

DISCUSSION

SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.¹

MR. TYRRELL'S book is an excellent introduction to Psychical Research by a writer who has himself made an important experimental contribution to one branch of the subject, viz. extra-sensory perception. It is based, so far as the facts are concerned, mainly on the publications of the English Society for Psychical Research, though it also makes some use of materials from American and Continental sources. As Mr. Tyrrell remarks in his *Introduction*, "after fifty-five years of steady work" the S.P.R.'s "*Proceedings* and *Journal*" have grown into a veritable mine of carefully ascertained information. Yet comparatively few people care to read this information or take any interest in its work." The serene indifference or complacent quarter-knowledge with which most philosophers and psychologists dismiss this mass of carefully sifted material, which must (on *any* interpretation of it) be vitally important to their studies, is evidently due to some very strong and deeply rooted non-rational cause. It is to be hoped that Mr. Tyrrell's book will be widely read, and that many of its readers will be stimulated to tackle the original papers and to help in carrying forward research in these subjects.

It is natural to compare Mr. Tyrrell's book with Frank Podmore's *Studies in Psychical Research* and *The Newer Spiritualism*, which are at present the standard introductory works. Podmore's great merit is that he combined an immense amount of first-hand knowledge of the facts with an almost extravagant scepticism about all super-normal inferences from them. Therefore any candid reader feels that he must take very seriously anything that Podmore cannot explain away and a good deal which Podmore can account for only by postulating extremely far-fetched *ad hoc* normal causes. For these reasons I think that Podmore's two books are still indispensable to anyone who is beginning to study the subject. But they have several deficiencies, and Mr. Tyrrell's book supplements them in these respects. In the first place, they date back to the beginning of the century. Since then there have been great advances in normal and abnormal psychology, and a mass of very important ostensibly super-normal material has been added to the subject of Psychical Research. This later material is fully treated in Mr. Tyrrell's book. Secondly, Podmore made no attempt to consider the philosophical bearings of the alleged facts, or to see how they fit or fail to fit into the generally accepted framework of human knowledge and belief. Mr. Tyrrell is, I should judge, less sceptical by nature than was Podmore of the possibility of the super-normal; his own very remarkable experimental results have convinced him (not unreasonably) of the reality of extra-sensory perception, including clairvoyance and pre-cognition; and he has wide philosophical interests and considerable philosophical knowledge. So his book contains an element which is altogether absent from Podmore's.

The book is divided into five Parts, preceded by a short Introduction. Parts I, II, and IV are mainly expository, being designed to give the reader good samples of the evidence for various kinds of ostensibly super-normal phenomena. Parts III and V are primarily interpretative and theoretical, and,

¹ G. N. M. Tyrrell (London: Methuen & Co., 1938. Pp. xvi, 379. Price 12s. 6d.).

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

for that reason, should receive more attention than the others in a review in *Philosophy*. I propose, therefore, to give a brief account of the contents of Parts I, II, and IV, and then to treat Parts III and V in rather more detail.

Part I deals with Spontaneous Extra-sensory Perception. It is divided into four chapters. The first of these defines certain terms which constantly recur in the literature of the subject; discusses the nature and reliability of the evidence for spontaneous (as opposed to experimental) extra-sensory perception; and gives a very brief account of the S.P.R.'s important "Census of Hallucinations." Chapter II gives examples of the evidence for what appears to be spontaneous telepathy between living persons. It includes the famous "Chaffin Will Case" (1925), and a remarkable case connected with the fatal accident to an excursion train at Darlington in June 1928. Chapter III gives examples of the evidence for what seems *prima facie* to be spontaneous clairvoyance. The most interesting case here is taken from Dr. Osty's book *Sur les Connaissances Supranormales*, and concerns the finding of the body of an old French peasant through the clairvoyance of Mme. Morel. Chapter IV gives samples of the evidence for non-inferential knowledge of future and past events and for so-called "psychometry" or "object-reading." Here, again, it is an advantage that Mr. Tyrrell is able to quote quite recent cases from the publications of the S.P.R.

