

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE
New Members and Associates .. .. .	305
Meeting of the Council .. .. .	305
General Meeting .. .. .	306
Cases supplied to the Literary Committee .. .. .	307
Explanation of Mysterious Sounds .. .. .	311
Correspondence .. .. .	312
Supplementary Library Catalogue .. .. .	320

### NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

#### MEMBERS.

BALFOUR, LADY FRANCES, 32, Addison-road, London, W.  
 TAKAROFF, LEON, M.D., 49, Eaton-square, London, S.W.

#### ASSOCIATES.

BUTCHER, MISS, 22, Collingham-place, London, S.W.  
 PARRY, REV. WILLIAM EDWARDS, 286, Upland Road, Dulwich, S.E.  
 SMITH, MISS J. M., 56, Longridge-road, London, S.W.  
 SWANWICK, MISS ANNA, 23, Cumberland-terrace, London, N.W.

### MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

At a Meeting of the Council held at the Society's Rooms, on July 16th, the following Members were present:—The President (in the chair), Professor W. F. Barrett, Dr. A. T. Myers, and Messrs. F. W. H. Myers, Frank Podmore, and H. Arthur Smith.

It was proposed by the President, seconded by Mr. H. Arthur Smith, and unanimously carried, that Mr. F. W. H. Myers and Mr. Frank Podmore be appointed joint Hon. Secretaries of the Society.

It was also agreed that Professor H. Sidgwick should be the Editor of printed matter circulated by the Society.

Two new Members and four new Associates, whose names and addresses are given above, were elected.

Votes of thanks were passed to Mrs. Gurney for the present of a number of books to the Society, and also to Mrs. Myers for a donation of £5 to the Funds.

Various matters of routine business were attended to.

It was agreed that a General Meeting of the Society should be held in November, and that the next Meeting of the Council should be on September 28th.

## GENERAL MEETING.

A General Meeting was held at the Westminster Town Hall on July 16th.

The President gave a brief survey of the work of the Society since its foundation, dwelling chiefly on the methods of investigation.

Mr. F. W. H. Myers then read a paper on "French Experiments on Strata of Personality," reviewing especially certain recent experiments of Professor Pierre Janet's with Madame B., the hypnotic subject already so often referred to, and into certain other subjects.

The method adopted by Professor Janet has been to observe the *unconscious actions* which the subject performs, in any phase of personality, and to try to discover whether these unconscious actions are recollected by her in any other phase of personality. Thus it is now a familiar fact that actions which are performed in the waking state, but in obedience to a post-hypnotic suggestion, are apt to be forgotten in the waking state, and remembered only when the subject re-enters the hypnotic state. Madame B. is for convenience sake styled Léonie in her waking state, and Léontine in her hypnotic state. As we should expect, therefore, Léontine has a chain of memories which Léonie does not share. And these memories cover so large a part of Madame B.'s life, owing to the frequency of her hypnotic trances, that by this time Léontine almost rivals the "second state" of the celebrated Félicité X. But there are *some* unconscious actions of Léonie's which Léontine does not remember. And there are unconscious actions of Léontine's also, *none* of which are remembered by Léonie. It is found that by prolonging the process of hypnotisation, Madame B. is brought into a *third* state, to which the name of Léonore has been given, in which all the unconscious actions, both of Léonie and of Léontine, are fully remembered. And Léonore again performs certain unconscious actions which neither Léonie nor Léontine remember, but which Léonore herself remembers when, as occasionally happens, she enters a state of apparent ecstasy. From this and similar cases it was argued that the most significant indication of differences in various hypnotic states is to be found in differences of the range of memory, and that the state in which the range of memory is the most extensive,—the state which includes the memories of other states, but is not included by them—has a *primæ facie* claim to be considered as the *profoundest* state of the subject, though it may not be the state best suited for the ordinary business of life.

The paper was illustrated by a diagram of Madame B.'s several states of personality.

A discussion followed, in which several members took part, turning mainly on the differences of *character* observable in the different states, and the relation of each state to the complete individual.

