The first crude hypothesis, that "ghosts" are the spirits of deceased persons, actually walking this earth in quasi-material form, and holding familiar intercourse with their survivors, is probably held now by few if any of the intelligent students of the evidence amassed by the Society. It is not that this hypothesis has fallen by the weight of argument and evidence arrayed against it; it has merely shared in that general euthanasia which has overwhelmed many other pious opinions found inadequate to the facts. It has silently dropped out of view. But, nevertheless, in the belief certainly of most of those who have contributed experiences of their own to our collection, and of nearly all those who have recorded for us experiences related to them by others, the "ghost," the thing seen or heard, manifests intelligence, and bears some definite relation to some deceased person; a relation possibly similar to that suggested in Phantasms of the Living to exist between the apparition seen at the time of a death and the person whom it resembles.

It is recognised, in short, that the phenomena are essentially hallucinatory, but it is suggested that the hallucinations are in some sense due to the agency of a deceased person, that they are possibly a reflection of his uneasy dream; or, if that conception should be found too definite, that they represent in some way the fragmentary thoughts of a decaying personality.

A close familiarity with the evidence amassed by the Society—a familiarity extending over nearly eight years—has led me, not only to question the adequacy and relevance of the evidence on which this belief is founded, but to consider, further, whether the very existence of the evidence, in its present form, may not be largely due to the pre-existence of that belief in the minds of the witnesses. The hypotheses advanced in the following paper, it should be premised, are purely tentative. I am fully aware that the evidence is at present far too meagre to justify confidence in any solution of the problems which it presents. In fact, the main justification for attempting any solution at the present time is to be found in the hope that such an attempt may direct and encourage the accumulation of further evidence. Moreover, a theory founded upon the evidence has recently been put forward by Mr. Myers. And it seemed to me that the facts, as so far ascertained,
lent themselves quite as readily to what may perhaps be called an agnostic interpretation; and that it would advance the ultimate solution of the problem if both views were fairly represented.

It will, I think, conduces to clearness if I here explain exactly what evidence I am going to discuss. It is the series of narratives, collected by the Literary Committee of the Society, which has been classed together as the “G.” series. This includes recognised phantasms of dead persons, unrecognised apparitions and voices, and the mysterious noises which popularly suggest haunting. In fact the G. series corresponds roughly to the popular idea of “ghosts.” Early in the course of the Literary Committee’s work it was found that the labour of studying the mass of evidence accumulated in MS. would be well nigh intolerable, and a large part of it was, therefore, printed at the expense of a member of the Committee—not for publication, but merely for the convenience of the Committee itself. The cases thus printed are numbered G.1, G.2, &c. (in the series we are dealing with), and by these numbers I shall refer to them. At a later date some of the narratives were copied, in manifold, by the type-writer or cyclostyle, and these subsidiary series are referred to as G.t.1, G.c.1, &c. Files of these narratives are kept at the offices of the S.P.R., and can under certain conditions be inspected by any Member or Associate. After a time the plan of printing on slips was abandoned, and that of printing the narratives in the Journal (for private circulation) was adopted instead, the same plan of lettering and numbering being retained.

The evidential standard to which a narrative must attain before being printed even for consideration by the Literary Committee has never, of course, been rigidly defined. It has naturally risen since the Committee began its work, but even now it should be borne in mind by Members reading the Journal that the Committee do not pledge themselves individually or collectively to any estimate of the value of a story as evidence for supernatural phenomena by printing it for consideration in the Journal.

From the following review of the evidence for “ghosts” I have excluded, except for illustrative purposes, all cases of the apparition of a human figure, whether recognised or not, to a solitary percipient, except when some connection with matters outside the knowledge of the percipient is established, on the ground that there is nothing in such a case to distinguish the figure from a purely subjective hallucination, and that as such, in the absence of further evidence, we are bound to class it. Cases in which the only phenomena are auditory have also been excluded. Such cases stand much lower in the evidential scale than cases which treat of visual phenomena. The consideration of them would not appreciably affect the conclusions to be drawn, whilst to introduce them would cumber the argument.
There remain some 200 stories, the majority hitherto unpublished, included in series G. of the Society's evidences. These narratives record the apparition of a figure either on separate occasions to different percipients in the same locality—successive cases; or to two or more persons simultaneously—collective cases; or to a solitary percipient, where the veridical nature of the phantasm is proved by some corroborating circumstance. A small proportion of narratives given at second-hand, or otherwise of doubtful authenticity, have been included in the collection, and these have been employed in the argument to illustrate the tendency of such narratives generally to merge into myth, and to indicate the possible genesis of some of their more remarkable features. In discussing the narratives in detail it will be shown, first, that there are certain features—to wit, the recognition of the phantasm, the furnishing of information by it, its association with human remains or with some past tragedy—occurring commonly in these stories, which strongly suggest the connection of the phantasm with some deceased person. The stories, however, in which these features occur are almost invariably either second-hand, or, if narrated by the actual percipient, are in some other point open to suspicion of inaccuracy. It is inferred, therefore, that the frequent occurrence of these features in narratives which are evidentially weak, and their absence, as a general rule, from those which are evidentially strong, indicate that there is a strong mythopoeic tendency at work, moulding ghost stories into conformity with the preconceived opinions of the narrator; that first-hand stories, as a rule, escape the effects of this mythopoeic tendency through the greater sense of responsibility of the narrators; and that when first-hand stories present any of the unusual features referred to they are, to some extent, to be held suspect.

It will be shown, next, that first-hand, and less commonly second-hand, narratives present many points—for instance, the absence of any apparent motive in the appearance of the phantasm, its tendency to assume various forms, the liability of the percipients to casual and apparently non-veridical hallucinations, the occurrence of phantasms resembling animals—difficult to reconcile with the hypothesis that the apparition seen is the manifestation of an intelligent entity, and suggesting rather that it is to be attributed to casual hallucination.

One or two narratives, given by the percipients as "ghost" stories, are then quoted, and it is shown that they may be attributed to simple hallucination. It is suggested that in such narratives as these we have the raw material of ghost stories; that a morbid tendency on the part of the percipient, or the feeling of vague alarm caused by the occurrence of inexplicable sounds, may give rise to a hallucination; and that this may be repeated in the experience of the original percipient, or in that of others who have shared his alarm. The resemblance alleged to exist
between successive apparitions may be attributed, it is suggested, partly to expectation due to half-conscious hints, partly to the action of the mythopoeic tendency above referred to, which operates to reduce discrepancies and enhance similarities in the recollection of the various experiences. Finally, it is suggested that in successive cases, where these causes are demonstrably insufficient, and in collective cases generally, thought-transference may have operated between the original percipient and all who share a similar experience.

As regards the numerous instances quoted in previous papers read before the Society, of recognition of a phantasm by some marked peculiarity, it is suggested that thought-transference from the minds of persons still living is in almost all cases the explanation more directly suggested by the facts. Moreover, such thought-transference is a cause of whose operation we have independent proof, whilst we have little or no evidence of the action of disembodied intelligences.

On the hypothesis, then, that the apparitions seen in what are known as “haunted” houses are actually connected with a deceased person, there are certain characteristics for which we should be justified in looking. We should expect, for instance, to find in some of these stories evidence tending to identify the figure seen. Such evidence would be furnished (1) by the recognition of the features or the clothes, or (2) from correct information given by the apparition on matters outside the knowledge of the percipient. Or, in cases where the apparition remained unrecognised, the probability of its connection with some person deceased would be greatly strengthened by the discovery (3) of human remains, or (4) of other evidence pointing to a former tragedy in the locality of the appearance.

(1) As regards the first head, it is not enough, as already said, that a solitary percipient should see a figure which he recognises as resembling that of some friend whom he knows to be dead. To establish any claim upon our consideration the phantasm must be seen by more than one person; or appear at a time when the fact of the death is not known to the percipient; or the recognition must be of an indirect kind—that is, the phantasm must exhibit some true feature previously unknown to the percipient; or must be subsequently proved to resemble some deceased person who was unknown to the percipient. Cases coming under each of these categories are alleged to occur, but for the sake of clearness they will be more conveniently discussed in the latter part of this paper, which deals with the evidence recently brought forward by Mr. Myers in his papers in the *Proceedings*, Parts XIV. and XV. One exception may, however, be made.

In those cases in which, from a mere description of the figure,
resemblance is inferred to some person unknown to the percipient, the evidence must, it is obvious, as a general rule be inconclusive. Except in cases where there is some marked physical peculiarity or deformity, it is difficult to conceive a verbal description which, taken alone, would satisfy an intelligent critic of the identity of the person described. But an account where the percipient is alleged to have selected a picture or photograph as resembling the apparition would seem to stand upon a somewhat different footing. The materials for recognition are here ampler and more precise, and the evidence may be conveniently discussed at this point. The results may be given in a few words. There are six such cases in our collection. Of these, one (G. 62) is third-hand. In two other narratives (Mr. X. Z.'s case, Proceedings, Vol. I., pp. 106-7, and G. 28, Proceedings, Vol. III., p. 101) the evidence of the percipient is entirely uncorroborated as regards the recognition of the picture or photograph. In the first case there is a very strong presumption that such corroboration would have been forthcoming if the facts had been accurately represented in the percipient's narrative; and there are proved inaccuracies, which have led to the case being withdrawn. (Journal, Vol. II., p. 3.) And an element of weakness is introduced into the other case by the fact that the painting which was recognised, not without some prompting, was actually hanging in the dining-room of the house in which the figure appeared, and might conceivably have been seen by the percipient on the previous day. Moreover, this case also is susceptible of another interpretation (see p. 281 below). In the fourth case (G. 133)¹ the evidence for the recognition has, under a rigid scrutiny, broken down, and there is strong ground for believing that there was a mistake of identity, the supposed ghost being a real boy. The two remaining stories are discussed below (pp. 280, 292), and grounds are shown in each case for attributing the recognition to some other cause than the action of the deceased. None of these six cases, therefore, in which the apparition of a person unknown to the percipient is alleged to have been subsequently recognised from a picture, go far to prove any connection of the apparition with the dead. There is another narrative (G. 48) in which the phantasm is said to have been recognised from a corpse; but in this case the evidence is third-hand, if not even more remote. Lastly (G. 102), there is an alleged recognition of an article of dress worn by a phantasm, but it is only at second-hand.

(2) I have found 20 cases—there may be more—in which information outside the possible range of the percipient's knowledge is said to have been given by a phantasm, or in a dream. Of these 20 cases only two (G. 157 and 623) are undoubtedly at first-hand. The first is the

¹ An account of this case—the ghost of Tom Potter—was published in Apparitions, by Mr. Newton Crosland, pp. 45-50.
account of the discovery of the dead body of a suicide through a dream. The evidence here is insufficient; the person who was in a position to give the most conclusive corroboration to the percipient's narrative declined to answer any questions, or give any information whatever. And the place where the body was found—a neighbouring summer-house—seems not beyond the range of conjecture, unconscious or otherwise.

In G. 623 (quoted and discussed in Mr. Myers' paper in *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., pp. 35-41), a skeleton was actually discovered in a spot indicated by the percipient, which he stated was revealed to him in a dream. Unfortunately the percipient was dead some years before the story reached us, and we have had to rely upon his testimony as recorded. The case is discussed at length below (p. 303). Of the remaining 18 narratives, none of which, as said, are at first-hand, there are six cases in which a murder is alleged to have been revealed (G. 150, 170, 308, 414, 460, 611). There are two cases (G. 129 and 171) in which information is given as to the condition of a body lawfully buried; two cases (G. 421 and G.c. 600) in which the phantasm shows a laudable desire to discharge his just debts; and there are eight cases (G. 141, 173, 304, 362, 379, 411, 412, and G.c. 305) in which the apparition gives warning of impending death, indicates the whereabouts of a missing will, or supplies some other information. Of these, one (G.173) treats of a missing will discovered through the agency of a deceased uncle. The story was never published, and as, since its receipt, we have ascertained that the narrator is a young woman who at one time earned a precarious livelihood by copying articles from American magazines, and submitting them as her own composition to the judgment of English editors, and as a critical examination has made it evident that the necessary attestations to the truth of the narrative, purporting to be written and signed by various persons, are in the same handwriting variously disguised, it is perhaps not unreasonable to conjecture that the story itself lacks objective foundation.

Lastly, there are three cases, all second-hand, or more remote (G. 138, 338, 435), in which an apparition averts a catastrophe—either suicide or a serious accident. Thus out of 23 cases in which a definite piece of information is alleged to have been given, or a definite purpose shown, only two are at first-hand, and in both of these narratives the evidence is incomplete, whilst the facts themselves suggest a perfectly normal explanation.

(3) There are about 13 cases in our collection in which human remains are alleged to have been discovered on the scene of unexplained ghostly manifestations. But in three instances only does the actual discovery rest upon unquestionable evidence (G. 18, 154, and 386, quoted in *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., Case IX.). In four other cases
(G. 61, 606, G.c. 306, 617), the whole of the evidence is second-hand and even more remote; and in one of these (G. 61) the discovery of the skeleton is explicitly contradicted on evidence which may be taken as authoritative. In G.c. 900 the evidence for the finding of a skeleton rests on the uncorroborated memory of a child of six, who does not profess to have seen the skeleton dug up; this story appears to have been first committed to writing nearly 50 years after the alleged event. In G. 456 (Proceedings, Vol. VI., Case X.) the evidence for the skeleton depends on the narrator's remembrance of a conversation held at least 30 years before, and in G. 2 and 614 the authority for the alleged discovery is not given. In G. 331 the story, though first-hand, is from an illiterate person; and the figure said to have been seen, that of a shadowy woman, has no obvious connection with the remains found, which were those of a baby. In G. 156 the evidence for the finding of the skeletons is not first-hand, and the narrator is not inclined to attribute the apparition seen "to other than natural causes." The story, however, is quoted here in order that readers may be in a position to judge of the evidence for themselves. We received the original account from Mr. T. J. Norris, Tempe, Dalkey, Ireland.

G. 156.

October 17th, 1883.

I send you particulars of an apparition seen by three sons of the late Rev. E. L., for many years incumbent of this parish, and by him related to me.

About 30 years ago, Mr. L.'s three eldest sons went to spend the evening out, and on their return home they saw, near Glasthun (a village between Kingstown and this), three figures rise from the ground to a few feet above the ground, and then slowly vanish into air. One saw it and called the attention of the others. They told their father on their return, but he treated it as a delusion, and silenced them by his declared belief that it was a spirituous, not a spiritual, appearance.

They all entered either army or navy, and were absent when, in sinking the foundations of a house, they came upon three skeletons. On the return to Ireland of one of his sons, Mr. L. got him to point out where they had seen the appearance, and he pointed out the very place where the bodies had been found.

Major L., one of the percipients, writes to us in 1884:—

On a fine clear night many years ago, I and a brother walked home between 10 and 11 o'clock, after spending the evening with some friends. On our way along the high road we passed a small villa, situated close to the sea shore; an open, level grass lawn lay in front, reaching to the road where we stood, from which it was divided by a low wall. The lawn was enclosed on either side by walls and small trees, the house being in the open space directly opposite to us, about 150 or 200 yards distant. Our attention was somehow

1 The workmen.—F. P.
attracted, and we saw what appeared to be three indistinct figures in white, which seemed to rise as it were from the ground in front of the villa. The figure in the centre was taller than the others. We watched for some time and finally the figures subsided just as they had risen. I think there was a slight declivity in the ground close to the house, which was probably built on a lower level, and thus the effect described might be accounted for if figures had approached from the base of the house. There were many houses in the immediate vicinity, but, so far as I can remember, they were closed at that hour, and there were no people about. I feel almost certain also that the villa was not then occupied, unless it may have been by a caretaker.

On arrival at home we related what we had seen, and were of course laughed at, and indeed the matter did not make much impression upon us, and in a short time passed from our minds. Some years afterwards I was serving abroad with my regiment when I received a letter from a member of my family who was present on the occasion referred to, recalling my memory to it, and stating that the lawn had recently been broken up, that in the spot indicated by us three skeletons had been found, and that the one in the centre was the tallest. I should add that there was no story or legend associated with the place, that the discovery of the skeletons caused much surprise, and that, so far as I am aware, no clue has been found to their identity or history.

In reply to our questions Major L. writes:—

1st. The night was very clear and bright. Whether the moon was actually shining I cannot positively remember, but I think it probable.

2nd. My approximate distance from the figures was perhaps a little over 100 yards. I feel sure that what I saw was not an effect of mist rising from damp ground.

3rd. I have never before had any experience of the sort, or been the subject of any hallucination that I am aware of. Nor am I in this instance inclined to attribute the circumstance which I have narrated to other than natural causes. The discovery of the skeletons was a very remarkable coincidence, but it may be nothing more.

We have also received a precisely similar account of the incident from the son of the other percipient—now dead.

(4) In nearly all the second-hand narratives, and in a very large proportion of those which have been given to us by the actual percipients, a tragedy is reported to have taken place in the locality where the manifestations occurred. The tragedy may take the form of a premature death, a murder, a suicide, sometimes the death of a miser. The account of the tragedy is often very circumstantial; but usually rests upon tradition alone. It is manifest, therefore, that until some proof of the death has been adduced, we cannot assume the report to afford evidence of more than the tendency of tradition to conform to preconceived ideas of the general fitness of things. In one case, indeed (Proceedings, Vol. I., pp. 106-7), the narrator states that he had himself searched the parish registers, and ascertained the date of the death, or rather deaths, the tragedy in this case taking the form of a murder,
and the subsequent suicide of the murderer. The month and day were stated to correspond with the date of the appearance of the phantasm. As was stated, however, in the *Journal* (Vol. II., p. 3), a prolonged and careful search of the registers has failed to corroborate our informant's statement; and we have learnt from another source that the double event referred to never took place; and that the alleged murderer actually died in another part of the country, and at another time of year. There are, however, a few cases in which the death, though no valid evidence for it is adduced, is alleged to have taken place so recently that there is perhaps a reasonable presumption that the facts are correctly stated. Some of these cases will be referred to later. There are also a few cases in which we have sufficient evidence that the death did occur as alleged. In one such case (G. 182, *Journal*, Vol. II., pp. 385, *et seq.*), the evidence is furnished by a tombstone in the parish churchyard; and it seems not unlikely that the tragedy, thus solidly and obtrusively attested, may actually have been the cause of the disturbances in the house, though not in the precise manner suggested in the narrative. Three other cases are given below (G. 187, 188, 189), and it will be seen that in at least two of these cases the facts of the life and death were within the knowledge of the percipients, and the person whom the phantasm was supposed to resemble had been known personally to some of those present in the house.

To sum up: The characteristics which we should expect to find associated with these manifestations, if they are actually connected with deceased persons, do not, it would seem, occur at all, or occur very rarely. The appearance of these characteristics in some of the narratives now under review is due, in at least one case, to deliberate hoaxing (G. 173); in a few other cases, as in *Proceedings*, Vol. I., pp. 106-7, they may reasonably be attributed to hallucinations of memory. Most commonly, however, they appear to be the result of unconscious misrepresentation by the narrator of the experiences of others. From another point of view it may be regarded as a strong testimony to the general accuracy and trustworthiness of the first-hand narratives which we have received that, in spite of the urgent temptation to embellishment thus demonstrated, these characteristics so rarely occur. Conversely, when they do occur they must from their very rarity be regarded with reserve.

But we may learn much, not only from what we fail to find, but from what we actually do find in the best attested narratives. We have seen that the authentic ghost with any characteristics to distinguish him from a subjective hallucination is rarely recognised: that he rarely brings any message from the dead to the living: that his connection with skeletons and tragedies is obscure and uncertain. He is, in fact, usually a fugitive and irrelevant phantasm. He flits as idly across
the scene as the figure cast by a magic lantern, and he possesses, apparently, as little purpose, volition, or intelligence.

Often his appearance is so brief and so unsubstantial that he can be called little more than the suggestion of a figure. He bears as little resemblance to the aggrieved miser, the repentant monk, the unquiet spirit of the murderer or his victim, with whom the teachers of our childhood and the dinner-parties of our maturer years have made us familiar, as the Dragons whom Siegfried slew bear to the winged lizards whose bones lie buried in the Sussex Weald. Moreover, there are certain constantly recurring characteristics in these stories which are difficult to reconcile with the hypothesis that the apparitions are due to any external agency, and which seem to point to another explanation.

(1) It frequently happens that the apparition assumes a different shape at different times, or to speak more accurately, that different figures are seen in the same house. And even when the different narrators represent the figures seen as being on all occasions identical, examination of their evidence makes this identity doubtful. Impressions so momentary as these must of necessity be very vague and elusive in the subsequent memory. The details are likely to be filled in after hearing the descriptions of others; so that features discerned or believed to be common become more definite in recollection and discrepancies tend to disappear. In short, the image which remains in the memories of all the percipients is apt to resemble a composite photograph, in which all the common features are emphasised, and details found only in individual cases are blurred or faintly indicated. Sometimes, however, the diverse character of the ghost is no matter of inference. Thus in G. t. 314 (Journal, Vol. III., pp. 241, et seq.), the dress of a female figure is variously described by different witnesses as "greyish or mauve," "lilac print," "white," "light," "red," "slate coloured silk with red cloak"; and the hair is described as "fair," "dark," "brown," and "brownish." The events occurred in the years 1885-6-7, and the accounts were written, in some cases, within a few weeks of their occurrence. If a longer interval had been allowed to elapse between the events and their record, it would seem not improbable that this more than Homeric latitude of colour-epithets might have been blended into uniformity. From the same narrative it appears that, in addition to the polychromatic figure or figures referred to above, there were seen in the same house by various percipients a man with an evil face in a white working suit; "a dark swarthy-looking man with very black whiskers, dressed like a merchant sailor," and a "devilish face" and hands with no body attached. In G. 16 the narrator and others see at one time the tall slender figure of a woman dressed in black, at another time a short lady in a dark green dress; in G. 316 we hear of "a clergyman dressed in his clericals," and a woman; in G. 388
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a woman in white and a woman in green; in G. 454 a little girl "in white, with long streaming fair hair," "a man in a scarlet hunting-coat and top-boots," and a tall lady with a child in her arms. In G. 463 we have "a trim little page in antique costume," a man with bloodstained face, and a woman in short-waisted dress and broad frilled cap; in G. 468 a man with a face "pale to sickliness," and a little old lady. And in G. 168 we make the acquaintance, successively, of an old man, a large white "waddlewayed" dog, "a white figure" not more precisely described, a stout middle-aged woman with large flapping frills and a baby, and a shower of blood. (See also G. 19, 64, 73, 179, 181, 183, 407, 440, 477, G. t. 301, and below G. 186, 189.) In two out of the very small number of cases in which we have been able to trace the occurrence of visual phenomena in the same house through two or more successive tenancies, the character of the figures is found to vary. (See G. 181, Journal, Vol. II., pp. 249, et seq., and G. 187 below. See also Proceedings, Vol. III., pp. 117, 148.)