Part II treats of Experimental Extra-sensory Perception. The first chapter gives a short history of the subject. The most important cases mentioned in it are the experiments of Miss Miles and Miss Ramsden in 1905, and those of Mrs. Upton Sinclair in 1928-29 published by her husband in his book *Mental Radio*. The second chapter describes certain collective experiments, done in recent years with large numbers of percipients. Such experiments were tried, and reported in the S.P.R. *Proceedings* by Miss Jephson in 1924; by Miss Jephson, Mr. Soal, and Mr. Besterman; by Dr. Woolley and Sir Oliver Lodge through the B.B.C. in 1927; and by Mr. Soal with certain subjects who were chosen because they had shown *prima facie* signs of super-normal powers in the Broadcasting Experiment. The results of these experiments were negative. Mr. Tyrrell explains this by referring to two facts which, he says, emerge from his own work with individuals, viz. (i) that only a few persons possess the faculty of extra-sensory perception to an appreciable degree, and (ii) that, even with good subjects, this faculty is very liable to be inhibited by psychological resistances. This chapter ends with a description of M. Stefan Ossowiecki's remarkable achievement in describing a drawing presented to him at Warsaw in a carefully sealed light-proof envelope prepared with elaborate precautions by Mr. Besterman at the S.P.R. rooms in London.

The third chapter of Part II gives an account of the much-discussed work done by Dr. J. B. Rhine at Duke University, North Carolina, and sponsored by Professor Macdougall. It is well known that, even after allowing due weight to certain criticisms which have been made by experts on the statistical details of this work, the proportion of successes scored is fantastically above anything that can reasonably be ascribed to chance. Whether it establishes the existence of extra-sensory perception is another question. On this matter the following observations, most of which are based on information that became available after the publication of Mr. Tyrrell's book, may be worth making. (i) I cannot help wondering why the proportion of persons who seem *prima facie* to have marked powers of extra-sensory perception should be so much greater among the students of Duke University, North Carolina, than among otherwise similar persons experimented upon in England. (ii) The S.P.R. have recently been supplied with samples of the kind of cards used in

PHILOSOPHY

these experiments. They are disgracefully badly constructed, and are so defective that in certain sorts of experiment a person familiar with them could sometimes guess the nature of the card from merely seeing the edge of it. (iii) It is quite true that in many of the experiments described by Dr. Rhine this defect would not have helped the percipient in the least. It is also true that the way in which successes tailed off after a time with some of his best percipients does not fit in at all with a normal explanation on these lines. But the facts about the defective cards do produce in my mind an impression of general "sloppiness" which makes me doubt Dr. Rhine's competence to devise properly and describe accurately *any* kind of experiment. This may be most unfair, but, as at present advised, "*ich kann nicht anders.*" (iv) Since Mr. Tyrrell wrote his book a most admirably careful series of experiments, on the same lines as Dr. Rhine's, has been carried out by Mr. Soal, partly on students at Queen Mary College, and partly on the medium Mrs. Garrett who scored an extremely high proportion of successes with Dr. Rhine. In none of Mr. Soal's experiments is there the least trace of any result which cannot reasonably be ascribed to chance. To speak quite frankly, I *know* that Mr. Soal is a highly competent investigator; I have some *prima facie* reason to doubt whether Dr. Rhine is so; and I do not think that any scientist would be prepared to accept as proven in *any* subject a startling claim coming from a youthful American university unless and until it was confirmed by experiments done in older and perhaps more self-critical seats of learning.

In the last chapter of Part II Mr. Tyrrell describes his own very important experiments with Miss Gertrude Johnson, and the extremely ingenious mechanical apparatus which he devised for carrying out a great number of such experiments quickly and for recording the results automatically. I have seen the apparatus, and have been most favourably impressed with it. The positive results which Mr. Tyrrell has obtained are, in my opinion, the most impressive evidence which exists at present for experimental extra-sensory perception. The discussion of certain suggested normal explanations of these results involves some interesting points in the theory of probability and shows how easy it is to fall into traps about "randomness."

