaching me more lucidly than the Theosophy of the East! That is all!

Kabbalism is an allied study of course, requiring, however, a peculiarly scholarly cast of mind, and a peculiarly gifted perception to make its study even on the exoteric side of any value.

This, the commonly understood, side of Kabbalism is really the spurious. A man may be a great scholar, and fully understand on the intellectual plane all its lore regarding magical rites, and yet he will be a stranger to the spiritual side, which the initiate alone knows. The initiate sees that Theosophy, the Hermetic science, and the Kabbala all arrive by different roads at the same gate. He sees also the various travellers wasting their time and obstructing their own progress, as well as that of others, by wrangling over the differences of detail, detail really suited to their various idiosyncrasies, on the road.

If people would only manfully and courageously walk along their own self-appointed road, giving the hand of fellowship at all the cross roads and stiles and gates where they meet travellers *by other routes*, all bent for the same bourne, we certainly should arrive more quickly, and we should be so much happier on the route; and what is greater than happiness?

Theosophy is great, the Hermetic sciences are great, the Kabbala is great. Let us try to study, in so far as we can, the spirit of all, but the details chiefly, of the one most suitable to us. The Divine Self or the Higher Self settles that business for us.

May I venture to say to "Eothen" that I think it on the whole a wiser course, while studying these matters, not to lay too much stress on what may be called opinions and views of various personalities? Eliphas Lévi has done noble service. He did right in devoting a long period to a voluminous exposition of Kabbalistic doctrine, including Evocation; he was also at all times, not only at his death, an opponent of those who confound the "higher with the lower." This may be a paradox, but "Eothen" will find the occult sciences full of paradoxes—the "contraries" of Boehme.

There is a saying of Jeremy Taylor's (where unfortunately I don't know) which is very pregnant. Speaking of the science of mysticism he says, "While in other sciences the terms must first be known, and then the rules and conclusions, the whole experience of mysticism must first be obtained before we can so much as know what it is, and the end acquired first—the conclusion before the premises."

This would apply to true Theosophy also, and is so extremely true and accounts for so much of the difficulty in the differences of opinions, because *all* is only opinion until full knowledge is achieved.

Even full knowledge seems coloured by temperament both of the seer and the student.

There is to me a certain charm about this mysterious fact of temperament. It gives endless variety; and also by studying a person's temperament we have the key to their revelations or their sayings or their actions which may help us to a *media res* in our judgment.

We are all of us much led by *kindred* temperaments—we think we are not, but practically (especially in spiritual matters) we fall in more comfortably with views emanating from a kindred temperamental nature.

The "three heavenly sisters" bear this in mind, and to the mystic contemplative is brought "a cloud of glory"; to the philosophical Theosophist they unclasp Nature's "infinite book of secrecy"; in the hand of the Theurgist, the Kabbalist, and Occultist is placed "an enchanter's wand"!

I should like also to add that it is quite true that Fludd, van Helmont, and Agrippa knew nothing of the views stated by "Eothen" as Theosophic, simply because they knew better, as will also "Eothen."

I write F.T.S. after my name because I am a Theosophist, and love the search after Divine wisdom, which has its fount and source in God. I deny, as a Theosophist, any belief in what is called an Anthropomorphic God. But of this enough; I feel I have already trespassed on your space. It is not for me to defend Mr. Sinnett and the Wisdom of the East. Neither the first nor the last can be "thrown over"—certainly not by members of the Theosophical Society, who owe unending gratitude to Mr. Sinnett; and the Wisdom of the East, being *one* with the West in *spirit and in truth*, will stand through time and eternity.

Bedford Park.

ISABEL DE STEIGER, F.T.S.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Under the heading "Kabbalists" your correspondent "Eothen" attempts to explain Theosophy, but he has only explained it as it has appeared to himself; and he has made a mistake, and a very serious one, when he asserts that Theosophy is a most immoral conception of man's after-life, and that it teaches that at death the single individual becomes two individuals. Would "Eothen" kindly explain how one can become two? We can easily understand how one can become two halves, but not two ones. As regards the individuality there is only one, never was more, and never will be more; but "Eothen" has mixed up the personality with the individuality,* and so has fallen into this misconception. Regarding the immorality of Theosophy, "Eothen" shows us plainly that his knowledge of the subject is one-sided, and if he would take the law of Karma into consideration his arguments would fall to the ground. Where did he get the information that "only fiends can influence mortals"? On behalf of Theosophy, I beg to deny this assertion. On the contrary, Theosophy teaches us that adepts can influence us and communicate with us, whether they are in a physical body or not, and also (under proper conditions) spirits of certain grades may communicate with us.