## CASES SUPPLIED TO THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

[The following case belongs to the very important "transitional" class between experimental and spontaneous telepathy of which instances are given in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 103-109, and pp. lxxxi-lxxxiv., cases in which the impression intentionally conveyed to the percipient's mind externalises itself in an hallucination of the senses. The present case differs from the contemporary cases recorded in *Phantasms* in that the agent was awake. We first heard of the case orally from the agent, Baron Albert von Schrenck-Notzing, secretary of the *Psychologische Gesellschaft* at Munich, and Corresponding Member to our own Society.—ED.]

## THE PERCIPIENT'S ACCOUNT.

There is not much to tell concerning the incident of which you ask me to give an account. It happened thus:—Baron Schrenck was returning home one night in March (or April, I am not sure as to the date), about 11.30, and stood for some time outside my bedroom window, which looked on to the street. I was in bed at the time, lying with closed eyes, nearly asleep. It seemed to me as if the part of the room where my bed was had become suddenly light, and I felt compelled to open my eyes, seeing at the same time, as it appeared to me, the face of Baron Schrenck. It was gone again as quick as lightning. The next day I told my friend Fräulein Priege of this occurrence; she went skating that same day, and met Baron Schrenck on the ice. They had scarcely conversed together five minutes before he asked Fräulein Priege if I had seen anything last night. Fräulein Priege repeated what I had told her, whereupon Baron Schrenck said that, at the time of my seeing him, he was standing outside my window, trying hard to impress his presence upon me. This never occurred again, and I believe Baron Schrenck did not have occasion to repeat the experiment.

This was written on May 11th, 1888. In a further letter Miss —— adds (1) that the blinds of her room were drawn down, (2) that she has experienced no other hallucination of any kind.

[Baron von Schrenck sent us his written account and that of Fräulein Priege in June, 1888, written in German, and what we print below are translations. They were written independently of Miss ——'s, and it will be seen that Fräulein Priege and Miss —— disagree as to when the latter first described her experience, showing how impossible it is to rely on the memory for details, even after little more than a year's interval. It is a point on which Fräulein Priege is most likely to be right, since she would be more impressed by being awoken than Miss —— would by awaking her. In any case, there seems to be no doubt as to the experience having been described before Fräulein Priege met Baron von Schrenck.]

## FRÄULEIN PRIEGER'S ACCOUNT.

The winter before last, shortly after Christmas, I was suddenly awakened in the night, between 11 and 12 o'clock, by my friend ——, who asked me in an excited manner if I *also* saw Baron von Schrenck, who was close by her bed. On my objecting that she had been dreaming, and should now

quietly go to sleep again, she repeated that she had been completely awake, and had seen Baron von Schrenck so close to her that she could have caught hold of his beard. By degrees she quieted herself, and we both went to sleep.

The following day, on my way home from the ice, I told Baron von Schrenck of this exciting nocturnal scene, and noticed to my not slight astonishment that he seemed greatly rejoiced, as though over a successful experiment, which had received its completion in what I communicated to him.

*My* interest in the whole occurrence increased from the moment when Baron von Schrenck related the following to me. LINA PRIEGER.

Gubelsbergerstrasse, 15 I.

#### THE AGENT'S ACCOUNT.

In the winter of 1886-87, I think it was in the month of February, as I was going along the Bärerstrasse one evening at half-past 11, it occurred to me to make an attempt at influencing at a distance, through mental concentration. As I had had, for some time, the honour of being acquainted with the family of Herr —, and thus had had the opportunity of learning that his daughter Fräulein — was sensitive to psychical influences, I decided to try to influence her, especially as the family lived at the corner of the Bärerstrasse and Karlstrasse. The windows of the dwelling were dark as I passed by, from which I concluded that the ladies had already gone to rest. I then stationed myself by the wall of the houses on the opposite side of the road, and for about five minutes firmly concentrated my thoughts on the following desire:—Fräulein — shall wake and think of me. Then I went home. The next day when I met Fräulein —'s friend on the ice, I learnt from her (they shared a bedroom between them) that something strange had happened to the ladies during the preceding night. I remarked thereupon to Fräulein Prieger (such was the friend's name) that the time when the occurrence took place was between half-past 11 and 12; whereat she was greatly astonished. Then I obtained from the lady an account of the circumstance, as she herself has written it out on the accompanying sheet of paper. For me the success of this experiment was a proof that under certain circumstances, one person can influence another at a distance.