In G. 146 and G. t. 303, 308 it is by no means clear that the apparitions seen on different occasions bore any marked resemblance. And speaking generally, the identity of the figures seen in many cases is rather assumed from the absence of recorded variations than demonstrated by any detailed agreement in the accounts received by us; the descriptions given by different witnesses being frequently too vague to admit of any precise comparison.

Of course, it may be argued that each figure corresponds to a separate agent, and that when many diverse apparitions are seen in one locality, we may infer that that locality is haunted by many different ghosts. It is impossible at present to prove that this is not the true explanation of the facts. Indeed, if our imaginary interlocutor were to develope his hypothesis yet further, and contend that every so-called subjective hallucination is due to post-mortem agency of some kind or another, I should be at a loss to prove his position untenable. But it is clear that in a serious argument the burden of proof would lie upon him who invoked an unknown agency; and it is obvious that the characteristic which first drew attention to the phenomena occurring in "haunted" houses, and which more than any other still induces us to attach weight to the records, is the alleged resemblance between the various appearances. If this resemblance can in any case be shown to rest on insufficient evidence, the explanation by subjective hallucination will appear the easier alternative. And the argument in favour of adopting this explanation will be perceptibly strengthened if we find that the primary percipient or one of the percipients has had previous hallucinatory experiences. The popular instinct to assimilate the various apparitions is, no doubt, founded on a true appreciation of the bearing of the evidence.
(2) Again, figures of animals are seen occasionally in the same house with human figures. Thus in G. 38, at one time the figure seen is that of a man in black, at another that of a black dog; in G. 101 the figure of a man and a white cat; in G. 467 another white cat is seen, and a lady in deep mourning. (Cf. G. 43 and 168.) In other cases animals appear alone, without the accompaniment of human figures. Thus, in G. 34 the house was haunted by a spectral tabby cat, described as “a very miserable and unhappy looking creature,” which found a melancholy diversion in suddenly appearing before the cook and causing her to stumble. In G. 54, which I quote as an illustration, a figure resembling a bull is seen by two persons simultaneously. Mrs. Potter writes on December 6th, 1874:

G. 54.

**The Rake.**

Returning from church, my husband came to meet me at the Wynt-gate. Instead of going straight home, we went along the walk leading to the Dungeon, and as it commenced raining, we sheltered under one of the fine old trees overhanging the path. We had not stood many minutes when we saw a large beast, coming straight towards us. My husband, thinking it was one of the beasts from the park, met it, saying, “Get out, you beast,” striking at it, when, to our astonishment, it disappeared like a shadow. I must mention that we had a small dog with us. The night was a sort of grey light, and the animal seemed to come from the Dungeon; in fact, we thought it quite close upon us. We were not afraid, and both thought that it was delusion or a reflection at the time; it was after that I felt timid about it, and never dared venture near the old castle again, where I had spent many happy moments by myself.

Elizabeth Potter.

Benjamin Potter.

The above happened in 1858.

Miss Gladstone (now Mrs. Drew) wrote to Lady Rayleigh, from Hawarden, on December 9th, 1874:

It has taken a long time to get the old castle (story) from the Potters. . . . I see they have omitted to specify that it happened in September, about a quarter to eight o’clock, and that the “beast” was apparently a bull. . . . The Potters have left out several details in their account which I remember, and I suppose they have forgotten. The animal came so close that she sprang back and screamed, but he said, “All right,” and kicked at it with the words, “Get out, you beast.”

In a later letter Mrs. Drew adds:

Remember, the old castle, &c., stands in the garden, within the rails, so no cattle, or sheep, or horses come inside the grounds. No, there is no ghost story otherwise about the old castle that I know of.

With this account compare G. 123, 142, and 608 (second-hand), although it is not clear that in these cases the object seen may not
have been a real animal. The narratives numbered G. 124, 125, 144, (third-hand), 161, and 373 also deal with apparitions of animals.

In many cases mysterious lights are seen as well as figures of men or animals. (See G. 19, 63, 76, 148, 163, 168, 383, G. t. 4, and many others.)

No doubt many of those who have recorded experiences of this kind hold that, as the figures of men may be assumed to represent in some sort the “ghosts” of human beings, so the figures of animals may represent the ghosts of animals. The difficulties of such an interpretation are obvious, but they need not be discussed at length here. Most students of the subject, at any rate, are agreed that the actual phenomena are hallucinatory; and it is not necessary, therefore, to ascribe figures resembling animals to the agency of animals. It is at all events permissible to suppose that these figures are the products of some higher intelligence. And such a supposition is obviously necessary in the case of the hallucinatory lights and inanimate objects generally.

But if once this supposition is admitted, the outworks of the theory of post-mortem agency are destroyed. To the popular mind the things seen are what they represent; the figure of a man is the ghostly counterpart of a man, having a definite substance and extension in space; and so the figure of an animal is the ghost of an animal. The instructed adherents of the post-mortem theory reject this crude view; but, nevertheless, their position derives its main support from an assumption which is in essence indistinguishable from it—the assumption, to wit, that the hallucinatory figure necessarily bears some resemblance to the person by whose agency it is, on the hypothesis, produced. But if the figures of animals may be, and the figures of inanimate objects must be produced by a cause unlike themselves, what ground have we for assuming resemblance in the first case? And if no such ground can be shown—if it be admitted that the agent may produce images unlike himself—why should we restrict our choice of an agent in any case? Why should we, in any case, seek the agent amongst the dead, whom we do not know, rather than amongst the living, of whose existence and powers we are assured?

(3) Another very noteworthy feature in the well-attested narratives is that in many cases one or more of the percipients have experienced other hallucinations, which may or may not have been shared by others. Thus in G. 184, 305, 476,1 G.t. 7, 316 (Journal, Vol. III., p. 292), and G.c. 8, one of the percipients in a collective case, and in G. 187 (below p. 267) two percipients out of three, have had previous visual hallucinations unshared. In G.c. 111, the percipient describes four

---

1 Two different stories bear this number; the one here referred to is that printed in the Journal for May, 1886.
visual hallucinations, two of which were collective and two unshared. In G. 314 and 315 the narrator describes two collective hallucinations of his own experience. One of the two percipients in a collective hallucination (G. 334) has also lived in a “haunted” house (G. 333). And passing from collective to what may perhaps be termed “successive” cases—i.e., non-collective cases of the ordinary “haunted house” type, where a figure is seen on different occasions in the same locality—we find that in G. 328 and 395 one of the percipients in each case has had another visual hallucination; and in G.c. 313, a lady who was fortunate enough as a child to see Queen Elizabeth in a house in the Old Kent-road has also sent us accounts of other hallucinations, experienced by her, not shared by others.

And finally we have a large number of cases in which the same percipient or group of percipients has witnessed inexplicable phenomena, visual or auditory, on more than one occasion, and in more than one locality. (See G. 7 and 41, 14 and 104, 40, 101 and 114, 108, 116, 464, 5 and 6, 475 and 6, and lastly 468, 474, and G.c. 310.)

There are indications that this tendency to hallucination is hereditary. In G. 169, for instance, an unshared hallucination is reported of a lady, whose two sisters contribute similar experiences of their own in another house (Proceedings, Vol. I., pp. 109-113). In G. 318 and 319, various visual hallucinations, all unshared, are reported to have been experienced by two sisters; in 353 and 354, unshared hallucinations are reported of a father and daughter respectively; and Mrs. V. S., one of the percipients in G. 468, 474, and G.c. 310, resided in another house (G. 469), where not she herself, but her two daughters, saw hallucinatory figures. The daughters have also had other experiences of the kind.

These cases, however—and it is probable that there are others which I have passed over in an examination by no means exhaustive—must be taken only as samples.

In very few cases in our collection have we succeeded in obtaining the first-hand testimony of all the witnesses. Had we done so, I can feel no doubt that we should be able to point to a much larger number of cases in which the percipient's experience in a haunted house had been anticipated by a solitary hallucination apparently subjective.

Thus, while on the one hand we have found very little trustworthy evidence to connect the phantasm seen in a haunted house with any person deceased; very little, indeed, to suggest the intelligence, the personality, or even the continuity of the underlying cause, there are many constantly recurring features in the best authenticated of the narratives under review which are very hard to reconcile with any such hypothesis. It is difficult, for instance, to recognise the
identity of a phantasm which, as in G. 168, presents itself now under the guise of an old man, now as a middle-aged woman with flapping frills and a baby, and occasionally as a "waddlewayed" dog, a white figure, or a shower of blood. Unless, indeed, we suppose, with one of the most ingenious of our critics,¹ that ghosts suffer from a want of co-ordination between the sub-conscious cerebral centres, and that these Protean transformations are the result of aphasic attempts to render themselves intelligible.

Seriously, it must be admitted that the fact that the figures seen in a haunted house are apt to assume at different times different forms, including those of animals and vague lights, suggests that the phenomena are due, not to an alien spiritual presence, but to some predisposition to hallucination on the part of the percipients. And the numerous cases in which it can be shown that the percipients have experienced other hallucinations of various kinds, shared and unshared, give strong confirmation to this view. If the possibility be once admitted that a casual hallucination may not only be repeated in the experience of the original percipient, but may be communicated by him to other persons living in the same locality, most of the difficulties in the interpretation of our evidence disappear. In the great majority of cases expectation or terror, when once the first vision is bruited abroad, might be sufficient to account for its repetition, and the greater or less resemblance which the experience of later percipients bore to that of the original seer would be attributable to hints of the original appearance unconsciously received or half forgotten. In the cases, not very numerous, where there seems to be some proof that no hint of any former experience had reached the percipient,² it is still possible to suppose that any resemblance between the earlier and later apparitions, if substantiated, is due to the operation of thought-transference.

I proceed to give various narratives as illustrations, beginning with three cases where there seems reason to attribute the apparition witnessed by a single person to fear, expectation, or, generally, the emotional state of the percipient.

The following case has been received from Mr. Joseph Skipsey, the miner poet, now custodian of the Shakespeare Museum at Stratford-on-Avon.

G.c. 613.

When I was 10 years old, working in the pit at Percy Main Colliery, near North Shields, I yoked a horse to a train of rolling waggons and waited at a siding, a spot on which some 30 years before a man had been killed. I

¹ Mr. Andrew Lang, in Castle Perilous.
² See for a collection of some of these, Mrs. Sidgwick's paper on "Phantasms of the Dead," in Proceedings, Vol. III.
had frequently been at this point before without thinking about this circumstance. Upon this morning it suddenly occurred to me strongly that this tragedy had happened; I felt afraid and blew my light out lest I should see anything. A few minutes afterwards everything around me became visible—the coal-wall, the horse, &c. I was astonished at this because there was no visible source of light. I then heard a footstep coming and saw along the drift-way a pair of legs in short breeches, as a miner's would be, and hands hanging down the sides. The upper part of the advancing figure was shrouded in cloud. The figure carried no light. This imperfect figure came to me, took hold of me, and I felt a man's grip, but I also felt that it was friendly. It fondled me, and I felt both the hands and the body. I looked earnestly for the face but saw nothing but dark cloud. Then the figure passed me and disappeared. I felt paralysed and unable to speak. I felt no fear after it had left me, and I often went to the same place but saw nothing.

On my telling this to Tom Gilbis, a miner friend, he told me that he had seen a light in a hand in a tramway in another mine, but no body. The light swung round and disappeared.

December 13th, 1884.

Joseph Skipsey.

The obvious explanation of the experience narrated is that it is a simple hallucination, rounded, perhaps, into a more perfect whole in the memory of an old man recounting a vision of his childhood. The hallucination may well have been due to terror, caused by the awe-inspiring surroundings—a terror of which sufficient evidence is given by the percipient's action in blowing out his light. It would not, perhaps, be hazardous to conjecture that under favourable circumstances the story, if widely reported, might have given rise to a whole crop of more or less similar apparitions, material for the story of a haunted mine.

In the next case (G. 174), which is extracted from *A Highland Tour with Dr. Candlish* (second edition, pp. 85-88), by Dr. A. Beith, a well-known minister of the Free Church of Scotland, the percipient's visual hallucination or dream appears to have nearly coincided with a noise heard by two other persons as well as himself. It seems not improbable that the noise heard was due to some normal agency, and was itself the cause of the vision, which in the order of perception preceded it. It may, for instance, conceivably have been caused by the percipient in a state of somnambulism. Dr. Beith himself was at first inclined to attribute his experience to nightmare, and it is evident that he is by no means clear that he was actually awake until after the occurrence.

G. 174.

[This event took place in the August of 1845. Dr. Beith had been chosen by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, together with Drs. Candlish and M’Kellar, to make a tour of the Highlands and report on the condition of the adherents of the Free Church in that district, who were at the time ill-cared for by the State. Dr. Beith was, on this occasion,
the guest of Mr. Lillingston, of Lochalsh, Ross-shire, for the evening. After talking for some time with his host he was shown to a large bedroom on the top floor of the house. Mr. and Mrs. Lillingston slept on the ground floor, so that between their bedroom and his the drawing-room floor intervened. At the foot of Dr. Beith's bed was a large fireplace, in which the dancing firelight flung shadows on the curtains. Being very weary he soon fell asleep.

I had gone to bed. After a little I fell asleep, and I slept I know not how long. Suddenly I was awakened by what I imagined was a loud knock at my door. I opened my eyes. The fire was still burning; but was about to expire. I called, "Come in." No sooner had I done so than I saw the door slowly open. A man of gigantic stature, of huge proportions, red-haired, half-dressed, his brawny arms bare high above the elbows, presented himself to my view. I saw him distinctly advance, not towards me, but direct to the fireplace, the glimmering light from the grate falling on his massive frame. He carried a large black chest, which appeared to me to be studded with brass nails and to be so heavy as to tax to the utmost his strength, strong man as he was. I saw him pass the foot of my bed as if turning to the side of the fire next the bed. The black chest seemed to grow into a coffin of dread dimensions. In that form I saw it but for a moment. My bed-curtain almost instantly concealed from my eyes the bearer and his burden. He set it down with a crash which startled me, as I thought, and which seemed to shake the house, and, as I believed, fairly roused me. I tried to look round to the fireplace, but saw nothing. Everything was as I had left it on going into bed. The vision had passed. In whatever condition I had been previously, I felt confident I was by that time thoroughly awake. Reflecting on the incident, I soon set the whole thing down to a fit of nightmare, brought on, perhaps, by the conversation in which I had been so deeply interested before retiring to rest, and which had somewhat excited my nervous system. In a short time I had got over my agitation and was composing myself to sleep, when I again suddenly heard a knock at my door. I raised myself on my elbow with a resolution to be at the bottom of it, and said firmly, perhaps fiercely, "Come in." The door opened and Mr. Lillingston appeared in his dressing-gown, a light in his hand. As he was in figure tall, though not robust, and of a reddish complexion, his appearance slightly resembled what I had previously seen. "Have you been ill?" "No; I am quite well." "Have you been out of bed?" "No; I certainly have not since I lay down." "Mrs. Lillingston and I have been disturbed by hearing heavy steps in your room, as we thought, and by the sound of the falling of some weighty article on the floor."

[At the breakfast-table next morning the engrossing subject of conversation was the noise in Dr. Beith's room. He did not tell what he had seen. The room was examined lest some article of furniture or a picture might have fallen, but both in it and in the drawing-room below everything was in its place undisturbed. Dr. Beith goes on to say:—]

I would have forgotten it altogether, but the succession of deaths in our family, just a year after—four children, as already noted, being taken from us within a few weeks—brought up the remembrance of what I had seen; and I felt a strange—an unreasonable inclination, I am willing to admit
—to connect the two things, and to conclude that what I had witnessed, in the Balmacara attic, was a kindly presentiment or pre-intimation of sorrow to come.

I called on Dr. Beith on Sunday, September 14th, 1884, and heard an account of the story as above given from his own lips.

Dr. Beith believes himself to have been awake at the time the figure entered the room. He is quite clear that he did not go to sleep in the interval between the disappearance of the figure and the entrance of Mr. Lillingston.

I asked him if it were possible for the whole thing to have been a trick. He explained to me that the room was a very large one, with the door in the corner opposite to the bed, so that no one could enter or leave the room without being seen. The fireplace was by the side of the bed, whose curtains hid it, but when he sat up in bed and looked round the curtains he satisfied himself that the figure was not there.

He has never experienced a hallucination, or seen anything else of the kind. He has, however, had other psychical experiences. Dr. Beith had never heard of any other unusual experience in the house.

Another case of an isolated phantasm is, perhaps, worth quoting as a curious example of the survival of a medieaval superstition. There is no need here to look beyond the emotional condition of the percipient for the origin of the hallucination, its precise form being determined by her intellectual inheritance and environment. The story is in the words of the clergyman who visited the dying woman.

G. 104.

I was once sent for to see a dying old woman, who, her daughter who came to me said, had something to say before she died. I saw that the daughter, a middle-aged woman, was full of curiosity to know what her mother had to say. When I got to the bedside of the old woman, I endeavoured to persuade her that I did not want to hear anything, and told the daughter that she should not trouble her mother by insisting upon hearing something out of mere curiosity, but she kept saying, "Mother, you know you said you would tell it, you promised," &c. Thus teased into making a confession, she, in almost her last breath, said that after the funeral of her husband she returned to their bedroom, and (I use her very words) "I saw a man come down that chimley, and a better looking man you never saw, and he said, 'If you will serve me you shall never want.'" I gathered that she believed this to be the devil, and she resisted his offer. This proves to me that monkish legends of such apparitions are not necessarily lies of those who first gave them. The poor widow was in a frenzy of desolation, and Satanic suggestions took a shape, or she fancied they did, and made a lasting impression upon her mind. This story happened 30 years ago, and an old woman then, in that class of life, would retain much of the ignorance of the uneducated in the last century.

Passing from these cases of apparently unshared hallucination, which,
on the view now propounded, may be taken as the raw material of ghost stories, we come to a class of cases where a phantasm is witnessed by two or more persons simultaneously. There is, so far as I am aware, no evidence for collective hallucination in the normal state outside the phenomena which we are now discussing; and it is always open to the critic to maintain that the fact that a percept is shared by more than one person is in itself a proof of its claim to objective reality of some kind. Such a critic, however, it may be pointed out, will have to claim an objective existence not merely for apparitions resembling the human figure, but for the bull seen by Mr. and Mrs. Potter, the spectral cats and dogs, the coach and horses, and the mysterious lights seen by other witnesses. But, at all events, collective hallucination may be accepted as a working hypothesis, and if it is found to fit the facts, it will have advanced one step nearer to acceptance as a vera causa. It is interesting to note, moreover, as bearing upon the question of the transference of hallucinations, two cases in which contact or vicinity, as in some of our own experiments in thought-transference, appears to have influenced the result. In G. 118 a curious phantasmagoria—a "witch fire" with people dancing round it—which is witnessed by several persons, disappears on the approach of a man "who, being born in March, can never see them." And in another story (G. 636), which, however, is second-hand, the narrator's mother is said to have seen the figure of a man, "but my father protested that he did not see anybody. This surprised my mother, and, laying her hand on my father's shoulder, she said, 'Oh, George! do you not see him?' My father thereupon exclaimed, 'I see him now!'"

It will, however, no doubt, be readily admitted that if, as suggested by Mr. Gurney, a casual hallucination, originating in the mind of one percipient, may by some process of telepathy be transferred to others in his immediate vicinity, so that they also should share in his perception, the following are instances of such collective hallucinations. The first narrative comes from Mrs. Stone, of Walditch, Bridport, from whom Professor Sidgwick received a viva voce account of the incident.

G. 20.

The date is a little uncertain, but I think it was the summer of 1830. My cousin Emily was staying with me, and my friend, Mary J., was spending the day with us. Emily said, "How pleasant it would be to drive over and drink tea with my father and the girls this lovely afternoon." In a very short time we were driving in a little four-wheeled carriage to my uncle's vicarage, at Sydling, about seven miles from Dorchester. They were all at home, delighted

1 The question has been carefully examined by Mr. Gurney in Phantasm of the Living, Vol. II., pp. 168-270. See also Mr. Myers' note, pp. 277-284.
to see us, and we spent a most delightful evening. As there was no moon we left early enough to reach home before dark. A most beautiful evening it was, and three more merry girls could hardly be met with. Just after passing Wrackleford the road is rather elevated. It had been somewhat dusky before, but here the evening glow showed the hedges, road, and all near objects. There it was that I saw the figure of a man on the right-hand side, walking, or rather gliding, at the head of the horse. My first idea was that he meant to stop us, but he made no effort of the kind, but kept on the same pace as the horse, neither faster nor slower. At first I thought him of great height, but afterwards remarked that he was gliding some distance (at least a foot) above the ground. Mary was sitting by me. I pointed out in a low voice the figure, but she did not see it, and could not at any time during its appearance. Emily was sitting by the man-servant on the front seat; she heard what I said, turned round, and speaking softly, "I see the man you mention distinctly." Then the man-servant said in an awful, frightened voice, "For God's sake, ladies, don't say anything! please keep quiet!" or words to that effect. I had heard that horses and other animals feel the presence of the supernatural; in this instance there was no starting or bolting; the creature went on at an even pace, almost giving the idea of being controlled by the figure. The face was turned away, but the shape of a man in dark clothing was clearly defined. At the entrance of the village of Charminster it vanished, and we saw it no more; though in passing through the dark parts of the road, then shadowed with elms, I looked round in some little trepidation. We could never get much out of the man-servant, except that it was a ghost. It has struck me since whether he knew more about it than he chose to say. He was more terrified at the time than either of us. I never heard the road was haunted.