But have any of them ever taught us anything that was not known on the earth before? Certainly not, because they draw their knowledge from the earth.

In conclusion, if we were fully aware of the dangers attending this communion we should be more careful how we entered upon it.

J. M. W.

Spiritualism versus Theosophy.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—It seems to me that the importance of the issue between Spiritualism and Theosophy is not sufficiently realised. If the doctrines of the latter be true, the whole fabric of Spiritualism falls, and its brightest hopes are delusions.

The main points of difference appear to be these—the immortality of the Ego, the nature of the future state, the value of human love and feelings, and the duty of man.

The belief in these things must have an important practical bearing on our life here, and it is not enough to say that the ultimate destiny of man is quite beyond our present comprehension.

We are human beings, and as such we must consider the question, for it is our human nature that is on its trial.

Theosophists draw a distinction between individuality and personality on which the whole question turns.*

Surely no human mind can really comprehend such a thing as a dual self—a divided consciousness—one part living for ever and the other only for a time! The Ego, it is true, may have two separate states of consciousness (*e.g.*, the trance state and the waking state), but not contemporaneously. Those cases where spirit identity seems fully proved are met by the assertion that the astral body retains not only memory but volition; yet we are told that it is not the real self. Now this seems a palpable absurdity, and those who have had experience of Spiritualism will find it impossible to entertain such a proposition.

Again, Theosophists hold out Nirvana as the ultimate goal for humanity. And what is Nirvana? Not annihilation, we are assured, but absorption into universal spirit. Let us examine what this involves.

First we must get rid of all human desires, not only those

* What is the difference between personality and individuality?—Ed.

of the baser sort, but also those which men look on as the highest virtues.

All human affections must be blotted out; those ties which we regard as most sacred are pronounced to be but selfish and mortal after all. Now, if these things be true, does it not follow that humanity is a huge mistake, and nature, as manifested on this plane, a monstrosity? Man is considered superior to the mere animal, not only by virtue of his mind, but also in his love; as that of parent and child, of husband and wife, or of friend for friend. This very quality is most marked in those whom we regard as the best of our kind, yet Theosophists tell us that these affections do not last beyond our earthly life, and that they are a clog to our advancement in proportion to their intensity. Love has been called "other-selfishness," but, if it is so, surely it is a kind of selfishness that is wholly good.

It may be said that to love one more than another is an injustice, but if so all nature is unjust. The animal loves its own offspring more than that of others, as the ivy clings to the tree that happens to be nearest; the sun shines impartially, but it warms only those who chance to come within its rays.

Man is born with affections; the higher his spiritual nature, the stronger and purer they are, and they last so long as memory continues.

Is he then to strive against nature, and to pluck out by the roots all that makes existence worth having? Is Heaven to be gained only by the suicide of our humanity?

Are not Theosophists beginning at the wrong end, and instead of eradicating these feelings, ought they not rather to enlarge their sphere until it embraces the whole world?

But we shall be told that these things belong to the personality, and that the memory and the earthly affections gradually fade away in a future state.

Then, I would ask, what remains? Is it the Higher Self, of which we hear so much? If so, it is not the Ego. As described by Theosophists, it can be nothing more than a kind of guardian angel, or that which is referred to in the prayer, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from us."

Such a being is, no doubt, divine and immortal, but it can have no interest for me if I myself am not to survive. In short, the immortal spirit conceived by Theosophists can have no more concern for a mere human being than the affairs of another planet which he is never to behold. If I have lived before and have forgotten it, and if I am to live again and forget this life, then this life is but a delusion and a nightmare; and the wisest man is he who, wrapped in a cloak of selfishness, neither makes friends nor mixes with the world; for if this earthly personality is not to be retained in the memory, it follows that it is not immortal.