ALBERT FREIHERR VON SCHRENCK-NOTZING.

#### CASE OF THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE.

The discrepancies in the following narratives are noteworthy: but they do not seem to affect the main point in which both narratives agree:—viz., that letters were obtained through movements of a table, which were the initials of a name that was the correct answer to a question unknown to the persons sitting at the table. Incidents of this kind may perhaps be explained—like the results obtained by M. Richet under somewhat similar conditions (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., pp. 72-81, and *Proceedings*, Part XII., pp. 38-46)—as cases of thought-transference, though in the present case the "thought" on the

agent's side was partly latent. The method of experiment—the result being given by automatic movements or automatic writings on the part of the percipient—is one which we are specially anxious to see widely adopted. It seems probable that examples of thought-transference may be thus obtained by persons who would not succeed in any other way.

From Mr. W. S. D. Hunter, 31, Leicester-street, Southport.

*May 30th, 1888.*

I had just returned from a 10 years' residence in India and had been accompanied from Bombay by my cousin, Jack Stuart.

At Hastings we had had several sances with his sister and her husband, and out of a mass of nonsense we had had some very extraordinary replies and "communications." Both Jack and myself were complete infidels as regards belief in Spiritualism, though we were keen inquirers.

On returning to London, to my mother's house in Kensington, I told her all that had happened and how very much surprised I was, and at the same time curious about it all, and she begged me to get Jack to come up some evening and have a sance.

The table used was an ordinary small "Teapoy" that stood in the room.

After a few minutes, working and questions, my mother proposed that we should try and answer questions without knowing what they (the questions) were.

In the meantime I asked the table "who" was influencing it, and at once the name of "*Minna*" was given. This, I may say, was *fully* anticipated by me, *Minna* being my favourite sister who died in India, and up to then the only direct link with the "other world" that I had, and being a great favourite with my parents I had told my mother that this name would *most certainly* be given, although when working with Jack at other places his dead brother's name had invariably appeared. I take this to be that on this occasion *I* had the stronger *feeling* in question, and, therefore, the stronger *will*. Anyway "*Minna*" having been given, my mother appeared much affected and went to the end of the room to write a question. Whilst she was thinking I casually remarked that, if possible, the question should be one that neither Jack nor I could answer if we *saw* it. My mother then said she had written a question, and, having folded the paper, asked my father to hold it. He took the paper with great compunction, as he considered the proceedings altogether "uncanny" and partaking of the *black art*. Neither Jack nor I saw the question, and I then said to the table had it seen the question and would it give the answer. The reply was three motions, which we took to be Yes, and I then said, "Well, go on," and then the following letters were given out, the table stopping after each one :—

Apharrison.

When it stopped for good I laughed, and said *rot*, but on looking at my mother, who was still at the writing-table, I saw she was much affected, and only said, "My God, it's true," or some such words. She, however, was apparently doubtful about something, and left the room, and on return brought a letter signed by "A. P. Harrison."

I took the question from my father, and it was, "What was the name of the nurse who nursed you in your last illness?"

"Now, I may say that my cousin Jack, living in Burmah, could not possibly have known the name, nor did I, having been in Scinde at the time, whilst my sister died in Guzerat, and that this nurse was a soldier's wife, taken haphazard out of the regiment to which my sister's husband belonged, and it appears that at my sister's dying request this nurse had written a few lines to my mother, giving particulars of the death, &c.

My mother had forgotten the exact initials, hence her going upstairs to find the original letter.

At this lapse of time this is about all I can remember, and I think the name and initials I give are the correct ones, though that has little to do with the fact that the correct answer to a question was given, and that neither Jack or I, had we *seen* the question, could have answered it. I have not had many chances of making further researches in this line in India since, but of what little I have done I have never had anything that has puzzled me more than the instance I have given you; as I am positively certain of the good faith of all concerned in the experiment. My cousin Jack followed the matter up in a general way afterwards, even to the extent of going to professional "media," spirit photographers, &c.; but his final opinion given me was that the bulk was fraud.