Part IV is concerned with Mediumistic Trance. The first chapter begins with a general account of the three varieties which this may take, and then describes and discusses the mediumship of Mrs. Piper, which was studied intensively by Wm. James, Richard Hodgson, Professor Hyslop, and others over a long period of years. There is a masterly paper in Vol. XXIII of the S.P.R. *Proceedings* by Mrs. Sidgwick, entitled *The Psychology of Mrs. Piper's Trance*, and Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from this. He sums up as follows (p. 178): "The Piper case suggests . . . that in trance-mediumship we are dealing with certain states of consciousness which bear an analogy to hypnosis or auto-hypnosis; that these are full of dream-like associations leading to much nonsensical material; that impersonations of the dead take place, sometimes unconvincingly, sometimes presenting false communicators, sometimes more convincingly; but that behind all this there is evidence of a will to communicate which, when conditions are at their best, gives a strong impression of a genuine deceased communicator somewhere in the background." This seems to me to be an eminently fair summary of the facts.

The second chapter gives an account of the very remarkable "A.V.B." case, which was fully reported by Una Lady Troubridge and Miss Radcliffe Hall, two friends of the ostensible communicator, in Vol. XXX of the S.P.R. *Proceedings*. In this case the trance-medium was Mrs. Osborne Leonard; the ostensible communicator "A.V.B." frequently took control of the medium's

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

organism and spoke with the "direct voice"; and the two sitters seem to have taken all possible precautions against fraud, fishing, and leakage of information by normal means.

The third chapter explains certain attempts which have been made in recent years to devise a system of numerical scoring for the various statements made by a medium in the course of a sitting, so that the amount of correct information actually given may be compared with the amount which might be expected to arise purely by chance. This presents a very difficult problem, both theoretically and practically. A theoretically satisfactory method of combining "marks" has been devised by Mr. Soal and modified by him to meet certain criticisms by Professor Fisher. But there still remains the practical problem of estimating the antecedent probability of individual statements being true by chance. Some attempt to solve this latter problem statistically has been made by Mr. J. G. Pratt, of Duke University.

The fourth chapter contains a sketch of an extremely interesting and original method of research which Mr. Whately Carington devised some years ago and has since been practising and perfecting. It consists of two parts. The first is to apply certain psychological tests, such as the reaction-time test, which Jung devised in order to identify the emotional complexes characteristic of an individual, to a medium (*a*) in her normal state, (*b*) when speaking in the person of her habitual "control," and (*c*) in that much rarer state in which her organism is ostensibly under the direct control of this or that deceased "communicator" who is speaking with the medium's vocal organs. The second part of the method is to subject the quantitative results of these tests to a certain kind of statistical analysis, devised by Professor Fisher and constantly used in other fields of research, known as the "Analysis of Variance." Whately Carington used his method (i) to compare the reactions of the same medium in these various states and when controlled by various ostensible communicators, and (ii) to compare the reactions of different mediums through whom the same ostensible communicator was ostensibly communicating. This was pioneer work, and it is admitted that a great many errors and obscurities occurred in the earlier papers, which the author has gradually removed partly by his own self-criticism and partly through the criticism of expert statisticians. The present situation is admirably stated in an expository and critical paper by Professor Thouless in Vol. XLIV of the *S.P.R. Proceedings*. Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from this paper, and gives as intelligible account of the method as can be expected in the space at his disposal. It is evident from the discussion in pp. 215-20 of his book that he is not himself inclined to view these quantitative methods very favourably. I do not altogether agree with Mr. Tyrrell's arguments on this point, but I accept his conclusion that "although the quantitative method might in time bring to light useful facts, it would be unsafe in the light of our present knowledge to draw any conclusions from the results, whether they are positive or negative."

The last two chapters of Part IV contain an account of two kinds of test which are of special interest for the following reason. They were not originally designed by the investigators, but were proposed in the course of automatic writing or speech by certain ostensible communicators who claimed to be giving tests of their identity. These are the "Book-tests" and the "Cross-correspondences." The latter, whatever may be the right interpretation of them, are certainly signs of great ingenuity and remarkable knowledge of out-of-the-way literary and classical allusions on the part of *someone* other than the conscious mind of any living person concerned in the experiments. It is extremely difficult to give a satisfactory summary of a cross-correspond-

PHILOSOPHY

ence case. Mr. Tyrrell's account of certain of them, including the "*Thanatos*" case and the very remarkable "Ear of Dionysius" case, should suffice to convince any intelligent reader of the great interest and importance of this kind of evidence. Anyone whose interest is aroused by these samples should read an admirable little book by Mr. H. F. Saltmarsh, which has recently appeared, entitled *Evidence for Personal Survival from Cross-Correspondences*. From this he may pass on to the original reports and critical discussions of them in the S.P.R. *Proceedings* which are listed at the end of Mr. Saltmarsh's book.