It is not enough to reply that the forgetting of our childhood does not destroy our identity, because the whole of our past life can be, and sometimes is, brought before us like a flash.

It is a record always and fully recoverable. Lest I should make this letter too long, I will, with your permission, add a few remarks next week.

G. A. K.

Altruism.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Language is inadequate to express subtle spiritual ideas, and it is, perhaps, for this reason that I do not quite understand Mrs. Boole, and for this reason also I may not be able to make myself quite clear, but as the subject is one of importance it is worth while to try and explain myself so far as I can, and to present the truth I perceive in as plain and practical a way as possible.

With regard to the hereafter, the same morality will hold good there that is a guide for conduct here. It is true that we shall eventually, so I believe, reach heights as yet undreamt of, but the ascent to those heights should be continuous ascension through continuous effort. As soon as one can perceive an ideal it is an unfailing sign, so I hold, that one has strength given, with the vision, to struggle towards the goal. It is true we may not reach it here, but we certainly shall not reach it there unless we begin now, promptly, to do our best in the present. This seems to me only plain common-sense, not "idolatry" or "witchcraft."

Mrs. Boole may differ from me entirely as to the way of reaching that goal, and I should entirely respect her opinion, for the truth is a centre approached from a wide circumference, each individual nearing it by a little different route; therefore it

would be a great impertinence to do more than show my path to a fellow traveller and watch her journey, approaching from a different radius, with sympathetic interest.

With regard to my experience, it has been widespread, extending over a number of years spent in various parts of the world, including the care of the insane as well as of the sick, and so far as that experience goes it has taught me to believe that the more "absolute, entire, and continuous" self-abnegation is the more perfect is the result. I am far from claiming that I have been able to rise to this requirement, but in the measure in which I could answer to this ideal has the work been satisfactory.

As I do not quite understand Mrs. Boole's theory I may be answering wide of the mark; but if by a "crisp, resolute reversal" she means in any sense a withdrawing of oneself from a needy fellow creature I cannot agree with her. The one normal attitude of the soul I hold to be that of giving, and never that of withholding; there is no half-way attitude between these two; any conscious withdrawal is to enter the cell of self and to shut out the free air of God. No man or woman can bear to be the transmitter of God's life to humanity until he or she has assumed this attitude, because the rush of power and of joy is more than an isolated human creature can retain and bear. It is true that continuous altruism must include continuous practical sense. One must not treat a savage as one does a sage, nor a child as one does an adult; the application of this law varies with every individual, but the psychic attitude should ever remain the same, the one prayer should be "God use me to serve my brother," for this is the only attitude, this the only prayer, which can teach us that we are bits of God, and which can mould these bits into the divine mosaic of Universal Brotherhood.

For three generations this has been the hope of my family, of David Dale, Robert Owen, and Robert Dale Owen, and these at any rate have never regretted the continuous altruism which induced them to yield time, strength, and money to the utmost limit for the good of humanity.

I speak thus earnestly, not because I wish to induce others to accept my theory, but because the acceptance of that theory will bring to them an influx of joyous new life, and having become acquainted with its practical workings through three generations, I have a right, perhaps, to speak with some authority. Robert Owen failed in his external schemes, it is true, but none can measure the extent of his influence, and all who remember him in his old age can testify that his face was illumined with a great inward peace. We can, perhaps, put this testimony against the experience of James Hinton, and thus renew our faith in lives which yield every personal desire in one life-long effort to advance the common weal. So far as my experience goes, we imperfect human creatures need not be concerned about advancing too rapidly; the tendency I find in myself and in others is quite the reverse of this; there is no imminent danger at present that we shall reach too high a spiritual altitude provided we mount on the solid steps of practical effort in well-doing.

ROSAMOND OLIPHANT.

Visions of Faces.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—As I am appealed to, and as a theory seems to me to be built up before we know the laws that govern the phenomena, I state what has come under my notice in my own family during this last week.

On Sunday last my little boy of six years old, ten minutes after he had been put to bed, began crying, an unusual thing with him. He said that ugly men came into the room. I told him to say his prayers and they would not hurt him. We heard no more of him that night; but on being questioned two days after, he said that all he saw was beautiful, and he has never been troubled again. He has sat with me in séance twice since, alone, and has shown signs of clairvoyance, seeing a light in the room, a little girl in the armchair, and so on. (Be it observed that we never talk to the children about Spiritualism.)