My own impression is that some sort of "force" exists of which we know little or nothing, and that my mother being in the room influenced, say, me to give the answer; or I, as it were, picked her brains for the answer.

W. S. D. HUNTER.

The following account of the same incident was sent to us in 1883, by Mrs. Hunter, 2, Victoria Crescent, St. Helier's, Jersey, mother of Mr. W. S. D. Hunter, whose evidence was given quite independently.

The medium was my nephew, just returned from Burmah. He was an unbeliever, but the sudden death of a very much younger brother, to whom he was much attached, set him to find out, in some way, whether there was *really* "life beyond the grave," and he got among the London Spiritualists, and, strange to say, developed great powers as a medium. My younger son visited him and his family at Hastings, and on his return told us most wonderful stories of "*Jack's*" prowess. [The account goes on to describe some messages purporting to come from the little brother above mentioned and a deceased daughter of Mrs. Hunter's, all completely explicable as examples of "automatic writing."] But my nephew said all this *proved* nothing. Could she [the deceased daughter] answer any question known only to herself and her mother? "Gladly." J. then told me to go to the other end of the room and to *write* my question and show it to no one. I withdrew and *tried* to think of some former secret; but my poor head and heart were full of pain. At last I thought of something,—the name of the nurse who had attended her in her last illness, and from whom I had had a nice letter, which I had preserved with all the other sad memorials. *Harrison*, I wrote. "Could she answer my thought?" "Yes, yes." First came "O," then "P." "No no," I cried, "it is all wrong." "Stop this dreadful work," cried my

husband, and so our séance ended. But all night long the walls of my room resounded with *knocks*. Sleep was impossible; and next morning my son told me of a similar experience in his room, far away from mine.

After breakfast the desire to inspect my sealed packed of "Memorials" became irresistible. I opened them, and there the first thing that came was the letter of the nurse, signed in a firm hand, O. P. Harrison. To be quite sure, I went to my husband and asked him, "What were the letters spelt out last?" At once he said "O and P." On telling my nephew, he remarked that there was, after all, some small satisfaction got out of our séance, more than out of many he had held. The odd part of this is that I had entirely forgotten, indeed hardly remarked, Mrs. Harrison's Christian name, and, moreover, my elder daughter said, on hearing my story, "I am almost certain our poor darling didn't know it either. She and I always called her *Nurse* or *Mrs. H.*" Neither my nephew nor son knew I had such a letter, and my husband never supposed I had kept it for so many years.

H. C. HUNTER.

In a recent letter (August 8th, 1888) Mrs. Hunter says of the discrepancies observable in these accounts: "My account is the correct one. My son has mixed up what happened next day with our séance. I used the expression 'It *is* true, then!' on finding the letters O. P. in the signature next morning. The date was in December or end of November, 1876."

---

#### EXPLANATION OF MYSTERIOUS SOUNDS.

---

I record the following circumstances merely because I think they may be useful as affording a hint towards the investigation of certain classes of apparently mysterious circumstances.

In the winter of 1857 I was living in a roomy old-fashioned house in Wiltshire. Many people will recollect the severity of that winter, and in particular the bitter cold of that Christmas Eve.

On that intensely cold afternoon, my father-in-law, Mr. D., started from London and travelled by a very slow train stopping at every station, and not reaching the town where I lived till quite late in the evening. The result of that journey to him was a severe attack of bronchitis. He was confined to his bed for some days, and we were getting rather anxious as to the prospect of his recovery.

One night I had occasion to go downstairs rather late and saw a light in the pantry, a small room on the ground floor, without a fire-place and paved with stone. I knew no one had any business there, so I went to see what was the matter and there found all our servants sitting working. I said at once, "What brings you all here this bitter cold night when you have a warm, comfortable kitchen to sit in?" I was met with the reply, "Oh, sir, we daren't sit there. There's a horrible noise there every night. We never hear it in the daytime. We are sure Mr. D. is going to die."

I said, "What nonsense! Come into the kitchen, and let me hear it."