Having now given a conspectus of the factual content of Mr. Tyrrell's book, I will conclude by saying something about the more theoretical and speculative portions of it, which are contained in Parts III and V.

Part III is concerned with the Significance of the Evidence for Extra-sensory Perception. In the first chapter of this Part, Mr. Tyrrell is concerned to show that extra-sensory perception, if it exists, "has every appearance of breaking away from the scheme of the world as we at present understand it, and of refusing to fall into line with the causal scheme." He shows, conclusively I think, that explanations of telepathy and even of clairvoyance in terms of the emission and reception of physical radiations are utterly hopeless when we consider them in detail. Hence these kinds of perception, if they exist, must be utterly unlike sense-perception as ordinarily conceived. It is still more obvious that non-inferential pre-cognition, if it occurs, falls altogether outside the range of our habitually accepted axioms and postulates. In this part of his discussion Mr. Tyrrell quotes largely from two papers by the present reviewer, viz. the Presidential Address to the S.P.R. in 1935 on *Normal Cognition, Clairvoyance, and Telepathy* and a paper entitled *Philosophical Implications of Foreknowledge* in Supplementary Volume XVI of the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. The latter paper called forth a most interesting critical commentary from Professor H. H. Price, which Mr. Tyrrell here summarizes. He also makes a brief mention of Mr. J. W. Dunne's theory of Time, and gives a more detailed account of an attempt by Mr. Saltmarsh to account for pre-cognition by postulating a greatly extended Specious Present.

In the second chapter Mr. Tyrrell, making great use of Professor Price's book *Perception*, is concerned to stress the following points: (i) That natural science is based entirely upon the deliveries of human sense-perception, and that all its theories in the last resort are concerned with the sensations which would be experienced by normal human beings under conditions which are themselves describable in terms of sensations. (ii) That human sense-perception is not, as it seems to the uncritical experient, an act of directly prehending independent and public things or events. The objects which a human being prehends in sense-perception are private to himself and directly dependent, both for their existence and their sensible qualities, on his own organism and to some extent on his own past experiences and present expectations. Physical things and events are known only as rather remote causal ancestors of certain groups and sequences of characteristically interrelated sensations. (iii) That the axioms, postulates, and procedures of human thinking are themselves limited and conditioned to an unknown extent by the special situation of human beings as living organisms coming at a certain point in a certain line of biological development.

From the first of these contentions it follows that, if there were extra-sensory perception, it would be very unlikely to fit into the existing scheme of natural science. Mr. Tyrrell appears to hold that the resistance to considering seriously the evidence for extra-sensory perception, which is so notice-

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

able among scientists, rests upon a failure to recognize the truth of the second and third of these contentions. (In the third chapter of this Part he gives a very amusing instance of this resistance by quoting from the ludicrously inadequate, ignorant, and supercilious chapter on psychical phenomena which disfigures an otherwise excellent book, viz. *The Science of Life*, by Messrs. H. G. Wells, G. P. Wells, and Julian Huxley.)

In regard to this part of Mr. Tyrrell's book the following remarks seem worth making. (i) In fairness to the scientists (who certainly need all our charity in this matter) it is necessary to stress one point which Mr. Tyrrell rather under-emphasizes. This is the extremely unsatisfactory nature of the evidence, the enormous amount of admitted fraud and self-deception, and the maddening difficulty of reproducing positive results under absolutely satisfactory conditions. When one remembers that at one period this almost made a man so patient, persistent, and fair-minded as Sidgwick abandon the subject in disgust, one can scarcely blame the average scientist for refusing to touch it with a barge-pole. What one *can* blame is his talking dogmatically and pontifically and tendenciously about matters which he has decided (often quite legitimately) not to waste time and temper in studying. (ii) Mr. Tyrrell appears to think that the admission of these three propositions would not only have the negative effect of removing prejudice against the possibility of extra-sensory perception but would also enable us to suggest and test hypotheses about it. I cannot feel very hopeful about this. The difficulties which Mr. Tyrrell has pointed out in conceiving the *modus operandi* of telepathy, of clairvoyance, and still more of precognition, seem to arise from their conflicting with certain fundamental postulates of human *thinking*, in terms of which all causal explanations have to be made. Even if we come to recognize that these postulates are bound up with our special position as biological individuals, I do not see how we are to get outside our intellectual skins and formulate hypotheses in other terms.