I should like now to ask advice on this point. My boy complains of a pain across his forehead. He is a light-hearted, strong lad, and soon shakes it off when he is playing. What I want to know is, whether sitting in séance is hurtful to him. It is worth noting that until he so sat he never saw the visions, and knew nothing of Spiritualism, yet on the third and fourth day after he saw visions with his open eyes.

The same remarks apply to myself, except that I attended private séances for months before I saw visions.

We ought to be sure of our facts before we fabricate our theories, and it would be interesting to me to know on what grounds "S. E. de M." frames the theory set forth in these words:—"The visions of faces are the result of a form of spiritual sensitiveness in which the impressions pass away rapidly, but, as I believe, having an objective sphere of its own, corresponding with the mental state and temper of the seer"—(surely not)—"or being perhaps their embodiment and representation."

On the face of the evidence, I cannot agree with that theory. Good men, and children like my boy, see at first evil faces, and afterwards, though the seers are the same, living the same lives, they see faces of a better type. Only yesterday I saw some very evil faces, others that looked more spiritual, others cold and rigid as in death, and many other things which I feel quite unable to explain.

As every fact is of importance, I may mention this:—As I was thinking about these matters and my difficulty in explaining them, a voice spoke in my ear, "Cannot you, now?" The voice was low, full, and distinct. Are spirits able to read your very thoughts?

Lee, S.E.

J. ROBINSON.

Spirits as Detectives.
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—The notion of employing the spirits as detectives is at once preposterous and absurd, but I see in "LIGHT" that you think clairvoyance might possibly reveal the mysterious author of the Whitechapel murders. Now, although no clairvoyant need apply at Scotland-yard, and, as you say, would simply take the risk of being locked up if he did so, I am tempted to suggest that any revelation obtained through clairvoyance might be used without naming its source, and someone carefully chosen to convey it to the police whose character and position would protect him from the damaging suspicion of being a "Spiritualist"! And the temptation to "cheat" might be made impossible to the clairvoyant, by only offering the reward in case of success—thus putting the experiment before him as a speculation worth engaging in.

October 20th, 1888.

M. B.

Hypnotism of Animals.
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Can any reader of "LIGHT" give me particulars of the effect of hypnotism on animals, and of the best methods of procedure? A book has been published on the subject, but unfortunately it is out of print. I have heard that the Kaffirs mesmerise their oxen, and that some horse tamers have used the power on horses, and also that dogs, rabbits, and even wild beasts can be made submissive to man by its means. Some particulars of experiments will be interesting. The book I refer to is, *Trials of Magnetism on The Brute Creation*, by J. Wilson, Physician to the Middlesex Hospital, 1839.

X. Y. Z.

The "Spiritualist"
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I beg to say that I never sent any contributions to the *Spiritualist*, for the simple reason that that journal had ceased to exist before I became interested in the subject of Spiritualism. I wrote an article on Re-incarnation about two years ago, or rather less—not being able to refer to the back numbers of "LIGHT," I cannot fix the precise date—which appeared in the pages of "LIGHT," and which gave rise to some correspondence on that much vexed question. I will only add that I have never written for any other paper.

Leghorn, October 16th, 1888.

"V."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

It will ensure despatch if all matter offered for publication is addressed to the Editor of "LIGHT," 16, Craven-street, Charing Cross, and not to any other name or address. Communications for the Manager should be sent separately.

The Editor begs respectfully to intimate that he cannot undertake to return rejected MSS. If accompanied by stamps to pay postage in case of its being deemed unsuitable for publication, he will use reasonable care in re-posting any MS.

He also begs respectfully to intimate that he cannot undertake to prepare for the press communications that are not suitably written. He begs his correspondents to see that all articles and letters forwarded are written on one side of the paper, are ready for the printer, and are of moderate length. Those over a column in length are in danger of being crowded out.

RECEIVED from A. V. B., £1 1s., for Mr. Husk.

A. THORPE-LOFTUS.—We regret that our space does not suffice for your long paper.

SOCIETY WORK.