So we went there. On the way I asked what sort of a noise it was, and where it seemed to come from. I was told that it sounded like a woman very far off screaming in pain, but that they could not find where it came from.

When it seemed in one place and they went there, it moved to another ; and when they went there it moved somewhere else, and so on. There was the noise, sure enough. An uncanny sound of a small voice of some one in pain at a distance, or, rather, as if it came through a wall. I listened attentively, and felt sure it came from the scullery. I went there, and it sounded back in the kitchen, near the chimney. I went there, and it sounded in the cellar. I went to the top of the cellar steps, and then I was certain it was just outside the back door. I went out, and immediately it was back in the kitchen. I came into the kitchen again thoroughly puzzled. I stood and listened awhile more carefully than ever, and then it struck me that the sound came at regular intervals. "Ha," thought I, "I've caught you now." I took out my watch and found it came exactly once in three seconds. This I felt sure indicated that the sound must be due to some mechanical cause. I looked all round the room to see what mechanism there was at work, and my eye soon rested on a gas meter affixed to the wall about 12ft. above the floor. I soon had a table placed under it and a chair on that, and mounting up applied my ear to the meter. There it was. It was a water meter, and somehow the valve had got rusty, and every time so many feet of gas had passed through the meter the valve went over, and scooped as it went. I explained this to the maids, and told them to mount the chair after I was gone and listen for themselves.

Of course the sound had never been heard in the daytime, as the gas was not turned on and the valve was still till dark. A few days afterwards I inquired about it and found that the servants were satisfied ; but the noise was never heard after that night, and my father-in-law began at once to get well. I suppose one of the servants when listening had shaken the meter, and so altered the position of the valve that the friction was removed, and that the crisis in the illness of our patient had occurred about the same time. Perhaps this account may supply a hint as to the mechanical causes of many mysterious sounds.

THOMAS E. CRALLAN, M.A.,

Late Chaplain to Sussex County Asylum, Haywards Heath, Sussex.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

NELLIE MORRIS.

[The following correspondence has been placed in my hands by Mr. Vaughan Jenkins (Associate of the S.P.R.), with a view to its being printed here. It relates to the case of Nellie Morris, communicated to the June number of this *Journal* by Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace. I am unable to find room for the whole correspondence, but I have thought it best to print Mr. Wallace's letters in full,—partly on account of his scientific eminence, partly because I disagree with his arguments and conclusions, and should therefore be afraid of not doing justice to the former, if I attempted to abridge them. Of the other letters only portions are printed.—ED.]



The correspondence begins with a letter addressed by Mr. Vaughan Jenkins to Mr. Wallace.

Energlyn, St. Margaret's-road, Oxford.

June 21st, 1888.

DEAR SIR,—

\* \* \* \* \*

Until I read General Lippitt's statements my conception of the Spiritualistic theory of materialisation was—that taking it for granted that we shall live after death, in a spiritual body . . . why cannot these spirits in the form of *apparitions* or spectres return as they are alleged so to have done by many—to visit their friends whom they have left behind them? Such appearances, subject to the premise, would be conceivably possible, and the objection to the physical obstruction of stone walls, &c., would not arise. But the young ladies who “came” to the General came in their own prior natural bodies fully *organised*, and in violation of all known cosmic laws and conditions. . . . There is nothing 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 Nelly'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.

\* \* \* \* \*

I know and feel that I ought to obey the law of evidence, and to accept the General's confirmed unimpeachable testimony, but my inability to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable is my present stumbling-block. . . . Personally, I dismiss from my mind any idea of personation, psychic illusion, or hallucination, or collusion of any kind whatever in connection with General Lippitt's manifestations—hence my greater difficulty. If, therefore, at any time that may be convenient to you, you would kindly favour me with any helpful information in my struggle for a belief, I shall be very grateful to you.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS.

MR. A. R. WALLACE'S REPLY.

Firth Hill, Godalming.

June 26th, 1888.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS, Esq.

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 imposture. A little book called *Materialised Apparitions*, by Mr. E. Brackett, published at Boston, and which you can probably get from Burns, Southampton-row, will give you much information on the nature and peculiarities of these forms and the conditions under which they appear. I met Mr. Brackett in Boston, and can testify to the honesty, ability, and earnestness of the man and of his book. 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.