Part V, the last section of the book, deals with the Theoretical Aspect of the Mediumistic Trance. It opens with two chapters devoted to the extremely important paper which the present Earl of Balfour contributed to Vol. XLIII of the S.P.R. *Proceedings* under the title of *A Study of the Psychological Aspects of Mrs. Willett's Mediumship*. Mrs. Willett's mediumship, which was studied intensively over a period of twenty years by Lord Balfour, was of a peculiar kind. It was not trance-mediumship in the usual sense. She did not have a certain habitual "control," such as "Fedra" in the case of Mrs. Leonard, nor did the ostensible communicators directly control her organs of speech or writing as in the A.V.B. case. The ostensible communicators through Mrs. Willett professed to be Edmund Gurney and F. W. H. Myers, two of the founders of the S.P.R. The former was an intimate friend of Lord Balfour. They claimed to be deliberately training Mrs. Willett for a special kind of mediumship in which the essential point was that she should remain in an almost normal condition and should then, in her own speech or writing, convey to Lord Balfour what the communicators had impressed on her mind. The mere fact that this claim was made and dramatically and consistently maintained throughout a long series of sittings is of the utmost psychological interest, even if we refuse to admit that what was claimed was in any sense true. But the contents of the communications which come through Mrs. Willett are still more interesting. They consist largely of painstaking attempts by the ostensible Gurney and Myers to describe and analyse the processes by which they initiate their communications and by which the medium's mind gradually elaborates them and eventually utters them in speech or writing. The contents of most mediumistic communications are trivial and twaddling

PHILOSOPHY

in the extreme, but the cross-correspondences and the Willett communications are on an altogether different intellectual level. As Mr. Tyrrell quite justly says, "the communicators are strong, intelligent, natural, and give one the impression of being human beings engaged in a difficult task, hampered by certain natural impediments, and explaining their difficulties and what they are doing as they go along." (It may be remarked that a good deal of information purporting to describe the mechanism and the difficulties of communication from the point of view of the "other side" occurs in sittings held by Mr. Drayton Thomas with Mrs. Leonard, in which the ostensible communicators are his father "John" and his sister "Etta." Here again the contents of the communications are intelligible and informative.)

Basing himself mainly on the Willett communications, but also to some extent on those which come through Mrs. Leonard and Mrs. Piper, Mr. Tyrrell reaches the following tentative conclusions. (i) The ideas which finally emerge in the form of automatic speech or writing originate in the depths of the medium's subconsciousness through the exercise of a faculty of "telaesthesia." This is described as a form of extra-sensory cognition in which the trance-personality "reaches out to gather the fact that it needs from wherever the knowledge of it is to be obtained." (I think that "telaesthesia" would stand to "telepathy" in a relation analogous to that in which "listening" stands to "hearing," or "searching" to "seeing," or "exploring tactually" to "passively touching.") (ii) The ideas, thus super-normally acquired, then rise through various levels of the self until they finally "crystallize into the clear-cut discrete ideas with which we do our normal thinking, and in which form alone they can attain verbal expression." (iii) The function of the communicator is "to select and control, guide and shepherd" the telaesthetically acquired material, in such a way that what finally emerges in automatic speech or writing shall convey a certain idea which he wishes to get through to the sitter. (iv) At every stage of this highly complex process there are snags and difficulties, due partly to the associations and resistances of the medium's mind, partly to the very imperfect control which the communicator can exercise over the medium's mind, and partly to the very imperfect knowledge which the communicator has of his own success or failure. (v) The images, sensations, and quasi-sensations which the medium experiences and describes when in trance are created by her own mind, no matter whence the initial stimulus to this process of creation may have come. Items which originate from purely internal sources, and others which are ultimately due to telepathic influences from outside, are inextricably blended with each other. (vi) There is a peculiar kind of experience in which the medium seems to herself to be directly aware of the presence of this or that communicator, to identify him, and to feel in herself certain emotions which she unhesitatingly takes to be *his* emotions at the time. On such occasions she may have no visual, tactual, or auditory images representative of the communicator's body or his gestures or his speech. (vii) Lastly, some of the statements made by Mrs. Willett and other mediums compel us to envisage the possibility of some kind of literal fusion of two persons and literal joint-ownership of certain experiences.