P.S.—My cousin and the man-servant saw it distinctly, but my friend was unable to do so, though the figure stood out plainly against the evening light.

In January, 1883, Mrs. Stone adds:—

My cousin Emily is not living. I have lost sight of the man-servant for many years.

Miss Henrietta Coombs writes, in August, 1883:—

In the summer of 1856 I was driving in a pony-carriage on the Wrackleford road, when just on the brow of the little hill, before reaching the dairy-house, the pony stopped short and shook all over, as if violently frightened. I expected it to start off, and I got out quickly, as did my cousin who was with me, the driver remaining in the carriage. My cousin, a military man, and accustomed to horses, examined the pony and could find no cause for its alarm or illness. It went on very well afterwards, and I never heard that it had a similar attack, either before or after that time. I had forgotten the occurrence until I heard Mrs. Stone speak of the appearance she saw many years before, when I exclaimed, "That must be the place where our pony was frightened in '56."

In this case, it will be observed, one of the persons present saw
nothing unusual, a circumstance which tells strongly in favour of the view that the thing seen was of a hallucinatory nature.

The next account was given to us, within a few weeks of the occurrence narrated, by the two ladies named, with one of whom I have had a personal interview.

G. 185.

From Mrs. Knott, London, S.W. March 5th, 1889.

The incident I relate occurred at this address early in February, 1889. I have lived in this house four years and constantly felt another presence was in the drawing-room besides myself, but never saw any form until last month. My cousin Mrs. R. and myself returned from a walk at 1.30 p.m. The front door was opened for us by my housekeeper, Mrs. E. I passed upstairs before my cousin, and on turning to my bedroom, the door of which is beside the drawing-room door [i.e., at right angles to it], I saw, as I thought, Mrs. E. go into the drawing-room. I put a parcel into my room and then followed her to give some order, and found the room empty! My cousin was going up the second flight of stairs to her room, and I called out, “Did you open the drawing-room door as you passed?” “No,” she replied, “Mrs. E. has gone in.” Mrs. R. had seen the figure more distinctly than I; it seemed to pass her at the top of the stairs, and she thought “How quietly Mrs. E. moves.” I inquired of Mrs. E. what she did after opening the door for us, and she said, “Went to the kitchen to hasten luncheon as you were in a hurry for it.” The day was bright and there is nothing on the stairs that could cast a shadow. I quite hope some day I may see the face of the figure.

From Mrs. R., Malpas, Cheshire. March 1st, 1889.

In answer to your letter on the subject of the figure seen at C.-terrace, Mrs. K. and I had just come in at about half-past one o’clock. Mrs. E. (the housekeeper) had opened the door. We went upstairs, and on the first landing are two rooms, one the drawing-room, the other Mrs. K.’s bedroom. She went into her room while I stood a minute or two talking to her. Just as I turned to go up the next flight of stairs I thought I saw Mrs. E. pass me quickly and go into the drawing-room. Beyond seeing a slight figure in a dark dress I saw nothing more, for I did not look at it, but just saw it pass me. Before I had got upstairs Mrs. K. called out, “Did you leave the drawing-room door open?” I answered, “I did not go in; I saw Mrs. E. go in.” Mrs. K. answered, “There is nobody there.” We asked Mrs. E. if she had been up; she, on the contrary, had gone straight down. Also, as she said, she would not have passed me on the landing, but have waited until I had gone upstairs; and as it struck me afterwards, she could not have passed me on such a small landing without touching me, but I never noticed that at the time. I do not know if a thought ever embodies itself, but my idea was, and is, that as Mrs. E. ran downstairs her thought went up, wondering if the drawing-room fire
was burning brightly. The figure I saw went into the room as if it had a purpose of some sort. I have never seen anything of the sort before.

From Mrs. R.  

March 10th, 1889.

I am afraid I cannot give any very definite reply to your questions.

(1) "Had I any idea of the house being haunted?" No; and I do not think it is supposed to be haunted. Mrs. K. has said that at times it has seemed to her as if there was someone else in the room besides herself, but I think that is a feeling that has come to most people some time or other.

(2) "Did we see it simultaneously?" That I cannot exactly say, but I should think yes, for we neither of us said anything till Mrs. K. called out to me to know if I had been in the drawing-room.

I called on Mrs. Knott with Major Jebb, on February 27th, 1889, and heard her account of the incident, and inspected the landing where the figure was seen. The landing is very small and narrow, but well lighted by a wide uncurtained window at the top of the stairway, between the first and second floors. The figure was seen on the first floor. A real person could not have passed the two ladies on the stairs without considerable difficulty, and it seems impossible that a real person could have passed out of the room again without detection.

Mrs. Knott has occupied rooms in the same house for about three and a-half years.

Here we may almost see the story of a haunted house in the making. The essential elements are there. We have the visionary figure seen by two persons at once, and the mysterious feeling of an alien presence in the room. It is quite possible that the latter circumstance would have passed unrecorded, and even unnoticed, but for the subsequent phantasm, through which it gained a retrospective importance. It is not improbable that in this case the phantasm was a hallucination actually generated by the same state which gave rise to the eerie feelings; as in other cases the phantasm may have been the product of the uneasiness and vague alarm caused by inexplicable noises. That there is a constant tendency for mysterious sounds to bring visual hallucinations in their train we see in many of the stories. And what the experience of the moment has failed to produce, the narrator's imagination after the lapse of many years may sometimes prove competent to supply. In the story, for instance, printed in the Journal, Vol. II., pp. 385, et seq., (G. 182), to which I have already referred (p. 237), the only phenomena recorded on first-hand evidence are auditory. But the narrative originally appeared in a newspaper, and as there printed contained an account at first-hand of an apparition of the orthodox kind—a figure in military uniform, gaunt and haggard. But the percipient was only a child at the time of the alleged appearance, and the account was published nearly half a century afterwards. In correct-
ing his narrative for us he requested that this episode might be omitted. With a witness a little less conscientious or a little more imaginative, the figure might have remained as the brightest ornament of the story. The weakness of second-hand testimony to apparitions is also well exemplified in this story. The same witness reported two other appearances of a headless woman at second-hand. But on going to the original sources, we find that in neither case was anything seen; a horrible presence was felt on one occasion, and steps were heard leaving the room on the other.

The following case (G. 186) presents in many respects a typical instance of a good haunted house, and I therefore welcomed the opportunity afforded me in 1888 of sleeping in the house, and of introducing other members of the Society. This unfortunately, however, led to no result. The case is, as it will be seen, very recent, and apparitions seem to have been seen independently by two people. Altogether, if any of these cases of wholly unrecognised apparitions haunting houses are to be attributed to post-mortem agencies this would have a fair claim to such origin. I am myself, however, disposed to adopt the explanation above suggested, viz., that the figures seen were hallucinations, due to alarm caused by mysterious sounds.

G. 186. From Mrs. G., the landlady of a London lodging-house.

May 15th, 1888.

I came into this house at the end of September, 1887. On the first night I slept with a friend in the back drawing-room. We both heard in the course of the night a rustling sound in the front room, as if several ladies in silk dresses were walking round the room.

On several occasions after this, when sleeping in the little room on the second floor, facing the top of the stairs, I heard these rustling noises again, and a noise as if several people were coming upstairs. I remember once thinking Mr. Guthrie had brought some people home to sleep, and wondering what they would find to eat for breakfast. At the same time I saw a faint greenish light, as if from a flame which I could not see, coming up the stairs and disappearing into Mr. Guthrie's room. Once I thought (I was sleeping with my door open then) that I heard someone come into the room, breathing very heavily, like a pig. I did not speak. The next morning Mr. Guthrie asked what I was doing in their room the night before, and I said, "I was just going to ask you the same question." He told me he had not been into my room. After this I got frightened and locked my door, and then I used to leave two candles alight in the room whilst I slept.

One Tuesday night, about the end of November, I think, I woke up at 1 a.m. with a feeling that someone was in the room. I had my face to the wall, but I turned round and saw between the bed and wall [a distance of three or four feet only], just opposite to me, the figure of a woman apparently about fifty, dark hair and eyes, a red dress and a mob cap. I looked at her and asked her what she wanted. She bent her head back, and I saw what I thought at first was a very wide mouth. Then I saw that
her throat was cut. I was very frightened, the perspiration came out on me like peas, and I called out to her in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to go away. She did not stir, however, and I remained looking at her by the light of the two candles in the room, too frightened at first to put out my hand and rap on the partition with the stick which Mr. Guthrie had lent me for the purpose. At last I managed to give two quiet knocks. Then I heard the two gentlemen knocking at my door, and the figure slowly vanished like a shadow. I got out of bed all shaking and trembling, and went with them downstairs and spent the rest of the night in the drawing-room. My bedroom on the second floor has remained empty since.

From Mr. I. Guthrie, a lodger in the house.

May 10th, 1888.

The curious circumstance which you have asked me to relate happened between the hours of one and two in the morning about Christmas time.

On the night referred to I lay down to rest about my usual time, between 11 and 12. About the time mentioned I awoke suddenly to hear the noise as of a person in a silk dress moving away quietly from the side of my bed. It continued moving until I heard it stop in the adjoining bedroom.

Immediately the sound stopped I heard the woman who was sleeping in that room begin to speak; it was, to me, as if she was trying to wake her little son, aged nine, who slept with her. All this time I was conscious that our old friend the ghost, seen before and expected again, had once more condescended to visit us. But a strange weakness in the legs, to which I am subject in moments like these, prevented my rising until a hurried knocking—not very loud—was heard on the wall. At the sound my strength came back to me, and I sprang out of bed, pulled my brother out of his bed, opened the doors leading to the passage and the door of the next bedroom, at which we knocked. It was at once opened to us, and the woman appeared carrying a lighted candle in her hand, and in a state of extreme agitation bordering on prostration. She was trembling so much that she was scarcely able to stand; the perspiration rolled from her in great drops. The small room was completely illuminated by two or three candles. Her story was as follows:

She awoke hearing movements as of a person fumbling about the room. On looking up she saw by the side of her bed a woman standing in a red dress, seemingly about 50 years of age, and with a curious cap on. She fell to praying and addressed the apparition. When at length she had gained the courage to knock and we were to be heard approaching the door, the apparition leaned back against the wall and seemed to fade away, showing at the same time a deep cut across the throat almost separating the head from the torso.

My brother and I, after seeing to the safety of the woman, searched the whole house thoroughly, but without effect, as we could see and hear nothing. At this distance of time I can remember a curious dancing light which we noticed on the stairs and which we remarked at the time, but did not trace it.

The strangeness of the foregoing lies in the fact that the woman and I
were both awakened at the same time by the same noise, that I should hear the noise going to her room and stopping there, and that she should hear the sound as in her room. Her story appeared to me to agree perfectly with what I heard and what I felt was going on in her room.

We came into the house in October, 1887, and for the first four months I and others had been troubled with noises (especially in my case the silk dress sound) and mysterious awakenings during the night. Someone in every room in the house complained similarly. On two occasions at least—one I can swear to—I am perfectly certain I saw an apparition in my room. I was mysteriously awakened in the usual manner, and on lifting my eyes saw distinctly in the middle of the room a moderately tall female form, clearly defined and dark as of a real body, which on my looking at it moved towards me down the room and out through the closed doors, the rustling noise dying away in the distance. I have not seen or heard anything for some months, but lately there have again been complaints from others in the house.

This, in brief, is my account.

I. Guthrie.

June 26th, 1888.

In reply to your two questions I beg to inform you that never had I reason to suppose I had heard or seen anything supernatural before October last.

I. Guthrie.

From Mr. D. Guthrie.

May 15th, 1888.

In consequence of the noises that had been heard by my brother, the landlady, and others, we had been sleeping with swords by our sides for several nights previous to the night I am writing about. On that night I was awakened by my brother, who threw the bedclothes from me, exclaiming, to the best of my recollection, "I've seen it." Since then, I must tell you, he says he didn't say so and didn't see it, only felt conscious of it and heard it. This is, however, my account of the affair—not his. As I sprang out of bed I heard my landlady speaking in a strange manner in her own room, which is separated from mine by a wooden partition. My brother and I lit a candle; opening the two doors and reaching the landing was the work of an instant, and standing on the landing I distinctly saw a wavering light, like the reflection of, say, sunlight, moving down the staircase wall. As soon as our landlady could present herself she opened her door, which was locked, as both of ours had been; when she appeared she was trembling from head to foot, and with perspiration dropping from her face. She had all the appearance of a person who has just seen an awful sight. We saw her down to the drawing-room door, which was also locked when she got to it, and made a considerable noise in opening, and we then proceeded with candles and swords to search the house, which we did from top to bottom, with the exception of the drawing-room, which had been locked, and Miss H.'s bedroom, which was inaccessible to us, but we looked round the sitting-room adjoining. All our searching proved fruitless, and the mystery of the light is as yet unexplained.

The noises and apparition I have never been favoured with, and but for having seen the light I would never have given the subject a second thought;
but I feel confident that that light was not caused by the reflection of our candle, and am unable to suggest any solution of it that would be satisfactory to myself.

D. Guthrie.

May 17th, 1888.

As far as I remember my brother saw a dark figure (woman's) move down the centre of the room, approaching from the window to the door and rustling past him. He wakened with what he calls the "feeling" that something was about the room, and immediately this figure began to move towards his bed and past it.

D. Guthrie.

May 28th, 1888.

It is impossible for me to remember when my brother told me. He would be likeliest to speak to me about it when we were dressing next morning, but I am not prepared to assert that he did so.

D. Guthrie.

From Miss H.

May 28th, 1888.

According to your request that I should give you an account of what I heard on the night referred to in the account you have received already from my aunt [i.e., the first night spent in the house].

As far as I remember I was awakened by a strange noise, like the rustling of silk, or silk handkerchiefs.

I was too frightened to look up at the time, and cannot remember when I fell asleep again. This has been repeated several times since.

June 28th, 1888.

On Wednesday last, the 20th inst., I went to bed at about my usual time, 11.30 p.m. or a little later, and, as far as I know, in my usual health. My aunt, Mrs. G., and I occupy one bed, she sleeping next to the wall. I suddenly woke up, to find myself sitting upright in bed. I have no recollection of having been dreaming. It was just beginning to dawn (the time, as I found out afterwards, must have been between 2 and 3 a.m.), and I saw, standing up so near that I could have touched it, a tall woman's figure dressed in black, so that I could distinguish no features. I was rather frightened, and spoke to my aunt and tried to wake her, but could not succeed. The figure moved slowly away from me towards the window (the bed faced the window) and finally disappeared, as it were into the strip of wall between the window and the fireplace. I did not get to sleep again for some time. After about an hour, as near as I can judge, I got up to see what the time was and found it was just 4 a.m. After my aunt got up, about 5 a.m., I dropped off to sleep again.

I had, of course, heard what Mr. Guthrie saw, and what my aunt saw, before Christmas. But I don't think that my mind had been dwelling upon it at all lately; indeed, I had almost forgotten it. And until this week I had hardly known anything about the people who were coming to sleep in my aunt's old room, so I don't think there was anything to call up the idea
of the ghost in my mind. I was quite well, too, and I had never seen anything else of the kind. I never remember to have either seen or heard anything except in this house—anything that was not really there. I have not heard any of the noises lately, not since Christmas in fact.

[Signed in full] M. E. H.

Mrs. G. stated that these inexplicable noises had been heard by two successive lodgers on the drawing-room floor, and that the first had left in consequence. The other at the beginning of May, 1888, told Mrs. G. that she had seen an apparition—the figure of a woman in a red dress—in her bedroom in the course of the previous night. We have not been able to trace either of these persons.

It will be observed that noises, which may have been due to normal causes, had been prevalent in the house throughout its occupation by the narrators, who appear to have been considerably disturbed by them. Indeed, that the landlady had been much alarmed is proved by the fact that Mr. Guthrie had lent her a stick to rap the wall, in case she should be again disturbed in the night. Mrs. G.'s vision and Mr. Guthrie's are apparently independent. Miss H., however, saw nothing until long after, when the experiences of the others had been matter of common talk in the household for months. Her evidence cannot, therefore, be considered as possessing much corroborative value. Moreover, the apparition differed materially from that seen by Mrs. G. It should, however, be stated as regards both this case and that which immediately follows, as a fact of some importance in assessing the part played by expectancy in generating hallucination, that many members and associates of the Society for Psychical Research and friends introduced by them have slept in both houses, in some cases for several nights consecutively, with a full knowledge that inexplicable phenomena had been recently observed. Nothing unusual has, however, been seen in either house by any person connected with the Society; nor, with one or two doubtful exceptions, have any inexplicable sounds been heard. The same may be said of the houses described in the Journal, Vol. II., pp. 196, et seq., and Vol. III., pp. 241, et seq. (G.t. 314). This fact, however, will appear less significant if we bear in mind that, as our evidence in this and other directions tends to show, the proportion of persons who are readily susceptible to impressions of this kind is not very large; and that the persons who are most sensitive would, it is certain, in most cases be unwilling to expose themselves to such an ordeal as sleeping in a "haunted" house.

The following case (G. 187) is remarkable because two successive sets of occupants of the house, without any communication with each

1 See Appendix.
other, or any conscious knowledge on the part of the second set that the first set had had experiences, were "haunted" by sounds and sights. The whole has occurred since 1882. We have the first-hand testimony of most of the principal witnesses, and have had the opportunity of talking over their experiences with them. One tenant was fairly driven out of the house by the "ghosts." Here, too, there is a recent and well-evidenced tragedy, though its connection with the apparitions and noises is not very clearly established, and does not, I think, make very strongly for the hypothesis of post-mortem agency. The first account comes to us from Miss L. Morris, whose address is withheld lest it should lead to the identification of the house. Miss Morris writes in June, 1888:


It was at the latter end of October, 1882, that we decided on taking a small house on a lease, looking forward to taking possession of it and furnishing it, with great expectations of future happiness, and longing for the day to come to enter it. On the day in question we arrived late in the afternoon, and occupied ourselves in arranging and putting finishing touches to the furniture, amusing ourselves, and laughing, as we were in high spirits over our luck in finding just the little house to suit us. That same evening, about a quarter to 10, I happened to be alone in the front drawing-room, when for the first time in my life I heard, without seeing anyone, heavy footsteps tramping round the drawing-room table, at which I was reading. Naturally I was surprised, as I had never read or believed in anything supernatural. A few minutes later my eldest sister comes and sits by my side, when suddenly she exclaims, turning pale, "Charlotte, there is some one who has got into the house, walking about upstairs. I heard such a noise, like a door banging to." We were alone at the time, excepting a little child sleeping above, and my sister had never fancied such a thing before. I replied, "Oh, it's fancy." "No, I heard it again; listen!" At which I said, "I will take up the poker with my lamp; you come too, and we will see." "No," she said, "I am afraid to go up, and will stop here." So saying in fun, "I will go, and not be afraid, though 10,000 men are against me!" I flew upstairs, and searched everywhere—discovered nothing—descended alone to the basement, but with the same result.

We laughed at our fears, and went to our rooms, but that night I could not sleep at all, for incessantly round and round the room, and up and down the stairs, I heard these ceaseless and unwearying footsteps. I slept, and they woke me again, making me light my candle, and look about me, and outside the room, to see if I could discover the reason for the strange sounds. Putting it down to noises in the adjacent house, I blew out my light, and again closed my eyes, but was awoke an hour after by feeling someone in the room, and again hearing the measured footsteps. I controlled my fears by not lighting my candle, and tried, though in vain, to sleep. I said nothing about the occurrence to anyone the next day, but kept what I thought must have been fancy to myself. Still, the same experience happened to me each night, till I got accustomed to it, not allowing myself to give way to fears which,
because unseen, could not be explained, till an experience most unforeseen and strange occurred.

It was three weeks since we had occupied the house and it was about five o'clock one afternoon in November, and so light that I had no need of the gas to enable me to read clearly some music I was practising, and which engrossed my whole attention and thought. Having forgotten some new waltzes I had laid on the music shelf in the back drawing-room, I left the piano, and went dancing gaily along, singing a song as I went, when suddenly there stood before me, preventing me getting the music, the figure of a woman, heavily robed in deepest black from the head to her feet; her face was intensely sad and deadly pale. There she stood, gazing fixedly at me. The song died on my lips; the door, I saw, was firmly closed where she stood, and still I could not speak. At last I exclaimed, "Oh, auntie, I thought it was you!" believing at the moment she or some strange visitor stood before me, when suddenly she vanished.

Thinking it was a trick practised on me, and trembling violently, I went back, not getting the waltzes, to my piano, which I closed, and rushing upstairs, found my aunt alone in her room, my sisters and the servant being out. "Did you not come into the drawing-room?" I asked her. "No," she replied, "I have never left my room; I am coming down now, though." As we were alone, I saw no trick had been played upon me, and my strange vision was not imagination.

Not wishing to alarm my aunt, I did not communicate my strange experience to her, nor did I relate it subsequently to my sisters or any friends, thinking, as they could not account for it, they would not believe me if I did, so I kept it as a secret for three years, though I longed to disclose it to some friend who would believe me, and not make fun at what troubled me so much; when another, though different, circumstance occurred, which puzzled us all, and which we have never yet proved.

