this sort—a subconscious fragment of the medium's Self, play-acting in this fashion. Professor William James, in his *Psychology*, Vol. I, p. 393, says:

". . . Mediumistic possession in all its grades seems to form a perfectly natural special type of alternate personality, and the susceptibility to it in some form is by no means an uncommon gift, in persons who have no other obvious mental anomaly. The phenomena are very intricate, and are only just beginning to be studied in a proper scientific way. . . . In the highest phase the trance is complete, the voice, language and everything are changed, and there is no after-memory whatever until the next trance comes. . . ."

Genuine amnesia exists for the trance state, that is, when the trance itself is genuine.

MEDIUMISTIC 'CONTROLS'

Now, it must be admitted that the evidence for the genuinely spiritistic character of the majority of regular mediumistic "Controls" is very slight: Mrs. Piper's "Phinuit," who claimed to be a Frenchman and a medical man, when driven into a corner by Dr. Hodgson, had to admit that he knew very little French and very little medicine; Mrs. Smead's "Harrison Clarke" was got rid of by Dr. Hyslop, after the latter had concluded that he was a "fake"; and so on. But the curious thing about it all was this: That, although the evidence for the existence of these trance personalities was of the slightest, they did nevertheless succeed in bringing through a vast mass of supernormal information which could not be obtained in their absence. They seemed to act as a sort of psychic catalyser! After Hyslop had disposed of "Harrison Clarke," the supernormal content of the communications fell off immediately, and Hyslop afterwards admitted that he was rather sorry that he had 'banished' him, for, whatever he was, he certainly succeeded in bringing through a quantity of valuable material. The function of such a regular mediumistic Control seems to be that of intermediary, and, whether he be a spirit, as he claims to be, or a mere personification of the medium's, this being usually of secondary importance, since it is undoubtedly through 'his' instrumentality and presence that veridical messages are often obtained. He acts as a sort of vehicle for the delivery of transmitted messages, and, whether he be a part of the medium's subconscious mind or a genuine entity, the fact remains *that veridical spiritistic material of a striking character is often obtained by reason of, and only by reason of, 'his' cooperation.*

Assuredly we have here, therefore, an essential and significant difference between the ordinary secondary personality—as observed in pathological cases —and the Control personality (whatever its nature may be) in mediumistic cases; for, in the former instances, the secondary personality acquires no supernormal information, while in the latter cases it does. In the pathological cases, we seem to have a *mere* splitting of the mind, while in the mediumistic cases we seem to deal with a (perhaps fictitious) personality which is nevertheless in touch or contact, in some mysterious way, with another (spiritual) world,

from which it derives information, and through which genuine messages often come.

'CONTROLS' VS. MULTIPLE PERSONALITY

Is there any means by which this mediumistic (Control) personality can be distinguished from the usual secondary personality, as manifested in spontaneous, pathological cases? This was one of the primary objects in view, when undertaking the present series of experiments. It was realized that there is usually a great resemblance between the two, and, in the absence of proof to the contrary, we must assume their practical identity—while freely acknowledging the fact that supernormal information is obtained in one set of cases, and not in the other. At the same time, it would be a highly significant and important fact if it could be shown that there are certain fundamental psychological differences between ordinary secondary personalities and mediumistic "Controls." What, then, seems to be a more or less universal characteristic of these "selves," in cases of multiple personality? And is this characteristic to be found in the mediumistic (Control) personality? If not, we should have established a fundamental and highly important difference between the two.

Now, in examining the various historic cases of multiple personality, etc., which have been recorded in the past, this significant fact is brought to light, *viz.:* That, no matter how fundamental may be the cleavage between the various "selves," and no matter how complete the degree of amnesia between them, the fact nevertheless remains that there is a certain amount of subterranean "leakage," back and forth, between these various selves. This is a fact of such capital importance that evidence and authoritative statements are certainly needed in its support. It would be possible to quote a vast quantity of evidence of this character; but the following typical excerpts will doubtless suffice for our purpose.

In the now classical case of Ansel Bourne, two quite distinct personalities were noted. Nevertheless, as Boris Sidis pointed out: "He knew how to eat, drink, dress, and take care of himself; he could speak, read and write, and could readily understand written and spoken language. He even retained his habit of churchgoing and making sermons." In the famous case reported by Dr. Gilbert, he writes: "The changes from one personality to another were at times gradual, instead of abrupt. At times memory of one stream of consciousness faded out gradually as the other came into prominence. . . . Several times, in one personality, short preceding experiences were vaguely recalled and thought to have been dreams, showing that at times the different selves overlapped, as it were, to some extent, leaving the period of change indistinct in each. . . ." Lurancy Vennum, toward the end of her life, had a vague remembrance of herself in her secondary state—completely isolated as that was. In one famous case, the individual in state A. knew French well, while in state B. she knew no French—could neither read, write nor understand it; neverthe-