The next chapter, *Trance-Personalities*, and the earlier part of its immediate successor, *Nature of the Communicators*, may be taken together. It is obvious that an habitual control, such as "Fedra" in the case of Mrs. Leonard or "Phinuit" in that of Mrs. Piper, bears some likeness to the secondary personalities recognized by students of abnormal psychology. This *prima facie* resemblance is to some extent confirmed by the quantitative results of Mr. Whately Carington's work, which also strongly suggest that there is a profound difference between habitual controls and ostensible communicators,

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

such as "John" and "Etta" in Mr. Drayton Thomas's sittings with Mrs. Leonard. Mr. Tyrrell points out that there are well-known cases of ostensible communicators who show super-normal knowledge and are dramatically self-consistent and yet can be proved to be fictitious. Some very interesting cases of this kind are described by Mr. Soal in his *Report on Some Communications received through Mrs. Blanche Cooper*, published in the S.P.R. *Proceedings*, Vol. XXXV. In some cases the ostensible communicator, who purports to be dead and gives accurate information about events in his life unknown to medium or sitter, is in fact alive and oblivious of what is going on at the sitting. The essential point which emerges from Mr. Tyrrell's discussion of these and other facts may be summarized in his own words as follows: "We must not assume that there are only two alternatives, either (i) that a communicator, substantially the same as the deceased person in question was when alive, is standing at the other end of a psychic telephone, or (ii) that some hypnotic stratum in the medium is playing a part, eked out by telepathy from the living. It is pretty clear that both these theories are too crude and too simple." The alternative which Mr. Tyrrell and certain other highly competent and experienced investigators are inclined to accept is the following. When it appears *prima facie* that a certain deceased person (e.g. Myers) is communicating through a certain medium (e.g. Mrs. Piper) the communications are produced by something which is a compound of two different factors. One of these factors is a certain constellation of the medium's own experiences, traces, dispositions, associations, etc. The other is a factor which is independent of the medium. This may combine on other occasions in a similar way with a certain constellation of experiences, traces, etc., belonging to another medium (e.g. Mrs. Willett), and the compound thus formed may produce communications which appear *prima facie* to come from the same deceased person (e.g. Myers) but are characteristically different in content, emphasis, emotional colouring, etc. Following Mr. Kenneth Richmond, Mr. Tyrrell calls the first factor a "communicator-vehicle" and the second a "communicator-impulse."

Granted that this is the description of the observable facts which seems least inadequate to those who know most about them, it is plain that it immediately leads on to further questions. What is the nature of the "communicator-impulse"? How is it related to the once-living person, Myers or Gurney or "A.V.B.," in whose name the ostensible communications emerge from the medium? Might it not be due to the subconscious activity of some friend of the deceased, still living among us, and unwittingly gaining knowledge by telaesthesia and impressing it telepathically on the medium's mind? Mr. Tyrrell considers such questions as these, and certain suggested answers to them in Chapter XXI of his book.

Mr. Tyrrell first states and discusses a form of the Compound theory which was tentatively suggested some years ago by the present reviewer in *The Mind and its Place in Nature* as a minimal hypothesis to cover most, but not all, of the well-established facts of trance-mediumship. His objections are as follows: (i) He thinks that, if this theory were true, the most impressive and characteristic communications might be expected to occur in those cases where the ostensible communicator is ostensibly in direct control of the medium's organism. But in fact, he alleges, this is not so. The most impressive and characteristic communications occur in connection with Mrs. Willett's peculiar kind of mediumship, which does not fit at all easily into the theory under consideration. (ii) It is admitted that the theory has to be eked out by the hypothesis of elaborate telepathic action from certain living persons on the mind of the medium. If this can do as much as is required of it, it can

PHILOSOPHY

do enough to make the postulate of a persistent "psycho-genic factor" (which is the essential feature of the theory) superfluous.