Copies of these letters having been forwarded to Mrs. Sidgwick, she replied to Mr. Vaughan Jenkins.

\* \* \* \* \*

I quite agree with you as to the great difficulty of fitting in a belief in materialisations with our knowledge either of matter or of spirit. If materialisations be proved, we must accept them and arrange our theory of the universe to suit them. But it does not appear to me that at present they have been proved . . . that is, it does not appear to me that in the evidence hitherto presented there is sufficient proof that the supposed materialisation is neither the medium nor an accomplice, and that no trick is being played upon us. I am impressed with the fact that such men as Mr. Wallace and General Lippitt should be convinced, but I cannot perceive that the evidence brought forward by them is any exception to this general rule, as I have tried to explain in the July number of the *Journal*.

ELEANOR M. SIDGWICK.

\* \* \* \* \*

Firth Hill, Godalming.

July 15th, 1888.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—Mrs. Sidgwick is right from *her* point of view—that nothing is to be accepted that can possibly be explained away by imposture, however complicated and difficult. But she 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. The best thing to be done is to adduce more *facts* proving the reality of the phenomena, and I have fortunately just received from General Lippitt copies of a pamphlet by him which does this admirably for one of the mediums concerned. As I feel sure it will interest you, I send it you by post, and you can return it to me at your leisure. A copy of the pamphlet was sent to Mr. Gurney, so most likely Mr. Myers and Mrs. Sidgwick will be able to see it. I am, however, doubtful whether they will admit either article. What they ought to do, if they want to put the evidence fairly before the members of the Society, would be to reprint the General's pamphlet entire, *as it contains a mass of valuable facts*, and shows besides how *utterly untrustworthy* are the reports of the Seybert Commission, which, in the last part of the *Proceedings*, Mr. Myers commends as valuable and conclusive.—Believe me, yours faithfully,

ALFRED R. WALLACE.

Hill Side, Chesterton-road, Cambridge.

July 18th, 1888.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged to you for letting me see Mr. Wallace's letter, which I return. I do not feel that I quite understand his statement that I "pass over the evidence for facts, and especially the evidence of the genuineness of the mediums as opposed to the mere accusations and assertions against them." It was, I thought, the evidence for facts that I examined in my letter to the *July Journal*. And the second part of the sentence I have quoted seems to me to involve a certain confusion. 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.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS, Esq.

July 31st, 1881.

DEAR SIR,—Mrs. Sidgwick's exposition of her point of view is very interesting, but there seems to me a weakness of fallacy in it as she applies it. If we assume, to begin with, that mediums are *all* imposters, and that no fact in Spiritualism has been proved, I admit that Mrs. Sidgwick is right. But she puts forth this argument *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 imposters 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 faculties 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. As I said in my preliminary note, the evidence in the case of "Nellie Morris" will have no weight with those who deny that any mediumship *exists* or *is possible*; but if the *fact* of mediumship is held to be proved in any cases, then the evidence in this case becomes very strong if not conclusive.

I do not think I ever said I was *convinced* that some of Dr. Lynn's exhibitions (through another performer) were Spiritualistic, but it seemed to myself and others probable that he had engaged the services of a remarkable physical medium. I know a young man who combines thought-reading and conjuring very skilfully.—Yours very truly,

ALFRED R. WALLACE.

E. VAUGHAN JENKINS, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Wallace's letter makes me think that I have somewhat misunderstood his position. I had thought that he brought forward the Nellie Morris case as evidence of the genuineness of materialisations and of spirit communications, adapted to convince persons whose judgment on the general question was still in suspense, and it was from this point of view that I criticised it. This case, so regarded, still appears to me evidentially valueless, because the possibility of trickery was not adequately excluded. But if Mr. Wallace brought forward the case as an interesting one to those who feel able to start with the assumption that the mediums concerned are genuine, I am ready to admit that it does not in itself contain positive proof of imposture, any more than it contains proof of the absence of it.