It was in June, 1884, that our hall-door bell began to ring incessantly and violently. We had frequently heard at intervals a ring, and discovered no one was at the door, but this especially annoyed us, and puzzled everyone inside and outside the house by the noise repeatedly made. We had always put it down to "a runaway ring" and took no notice, but for three weeks, at intervals of a quarter of an hour or half an hour, it rang unceasingly, and such peals, it electrified us. We put ourselves on guard and carefully watched, believing it a trick. We had everyone up from the basement, out of connection with the wire, in the front drawing-room, and placed the hall door and our doors wide open; it was the same result: loud and piercing peals from the bell, which, at last, after three weeks, we had taken off, when we saw the wire in connection with it vibrated as if the bell was attached to it. There were also loud knocks at the door, and no one there when we went to answer; and I repeatedly heard loud knocks at my own room door the whole time I was in the house. Though my aunt could not understand the communication I related to her, she would not believe me, and laughed at my "imaginative fancies." A few afternoons later, I was having tea with her (we had sent our maid out shopping) when she exclaimed, "There's a double knock at the door." I ran to open it; on my way along, I noticed the front and back drawing-room doors were firmly closed, as I remembered shutting them as
usual when we took tea in the breakfast-room adjoining. On answering the
doors, no one was there, and on returning, I found the back drawing-room
door half wide open. I exclaimed to my aunt, "Oh, you have been in the
drawing-room!" "I have never got up from the table," she said. I replied,
"The door was wide open which I shut!" to which she said, "What non-
sense will you be talking next?" and there the matter dropped.

A few months later I had gone to rest. It was about 2 a.m. I was
awoke by a tremendous knock at my door, and the handle turning. Having
a light I sprang out of bed, being close to the door, angry, and being deter-
mined to catch whoever it might be. No one was there! and on looking
across to my sisters' room I saw their door was wide open. Believing it
was a trick on their part, and being annoyed at having been disturbed, I
waited till the next morning, when I accused them of the trick, but was
amazed to find they had been startled in the same way, and put it down to
a dog having opened their door, but they found he was asleep, and they had
previously heard footsteps, and were too frightened to move. They also
both heard the door opened. They assured me they had never come to my
door or knocked at it, and I could see they were too startled to be acting an
untruth. In fact, my sister, though older than I, would not sleep alone in
that house by herself after.

Another occurrence happened a few months later in the year 1885, in the
winter. I was alone in the house with my aunt, and had gone (the servant
being out) to fetch some wood from the kitchen cupboard. Having got all
I wanted to re-light the fire, which had gone out in the drawing-room, I
shut to the door and locked it, when from the inside came a tremendous
knock, which so startled me I quickly ran upstairs, when repeatedly, as if
beneath my feet from the cupboard, I felt loud knocks as plainly as at the
door I had just closed. I had previously laid and brought the supper, when
just before going to my aunt to say all was ready, in the hall from the
kitchen into the housekeeper's room (front room on basement), I saw a
woman robed in black slowly and distinctly walk. (It moved like gliding.)
She was walking before me, as it were, down in the hall. Believing it was
my aunt, I went straight to the drawing-room, and found her deeply
interested in her work-book, and found she had not gone downstairs that
evening. To her I did not communicate this, as she was not well.

A little time after she fell ill, having long been suffering, and when a
little later on we lost her to our grief, we left the house altogether, as our
lease had expired just about that time; but I give my testimony I never
knew one happy day in it, for I could not forget the peculiar experiences so
frequently happening, and which seemed to haunt me wherever I went
about in it, and which I accounted for by the communication confided in
me by a friend of the fact of a woman having a few years back hung
herself there.

I saw Miss L. Morris on July 9th, 1888. She explained to me that
she and her aunt (dead) were the regular occupants of the house
from October, 1882, to December, 1886. Two sisters came to stay
occasionally, and slept, when they came, in the little "off" room on a
lower level than the other bedrooms. She believes that after their
departure the house remained empty until Mrs. G. took it. The tenant
before her was a Miss E. Miss L. Morris learnt from her that she
(Miss E.) had heard or seen nothing abnormal during her stay in the
house. Miss L. Morris, who is rather deaf, has had no other hallucinations.
She told me that they had the boards taken up to trace the cause, if
possible, of the bell-ringing, but could discover nothing. She and her
sister had frequently watched the front door when the bell was ringing
violently. Miss E. M. Morris told me of two occasions (one described
in Miss L. Morris's account) on which, when she and her other sister
were sleeping in the little back room, their door was opened in the
night at the same time that Miss L. Morris, sleeping in another room,
was disturbed by noises. Miss E. M. Morris also confirmed her sister's
account of the bell-ringing.

From December, 1886, until November of the following year the
house remained empty. It was then taken by Mrs. G., a widow lady
with two children, girls of about 9 and 10 respectively, and one
maid-servant. Mrs. G. had only come to X. about six months
before taking the house, and was entirely ignorant that anything
unusual had happened there. The account which follows, written at
Mr. Gurney's request, in June, 1888, was compiled with the help of a
diary, in which she had jotted down from day to day brief notices of any
unusual occurrence. This diary she kindly permitted me to inspect, and
some extracts from it, copied by me, are printed after the account.

The names given to the children in this account are fictitious, and
the same names have been substituted for the real ones in the extracts
from the diary.

From Mrs. G.

It was towards the end of November, 1887, I took a pretty house
. . . . in the South of England. I had never been in that locality
before, and knew no one at all in that neighbourhood, although I had for
the last six months been living in another part of the town; my dear hus-
band, an officer in the army, dying there (he had been badly wounded in the
Mutiny), I resolved to go into a quieter part of the town and take a less
expensive house.

We had not been more than a fortnight in our new home (it was in
December) when I was aroused by a deep sob and moan. "Oh," I thought,
"what has happened to the children?" I rushed in, their room being at
the back of mine; found them sleeping soundly. So back to bed I went,
when again another sob, and such a thump of somebody or something very
heavy. "What can be the matter?" I sat up in bed, looked all round the
room, then to my horror a voice (and a very sweet one) said, "Oh, do forgive
me!" three times. I could stand it no more; I always kept the gas burn-
ing, turned it up, and went to the maid's room. She was fast asleep, so I
shook her well, and asked her to come into my room. Then in five minutes
the sobs and moans recommenced, and the heavy tramping of feet, and such
thumps, like heavy boxes of plate being thrown about. She suggested I
should ring the big bell I always keep in my room, but I did not like to alarm the neighbourhood. "Oh, do, ma'am, I am sure there are burglars next door, and they will come to us next." Anything but pleasant, on a bitter cold night, standing bell in hand, a heavy one, too, awaiting a burglar. Well, I told her to go to bed, and hearing nothing for half-an-hour, I got into mine, nearly frozen with cold and fright. But no sooner had I got warm than the sobs, moans, and noises commenced again. I heard the policeman's steady step, and I thought of the words, "What of the night, Watchman? what of the night?" If he only could have known what we, a few paces off, were going through. Three times I called Anne in, and then in the morning it all died away in a low moan. Directly it was daylight, I looked in the glass to see if my hair had turned white from the awful night I spent. Very relieved was I to find it still brown.

Of course nothing was said to the children, and I was hoping I should never experience such a thing again. I liked the house, and the children were so bonny. I had too much furniture for that small house, so stowed it away in the room next to the kitchen, and we used the small room at the top of the kitchen stairs as a dining-room, and then I had a pretty double drawing-room, where I always stayed. Still the children had no play-room, and no place for their doves. I therefore had most of the furniture and boxes taken out and put in the back kitchen. It seems from that day our troubles commenced, for the children were often alarmed by noises and a crash of something, and did not like sleeping alone. I felt a little uncomfortable, and thought it was all rather strange, but had so much business affairs to settle, having no one else to help me, that I had not much time to think.

I was in the drawing-room deeply thinking about business matters, when I was startled by Edith giving such a scream. I ran to the door, and found her running up, followed by Florence and the servant, the child so scared and deadly white, and could hardly breathe. "Oh, Birdie dear, I have seen such a dreadful white face peeping round the door! I only saw the head. I was playing with Floss (dog), and looking up, I saw this dreadful thing. Florence and Aune rushed in at once, but saw nothing." I pacified them by saying someone was playing a trick by a magic lantern, but after that for months they would not go upstairs or down alone.

It was very tiresome, and thinking seriously over the matter, I resolved to return my neighbour's call, which she honoured me with the day after the first terrible night. I was ushered into the presence of two portly dames, and I should think they had arrived at that age not given to pranks. I looked at them, and mentally thought, "That sweet voice does not belong to either of you." They informed me they had lived in that house 18 years, so I thought I might venture to ask whether anything had ever taken place of disagreeable nature in my house, as we were so constantly alarmed by heavy noises, and that my eldest daughter, aged 10, had seen a dreadful white face looking round the door at her, and of course I should be glad to know; that as far as I was concerned, I feared nothing and no one, but if my children were frightened I should leave, but I liked the house very much, and thought perhaps I might buy it. They said, "Don't do that, but there is nothing to hurt you." and I saw sundry nods and winks which meant more, so in desperation I said, "Won't you tell me what has occurred?" "Well, a few
years ago, the bells commenced to ring, and there was quite a commotion, but then the former tenant, a Miss M., had a wicked servant." The other dame replied, "I may say, a very wicked servant." Well, I could not get much more, but of course I imagined this very wicked servant had done something, and felt very uneasy.

On my return, Edith said, "Oh, dear, I have seen such a little woman pass, and I often hear pitter patter; what is it? Of course magic lanterns couldn't do that." So I said nothing, and said I was too tired to talk. That night I felt a very creeping feeling of shivering, and thought I would have Florence to sleep with me, so when I went to bed about 10, I carried her in wrapped up in a shawl, leaving Edith asleep with the maid. It was about 11; I had tucked my little pet in and was about to prepare to go to sleep, when it seemed as if something electric was in the room, and that the ceiling and roof were coming on the top of us. The bed was shaken, and such a thump of something very heavy. I resolved not to risk my child's life again, for whatever it was came down on me, she would be safe in the next room with the others, but I dreaded going to bed, as I never knew what might happen before the morning.

We had a dreadful night, December 29th, such heavy thumps outside the bedrooms, and went to Mr. W., the agent, intending to tell him we must leave, or we should be bereft of our senses, but I was too late; the office was shut, so I went to friends and asked them to come and sleep, as I really was too unnerved to remain alone on New Year's Eve. They kindly came. Mrs. L. said she heard knocks. They returned home the next morning, having a young family to look after. I then wrote to a sister-in-law I was fond of at Cheltenham, and she came for a week, but everything was quiet. January 18th, I heard three loud knocks at my bedroom door. I was too terrified to speak for a minute, and then called out, "Who's there? What do you want?" My terror was intense, for I thought, supposing it is a burglar! It was a great relief to hear the children call out: "Birdie, who is knocking at your door?" "I wish I could tell you." A fortnight previously I asked a policeman on duty if he would see if anyone was in the empty house. He came to tell me it was securely fastened, and no one could get in. Then I suggested coiners under the houses, but he said they only go to old castles.

"Well, then what is it?" He said a sad occurrence had taken place some years ago. I said, "Oh, dreadful!" but he was matter-of-fact was Policeman X., and replied, "It is an every-day thing, and no doubt most of the houses people lived in something has happened in." "But," I said, "this is such a very strange house, and we have no rest either by day or night, and why should this dreadful white face appear to my child?" Well, he didn't believe in ghosts. "Very well," I said, "will you kindly catch whoever it is frightening us, and let them be well punished?" "But, madam, I can't catch nothing!" "Right, Policeman X., I knew that was impossible, but what am I to do?" So he suggested detectives, but that wouldn't do.

... I found that house very expensive, and I had to keep the gas burning downstairs and up all night. I asked a young friend from Richmond to stay, a clergyman's daughter. She laughed at such a thing as a ghost. We both went up the trap-door and explored the space over the bedroom, and next to the roof; it was very dark, but I took a candle, and then dis-
covered three holes as large as a plate between my house and the old ladies'. The next morning I walked down to the landlord who owns both houses, and told him again what we were continually going through and that I and my children were getting ill, and that it was quite impossible to live in the house. He came up on the following day, and told me that a woman had hanged herself, he thought, in the room the children slept in. The holes were filled up, and I thought now nothing can come in to alarm us. What puzzled my friend was that the two old dames being invalids should go out in the snow and wet between 9 and 10 most nights in their garden; it certainly was odd, but, of course, they had a right to do what they liked in their own house, only they banged the back door; when Anne locked up she scarcely made a sound.

Florence was often saying to her eldest sister, "You see it was your imagination, for I never see anything." "Wait till you do, you won't forget it!" The next morning, as Florence was passing the room on the stairs, she saw a man standing by the window staring fixedly; blue eyes, dark brown hair, and freckles. She rushed up to me, looking very white and frightened; the house was searched at once, and nothing seen.

I had forgotten to mention that the night after the knocks came to my bedroom I resolved that the dog, who is very sharp, should sleep outside, but oh, that was worse than all, for at a quarter past 12 I looked at my clock. He commenced to cry, it was not exactly howling, and tore at the carpet in a frantic manner. I threw my fur cloak on, threw the door wide open, and demanded what was the matter. The poor little animal was so delighted to see me; I saw he had biscuits and water, and the children were then awake, and asked me why Floss was making that noise. I went to bed, and in 10 minutes he recommenced. I went out three times, and then made up my mind not to move again, for I felt so cold and angry.

Another night something seemed to walk to the children's door, and turn the handle, walk up to the washstand, shake the bed, and walk out. It really was enough to shake anyone's nerves. My sister and brother-in-law, Mr. B., came for a couple of nights, but that was when I first went in. They heard nothing. I then had my husband's first wife's sister, who is very fond of me, to stay over Easter. She, fortunately, did not hear anything.

The children frequently saw lights in their bedroom, generally white, and Florence one night saw a white skirt hanging from the ceiling. She was so frightened that she put her head under the clothes, and would not look again.

Then my solicitor and his wife came down for a night, for he was very kind about my business matters, as I understand so little about money matters, so he came to advise me. Mrs. C. could not go to sleep until four, as she heard such a heavy fall outside her bedroom door.

One Sunday I was reading by the fire in the drawing-room, and thinking it was very cosy, when I heard a cry, and thinking it one of the children ill, was going upstairs. Edith called out, "Birdie, come quickly; something has opened and shut our door three times, and some one is crying." I went up, and we all heard someone sobbing, but where it came from we could not tell, but seemed near the wall.

One day, when I was out, the children were playing with Anne in the room downstairs; they all distinctly heard a very heavy footfall walk across
the drawing-room, play two notes on the piano, and walk out. I came in shortly after, astonished to see them, candle in hand, looking under the beds. It was a dreadful time.

March 3rd I was writing in the drawing-room, when the front door bell rang violently. I asked who it was; “No one, ma'am.” I thought I would stand by the window, and presently it rang again; down the servant came, no one there, and after the third time I told her not to go to the door unless she heard a knock as well. I knew no one had pulled the bell, as I was standing by the window.

I then had an interview with Miss M., the former tenant, who told me she had gone through precisely what I had, but had said very little about it, for fear of being laughed at. I was far too angry to take notice whether anyone laughed or not. Miss M. said one afternoon between four and five she was in very good spirits, and was playing the piano, and as she crossed the room a figure enveloped in black, with a very white face, and such a forlorn look, stood before her, and then it faded away. She was so terrified, but did not tell anyone about it. For some time after she was ill from fright on two occasions, but her aunt being old did not care to move, and she was too much attached to her to leave. It was satisfactory to find some one else had gone through what we were daily experiencing. March 20th. I was resting in the drawing-room, when as I thought, I heard Edith's voice say three times, “Darling!” I ran downstairs, much to their astonishment, and said, “Well, what is it now?” They replied, “We were coming directly, why did you come down?” “Well, that is cool; why did you call me?” “But we didn't; you called to us to put on our hats at once as you were going into the town.” Anne said she distinctly heard me say it when I had not even spoken. I believe it was that same night as they were going upstairs to bed, they saw a white figure standing by the little room. How I hated that room!

Well, then friends suggested I should have the floors up, the chimneys taken out to see if there was any communication to the other house, and the door taken away, and a new one put. One friend offered to lend me a mastiff which flew at everything; another offered me his savage bull-dog, which was always chained up when I called there, and then last, but not least, I was to have two detectives. “Well,” I thought, “it is time to move; in this bitter weather to have no floors, no grates, no door, a ferocious mastiff, and still worse a bull-dog and two detectives, a pretty state of affairs for any one!” I asked my landlord to release me, but he would not unless I paid my rent up to Christmas.

Having had very heavy expenses all the year, I thought I would if possible stay till September, as the evenings would be light, and we should be out all day, but even that I was not allowed to do, for coming home from paying visits, I found Florence looking deathly white, and in a very nervous state, and in breathless haste she said she had seen the same face, but the figure was crawling in the little room as if it would spring on her. I at once called on my doctor, who advised me to take the children away as soon as possible, and let them be amused, so I left my servant and her father in charge, locked my bedroom door, and took the key, went to London, where Edith was so ill that I had to call in Dr. F., and as soon as she was better I thought I would remain a week longer, making three weeks, so that she might go to a circus.
and be amused, and forget the frights; but even that I wasn’t allowed to do, for on Monday I received a letter from my servant to say they could not stay in the house any longer, for since her father left, her mother and sister had slept with her, and they were all startled one night by hearing someone walk upstairs, throw paper down, and run after it, and the next night someone knocked loudly at my bedroom door, walked and moved all the furniture about, and nothing was moved, and that in consequence they had locked up the house, taking the doves and Floss with them, and leaving food enough for the two cats for three days. I got up early, very much annoyed about the horrid house, packed and came back with the children, May the 8th. Fortunately, Edith kept well. My banker’s wife kindly met me at the station, and made me go back with the children to lunch. I telegraphed to my servant to meet me at the house, and Mrs. L. and I went to look at my present abode, and that afternoon agreed to take it from the 10th inst. Mrs. L. came up to sleep, and says she heard such thumps and bumps in the little room underneath, and a hissing sound round the top of the bed. I paid my rent and left; I asked Mr. C. to write and tell the landlord he must let me off a quarter, as I had been put to a great expense through his house, as we could not possibly live in it, and we cleared out on the following Thursday. Such a relief to be free from alarms and noises!

And so ended my sojourn of five months in that very extraordinary house. All is quite true that I have stated, whether mortal or immortal I know not. I am glad to say my children are recovering, though Edith is still very weak, and I am suffering dreadfully from neuralgia, the result of the anxiety and worry I have gone through.—June 15th, 1888.

Mr. Gurney wrote:

I had a long talk with Mrs. G. on June 13th, 1888. She went over the whole history of her and her children’s experiences in the house. She struck me as an excellent witness. I have never received an account in which the words and manner of telling were less suggestive of exaggeration or superstition. There is no doubt that she was simply turned out of a house which otherwise exactly suited her, at very serious expense and inconvenience.

Extracts from Mrs. G.’s diary.

January 2nd, 1888.—Anne went home from four to 10. I felt very nervous being alone with the children, having been so alarmed with noises and apparitions before. No. X. [i.e., police-constable] came to tell how they had made inquiries, and [no?] strange people came into the empty house. No noises since Sunday night.

Wednesday, January 18th.—I heard three loud knocks at my bedroom door, just as I got into my bed last night. So did the children and Anne; all very frightened.

January 30th, 1888.—At three this morning I heard soft knocks at my bedroom door, and the handle certainly was tried. I was very much frightened, but don’t want to alarm the children. Shall bring Floss up to-night.

February 1st.—I went out making calls. The children said they heard footsteps in the drawing-room before I came in.
February 6th.—Florence saw an apparition in brown at 7.30 a.m. I wasn't up. Edith was practising, and Anne was doing the grate in the drawing-room. What can it be?

February 24th.—Bell rang three times; no one at the door. [Mrs. G. told me that she was standing at the window.—F.P.]

March 3rd.—Heard the bell ring about 11. No one at the door.

March 20th.—Was lying down on the sofa, and heard a voice say "Darling," then kisses. Ran down to the children, but they were surprised, not having called me. Said they heard me call them to get ready to go out. I had not spoken. And on going to bed they saw a figure in white.

April 9th.—Florence much frightened at apparition. [About five in the afternoon.—F.P.]

(Went to London on the 19th.)

The above are copies of extracts from Mrs. G.'s diary, made by me on July 8th, 1888. At the same time Mrs. G. told me, in connection with the noises heard by the children on February 1st, that on the day following she purposely made her entry into the house very noisy; she banged the front door, walked heavily into the drawing-room, banged the lid of the piano, "I made as much noise as ever I could," but on going down to the children, who were in the play-room (front room in basement), she found they had heard nothing.

On the 6th of February Florence, having seeing the apparition in the basement room, where she was alone, ran up to Mrs. G. at once, much frightened. She described the figure as that of a man, with dark brown hair, blue eyes, and a freckled face. The figure stared at her, and seemed as if it would stop as long as she stopped. So she ran away.

Mrs. G. also told me a thing which she had not mentioned in her account—that she was one morning left alone in the basement room about 10 a.m., the children having gone upstairs to wash their hands, and suddenly looking round, she saw distinctly for a moment two human faces at her elbow. The apparition vanished instantly. She has had no other hallucination, either of sight or hearing; except that about twelve years ago she and her husband heard some noises, for which they could not account, and which may have been hallucinatory.

I also saw the children, Edith aged 11, and Florence aged 9. They are very bright, intelligent children; the elder very pale and excitable. I could not examine them at length on what they had seen, as Mrs. G. was very anxious, Edith having evidently not yet recovered from her illness, that they should not be made to attach too much importance to the subject, and I did not mention the word ghosts, nor did they. They gave me an account accurately corresponding to their mother's of what they had seen. On two or three occasions they saw a figure together. But the figure which Edith saw alone appeared only momentarily and then vanished, whilst Florence's man with freckles was apparently persistent. Edith described the beautiful hand placed on the door, which accompanied the "white face." Both were very positive they had seen something real, and Edith stamped her foot indignantly when her mother suggested "imagination." "Mamma, you know
it wasn't imagination!" They seem now to have forgotten a good deal of
their fright, and told me they were very sorry to leave the house.—F.P.,
July 9th, 1888.