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUALISTS' SOCIETY, WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—On Sunday last two able and eloquent addresses on reformatory subjects were given by Mr. Robert Harper. Next Sunday Mr. J. Hopcroft will speak at eleven and seven.—W. E. LONG, Hon. Sec.

GARDEN HALL, 309, ESSEX-ROAD, ISLINGTON, N.—We had a fair attendance on Sunday, when Mr. Clack gave a very excellent address on "Spiritualism," which was much appreciated. This was followed by some good clairvoyant descriptions. Next Sunday, Psychometry and Clairvoyance, at 6.30 p.m. On Wednesday evening, a séance, 8 p.m.—J. W., Hon. Sec.

THE LONDON OCCULT SOCIETY, 35, EDGWARE-ROAD, NEAR EDGWARE-ROAD STATION (Omnibuses pass the door).—Last Sunday evening "1st M. B. (Lond.)," gave the last of his course of lectures on "Soul Evolution." The hall was filled and great interest was manifested. Next Sunday, at seven, Mr. Tindall and myself will lecture upon "The Late Re-incarnation Controversy in 'LIGHT.'" We hope that all interested in this difficult subject will attend, especially opponents. The music will consist of a march and two solos from Mr. Tindall's cantata, *The Worship of the Image*.—F. W. READ, Hon. Sec., 33, Henry-street, St. John's Wood, N.W.

VICTORIA HALL, ARCHER-STREET, BAYSWATER.—On Sunday morning we commenced our work in this district. A few friends assembled, including Mr. J. Hopcroft, and we spent a profitable hour. In the evening greater interest was manifested. There was a good audience, and much enthusiasm was evinced. Mr. Drake gave a rough outline for future action. Mr. R. J. Lees followed with an excellent defence of the phenomena and teachings of Spiritualism, and was considered by many to have spoken with more fluency than on previous occasions. Mr. Veitch followed in the same line, and was successful in pressing upon his hearers the superiority of our teachings over those of the churches. Then followed a long tried worker, in the person of Mr. Emms, who took up the same theme, and spoke with great feeling and power. Many thanks for sympathising letters and generous offers of assistance. Next Sunday, 11 a.m. A meeting for Spiritualists and inquirers at 7 p.m. prompt, Mr. R. J. Lees and Mrs. E. A. Drake.—(From a Correspondent.)

PRACTICAL WORK.—Many reproach Spiritualism with its having little in the way of visible usefulness to show for itself. This stigma will be removed if the example be largely followed which a few Spiritualists hope to set by the establishment of a dépôt for the reception and the sale of waste. A room is already being used, but the payment for it comes chiefly out of the pocket of a man overburdened with cares and want of sufficient means. The root of want is waste in all its meanings. Just a penny a week from a few score of subscribers would allow the promoter, Mr. J. M. Dale, who can be recommended to the poor as one of themselves, to keep the thing active and afloat. A penny per week is the only monetary responsibility in connection with the Progressive Association. The subscription is made so small that the very poor may be associates, equally so with others. The pennies in schemes largely supported have grown into tens of thousands of pounds. The subscription may be sent quarterly by postal order. Attendance at the meetings is not necessary for membership. Those who charge the idea with being too visionary, we recommend to consider the opinion of John Stuart Mill that, "To do any real good, men should from conviction aim at some end, that seems to others Quixotic, Utopian." Meetings are held on Wednesdays and Sundays, at 3.30. Letters can be addressed by subscribers to Mr. Dale, 126, Seymour-place, Marylebone-road, W. In aid, Mr. Macdonald on Wednesday, October 31st, 3.30, gives the lecture which had such a great effect in Quebec Hall, "The Philosophy of Liking, Attachment, and Love."—L. T.

"You are thinking too much of the dead; you believe too much in their having secured rest. They have not secured it; they are like us, they are seeking to do so; they are trying to find a solution."—GEORGE SANDS' *Letters*.

"SUSAN L., a highly susceptible person, exclaimed, while in a sleep waking state, that a shower of fine small sparks of fire came from a hazel wand which happened to be in my hand. She did not see this from ash or from fir, but invariably saw it from every piece of hazel or white thorn that was brought near her. Subsequently eight other persons were separately examined as to their susceptibilities to different kinds of wood. Each gave the same results and saw the sparks of fire."—DR. ASHBURNER.