I do not, however, think that the hypothesis of trickery requires so elaborate a conspiracy with correspondence, &c., as Mr. Wallace suggests. The mediums in question seem to go about a good deal and may not improbably have met and imparted the required information in casual conversation.

ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK.

P.S.—With regard to the conjuring performance at the Westminster Aquarium, Mr. Wallace, I think, will find that his exact words were, "I must say I believe" the performer to be a real medium.—See *Spiritualist*, August 17th, 1877.

The following letter relates to the same subject.

To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

SIR,—I think the members and associates of the Society for Psychical Research have great reason to be grateful for the publication of Mr. Wallace's communication.

Nothing could bring out more clearly, on the one hand, the willingness of the Society to listen to any evidence that may be offered, and, on the other hand, the total contrast that there is between those phenomena which form the ordinary staple of the journals; those phenomena, that is to say, which are the subject of the researches prosecuted by the Society, and such occurrences as those which are detailed by General Lippitt.

It appears very odd that it should not have struck General Lippitt that whereas it was very possible for any medium to ascertain his first wife's birthday, it was not possible for his departed daughter to have a recollection of the way in which he and she used to keep her mother's birthday, because (as he informs us) they had not ever kept it in any way whatever since the child had been two years old, and that this made it very curious indeed that the first thing his daughter's spirit wanted to say to him was that they *went on doing* in the other world what they had *not done* in this. (See pp. 285, 287.)—I am, sir, yours truly,

E. B. BIRKS.

Trinity College, Cambridge, July 13th, 1888.

#### MULTIPLEX PERSONALITY.

To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

DEAR SIR,—In the very interesting paper read by Mr. Myers on July 16th, it appeared to me that while great stress was laid upon differences of memory between Léonie, Léontine, and Léonore, he did not lay enough upon the differences of *character*, which seem to me more surprising still. It was suggested that the difference between her assumption of different personalities in various stages of hypnotism, and that of the boys on whom Mr. Smith experimented, was perhaps due to a telepathic impression of different personalities in her doctor's mind; but it would be interesting to know in this case if the doctor had also a telepathic conception of the character belonging to the personality. Otherwise the change of character seems more analogous to that produced after indulgence in the habit of drink, which seems (at least, with women) to make a truthful person a liar, and a modest one coarse. I have known the same kind of change produced in a gentle and obedient little girl of nine years old, when the consumptive disease which had been on her lungs suddenly attacked the brain, and she became a child-maniac, without any memory of her past life, with habits and language those of the gutter, and with abnormal muscular strength above her knees, below which she was powerless. After some months the attack passed away as suddenly as it had come, leaving her the same good little child she had been before.

I cannot help thinking that these changes of *character* seem rather to point to some external influence affecting a *part* of our personality than to our possessing an indefinite number of personalities wrapped up in the sheath of the body like the coats of an onion. May I suggest a possible theory? It would be that Mr. Smith's experiments point to various strata and substrata of mental regions which can be reached separately in the hypnotic or hysterical state, but which, when our will is active, and we are in a normal condition of sane life, cannot be touched by any other hand. That when what Mr. Myers well calls the co-ordinating principle is not

allowed to work, either from hypnotism or brain or nerve disease, these lower strata of the mind become sensitive to suggestion *either* from ordinary human agents or from invisible influences, which, though sometimes morally bad, would seem to be more often simply silly, like Léontine, and a good many of the spirits whose utterances are given at Spiritualist séances.

If there is any possibility that this is the case, it would at once explain why hysterical subjects are the chief objects of scientific observation in this region, and it would also make it a question whether it is desirable for any one in a condition of sanity to put himself into a condition in which the co-ordinating principle is paralysed. If the result in any of us were to be that our Léontine acquired so much power over our Léonie as to take her ticket for her and put her into the train where she did not think it right to go, or to write postscripts to her letters, I think our upper and ordinary selves might well complain of us for having put them into a bondage which might have been avoided.—Yours faithfully,

M. B.

“M. B.’s” suggestive letter raises three separate questions, two of which seem to call only for a few explanatory words; the third points to a deeper problem.