Mr. Tyrrell then considers whether telepathy from the living will suffice to account for the facts. In the cross-correspondence cases it is generally admitted that Mrs. Verrall, and she alone, of the automatic writers concerned, had the necessary classical knowledge. If any living mind was responsible, Mrs. Verrall's was much the most likely candidate. But, in the first place, the cross-correspondences continued to go on in the same dramatic form and with the same ostensible communicators after her death in 1916. Secondly, we should have to suppose that some stratum of Mrs. Verrall's subconscious self not only telepathically conveyed to the various automatists concerned the various items of information which were to emerge in a cross-correspondence, but also telepathically induced these automatists to dramatize their utterances in such a way that they appeared to be characteristic of certain deceased persons, such as Myers and Gurney. Lastly, in the case of a medium like Mrs. Leonard large numbers of highly characteristic dramatizations of deceased persons whom she has never met have been produced in presence of various sitters. Some of these have been strikingly life-like from the very first. If we ascribe this to telepathy from the sitter, we must suppose that he not only has somewhere in his mind a "model" of the characteristic traits of his deceased friends, but that he can somehow induce the medium to act and talk in imitation of this "model" which she has never seen in the flesh. If we are going to call this "telepathy," we ought to realize that it is something enormously different from the spontaneous and experimental extra-sensory perception which was discussed earlier in the book.

Mr. Tyrrell reverts to the telepathic theory in the last chapter of his book, and gives an excellent summary of his objections to it. I will quote what seems to me to be a very fair commentary of his on the telepathic theory. "In order to make it work we have to regard the living mind as something different from and immensely wider than what we commonly mean by the term, and we have to endow it with such a range of 'subliminal self' and with such astonishing extra-sensory powers that the proposition of its survival takes on a new aspect."

In the latter part of Chapter XXI Mr. Tyrrell discusses certain arguments against the antecedent probability of human survival which have been put forward by Professor Richet; and certain other arguments, which seem to me to be much more impressive, enunciated by Professor Dodds in his paper *Why I Do Not Believe in Survival* in S.P.R. *Proceedings*, Vol. XLII. (It should be noted that both these writers are thoroughly familiar with the facts of psychical research, and that both accept the existence of various forms of extra-sensory perception.) The gist of Mr. Tyrrell's answer appears to be that both writers take far too narrow and conventional view about the nature and limitations of the embodied self and about what survival would be if it were a fact. Psycho-analysis and abnormal psychology suffice to show that the ordinary embodied self is a far more complex entity than it appears to superficial observation confined to the normal waking life of persons in good mental health. The occurrence of extra-sensory perception and trance-mediumship reveal further depths beneath those which are plumbed by the psycho-analyst and the abnormal psychologist. And the occurrence of pre-cognition shows that our everyday notions of time are so inadequate that it is unsafe to regard mere continuance of a self's earthly life as the only possible form that survival could take.

Mr. Tyrrell's own view about survival is stated very tentatively in the last chapter of the book (pp. 368-9). I do not think that I understand it well

DISCUSSION: SCIENCE AND PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA

enough to be able to give a useful summary of it. It involves the notion of a "self-principle" or "I-principle." This is said to have "animated" the deceased person when he was still alive in the body; to persist after the death of the latter; and to "animate" a new personality, which "becomes deranged in the process of helping to form the trance-personality" (during mediumistic communications) "and harks back to something more or less resembling its former terrestrial self, and, while doing so, may even forget a good deal about its other-worldly state of existence."

It remains for me to remark that Mr. Tyrrell devotes to the physical phenomena of mediumship a chapter which is short but is quite as long as the utterly unsatisfactory state of the available evidence warrants. He also discusses, briefly and sensibly, in two successive chapters, the relation of psychical research to Spiritualism and to Religion.

I have noted a good many typographical errors, and I hope that Mr. Tyrrell's book will soon go into a second impression which will give him an opportunity to correct them. On p. 42, l. 4, for *he* read *him*; on p. 114, l. 15, for *Case 17* read *Case 13*, and in the next line for *Lady Z* read *Lady Q*; on p. 125, l. 11, I think that *less* must be a mistake for *greater*; on p. 213, l. 23, for *imposter* read *impostor*; on p. 241, l. 8, for *Aristophenes* read *Aristophanes*; on p. 306, l. 33, for *analagous* read *analogous*. There are probably other small misprints which I have overlooked.

C. D. BROAD.