From Anne H., Mrs. G.'s Servant.

June 16th, 1888.

We had been in the house nearly three weeks when one night my mistress
came to my room and called me, and said she heard someone screaming and
groaning dreadfully. I went into her room and I heard it too; I thought
someone was being murdered. It seemed in the next house to me, as if
someone was being thrown about dreadfully. Then one afternoon Miss
Edith saw a little woman peep round the door at her; when she looked it was
gone; and then one morning Miss Florence was going up the kitchen stairs,
she saw a man standing in the little room at the top of the stairs by the side
of the window, looking at her; and one afternoon saw the same man again,
he was on his hands and knees under the table. We used to hear noises in
the roof of a night as if someone was up there throwing something about;
then it would seem to give a great jump down, and run up and downstairs,
and they tried the handle of the children's door; we heard something move
across the room and back again. The children heard something run across
the room and screw up some paper over by the cupboard in their room, then
go out again. Then we heard that screaming again; we heard it in the
children's room this time; it was most dreadful. Then we heard some door
shook as if to shake it down; then it kept banging all night long. We did
not get to sleep till between 11 and 12. Then we used to hear a great
clash every night about 10 o'clock; it was downstairs in the kitchen. I
used to think everything was being smashed; then one night it seemed as if
someone was out on the landing slipping about; then we heard some music;
it sounded like a musical box to me; it played three times; then one night
we all heard three loud knocks at mistress's door; then the bells used to ring.
When I got upstairs to the front door no one was there. It was the front
door because no one else used to ring. One day it rang three times while I
was dressing. I went down each time, but there was no one there then.
One evening Miss Edith saw some one standing at the top of the kitchen stairs,
all in white, peeping at her. Then Miss Florence went back and she
saw it too. One afternoon I was sitting in the kitchen with the door shut; I heard
someone go creeping upstairs; I looked up and the door was open; I went
up directly, but I could not see anything there. Then the same night as
mistress went to London I heard that screaming again as if they was knocking
someone about dreadfully. There was such a row. Father was in the house;
he did not hear anything; then he felt something breathing on his face; got
a light and looked about, but he could not see anything. Then he had to go
away; then my little sister came in to be with me, and she heard them throw
some paper downstairs and run down after it, and bring it up again. When
I woke up she was crying. I heard the spare room door open two or three
times; I had locked it before I went to bed, because it would not latch;
then mother came in; she did not get to sleep all night for the noises; she
heard someone go into mistress's room and begin moving the things about,
then something seemed to be in the wall, began tapping about. Then they
moved some paper right over by the cupboard; then we heard someone jump
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down outside the spare room door. Then she saw a face; it seemed to come right through the wall. Then one night in my bedroom I saw a shadow, it seemed all in a heap; it went right along the window and shaded right along the wall opposite. Then I woke up one night and heard such a row; it seemed close to my ear like an alaram. Then a thump in the ceiling one afternoon. We heard someone go right across the drawing-room and touch the notes of the piano and go out again.

A. H. (aged 21).

(I talked to Anne H., a clever, intelligent girl, to-day. She gave me a graphic description of the shadow moving across the window and wall of her bedroom. Has had no other hallucinations.—F.P., July 9th, 1888.)

From Miss R., Surbiton.

DEAR Sir,—In answer to your letter respecting Mrs. G.'s house in ——road, all I can tell you is that I was with her when she moved into it and for a week after, and during that time nothing happened to disturb us except the bells used to ring, but this we supposed then was done by boys in the street. I should never have thought of this again if subsequent events had not made me think of it. Sorry I cannot give you any further information.—Yours truly,

M. R.

Mrs. G.'s experience in the house appears very quickly to have become matter of common talk in the town, and in May of the same year, when the house was empty, a party of three gentlemen obtained access to it, on two different occasions, for the purposes of investigation. Their accounts are given below.

From Mr. W. O. D., Barrister-at-Law.

July 1st, 1888.

May 23rd, 1888.—First visit, in company with the Rev. G. O. and Mr. C., solicitor. Heard a bell ring, which I believe was not rung by any mundane agency. Subsequently we heard a heavy crash, as it were of crockery, not produced by any visible means.

May 28th.—Second visit. In company with the same gentlemen herein before mentioned I saw part of the dress of a super-material being. Mr. O. and Mr. C., who were in the room before me, saw far more of the form than I did. After the apparition, the Rev. G. O. performed a ceremony of exorcism, in which both myself and Mr. C. joined. I have since been to the house, but did not hear or witness anything unusual. I am firmly convinced in my own mind that the phenomena we beheld and the noises we heard were the results of super-material forces.

From the Rev. G. O.

July 3rd, 1888.

I have not kept and can't recall dates, but about a month ago I went to ——road, hearing it was haunted. I went with Mr. D. and Mr. C. and the agent's son, at eight. At 8.30 we heard bell ringing, but nothing to account for
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it. Little later on a crash and fall as of a box or board tumbling down. All
heard this, three of them being on the ground floor, I on the basement.
A few evenings after we went the second time, at nine o'clock. At 9.30
or about, as we were thinking of leaving, and as we stood in hall, I saw
a form glide from back to front room, and at same time my two friends,
who were beside me saw, D. a part of the figure and C. the entire.
This was all. I then said prayers for exorcism of the house and rest for
the souls. Since then no more has been heard.
I may add I saw myself, but not distinctly, a small column of misty
vapour on the first occasion, but not being very distinct, and not developing
into anything, I do not enter into it here.
In conversation Mr. D., who appeared to be a man of nervous
temperament, and who has implicit faith in the efficacy of the exorcism,
told me that he had had no other hallucinations. Mr. O., he said,
went first into the room, and drew the attention of the others to the
figure, which disappeared almost instantaneously. Neither Mr. D. nor
Mr. C. could remember accurately the position of the light; but they
thought it probable, on the whole, that Mr. O. carried a light in his
hand, and that there was no other light, except through the uncurtained
windows, in the room where the figure was seen. Mr. O., who is
extremely deaf, appears to have heard the noise on the first evening
with perfect distinctness. Mr. O. has had other sensory hallucinations
which may have been veridical. Mr. C. gave me an account of the inci-
dent corresponding with those given by Mr. D. and Mr. O., except that,
as he described it, he only saw the end of a woman's dress disappearing
round the door. Mr. C. also gave me an account of a hallucination,
resembling the human figure, which he had seen only a few weeks
previously in his own room, when, apparently, in normal health.
We have been unable, so far, to induce Mr. C. to give us a written
account of his experiences.
Finally, I subjoin an extract from a newspaper of April 5th, 1879,
relating to a suicide which took place in the house:—
Singular Case of Suicide.—The Coroner held an inquest on Satur-
day at the — Inn, on the body of Mrs. M. F., aged 42 years, who com-
mitted suicide by hanging herself on the previous day. Deceased, a
lodging-house keeper in ——road,1 had more than once threatened to
destroy herself, but no importance was attached to what she said. On
Friday, however, she sent a letter to a friend saying that she would never
be seen alive again in this world ; but this, like her previous assertions,
was regarded as an empty threat, and it was not until Mr. B. . . .
lodging at her house, missed her, and mentioned the fact to a relative, that
any notice was taken of the letter. The house was then searched, and

1 The number of the house is not given in the newspaper report; but it has been
ascertained from the police records of suicides.
deceased was discovered hanging by a skipping-rope to a peg behind the door of the top back bedroom, quite dead. The jury returned a verdict, "Suicide whilst in a state of unsound mind."

[Date of Suicide—March 28th, 1879.]

Here again it will be noticed that before anything of an unusual character is seen in the house a nervous state had been induced in the occupants in each case by the unaccountable noises which were heard. In the case of Miss Morris the phantasm was of a constant type. But with the subsequent tenants a general hallucinatory diathesis, almost comparable with that of the famous Mrs. A., appears to have been established, and the ghosts are multiform. The evidence of the third group of witnesses possesses little independent value. All three were acquainted with what had already taken place in the house: their general attitude towards the subject is illustrated by the fact that one of their number afterwards performed an act of exorcism in the house, with all due ceremonial observances: and two of them had previously experienced visual hallucinations.

The least readily explicable feature in the story is the appearance of phantasms to two independent groups of observers, the second of whom were almost certainly ignorant of the experiences of their predecessors. This may have been a mere coincidence; or the apparitions, which, it will be observed, were entirely dissimilar, may have, in each case, been generated by the alarm caused by the occurrence of inexplicable noises, themselves possibly to be explained as hallucinatory superstructures built up round a nucleus of real sounds, just as we know from the experiments of MM. Binet and Féré that visual hallucinations may be constructed on an external point de repère. Or it is permissible to conjecture that the later experiences may have been started by thought-transference from Miss Morris, whose thoughts, no doubt, occasionally turned to the house in which she had suffered so much agitation and alarm.

Readers to whom such a conjecture seems beyond the bounds of probability are reminded that the alternative explanation is not that of a semi-corporeal ghostly entity, capable of uttering expressive sighs and displacing the kitchen furniture. Such a conception may conceivably have appeared adequate at an earlier stage of the investigation. Such a conception, in a less crude form and with less explicitness, may still appeal to some as the simplest interpretation of the facts. But it is not held by Mr. Myers. He has anticipated me in pointing out that, however caused, the phenomena are of the nature of hallucinations. There has been no displacement of the kitchen furniture, the sighs heard were conveyed by no aerial vibrations. To him the manifestations seem to reflect "a dead man's incoherent dream." To me it is not obvious why
the dreams of the living should possess less potency than the imagined dreams of the unknown dead.

So far there has been no attempt to identify the phantasms. Indeed so many dissimilar figures have been recorded in the last two narratives that any attempt at identification must necessarily have been attended with considerable difficulties. But, as already said, in a large number of cases an attempt is made to trace the origin of the phantasm. The two following cases supply very good examples. In the first case (G. 188) we have the evidence of four witnesses, who testify to having seen the figure of a child in the house. And we have in our possession a certificate of the death of the child who, as stated by one of the narrators, died in the house some years before the apparition was seen. The first account is written by Mrs. H., wife of a doctor in a small provincial town; and, as we learn from her, Dr. H. has seen and admitted the correctness of what she has written, so that his evidence is practically first-hand. We owe this narrative to Mr. More Adey, of Wotton-under-Edge, who has seen some of the persons concerned; and the original accounts, which are undated, appear to have been sent to him in the latter part of 1883.

G. 188.

Some years ago (perhaps about 20 or more), we happened to be having one of our usual small gatherings for a musical evening, when the circumstance happened which I am going to relate. My husband had been detained visiting patients until rather late, returning home about 9 o'clock. He was running upstairs in his usual quick way, three or four steps at a time, to go to his dressing-room and dress for the evening, when, on turning the first flight of stairs, he was rather startled to see on the landing (a few steps higher) a little child, who ran before him into my room. My little boy B., about two or three years of age, was at that time sleeping in a small child's bed at my bedside. Mr. H. followed and spoke, calling the boy by name, but he gave no answer. The gas was burning on the landing outside my room, but there was no light inside. He felt about and on the bed, but instead of finding the child standing or sitting on the bed, as he supposed, he found him comfortably tucked in and fast asleep. A cold creepy feeling came over him, for there had not possibly been time for anyone to get into the bed, which was just behind the door. He lighted a candle, searched the room, and also saw that the boy was unmistakably fast asleep. He expected to find one of the other children, as the figure appeared to be taller than that of the boy. When the company had gone my husband told me of the occurrence. I felt quite sure that the mystery could be solved, and that we should find it had been one of the children, though he assured me there could be no one in the room, as he had made a thorough search.

I still thought he might be mistaken, and fancied that it had been G. (who was a year or two older than B.), who had escaped out of the night nursery, which was near; that she had been listening to the music, when she heard someone coming, and had run into my room to hide; but on inquiring closely the next morning, I found she had never left her bed. We did not
think much more about it, though there was still a feeling of mystery, and we never named it to anyone. Some years afterwards it was brought to our minds by two of my daughters having seen a child very early in the morning at the same time, but in different rooms. One of them only saw its face. Then, after a lapse of years, Miss A., while staying with us, saw the apparition mentioned in her ghost story. Whether the appearance has been a ghost or merely an optical delusion I cannot say, but each of those who have seen it had never heard the slightest allusion to anything of the kind before. If the apparition should be a ghost, I have thought that it must be the spirit of a little girl who died in part of our house before it was added to it. When we first came to this house, about 30 years ago, it was divided into two, the smaller part being inhabited by a doctor. His wife died soon after we came, and a few years afterwards his little girl. I used to see her when she was ill, and I last saw her the day before she died. She had fine dark eyes, black hair, oval face, and a pale olive complexion. This description I find exactly agrees with those who have seen its face. None of them had ever heard me mention the child; indeed, I had forgotten about her until hearing of these ghost stories. I said it must be J. M., who died here. Soon after her death her father went abroad. As far as I remember the child was about eight or nine years of age.

From Miss G. H.

I was up early one winter's morning just as dawn was breaking, and there was barely light enough for me to see my way about the house; I was feeling tired and somewhat sleepy, but not in the slightest degree nervous.

On passing the door of a room at the head of the staircase, in which my youngest sister slept, I perceived that it was open. Taking hold of the handle, I was about to shut it (the door opened inwards), when I was startled by the figure of a child, standing in a corner formed by a wardrobe which was placed against the wall about a foot and a-half from the doorway. Thinking it was my sister, I exclaimed, "Oh, M., you shouldn't startle me so!" and shut the door; but in the same instant, before I had time to quit my hold of the handle, I opened it again, feeling sure that it could not be my sister; and, sure enough, she was fast asleep in bed so far from the door that it would not have been possible for her to have crossed from the door to her bedside in the short space of time when I was closing the door. In the corner where the child had been there was nothing, and I felt that I must have seen a ghost, for I was suddenly seized with a feeling of horror which could not have been caused by anything imaginary. The child had a dark complexion, hair and eyes, and a thin oval face; it was not white as when seen by Miss A., but it gave me a mournful look as if full of trouble. Had it been a living child, I should have imagined it to be one who enjoyed none of the thoughtlessness and carelessness of childhood, but whose young life, on the contrary, was filled with premature cares. Its age might be about nine or 10; its dress I could not distinguish, as I only seemed to see its head and face; the expression struck me most; so vividly did I see it that if I were able to draw I could, I believe, give an accurate representation of it, even now after about five years.

On telling my eldest sister A. what I had seen she said, "How very curious! I thought I saw something, too, this morning."
I must tell you that to reach her bedroom it was necessary to pass through mine; on the morning in question as she looked into my room she saw a figure standing by a small table. Being short-sighted she thought for a moment that it was I, though it appeared to be smaller; and suddenly seized with a nervous fear, most unusual with her, she called out, “Oh! G., wait for me.” She turned for an instant to get something out of her room, and when she looked again there was nothing to be seen. The door from my room into the passage was shut. I was in another part of the house at the time, and we were the only two members of the family out of bed.

From Mrs. A. (formerly Miss H.)

I believe it was between five and six in the morning my sister and self thought we would get up early to read. We had our bedrooms close together, with the door in the middle joining the rooms always open.

My sister had just left her room about three minutes; when I looked towards her room I saw a little figure in white standing near a table. I did not see its face, but I attribute that to my being so short-sighted. Also I was suddenly overcome with nervousness that I ran from the room.

During the morning I told my sister what I had seen; then she gave me her account.

Asked whether they had experienced any other hallucination, Miss G. H. and Mrs. A. replied in the negative. Dr. H., however, explained that he had heard more than once strange unaccountable noises, and from a later letter we learn that on one occasion he had a visual hallucination after sitting up three nights in succession.

In answer to questions, Mrs. H. writes:

December 11th, 1883.

Strange that she [i.e., the child whom the phantasm was supposed to resemble] did not die in our house, but in the next one to it, which has since been added. It was originally all in one. It is since the two houses have been joined that the child appeared, and to three, Mr. H., G., and Miss A., in our old part. But when Mrs. A. saw it, it was in the very room in which she died. When the others described the appearance of the child, then it struck me it might be the one I knew, and when I gave a minute description of her they said it corresponded exactly.

* * * * * * * *

The first appearance to Mr. H. was in winter, but we do not remember the date. On referring to other events that occurred about the time, I think it must have been between January 1863 and 1865. The child appeared to both my daughters on the same morning. This happened in January, 1877. It appeared to Miss A. in July, 1879.

J. M. died January 21st, 1854, aged 10 years. I enclose a copy of the registration of her death.

April 11th, 1885.

My husband a few weeks ago began to hear again the loud knocks which he mentions in answer to one of your former questions. He does not say much about it, but I see that he thinks it is something supernatural.

I want to persuade him that it is a dream, and I cannot help thinking
that it may be, but I am trying to find it out. I cannot hear the knocks. They ceased for a few weeks, but came again two or three nights ago. I have begged that he will tell me when it comes again, and I shall make a note of each time, with the surrounding circumstances.

I think I told you before that it was only my idea that the apparition of the child might be one who died many years ago in part of our house, then detached, and I rather mentioned it in jest at the first. Long afterwards, however, and some time after the appearance to Miss A., when I gave a description of the child, my daughter G. exclaimed at once that it was exactly the same as the one she saw (she had partly described it to me before), and the same as the face Miss A. had seen. I distinctly remember J. M.'s face, although I have forgotten almost everything else about her.

May 20th, 1885.

I was only two nights absent, but on my return my husband told me that in the first night he had again heard the knocks very loud. This happened to be the night my brother-in-law died. Still I do not think the knocks are from any supernatural cause, though it is perhaps worth trying to find out. You will see in my answers that when quite a young man he heard noises immediately preceding a death. He has never heard anything of the kind for many, many years, except, I think, occasional noises within the last year, which I told you of. It is now quite six weeks, or more, since he heard a succession of knocks, that is, at intervals of a night or two.

The following account, written by Miss J. A. A., and communicated by her to Mr. H. C. Coote, appeared in Notes and Queries for March 20th, 1880, over the signature of H. C. C.:

The following interesting communication has been handed to me by a young lady, who is as intelligent as she is charming. Her hereditary acumen precludes altogether the possibility of any self-deceit in regard to her own personal experiences as narrated by herself.

"What I am going to relate happened to myself while staying with some North-country cousins, last July, at their house in —shire. I had spent a few days there in the summer of the previous year, but without then hearing or seeing anything out of the common. On my second visit, arriving early in the afternoon, I went out boating with some of the family, spent a very jolly evening, and finally went to bed—a little tired, perhaps, with the day's work, but not the least nervous. I slept soundly until between three and four, just when the day was beginning to break. I had been awake for a short time when suddenly the door of my bedroom opened and shut again rather quickly. I fancied it might be one of the servants, and called out, 'Come in!' After a short time the door opened again, but no one came in—at least, no one that I could see. Almost at the same time that the door opened for the second time, I was a little startled by the rustling of some curtains belonging to a hanging wardrobe, which stood by the side of the bed; the rustling continued, and I was seized with a most uncomfortable feeling, not exactly of fright, but a strange, unearthly sensation that I was not alone. I had had that feeling for some minutes, when I saw at the foot of the bed a child about seven or nine years old. The child seemed as if it were on the bed, and came gliding towards me as I lay. It was the figure of
a little girl in her night-dress—a little girl with dark hair and a very white face. I tried to speak to her, but could not. She came slowly on up to the top of the bed, and I then saw her face clearly. She seemed in great trouble; her hands were clasped and her eyes were turned up with a look of entreaty, an almost agonised look. Then, slowly unclasping her hands, she touched me on the shoulder. The hand felt icy cold, and while I strove to speak she was gone. I felt more frightened after the child was gone than before, and began to be very anxious for the time when the servant would make her appearance. Whether I slept again or not I hardly know. But by the time the servant did come I had almost persuaded myself that the whole affair was nothing but a very vivid nightmare. However, when I came down to breakfast, there were many remarks made about my not looking well—it was observed that I was pale. In answer I told my cousins that I had had a most vivid nightmare, and I remarked if I was a believer in ghosts I should imagine I had seen one. Nothing more was said at the time upon this subject, except that my host, who was a doctor, observed that I had better not sleep in the room again, at any rate not alone.

"So the following night one of my cousins slept in the same room with me. Neither of us saw or heard anything out of the way during that night or the early morning. That being the case, I persuaded myself that what I had seen had been only imagination, and, much against everybody's expressed wish, I insisted the next night on sleeping in the room again, and alone. Accordingly, having retired again to the same room, I was kneeling down at the bedside to say my prayers, when exactly the same dread as before came over me. The curtains of the wardrobe swayed about, and I had the same sensation as previously, that I was not alone. I felt too frightened to stir, when, luckily for me, one of my cousins came in for something which she had left. On looking at me she exclaimed, 'Have you seen anything?' I said, 'No,' but told her how I felt, and, without much persuasion being necessary, I left the room with her, and never returned to it. The curtains of the wardrobe swayed about, and I had the same sensation as previously, that I was not alone. I felt too frightened to stir, when, luckily for me, one of my cousins came in for something which she had left. On looking at me she exclaimed, 'Have you seen anything?' I said, 'No,' but told her how I felt, and, without much persuasion being necessary, I left the room with her, and never returned to it. When my hostess learnt what had happened (as she did immediately) she told me I must not sleep in that room again, as the nightmare had made such an impression on me; I should imagine (she said) all sorts of things and make myself quite ill. I went to another room, and during the rest of my visit (a week), I was not troubled by any reappearance of the little girl.

"On leaving, my cousin, the eldest daughter of the doctor, went on a visit with me to the house of an uncle of mine in the same county. We stayed there for about a fortnight, and during that time the 'little girl' was alluded to only as my 'nightmare.'