- (1) As to the relative characters of Léonie and Léontine, I do not think that Léontine is inferior to Léonie in any other way than as a dreaming or somnambulant person is inferior to the same person awake. Léontine, that is to say, is less cautious, less coherent, less adapted to the business of life than Léonie. But at the same time she is superior in acumen, initiative, energy; and the acts (such as taking a railway ticket) which were inconvenient or puzzling to Léonie, were conceived in the true interest of the joint individual, though without the restraint which Léonie’s shy, self-effacing habits might have imposed. It seems indeed that in secondary selves, such as Léontine, this increased *élan* and freedom is not unusual; but I do not remember any cases where a persistent secondary self, developed by hypnotism, has been distinctly worse or lower than the primary,
- (2) As to the influence of the operator’s unconscious *suggestion* in determining the character of Léontine, we must remember that Léontine, so to say, was born before Professor Janet. Mme. B. is much older than Professor Janet, and her secondary self was first evoked—whether by hypnotism or by some spontaneous change we cannot now know certainly—while she was still a child. Léontine’s life then ran mainly underground for many years, and reappeared when Dr. Gibert hypnotised the subject a few years ago. And, on the other hand, Professor Janet’s various subjects bear no particular resemblance to each other in the somnambulant state; nor has he, I think, any theory as to the hypnotic character which they are about to develop. While, therefore, it seems quite possible that in some cases the expectation or suggestion of the operator may influence not only the isolated actions but the whole *Wesen* of the secondary self, Léonie’s case is one where this supposition seems specially improbable.

- (3) As to the possibility of *possession*—in such a case as Léonie's—of the occupation, that is to say, of some one stratum of herself by an unembodied spiritual entity;—this supposition is, of course, extremely remote from the conceptions of modern science. But let us for the sake of argument assume that such a thing may occur—let us suppose that in the case of entranced “mediums” it does occur—what, then, will be the indication which suggests such invasion? Surely the utterance by the entranced subject of something unknown to him in the normal state. There must be more than a mere shifting of the kaleidoscope, there must be the introduction of new forms, new tints, in its readjusted imagery. But there is nothing of this in Léonie's case. There is no matter of knowledge in her subjacent personalities but what the joint personage has acquired through ordinary channels. The saying still holds good, “*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu,—nisi intellectus ipse.*” The *intellectus ipse*, in the secondary state, stamps the old material with a different pattern; but so it does for each of us every time that we dream. *Dreaming* is an admitted, an important, an ill-understood fact;—and in all these cases the analogy of dream should surely first be worked out before we appeal to hypotheses so much more remote and obscure.—F. W. H. M.]

Readers of the *Journal* will be interested to learn that letters were received in the month of July by the President (1) from Baron Goeler von Ravensburg, and Messrs. Hans Natge and Max Dessoir, writing in the name of the Berlin Society for Experimental Psychology, and (2) from Baron Schrenck Notzing on behalf of the Psychological Society of Munich, expressing deep sympathy with the loss sustained by our Society through Mr. Gurney's death. Both letters also contained a full and cordial recognition of the scientific value of Mr. Gurney's work, and of the services rendered by him to the cause of Psychical Research. The representatives of the Berlin Society, in particular, add a warm expression of gratitude for the “kind encouragement” and “unselfish help” received by them from our late Secretary. The letters were gratefully acknowledged by the President.—ED.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

- COOPER (Robert) *Spiritual Experiences, including Seven Months with the Brothers Davenport* ..... London, 1867  
 POWELL (J. H.) *Spiritualism; its Facts and Phases* ..... London, 1864  
 ROTH (Dr. Mathias) *The Physiological Effects of Artificial Sleep, with some Notes on the Treatment by Suggestion* ..... London, 1887  
 BELFIORE (Dr. Giulio) *L'Ipnotismo e gli Stati affini. Prefazione del Prof. Cesare Lombroso (2nd edition)* ..... Naples, 1888  
 † *HISTOIRES PRODIGIEUSES. Extraictes de Plusieurs Auteurs Grecs et Latins* ..... Anvers, 1595

† Presented by Prof. Chas. Richet.

The list of books presented to the library by Mrs. Gurney will appear in the next number of the *Journal*.