"In this I afterwards found there was a little reticence, for, just before leaving my uncle's, my cousin said to me, 'I must tell you something I have been longing to tell you ever since I left home. But my father desired me not to tell you, as, not being very strong, you might be too frightened. Your nightmare was not a nightmare at all, but the apparition of a little girl.' She then went on to tell me that this 'little girl' had been seen three times before, by three different members of the family, but as this was some nine or 10 years since, they had almost ceased to think anything about it until I related my experiences on the morning after the first night of my second visit.

"My cousin further went on to tell me that her younger sister whilst in
bed had one morning, about daybreak, to her great surprise, seen a little girl with dark hair, standing with her back to her, looking out of the window. She took this figure for her little sister, and spoke to it. The child not replying or moving from her position, she called out to it, ‘It’s no use standing like that; I know you. You can’t play tricks with me.’ On looking round, however, she saw that her little sister, the one she thought she was addressing, and who was sleeping with her, had not moved from the bed. Almost at the same time the child passed from the window into the room of her (my cousin’s) sister A., and the latter, as she afterwards declared, distinctly saw the figure of a child with dark hair standing by the side of a table in her room. She spoke to it, and it instantly disappeared. The ‘little girl’ was subsequently again seen, for the last time before I saw it, by my cousin’s father, Dr. H. It was in the early daylight of a summer’s morning, and he was going upstairs to his room, having just returned from a professional visit. On this occasion he saw the same child (he noticed its dark hair) running up the stairs immediately before him, until it reached his room and entered it. When he got into the room it was gone.

“Thus the apparition has been seen three times by the family, and once by me. I am the only one, however, that has seen its face. It has also never been seen twice in the same room by any one else.”

From Mrs. H.  
November 21st, 1882.

The first part told by Miss J. A. of the appearance of the little girl to her is most accurate, and is exactly as she told it to us the morning after, but the latter part, which she has written from memory, having heard it perhaps in a confused way, is not quite right.

This is among the most interesting and the strongest examples in our collection of the “successive” type. It is evidentially strong, because, in the first place, there is a reasonable presumption that none of the percipients had heard of any experience previous to her own, and, in the second place, the accounts, as they stand, show a marked similarity in the various appearances. And lastly, from the record the apparition appears to have borne an unmistakable resemblance to the child who had actually died in the house some years before. The similarity of the various appearances, however, and their common resemblance to the deceased J. M. is not sufficiently established to bear a very close scrutiny. The first percipient, Dr. H., mistook the figure which he saw for that of his little boy of two or three, or his little girl of four years of age; and Miss H. (Mrs. A.) believed the figure to be her sister, who must at that time have been at least sixteen. Further, it must be remembered that Miss G. H.’s description—the most detailed of all—was not written until some years after the event, and after the appearance of the figure had been discussed with Mrs. H., who held a theory of her own on the matter, and had, as she told us, given to her daughter a minute description of the dead child.

It is impossible to avoid a suspicion that under the circumstances
the definiteness of outline in Miss G. H.'s description may be due to a combination of her mother's narrative with her own experience. The same criticism applies to Miss J. A. A.'s account, which was not written until some months after the event, and after she had heard from her cousin of the previous appearances. Not much reliance, I submit, can be placed on the details of a description written under such conditions. The most, therefore, that can be said is, that in a house where a little girl is known to have died, a figure resembling a little child or young girl was seen on four different occasions by four independent witnesses. That, of course, is a remarkable series of coincidences.

It is not difficult to trace the probable genesis of the first appearance. A hardworking country doctor, who has on various occasions in his life experienced hallucinations, visual and auditory, coming home late one evening, after a long day's work, sees a figure bearing a vague resemblance to one of his children—a purely subjective hallucination. The later appearances, if in fact there was no communication of Dr. H.'s experience, are more difficult of explanation. The two earlier may have been the result of hereditary predisposition to hallucination. But it seems at least possible that all three were due to thought-transference, with Dr. A., or perhaps Mrs. A., on whom the first appearance seems to have made some impression, as the agent. In this way also the general resemblance which appears to have existed between the various appearances may most readily be accounted for. The explanation may seem far-fetched and improbable: but the critic should be reminded that we have much evidence for the operation of telepathy between living minds, but we have very little for the existence or the agency of disembodied spirits.

In the next case the identification of the ghost is more precise, and the explanation, perhaps, more difficult.

G. 189.

From Mary G., Nursemaid.

[This account was written by me from notes of a conversation with Mary G., and was subsequently corrected and signed by her.]

March 21st, 1888.

I have been three and a-half years in Mrs. Z.'s service as nursemaid. One night in November, 1885 (just before the baby came), I was going along the passage at about 8 p.m. The passage was very dimly lighted by the gas shining through from the housemaid's cupboard. I saw a woman's figure, dressed in something light, coming towards me. I noticed that the dress seemed a little way above the ground, and I thought it was the kitchen-maid. As she passed I put out my hand to touch her, but she moved on one side, and again to the other side when I followed her. At last she moved through and past me and disappeared, or my blocking the light hid her from view. I could distinguish no features at all. The dress was not quite so light as
white—perhaps a light grey. I did not see what kind of a dress it was. I
saw the same figure again the following night, in the same place. I told only
the nurse what I had seen, but she only laughed at me and said it was my
imagination, and I did not care to talk of it again.

I saw the same figure once afterwards in the following March, after L.
had told me what he had seen; it was standing at the dressing-room door
one evening. There was a gas-light just outside which shone full on the
figure. The figure seemed very tall, taller than an average man, and dressed
in some loose flowing stuff; it hid the chair at the dressing-room door. I
don't remember anything about the dress or the features. I was frightened
and gave a scream, and the nurse came out, but the figure was gone.

I have also before this seen a man in the dressing-room—three times in
one evening. This was before L. came. And once after this, I saw a woman
in a brown dress. But I have never seen anything else of the kind before I
came to this house. I have often heard noises of footsteps and the sound of
a scuffle, and of something heavy being dragged downstairs and so on. I
would wake up at night to hear the noises. I have not heard the noises for
about six months.

From W. L., Butler. July 12th, 1886.

I entered Mr. Z.'s service as butler on the 21st of October, 1885. I had
not been in the house three days before I heard a strange noise in the cellar.
It sounded to me as if it were a lot of barrels rolling, and planks of wood
being stacked. I started up in the bed and listened most attentively. I
could hear the barrels roll one after the other quite distinctly. I spoke of it
to my fellow-servants the next morning, and I saw a look and a quiet whisper
pass between them. On the following night we retired to bed a few minutes
past 10. I had just got into my bed when I heard a strange noise in the
pantry, which is adjoining my bedroom. I got out of my bed very quiet and
crept out, but I saw nothing. I returned to my bed, when I heard a heavy
thump in the cellar. I arose and partly dressed myself, took a light with me
to the cellar to see what was wrong. I crept down very quiet, but found
everything quite still and everything in its place, but on returning to my
bedroom it commenced again. I heard doors banging, and outside of my
door the noise was as if two people were wrestling one with the other. The
same kind of noise continued for some considerable time. At last I fell
asleep. I might have slept 20 minutes when the noise became so great I
could not stay in bed any longer, so creeping out to see what it was, but I
found I could not see anything, but still the noise continued the same. I
stood listening in the pantry about 10 minutes, and all of a sudden the
pantry door went bang, but still not a single thing could I see move. I
returned to my bed, and in less than two minutes I heard footsteps passing
to and fro on the stairs, which are at the head of my bedstead and have only
a very thin partition to part. Well, noises continued the same for a con-
siderable length of time. I was disturbed two or three times a week. A
nurse who slept over me heard the same kind of noises as I have described.
On March 9th, 1886, at 4.30 p.m., I went into the library and did up the fire;
on coming out I put the scuttle down to fasten the door after me. On
turning to pick the scuttle up I saw a figure standing before me; it was
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dressed in a brown garment with two tassels hanging at the left side; her figure was perfect with the exception of a head, which I could not see, as it appeared to me like a black mist. I stood like one struck dumb for about 10 seconds; I caught up the scuttle to fly when I felt something touch my left side. It was like a very cold hand, and a very cold chill passed over me at the time. I felt very sick, as the sudden shock was too much for my system. I felt ill all the evening after. I spoke to Mr. Z. on the following morning. He did not seem the least surprised to hear of it, as everybody was fully acquainted with the noises. At a later date I was decorating the dinner-table with flowers, and on looking up I saw the same figure again. I did not feel frightened, as I wanted to have a good look at it, but I could not see anything more than on the last occasion. Well, time passed by, and everybody as well as myself was got quite used to the ghost. Whether by accident or not I cannot say, some ladies and gentlemen tried table-turning, and found Mr. Z. to be a very strong medium. On the same evening, as they were at the table-turning, I was putting the grog-tray on a small table at the foot of the drawing-room stairs when it appeared exactly in the same place I saw it on March 9th; it was moving very slowly towards me. I felt rather timid, and I stepped into my pantry rather quick, and on looking at the clock I found it to be exactly a quarter before 11. I retired to rest shortly after, not seeing or hearing anything more.

On the following morning, Saturday, June 26th, I told Mr. Z.; so he communicated it to Colonel and Mrs. Y. and Mrs. M., they being bosom friends of one another, and Mrs. M. being a medium with the table. So they came down in the evening for table-turning.

[The narrator here goes on to recount a series of questions put to the "spirit," who replied by tilting the table, indicating a spot in the cellar where a box of jewels had been buried.]

Mr. Z. rang the bell and told me she said she would appear at 11, and he wished me to be present. At seven minutes to 11 I went into the drawing-room; then the medium asked if she was coming, and she said, "Now." We turned the gas down very low and put open the door; a gas-light was burning outside the door, which threw a light into the drawing-room. I placed my hands upon the table and I felt every nerve in my body move, for it felt stronger to the nerves than a galvanic battery. I took my hands off and stood behind Colonel Y.'s chair, with Mr. and Mrs. Z. at my left, Mrs. M. and Mrs. Y. next, and a Mr. J. on the outside, and as the clock struck 11 it walked very slowly, and stood opposite the gallery of the drawing-room. She appeared very indistinctly; the medium asked her to appear clear, and she immediately raised herself about three feet from the floor. Mrs. Z. and Mrs. M. could see everything as well as myself. She showed herself to us as clear as possible. Her dress was the same shape, with large bell sleeves and two tassels at the side. The colour of her dress was a light shiny kind of Japanese silk; it seemed to me as if it were figured with a flower similar to a chrysanthemum. Her feet seemed to be standing on a dark cloud, and she threw her arms up and down and continually wrung her hands and clutched her hair. Her face was of a long haggard-looking appearance, with a long thin nose. She looked very miserable. Her hair was very fair, but seemed to be torn to pieces, for it hung in one thick-
looking mass over her shoulders nearly to her waist. Her ears were very small and her eyes were cast up and appeared like balls of fire. She moved about the room and came close to me; her hand was held up to touch me, but I stepped in at the side of Colonel Y.'s chair. I felt quite ill; I never felt so sick before; then every drop of blood in my body seemed to be frozen. I felt sinking through the floor. Mr. Z. turned up the gas; she disappeared for a few minutes. I sat down to rest for a while. Still I felt I had not seen enough; so we prepared for her again. I sat on a chair in front of the table, and was holding Mr. J.'s hand, when she appeared in front of me again. As soon as I said, "There it is!" I felt Mr. J. sniggle up close to me, and he held my hand so tight that if I had wanted to get up to run back I should have found it difficult, as I was held down so tight. At last I got up to go near it, as she wished me to follow her. As soon as I stepped nearer to her she turned towards the door very slowly, and as she passed out of the door a flash of light struck over the room. It was as if someone had turned on and off an electric light. I followed to the cellar but could not find anything. We brought the table to the cellar, and she wished us to commence to dig up the treasures she had buried. She said her maid assisted her to bury them, and gave her name as E. H.; but being Saturday night we determined to wait until Monday to see if they were in the place as indicated. We wished her good-night.

On the following Monday, June 28th, B. and myself began to dig at the place; we removed the flagstones, but found the soil had never been disturbed. At last we came across a hole that had been moved, but there was nothing there. I got the table and asked her to appear over the spot. After some time she stood in the centre of the cellar and said it was there, but on digging we found nothing. She seemed to be dreadfully excited; she flung her arms in all directions on disappearing. B., the gardener, saw the flash of light. After digging all day and finding nothing we were determined to ask her why we had not found them, when she declared that they are there somewhere. She says she has lost the exact spot, but begged of us to help her.

Well, time passed by and I saw her again outside of the library door. Dinner being over I just left the dining-room, when she stood opposite the library door. It was about 8.30; and at a later date when some gentlemen dined here I saw her in the same spot. She has been dressed always in the same shaped dress; and I believe what she has answered in the way of questions to be perfectly true, and that the jewels or valuables, or whatever they may be, are still hidden in the cellar, and she will haunt this house till they are found. She may have lost the spot where they are hidden, but still I believe that some day the secret will be revealed, and she will receive the rest she says she shall get after.

I had a long talk on March 20th, 1888, with W. L., a rather delicate, refined looking man about 30 years old, as I should judge. He told me he had had no other visual hallucination, but he appears to have had previous experiences, seemingly of an hallucinatory nature, for which he was unable to account. He seemed, as indeed is evident
from his account, to be of a nervous and excitable disposition, with a full appreciation of the dramatic situations in his story.

Mr. Z., in sending us the account in July, 1886, writes:—

The above narrative written by my butler I believe to be true. Personally I have never seen her (the apparition) but I certainly have never had any reason to doubt the truth of the foregoing statement.

My wife has seen the apparition on four separate occasions. The chief interest in this affair seems to me to be in the utility of table-turning. I had never seen any table manifestations before, and we only began it one evening to pass away the time, and when we sat down we had no more idea that this particular spirit would make itself manifest than that any useful results might possibly accrue from our amusement. I had often heard peculiar noises in the house, and the servants called the place “haunted,” but nothing had ever occurred to establish the fact until last winter, when the butler saw the shadow when putting coals on the fire. One fact seems to be satisfactorily established, and that is, two or three people out of a room full can see a spirit, and the others remain in ignorance of its presence. I have tried on four occasions to see it when it has appeared. My wife, a lady friend, and the butler could see it, but four other people present failed to do so. In one place in the narrative the butler says that the spirit “raised itself” off the ground. I had better explain that there is a gallery at one end of the drawing-room, and it was on to this the shadow raised itself; of course I could not see it do so, for I have mentioned before my inability to see it, but that it did really raise itself on to the gallery there can be very little doubt, as all the people who saw it said so at the moment the action took place.

Mrs. Z. has, unfortunately, so far declined to furnish a written narrative of her experiences. At a personal interview, however, in March, 1888, she gave me a very full account of her own share in the matter, which entirely corresponded with that given by Mr. Z. and the butler. The séances referred to lasted for about six weeks in June or July, 1886. The woman's figure described by W. L. was, Mrs. Z. told me, also seen by her and by Mrs. M. during these séances, but at no other time. As far as she knew, all three saw the same figure. Mrs. Z. saw the face distinctly, and subsequently recognised it in a photograph of a lady who had lived in the house a few years previously. Mrs. Z. did not come to the neighbourhood until some years after this lady's death, and had never previously seen her, or any picture of her. She has had no other hallucination.

As regards the recognition of the photograph, Mr. Z. writes, in May, 1888:—

You ask me to tell you my account of the recognition of the photograph. I think that the butler’s recognition does not amount to much.

It (i.e., the photograph) was lying on my table one morning and on his coming into the room I asked him if he had ever seen anyone like it. He
said the eyes, forehead, and nose he knew, but that he somehow could not put a name to it though he had seen the person several times. I told him who it was supposed to be and then he said, "The eyes I should have known anywhere, but I have never seen the whole face so distinctly as this photo gives it," or words to that effect.

The second case is certainly more remarkable.

A gentleman in C., hearing of the supposed appearances and of my wife's having seen the apparition, brought over half a dozen photos, amongst others one of what is supposed to be the spirit, to test my wife. She was not present in the room when he arrived, but came in about a quarter of an hour later. We purposely refrained from mentioning the subject at all.

Taking up the photos I asked her if any of them reminded her of a friend, all the pictures being about twenty years old. She looked them through, and thought one an early one of a friend who was present.

I took up one and tossed it across the tea-table, and only uttered the words "Who's that?" and she, after looking at it for a moment, said, "Oh, that's the ghost—where on earth did it come from?"

We were all rather staggered at her recognition, especially the gentleman who brought the pictures, as he had laughed the whole thing to scorn.

Personally I am no believer in apparitions, and I offered a thousand pounds to anyone who would show me the ghost who so unceremoniously haunts my house. There the matter rests. Some people declare they have seen it, but others, including myself, cannot see the thing even when it is supposed to be close to one.

Under the conditions described it must be admitted to be possible that Mrs. Z. received unconscious indications, from the manner or look of those around, of the answer that was expected of her. But even so, her recognition of the photograph was certainly a remarkable incident. Our wonder, however, is somewhat diminished when we learn, as Mr. and Mrs. Z. informed me, that Colonel Y. had been acquainted with the deceased lady whom the phantasm was supposed to represent. Now Colonel Y. had been present at the various séances at which the figure had appeared: and as it appears, from Mr. Z.'s account, that those who were privileged to see the figure described at the time what they saw to the others, we can conceive it possible that the hallucination might take a definite outline under the guidance of leading questions and unconscious hints from the Colonel, who of all the spectators was likely to take the most interest in the details of the appearance. It is possible also that thought-transference may have aided in the development of the phantasm, or in the subsequent recognition of the photograph. But this supposition is, perhaps, under the circumstances hardly necessary.

The incident of the recognition of the photograph is thus deprived of much of its significance; but apart from this the story presents some remarkable features. The hallucinations in this case were unusually
frequent and unusually persistent; and the appearance of a phantasm, on several distinct occasions, and for a period of certainly some minutes, to three persons simultaneously, is a phenomenon perhaps without parallel in our records. The appearance of a phantasm at a predicted time is also very unusual, if not unique, except when it is the result of post-hypnotic suggestion. There are some parallel cases of figures seen by several persons simultaneously at a séance, where there was no ground for suspecting fraud. On the whole, it seems possible that the conditions of a Spiritualistic séance, admittedly favourable to the production of abnormal states, may also be favourable to the production and communication of hallucinations.

It will be noticed, moreover, that here also the phenomena began with noises, which appear to have exercised a very disturbing influence on the butler, W. L. Moreover, the two chief witnesses, and the only witnesses who saw any apparition when alone, appear to have been unusually subject to impressions of the kind, and were not highly educated persons. I learnt incidentally from another source that the house had been known some 20 years before to old inhabitants of the village as the "Haunted House," though no rumour of its reputation appears to have reached Mr. Z. or his servants. In such a case it seems possible that the phenomena may have been started in the minds of susceptible subjects by telepathic impressions received from the outside. As a correspondent suggests, in writing of another case, "the combined expectancy of a rural population may have uncomfortable telepathic consequences."

In the absence, however, of Mrs. M.'s evidence, and of a written statement from Mrs. Z., both of which it is hoped to obtain on some future occasion, the evidence in this case can hardly be considered complete.

The last case will lead us by an easy transition to that large class of narratives, of which many illustrations have been given in the last two Parts of the Proceedings, where the hallucinatory impression appears to be directly referable to the agency of some known deceased person. The evidence presented in many of these cases is of such quality as to compel our very careful consideration. The main incidents narrated are in many cases amply corroborated; and the details, it must be admitted, appear in most cases to be recorded with care. The question is no longer, therefore, so much of the acceptance of the evidence as of its interpretation.

For the sake of clearness, I will discuss the several narratives brought forward arranged under separate heads, in accordance with the various interpretations, or, rather, modifications of one primary interpretation, which I would suggest for them.
A. Cases Explicable by the "Latency" of a Telepathic Impression.

In some of the cases (e.g., *Proceedings*, Vol. V., Case IV., p. 412; Case IX., p. 432; Case XX., p. 455), the exact time of the death being indeterminate, it is possible to refer the phantom to telepathy from the mind of the still living agent. This explanation may, indeed, be hazarded in all cases where the agent was personally known to the percipient, if we admit the possibility of a telepathic impression lying latent for a few hours or days, or even weeks. (*Proceedings*, Vol. III., Case of Mr. Wambey, p. 91 (G. 357); Case of Julia X., p. 92 (G. 477). *Proceedings*, Vol. V., Case I., p. 408; Case II., p. 409; Case III., p. 412; Case VII., p. 420; Case X., p. 434; Case XIX., p. 453; Case XXII., p. 461; Case XXVI., p. 468, et seq.) It is true that we have little positive evidence for the latency of a telepathic impression. But there are a few of our so far recorded cases which unquestionably point to such an interpretation, though in these cases the latency appears to have been only of a few hours' duration. Miss X.'s researches, however, in crystal-vision (*Proceedings*, Vol. V., p. 486, et seq.) prove that normal sense impressions received by the unconscious self may remain latent for a day or more before emerging into consciousness; and may then be externalised as hallucinatory images. So, too, ideas communicated to a subject in the hypnotic trance may remain latent for many months, and may then become externalised either in a pre-enjoined action or in a sensory hallucination. If we may rely on the oft-quoted case of the girl, once servant to a Hebrew scholar, who years afterwards, in an access of delirium, astonished her attendants by reciting Hebrew words and sentences, we have an instance of sensory impressions originally recorded, it is probable, by unconscious centres, coming to the surface in a pathological condition. And it is noteworthy that in one of the cases now under review (*Proceedings*, Vol. V., Case II., p. 410) the percipient was in a pathological condition, i.e., recovering from childbirth. And in another case (*Proceedings*, Vol. V., Case X., p. 434) the percipient was operating with planchette, an occupation which is known to facilitate the emergence of unconscious impressions. So, too, in the small group of cases (*Proceedings*, Vol. III., p. 92, &c.) where the percipient on his deathbed becomes aware of the death of some friend, his pathological condition may be supposed to have aided in the development of a telepathic impression received at the time of the death. In cases, however, where news of the death has been intentionally withheld from the percipient by those around him, it seems easiest to refer the supernormal intelligence to direct communication from their minds, admittedly more or less pre-occupied with the news. Finally we must bear in mind that from the very nature of the case it would be almost
impossible to obtain conclusive evidence of the latency of a telepathic impression for any lengthened period. We can hardly, therefore, be justified in assigning any Procrustean limits to the operation of this cause. At all events, in our present ignorance, to postulate an unknown cause is more hazardous than to assume an unproved extension of the operations of a familiar agency.

In some of these cases, however, the explanation more directly suggested by the facts is that of thought-transference from persons still living at the time of the vision. This is most obvious in Case VII. (Proceedings, Vol. V., p. 420), which I have, for convenience, included under this head, although the dead persons were personally unknown to the percipient, because there is no assertion that the faces were recognised in the dream. A Quaker lady in England has a clairvoyant dream of a horse and cart, with two young women unknown to her, sinking in deep water, and subsequently discovers that her dream occurred but a few hours after the death of an unknown niece and her companion in Australia, in the manner indicated in the dream. Here, as indeed is suggested by Mr. Myers, the dream may well be supposed to have had its origin in the mind of the percipient's brother, whose thoughts in his grief and agitation would be likely to turn towards his relatives in England. In Case XXII. (Vol. V., p. 461) Mr. K. sees an apparition of his father lying in his coffin on the day and at the hour, as he states, when his father was actually buried. This choice of a time, inexplicable if we refer the vision to the action of the dead man, is seen to be peculiarly appropriate if we trace its origin to the minds of the mourners at the graveside. In Case XIX. (Proceedings, Vol. V., p. 453), that impression may have come from the mother of the dead child. In Case II. (Proceedings, Vol. V., p. 410), the father of the percipient is said to have known of the death, and to have known also that the news of the death would be of interest to the percipient.

The very remarkable story of General Barter and the spectral cavalcade (Proceedings, Vol. V., Case XXVI., p. 468, et seq.) seems to come under the same head. It is not inconceivable, that is, that the vision was due to the development of a latent image, since the figure represented the dead man as he was during life. It seems more plausible, however, to attribute it to telepathy from Lieutenant Deane, who had been well acquainted with the deceased during the last few months of his life, and who had left the percipient but a few minutes before. On the assumption that the vision had been due to the direct action of the deceased, its coincidence with Lieutenant Deane's visit remains unexplained. Another feature brought out prominently in the case, but which is common to all these stories, is that the vision is seen from the outside; as it would appear, that is, not to the principal actor, but to an interested spectator. It may even be suggested that, in some of the
cases where an apparition is seen at the time of death in the clothes actually then worn by the decedent, or in the actual circumstances of death, the origin of the vision is to be sought in the minds of the bystanders. The difficulty of supposing the thoughts of the dying man to be preoccupied with the idea of his own clothes would thus be eliminated; for whilst the clothes of the dying man do occupy a prominent position in the perception of the bystanders, they frequently do not even enter into the field of vision of the man himself.

In the great majority of the cases under consideration, however, the hypothesis of latency is clearly inadequate, and the suggestion of thought-transference from the living requires further justification.

(B) Cases Explicable by Collective Hallucination.

Frequently the apparition is seen by two or more persons simultaneously, all of whom were acquainted with the presumed agent in his lifetime. It is admitted that the apparition in such cases is not the person whom it resembles; that the popular ideas of the personality of the figure seen are at fault, and that it is, in fact, a hallucinatory image. But it is argued that the collectivity of the impression proves that it is in some sense veridical, and serves to distinguish it from a merely casual hallucination. We must, in such a case, it is contended, look for the source of the apparition in the mind, or what part of it has survived the change of death, of the person whom the apparition represents, and to whom, it is suggested, it bears a relation possibly analogous to the relation between the living agents and the hallucinatory images discussed in Phantasms of the Living. Of course, in the present state of our knowledge it would be rash to assert that such a position is untenable, or even difficult. But it may be pointed out that it involves not one assumption, but two. It assumes, in the first place, the survival after death of some form of consciousness, and in the second place, the affection by this consciousness of the minds of persons still living. The extraneous evidence for both these assumptions—the evidence, that is, outside the records now under consideration—will be differently estimated by different inquirers. But from the scientific standpoint no great weight can be attached to it, and it may even be suggested that the best evidence for either assumption is to be found in the facts which it is invoked to explain. On the other hand, the hypothesis suggested in this paper, that the phenomena are due to telepathy from the minds of living persons, advances but little beyond the facts already accepted by most members of the Society for Psychical Research. There is no question here of the existence of the supposed agents, nor of the operation under certain conditions of thought-transference. There is evidence that a man can transmit the image of some inanimate object—a picture or a
card—from his own mind to that of another person. There is evidence also that he can cause a hallucinatory image resembling himself to appear to another person. There is even some evidence already for the further action required by our hypothesis, the evocation of the hallucinatory image of some person other than the agent.

It may be admitted that the evidence in this last case is at present somewhat meagre. But it can scarcely be held that its rarity (unless, indeed, it can be shown that we should be justified in expecting more evidence to have been forthcoming) goes far to impair the validity of the theory as a working hypothesis. We have noticed already (p. 284) a case in which a dream of two dead persons may plausibly be explained by telepathy from the mind of a living relation. In the following narrative, where the impression took the form of a waking vision, a similar explanation seems almost inevitable. Few, probably, will look for the source of this vision of the dead child and his dog elsewhere than in the mind of the mother. The case was sent to Mr. Hodgson by Mrs. G., on the 18th May, 1888, and was published in the Arena, an American magazine, for February last.

. . . For nearly two weeks I have had a lady friend visiting us from Chicago and last Sunday we tried the cards and in every instance I told the colour and kind; but only two or three times was enabled to give the exact number. . . .

I must write you of something that occurred last night; after this lady, whom I have mentioned above, had retired, and almost immediately after we had extinguished the light, there suddenly appeared before me a beautiful lawn and coming toward me a chubby, yellow-haired little boy, and by his side a brown dog which closely resembled a fox. The dog had on a brass collar and the child's hand was under the collar just as if he was leading or pulling the dog. The vision was like a flash, came and went in an instant. I immediately told my friend and she said: "Do you know where there are any matches?" and began to hurriedly climb out of bed. I struck a light, she plunged into her trunk, brought out a book, and pasted in the front was a picture of her little boy and his dog. They were not in the same position that I saw them, but the dog looked exceedingly familiar. Her little boy passed into the beyond about four years ago. . . .

Mrs. I. F. corroborates as follows:—

May 18th, 1888.

I wish to corroborate the statements of Mrs. N. G. relative to . . . . and her wonderful vision of my little boy, and my old home. Mrs. G. never saw the place, or the little child, and never even heard of the peculiar-looking dog, which was my little son's constant companion out of doors. She never saw the photograph, which was pasted in the back of my Bible and packed away.

(Signed) I. F.

It is important to notice that in this case the vision appears to have
been the sequel of some experiments in thought-transference, conducted with but partial success a day or two before. It may be urged, however, that the vision here was not completely externalised. It was a picture which Mrs. G. saw, not a fully developed phantasmal figure. In the next case, however (L. 662), which, though remote, appears to be well attested by contemporary evidence, an unusually life-like phantasm was seen by two observers. The narrative was published in 1822 by H. M. Wesermann, Government Assessor and Chief Inspector of Roads at Düsseldorf, &c.¹ Some speculation of Mesmer's suggested to Wesermann to try to transfer mental images to sleeping friends at a distance; all the more, probably, because he had once succeeded in doing so some years before, though at the time inclined to attribute his success to chance. He first gives accounts of four experiments in which he was successful in thus imposing dreams on his friends. In his fifth experiment, however, at a distance of nine miles, he succeeded in impressing two waking percipients. The account is in his own words.

A lady who had been dead five years, was to appear to Lieutenant ——n in a dream at 10.30 p.m. and incite him to good deeds. At half-past 10, contrary to expectation, Herr ——n had not gone to bed, but was discussing the French campaign with his friend Lieutenant S. in the ante-room. Suddenly the door of the room opened, the lady entered dressed in white, with a black kerchief and uncovered head, greeted S. with her hand three times in a friendly manner; then turned to ——n, nodded to him, and returned again through the doorway.

As this story, related to me by Lieutenant ——n, seemed to be too remarkable from a psychological point of view for the truth of it not to be duly established, I wrote to Lieutenant S., who was living six miles away, and asked him to give me his account of it. He sent me the following reply:

D—n, January 11th, 1818.

... On the 13th of March, 1817, Herr ——n came to pay me a visit at my lodgings about a league from A——. He stayed the night with me. After supper, and when we were both undressed, I was sitting on my bed and Herr ——n was standing by the door of the next room on the point also of going to bed. This was about half-past 10. We were speaking partly about indifferent subjects and partly about the events of the French campaign. Suddenly the door out of the kitchen opened without a sound, and a lady entered, very pale, taller than Herr ——n, about five feet four inches in height, strong and broad of figure, dressed in white, but with a large black kerchief which reached to below the waist. She entered with bare head, greeted me with the hand three times in complimentary fashion, turned

¹ In Der Magnetismus und die Allgemeine Weltsprache, p. 28 et seq. See the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research for March, 1890, from which the above account is quoted. See also Phantasms of the Living, Vol. I., p. 101, where an account is given of the four dreams referred to, as well as an imperfect version of the narrative quoted in the text. The version in Phantasms is taken from the Archiv für den Thierischen Magnetismus, Vol. VI.
round to the left towards Herr ——n, and waved her hand to him three times; after which the figure quietly, and again without any creaking of the door, went out. We followed at once in order to discover whether there were any deception, but found nothing. The strangest thing was this, that our night-watch of two men, whom I had shortly before found on the watch, were now asleep, though at my first call they were on the alert, and that the door of the room, which always opens with a good deal of noise, did not make the slightest sound when opened by the figure.

Commenting on this story, Mrs. Sidgwick writes:—

"Wesermann states that in his experiments he concentrated his mind strongly on the subject to be transferred. It is much to be regretted that so little information is given to us as to his mode of action and as to other points. We have no reason to think that those with whom he experimented were persons whom he had mesmerised, or with whom he was in any way in special rapport. Lieutenant S., indeed, was a complete stranger to him, but this proves little, as his impression may have been received from Lieutenant ——n. Again we are left quite in the dark as to how often Wesermann tried similar experiments, but it seems probable that he sometimes failed, since he tells us in a letter contributed to Nasse's Zeitschrift für Psychische Aerzte, Vol. III., p. 758, that he had observed that these dream-pictures are only transferred to the sleepers if they are of a kind to interest, move, or surprise them. From the same source we learn that, in his view, apparitions such as that described above could seldom be produced; only, in fact, when the agent is brought into a very emotional and excited state about the subject chosen to be transferred, and when the percipient, whether owing to his physical or his mental constitution, is specially susceptible. He tells us, however, that he could relate more experiments if space permitted, but that he had found few friends who obtained such successful results as these. In a paper in the Archiv für den Thierischen Magnetismus, quoted in Phantasms of the Living, he says that only two of his friends succeeded. On the other hand he had convinced one of his strongest opponents—a doctor of law—who had himself caused his daughter to dream of a sudden attack of illness which had seized him in the night."

It cannot be contended that in any of the stories yet brought forward the phantasm is of such a nature that it could not have emanated from the mind of a living person as the result either of a spontaneous or a premeditated effort of thought-transference, such as are illustrated in the two narratives just given. In few, if any, of the cases can it even be held more probable—conceding the possibility of post-mortem agency—that the phantasm was due to such agency. In many cases the suggested alternative is distinctly to be preferred, on the internal evidence
alone. And it may fairly be urged that the theory which introduces no new postulates, and which deals only with familiar agencies, is entitled to claim precedence over any other, until it can be shown that it fails to account for the facts. For this, after all, is the most crucial test which it is, at present, in our power to apply. Will the hypothesis of telepathy from the living furnish an equally complete explanation of the phenomena recorded?

Let us apply it, for instance, to the following narrative (G. 190), which we owe to the Rev. W. S. Grignon, who received from Mrs. Davis in December, 1888, a verbal account of the incident, almost identical in terms with the narrative here given:

G. 190.

During the night of the 31st of December, 1882, I had a most remarkable vision. I retired late, having been with my daughters to the midnight service at the English Church. Mr. Davis, whose room adjoined mine, is an invalid, and, not caring to sit up so late, retired before I left for the church. On my return, judging from my husband's breathing that he was asleep, I did not inquire, as I usually did, if he wished anything. I fell asleep at once, but was awakened by an unusual light in my room. I sprang up in a tremor, exclaiming, "What is it?" and saw gliding by my bed the figure of an elderly person; it passed through the closed door into Mr. Davis's room. I fell asleep and did not wake again till morning. I should say that living as we did in the rez de chaussée, my shutters were closed, and the heavy curtains drawn and pinned together, so that no light could enter from the street. Owing to the fact that the next day was the first day of the year, and the news our papers gave us of Gambetta's death, the incident was forgotten until after dinner; we dined at six. I was still at the table, Mr. Davis had gone into the drawing-room, when he said to my youngest daughter, "Tell your mother a ghost visited me last night; she is not the only one they honour." For a moment I could not speak; my apparition was remembered, and I was, I confess, frightened by the remarkable coincidence that Mr. Davis should have seen the same figure that I saw, and in whom he recognised his mother. I ought to say that Mrs. Davis had been dead then 10 years, and that we had not spoken of her for a long time. Nothing occurred after the vision.

C. J. Davis.

In reply to a question from Mr. Grignon, Mrs. Davis adds, in the same letter:

I have had similar visions but have always attributed them to indigestion. This case, however, is somewhat different, appearing, as it did, to Mr. Davis also.

Florence, Pension Laurent.

February 21st, 1889.

Mr. Davis, whose account is enclosed in the same letter, writes:

On the night between the 31st of December, 1882, and New Year's Day of 1883, I was awakened from a quiet sleep by a light which seemed to come in at the door leading to my wife's chamber, and immediately a figure appeared, approached the bed, and leaned down as if to kiss me, and
suddenly passed away, but not before I had recognised in the features of the apparition those of my mother, who died in 1872, aged 81. The next day I recollected this visit and said to Mrs. D., "I can see ghosts as well as you; I saw one last night." And thereupon I related the circumstances to her. She exclaimed, "I was awakened by the appearance of the same figure and I knew it to be your mother," whom she had known practically all her life. Nothing came of the vision. I never had any other, before or since, worth relating, certainly none that I can recall.

G. H. DAVIS.

In forwarding the account to us on the 25th February, 1889, Mr. Grignon writes, with reference to the discrepancies in the two accounts:

A more important difference lies in his stating that his wife said at the time, "I knew it to be your mother," whereas she does not say that she recognised the figure at the moment of seeing it, describing it merely as "the figure of an elderly person." During her conversation with me I questioned her on this point and clearly recollect her saying that the face of the figure as it passed was not turned to her, and that she did not absolutely recognise it, but she seems to have had at the time an indefinite sort of impression of its being her husband's mother. Probably this impression would have been strengthened by what her husband saw, and with many persons would have rapidly grown into a certainty that she knew the figure. I think it speaks well for her accuracy that she adheres still to her original recollections of the fact.

The clue to the interpretation of the incident appears to lie in Mrs. Davis's statement that she has had other hallucinations, which she believes to have been purely subjective; and that, but for the accident of her husband's sharing it, she would have classed as subjective the experience above described. But if we make the assumption that a hallucination can be telepathically transferred: that is, if we suppose that an idea, which is so exceptional in its vividness as to affect the external organs of sense, is equally capable with other less vivid ideas—say of a card or a diagram—of being transferred from one mind to another, this difficulty disappears. The figure seen by Mrs. Davis may still have been a purely subjective hallucination, and her husband's vision merely the reflection of hers. Whether Mrs. Davis did or did not believe herself at the time to recognise the figure seems immaterial. On the first supposition she transferred to Mr. Davis the image of a figure long familiar to them both; on the other, the transferred image was slightly modified in its passage through Mrs. Davis's mind.

Mr. Myers has several cases which come under this head. (Proceedings, Vol. V., Case XII., p. 437; Case XIV., p. 440; Case XV., p. 442—the figures here being on most occasions unrecognised;—Case XVII., p. 447; Case XVIII., p. 450. Proceedings, Vol. VI.

1 Case XVI., Proceedings, Vol. V., p. 444, has been withdrawn.
Case II., p. 20; Case IV., p. 25-29; Case XII., pp. 55.) In all these cases the fact of the death is known, and the image of the dead person, or some hallucinatory appearance assumed to have reference to him, is seen simultaneously or successively by two or more persons who were acquainted with him when alive. In none of these cases is the apparition of such a nature that it cannot as plausibly be referred to a contagious hallucination as to the action of the deceased person whom it resembles. And it will be noticed that in at least one instance (Proceedings, Vol. VI., Case IV., p. 26) the lady who was first to see the figure, and who may therefore perhaps be regarded as the primary percipient, had experienced a previous hallucination, unshared; a circumstance which may be regarded as indicating some predisposition to sensory hallucination.

(C) Cases Involving an Element Unknown to the Percipient.

A very striking story (Proceedings, Vol. VI., Case I., p. 17) comes to us from the American Society for Psychical Research, in which a brother sees an apparition of his dead sister, with a scratch on the face, which, as it subsequently appears, was accidentally inflicted by the mother of the dead girl as she lay in her coffin. In this case it seems much less likely that the apparition was generated by the deceased than by her mother, on whom the incident of the scratch had made, as is proved by her own admission, a painful and lasting impression. To attribute it to the mind of the dead girl yet another assumption, beyond the two general assumptions already referred to, is necessary, to wit, that the dead have cognisance of their bodily appearance, not only during life, but after death. The same remarks will apply to the case of Robert Mackenzie (quoted in Proceedings, III., p. 95, et seq.); but here it seems probable that, while the details of the personal appearance of the corpse originated with one of the spectators, the percipient's own mind supplied the words put into the mouth of the phantasm in the dream. As Mrs. D., however, was actually reading a letter announcing the death at the time of her husband's dream, it seems possible that her mind may have originated, or at least reinforced, the telepathic impression received by Mr. D.

(D) Cases Involving the Transference of the Image of an Unknown Person.

From the last story we may pass to a class of cases which must be admitted to be the most difficult of explanation: those, namely, in which the percipient is unacquainted with the person whose phantasmal likeness he sees. In cases where the percipient had known the dead man by sight, it is always permissible to suppose that the hallucinatory image (when it contains no previously unknown details) has been
constructed from the percipient's own materials, the impulse to the construction alone having come from an alien source. But in the cases now to be considered we have to suppose the importation into the percipient's consciousness of a phantasmal image already completed, down even to very minute details. The difficulty may be frankly admitted; but it is common to both hypotheses. It could only appear easier for the spirit of a dead man to transmit such images, because we believe ourselves to know something of the limitations of ordinary human faculties, whilst we are free to ascribe to the dead whatever powers our imagination may feign. Of course, in such cases we must be specially on our guard against the dramatic instinct of the imagination, and the tendency, already referred to, to import from a subsequent description new details into the image actually seen. And, as already pointed out, verbal descriptions of a figure or dress are generally so vague as to readily lend themselves to such unconscious manipulation. We may suspect, therefore, that in many of the cases considered in this paper, the resemblance between the figure seen and the figure of the presumed agent may have been exaggerated. Our numerous informants have, no doubt, in every case given evidence in perfect good faith. To say that their evidence is not, on that account, to be taken in all cases as accurately representing the facts, is only to admit that they are not exempt from the common defects of observation, memory, and judgment, in a field where such exemption is a privilege accorded to very few. And it must be borne in mind that in these matters human testimony is peculiarly liable to suffer from the disturbing influence of the various affections and emotions engaged. It would be extremely difficult, in any particular case, to show that there is reason, on the merely general grounds above referred to, to suspect exaggeration; and when possible, it would, for obvious reasons, be undesirable. If, therefore, attention is not called to these perturbing elements in every case, their effect should, nevertheless, be allowed for in estimating the value of the evidence. But even when so much has been said, it still seems probable that detailed resemblances have, in some cases, been observed. In one case indeed, (Proceedings, Vol. V., Case V., p. 416), the phantasm was subsequently recognised from a photograph.

A case very similar to those quoted by Mr. Myers is given in Phantasms of the Living (Vol. I., Case 30, p. 214). Frances Reddell, a lady's-maid, is watching by the sick bed of a fellow-servant. She sees enter the room the phantasm of an old woman, with a red shawl over her shoulders, a flannel petticoat with a hole in front, and a brass candlestick in her hand: and subsequently recognised in the mother of the sick woman the original of her vision. To those who hold that these phantasms resembling the dead are in some fashion produced by the dead, the figure seen by Frances Reddell will, no doubt, be
attributed to the agency of Mrs. Alexander, suffering some spiritual attraction to the bedside of her dying daughter. To my thinking, the vision probably originated in a dream of the dying girl herself, transferred to her companion, and externalised as a sensory hallucination. The same explanation would apply to the stories, of not infrequent occurrence in the annals of the older members of the Society of Friends and elsewhere, of visions seen by the watchers at the bedside of the dying. The following case, which comes to us from a trustworthy source, may be quoted as an illustration.¹

G. 134.

The story was given to us, in February, 1883, by Miss Walker, of 48, Pemnroke-road, Clifton, Bristol, as her recollection of what she had heard from her cousin, Miss Emmeline Bingley, the percipient, who is now dead. Later, Miss Walker writes:—

The event narrated took place when she was about 20, and must have happened in (I think) 1844 or 1845. She told me her story very simply and evi1 voce. She also told it separately to my elder sister in precisely the same terms. It was I who threw it, for brevity's sake, into the narrative form.

The story is as follows:—

My father and mother had many children; most of us died in infancy; Susanna survived, and Charlotte and myself. Owing to these many gaps, Susanna was 20 years older than I was. Father's was an entailed estate, and the deaths of two sons, William, who died in boyhood, and John, who died in infancy, had been the great disappointment of his life. Susanna remembered both the boys, but William was born and died long before my time, and John died at about two years old when I was the baby. Of William there was no likeness, but you know John's picture well, a well-painted full-length oil picture representing a toddling babe in white frock and blue shoes, one of my father's prize greyhounds crouching beside him, and an orange rolling at his feet. ... I was grown up, about 20, Susanna was 40, and Charlotte about 30 years old. Father was declining, and we lived together contented and united in a pleasant house on the borders of Harrogate Common. On the day about which I am writing Charlotte was unwell; she had complained of a chill, and the doctor recommended her to keep in bed. She was sleeping quietly that afternoon, and Susanna sat on one side of her bed, and I sat on the other; the afternoon sun was waning, and it began to grow dusky, but not dark. I do not know how long we had been sitting there, but by chance I raised my head and I saw a golden light above Charlotte's bed, and within the light were enfolded two Cherubs' faces gazing intently upon her. I was fascinated and did not stir, neither did the vision fade for a little while. At last I put my hand across the bed to Susanna, and I only said this word, "Susanna, look up!" She did so, and at once her countenance changed. "Oh, Emmeline," she said, "they are William and John."

¹Given in Phantasms of the Living, Vol. II., p. 629.
Then both of us watched on till all faded away like a washed-out picture; and in a few hours Charlotte died of sudden inflammation.

There is no need here to suppose that the vision represented in any sense the spiritual presence of the dead brothers. It may more easily, and with greater probability, be referred to the thoughts of the dying woman. So, in a story communicated by the late Mr. Archer Gurney to the Church Times some years ago, the vision of a crown is said to have appeared to the mourners at the bed of a dying child. The cases in which music is said to have been heard at the bedside of the dying are susceptible of a similar interpretation; the images traditionally associated with death thus receiving a sensory embodiment. That such sounds have their origin, in some cases at least, in the minds of the living the following narrative tends to show:—

L. 1070.

From Mr. Septimus Allen, Steward of Haileybury College.

In the year 1872 I was living in Leeds, where I had the supervision of one department of an engineering works. At this time one of my wife's brothers was living with us. He was a journeyman painter, employed by a firm of decorators in Leeds. My wife had two brothers and one sister who were all deaf and dumb. This one, John, had taken a severe cold from having got wet in the early morning, and working all day in his damp clothes. A very bad attack of rheumatic fever followed. Can you imagine a man suffering from intense rheumatic pains, swollen hands and arms, so that he could not use his fingers, which were his only means of conversation? If so, you can picture one of the most distressing cases, and one, I hope, we may never see the like. Not a pain could he describe, not a wish could he make known. He got worse, and we were told by the doctor that we should send for any members of the family that might desire to see him. At this time, one afternoon, my wife and I were at tea (our two children were out), when we heard pleasant musical sounds in John's bedroom; all the other persons upstairs, we were very much surprised, and went up at once. We found him lying upon his back, with his eyes fixed upon the ceiling, and his face lighted up with one of the brightest of smiles. We did not disturb him, but I fetched in a gentleman, who was our next-door neighbour, to witness what we felt to be a strange occurrence. After some little time (I cannot say how long now), Jack awoke, and used the words "Heaven" and "beautiful," as well as he could by the motion of his lips and facial expression. He also told us, in the same manner, upon becoming more conscious, that his brother Tom and sister Harriet were coming to see him, and (considering that they were also a mute) we felt that of all members of our family residing in Herts or Cambs, these two were the least likely to undertake such a journey, but in (perhaps) fifteen minutes, a cab drove up to the door, from which they alighted. They had sent no intimation, nor had anyone else, of their coming. After his partial recovery, when able to write or converse upon his fingers, he told us that he had been allowed to see into Heaven, and hear music, it was beautiful.
What were those musical sounds, and how did Jack know that Tom and Harriet were travelling?

Haileybury College, March, 1889.

In answer to our questions Mr. Allen writes further:

1. I have always had the idea that the music was as if instrumental, and composed of many chords, such as I imagine would be produced by a strong current of wind upon a harp.

2. I cannot say how long it lasted, or whether we heard it after we got into the room; our attention was given to John, who we thought was dying.

3. [The address of the house was] Pottery House, Hunslet, Leeds. Not one of a row: it was a portion of what had been a large house, situate in Jack-lane. This rough plan is as near correct as I can make it now.

The music could not have come from next door or from the street.


5. [The gentleman referred to was] Mr. John Britton, Pottery House, Hunslet. We have not heard anything of the Brittons for some years, and I think that we heard of Mr. John Britton's death eight or nine years ago. At the time of my brother-in-law's illness a young clergyman was living with us, and my wife says that while I ran for Mr. John Britton this clergyman went for the doctor.

6. I do not think [my brother-in-law] ever heard; he used to feel sound vibrations, caused (say) by an engine whistle at a railway station, or the report of a gun, but I do not think he ever heard as we do.

7. I think he must have been in some kind of a trance; his eyes were open.
The Rev. L. S. Milford, of Haileybury College, kindly furnishes the following notes of an interview which he held with Mr. and Mrs. Allen:—

(1) Neither Mr. nor Mrs. Allen have ever had any other auditory hallucination.

(2) As to the nature of the sound, Mrs. Allen says it resembled singing—sweet music without distinguishable words. She cannot say the number of notes, but the sounds continued until she reached the door of the bedroom. She went upstairs as soon as she heard the music.

Mr. Allen's impression is that the sound was that of an Æolian harp—i.e., not the ordinary staccato notes of the harp, but the sustained full notes as of an organ.

Mrs. Allen's Statement.

My brother was deaf and dumb from his birth, but could make a few inarticulate noises which those accustomed to him could interpret. No one else would have regarded them as words. He had been lying ill for about a fortnight with rheumatic fever, and was so weak as to be unable to talk on his fingers to me as he usually did. I had thought him that morning rather stronger, and as the improvement continued I left him to go down to tea. I had been sitting in the kitchen about five or six minutes—as the open staircase communicated with my brother's bedroom I could easily hear any noise—when I was startled by sounds of singing, as I thought, and immediately went upstairs, when the sounds ceased just before I reached the bedroom door. When I entered the room my brother was lying with his eyes wide open, gazing into the far corner of the room, away from the door. He evidently did not hear me coming in, and continued for fully twenty minutes in this state. Although I stood close to him he did not seem to show any sign of recognition, but went on smiling, and his lips moved though he were in conversation with someone, although no sound came from them.

We had sent Mr. Johnson, the curate who was lodging in the house, to fetch the doctor, as soon as I had called Mr. Allen upstairs. When the doctor came, my brother was in the same condition as that in which I had found him, but after the doctor had given him a teaspoonful of medicine (ether?) he seemed to revive and made me understand in his inarticulate speech that he had been to Heaven and had seen "lots of angels," his mother, his sister, and his little brother. All this came out in broken, disjointed utterances. After this he seemed to fall into a drowsy state, but this appeared to have been the crisis of the fever, and he began gradually to regain strength. He could not, however, walk about at all for more than three months.

As soon as he could use his hands he began at different times to tell me more details of what he had seen. I cannot remember more than I have stated above, but I am sure that he told me all this at first, although the details were fuller afterwards. He also used the words "beautiful music," but I cannot say whether he heard sweet sounds or only saw "harpers harping with their harps."

I told Mrs. Britton—our next-door neighbour—of the music that we
heard, and my impression is that Mr. Britton came in and saw my brother as he lay.

In March, 1883, about five hours before my brother's death, while I and the nurse were watching in the room, my brother, looking just as he did on the former occasion, smiled, and said quite distinctly and articulately, "Angels," and "Home."

[I have taken this statement from Mrs. Allen.

L. S. Milford,
Clerk in Holy Orders,

March 11th, 1889.
Assistant Master in Haileybury College.]

The Rev. J. B. Johnson writes:

I remember the case of the deaf mute to which you allude. I was lodging in the house at the time. But I certainly did not hear any strange music, nor do I remember hearing either Mr. or Mrs. Allen speak of it. Deaf mutes sometimes make strange noises in their attempts to speak, but such sounds are by no means musical.

26, De Beauvoir-road, N.

February 28th, 1889.

J. B. J.

As the patient in this case survived for some years, the sounds heard (the hallucinatory nature of which is clearly shown in the narrative) cannot with any plausibility be referred to post-mortem agency.

There is one narrative under this head (Vol. VI., Case III., p. 22) in which the explanation above suggested seems peculiarly applicable. Madame de Gilibert, as a child, sees the phantasmal figure of a woman, in which she recognises, from a verbal description furnished "many years afterwards," a great-aunt whom she had never known. The figure was seen in the house of Lord Egremont, the dead lady's brother, and in the immediate vicinity of his rooms; and it appears from the narrative that Lord Egremont died shortly after the appearance. A very similar story is that printed as Case II. in the same paper (p. 20); but in this case the figure, representing a lady who had been dead some years, was seen by three persons simultaneously, all of whom had been acquainted with her in life. The vision here appeared a few hours only before the death of a sister of the lady whom the phantasm was supposed to represent. In both these cases it is suggested that the apparitions, if correctly described, may have been due to thought-transference from the dying relative. In the other cases under this head (Proceedings, Vol. V., Cases V., VI., VIII., XI., XXI., XXIII., XXIV., XXV.; Vol. VI., Cases XI., XIII., XIV.) the connection of the percipient with the presumed agent is a purely local one. The phantasm appears to a stranger in some locality with which the deceased was connected in his lifetime; and (except in the one case where a photograph is recognised) the likeness between the phantasm and the deceased is only established by a subsequent comparison of the description given by the percipient.
with the description given by others of the personal appearance of the deceased. The influence of the locality on the receptivity of the percipient presents a real difficulty. It may, of course, be argued that this influence is only apparent. The older geologists were inclined to infer, from the extreme hardness and durability of the primitive rocks, the prevalence, in earlier periods of geological history, of widely different conditions of deposition and stratification. They failed to see that the superior hardness of the surviving strata was the condition of their survival, and that all less durable rocks must, in the course of ages, have been disintegrated. So it may be argued that apparitions resembling deceased persons may be comparatively frequent, but that it is only when some connection can be traced that the record attracts any attention. The great majority have never found a sacred bard. Or, conversely, that these phantasms were in reality only casual hallucinations, which have attained a spurious importance through an accidental coincidence. Candid readers will probably, however, admit that the coincidences in such cases are too detailed and too well authenticated to be lightly explained away.

For, in the first place, there are several instances already published of telepathic affection where there was no apparent link to connect the agent and percipient. Intimation of the deaths of three Dukes—Cambridge, Portland, and Wellington—was thus conveyed to complete strangers, as it were by an impersonal rumour. The head master of a grammar school at Leicester saw in a vision the irruption of water into the Thames Tunnel. This last case bears some analogy to the following narrative, which has recently been given to us; but in this case, if actually telepathic, it seems possible that the nearness of the percipient to the scene of the disaster may have in some way aided the impression. Miss Y. writes to us from Perth on the 19th January, 1890:

L. 1074.

One Sunday evening I was writing to my sister, in my own room downstairs, and a wild storm was raging round the house [in Perth]. Suddenly an eerie feeling came over me, I could not keep my thoughts on my letter, ideas of death and disaster haunted me so persistently. It was a vague but intense feeling; a sudden ghastly realisation of human tragedy, with no "where," "how," or "when" about it.

I remember flying upstairs to seek refuge with mother, and I remember her soothing voice saying, "Nonsense, child," when I insisted that I was sure "lots of people were dying."

We both thought it was a little nervous attack, and thought no more about it. But when we heard the news of the Tay Bridge disaster next day, we both noticed (we received the news separately from the maid when she
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came to wake us) that the time of the accident coincided with my strange experience of the evening before.

We spoke of the "coincidence" together, but did not attach much importance to it.

I have never had any experience like it, before or since; but I am nervous and imaginative, frightened of the dark and of ghosts, so I don't think my Tay Bridge presentiment is of much value. A wild wind like that is very uncanny to listen to when you are sitting alone, and is quite enough in itself to set a nervous imagination to work.

Mrs. Y., in a letter of the same date, corroborates her daughter's account:

On the night of the Tay Bridge disaster E. was sitting alone in her room, when she suddenly came running upstairs to me, saying that she had heard shrieks in the air; that something dreadful must have happened, for the air seemed full of shrieks. She thought a great many people must be dying. Next morning the milk-boy told the servant that the Tay Bridge was down.

In a later letter, Miss Y. adds:

Mother says she cannot remember my having any other experience of the kind. It happened before 9 p.m., we think.

We learn from the *Times,* of December 29th, 1879 (Monday), that the accident took place on the previous evening (28th). The Edinburgh train, due at Dundee at 7.15 p.m., crossed the bridge during a violent gale. It was duly signalled from the Fife side as having entered on the bridge for Dundee at 7.14. It was seen running along the rails, and then suddenly there was observed a flash of fire. The opinion was the train then left the rails and went over the bridge.

In all the cases, however, under this head published by Mr. Myers, the influence of the locality is clearly indicated, and the difficulties of finding an explanation are, so far, lessened.

These difficulties, moreover, are by no means insuperable. Readers of *Phantasm of the Living* will remember several similar cases which are there discussed; and will remember also Mr. Gurney's suggested explanation,¹ that a similarity of immediate mental content between the percipient and the agent is the condition of the impression. In the ordinary case of an apparition at the time of death, *e.g.*, of a mother to her son, the condition of the appearance to that particular percipient, rather than to the man in the street, should on this hypothesis be sought in the community of intellectual and emotional experiences which may be presumed to exist between near relations who have passed a great part of their lives in the same environment. In the cases now under consideration the substitute for such far-reaching community is to be sought in the immediate and transitory occupation of both percipient and agent—the one in present sensation, the other in

¹ Vol. II., pp. 267-9.
memory—with the same scene. Such partial community of perception, by a kind of extended association of ideas, tends, under this hypothesis, towards more complete community, and the agent thus imports into the sensorium of the percipient the idea of his own presence in the scene which forms part of the present content of both minds. Whether this hypothesis be accepted or not, it is clear that the difficulty which it seeks to eliminate is common to both theories; since both reject the materialistic explanation of a physical presence in space, which the facts before us at first sight seem to suggest, and both rely upon some kind of affection of mind by mind. The difficulty cannot, therefore, fairly be urged by the adherents of one theory against the other.

The following case, taken from the article in the A rena before referred to, will serve as a typical example of these narratives. Mr. Hodgson writes: "We obtained the case at the close of 1888 through the kindness of Dr. S. T. Armstrong, from a lady who is unwilling that her name should be used."

One night in March, 1873 or 1874, I can't recollect which year, I was attending on the sick bed of my mother. About eight o'clock in the evening I went into the dining-room to fix a cup of tea, and on turning from the sideboard to the table, on the other side of the table before the fire, which was burning brightly, as was also the gas, I saw standing, with his hands clasped to his side in true military fashion, a soldier of about thirty years of age, with dark, piercing eyes looking directly into mine. He wore a small cap with standing feather, his costume was also of a soldierly style. He did not strike me as being a spirit, ghost, or anything uncanny, only a living man; but after gazing for fully a minute I realised that it was nothing of earth, for he neither moved his eyes nor his body, and in looking closely I could see the fire beyond. I was of course startled, and yet did not run out of the room. I felt stunned. I walked out rapidly, however, and turning to the servant in the hall asked her if she saw anything; she said not. I went into my mother's room and remained talking for about an hour, but never mentioned the above subject for fear of exciting her, and finally forgot it altogether. Returning to the dining-room, still in forgetfulness of what had occurred, but repeating as above the turning from sideboard to table in act of preparing more tea, I looked casually towards the fire and there I saw the soldier again; this time I was entirely alarmed, and fled from the room in haste; called to my father, but when he came, he saw nothing. I am of a nervous temperament, but was not specially so that night, was not reading anything exciting, had never heard any story about this incident at all before.

Four years after, however, my brother attended a boys' school next door to this house and an old gentleman told stories of the old houses in the neighbourhood during the war; and one was about a soldier who was murdered and thrown in the cellar. My brother told it, as a story collected with our old home, not relating to my experience; for he being very young then, I don't think it was communicated to him. The family, however, were all impressed by the coincidence. This is as near the exact state of facts as 'tis possible to write after the lapse of so many years.
In reply to inquiries we learn that the figure of the soldier occupied precisely the same position on both occasions of its appearance, that it was visible from different points of the room, and that the lady continued to see the figure at the time that her father was unable to see anything.

Even if the accuracy of the statements as regards the past history of the house could be established on unquestionable evidence, we should hardly be entitled to infer so much as the probability of post-mortem agency. But, in fact, the accuracy of the statements is immaterial. Taking the narrative as it stands, it is quite sufficient, for the interpretation suggested in this paper, that there was in existence an old gentleman who told stories about this and other houses in the neighbourhood, and induced some of his auditors to believe them.

Passing to the stories previously published, it will be noticed that in Case XXI. (Vol. V., p. 460), the apparition of the Bishop of St. Brieuc, as seen by the tenant of his room, at the hour of his funeral, is a suggestive coincidence, as already pointed out, on the one view, but apparently without significance on the other. In all the other cases, it will be noticed, there are other persons resident in the immediate vicinity, in most cases in the same house, to whose agency the phantasm may be attributed. As in not one of these cases is there any obvious, or, indeed, readily conceivable purpose to be attained by the apparition, the assumption that it did so originate seems, apart from the considerations previously urged, to involve less improbability; for it can be shown that in many cases the minds of the living would be much occupied with the image of the deceased. When, for instance (as in Proceedings V., Case V., p. 416; Case VI., p. 418; Case XI., p. 436; Case XXIII., p. 462; Case XXIV., p. 464), a guest is occupying a room in which a former tenant had died within a comparatively recent period, that circumstance is likely to have a disturbing effect on the mind of the host or other inmates of the house. And even when, as in Case XI. (Vol. VI., p. 53), where the phantasm of Voltaire is seen, the death is a matter of history, the knowledge that the apparition had previously been seen in the same room is likely to exercise the minds of the inmates on the visit of a new comer.

In some cases the manner of the appearance inevitably suggests the mind of the spectator. In Case VI., for instance, the figure of an old woman, in "a sowbacked mutch," a drab-coloured petticoat, and a checked shawl, is seen lying on a bed outside the bed-covering, with her legs drawn up close to her body, and her face turned to the wall. This attitude, though natural enough if the vision originated in the mind of the neighbour who had actually found the "old wife" on her deathbed in that position, is difficult to reconcile with its attribution to the agency of the dead woman.
In Case VIII. (Vol. V., p. 422), an apparition of an elderly gentleman, which was ascertained by subsequent description to resemble Dr. R., deceased some years before, was seen by an inmate of the house where Mrs. R. lay dead, on the night following her death. The vision here may be attributed to the mind of the surviving daughter, agitated by the recent loss of the other parent. Why the hallucination should have represented Dr. R., and not the lady who had died a few hours before, the one theory is no more competent to explain than the other. It will be observed that in one at least of these cases the percipient has had another hallucination. (Vol. VI., Case XIII., p. 57.)

(E) Cases where the Agency of the Living is doubtfully indicated.

There remains a small group of cases (Proceedings, Vol. III., p. 91.; Vol. V., Case I., p. 409; Case III., p. 412; Case XX., p. 455) in which the hypothesis of living agency appears at first sight more difficult. Of course in all these cases, as already pointed out, it is conceivable that the impression was actually received shortly before the death of the agent, and remained latent until a favourable opportunity offered for its development. But such a supposition seems, under the circumstances, unnecessary, since the possibility of thought-transference from the minds of the survivors is clearly indicated in all four stories. In the first case Mrs. Haly saw the shadow of an absent nephew on the wall of her room, and a few hours afterwards received by post the news of his death in Australia. In Case I. (Vol. V.) Mr. Tandy, returning from a visit to a friend, carried away in his pocket a newspaper. That evening he saw an apparition of his friend Canon Robinson, and subsequently found his death recorded in the newspaper which lay unopened on the table. The interval which occurred between the death and its record has not been ascertained, but it is noteworthy that the apparition occurred only after the percipient's visit to a region of newspapers. The phantasm may, as the narrative stands, have been due to the emergence and externalisation either of a telepathic impression received from the donor of the newspaper, or of an unconscious sensory impression received from the obituary column of one of the other newspapers lying on the donor's table, as in the instance recorded in Proceedings, Vol. V., p. 507 (No 30). I am unable on any theory to suggest any causal connection between the occurrence of the phantasm and the presence of the newspaper in the house.¹ In Mrs. Haly's case, however, it seems not improbable that there was a real connection between the phantasm and the receipt of the annunciatory letter. It is at all

¹ It is assumed in this interpretation—what is implied, though not expressly stated in the narrative—that the obituary notice could not have been seen until the wrapper had been torn off the newspaper.
events possible that the news had been received by other relatives of the deceased in England on the previous evening (by the same mail which brought Mrs. Haly’s letter), and that her vision was due to some communication from their minds. If the vision were really due to the deceased, it must be regarded as singularly unfortunate, from the evidential standpoint, that he chose such a time for delivering his message: a time, moreover, peculiarly inappropriate for his own purposes, since it rendered his message practically superfluous. So in the next case (Vol. V., Case III., p. 412), Mr. Le Maistre was drowned on September 27th; his body was recovered on October 22nd, and his apparition was seen by a friend on November 3rd. It seems to me a fact of extreme significance that the message came, not in the course of the three or four weeks during which the dead man was supposed to be alive and well, but after the fact of the death was known, and when the message itself could no longer serve any useful purpose. So again in Case XX., the percipient only dreamt of his brother’s death on the fourth day after the wreck of the vessel, and some hours after the news had reached England.

Thus, in the only cases recorded in which the mere communication at the right time of the fact of the death would of itself have afforded some evidence of the continued action of the dead, such communication is delayed until the intelligence had already reached others in the vicinity of the percipient by normal means, i.e., until the possibility of thought-transference from the living had been established. For the present I must regard that as something more than an unfortunate coincidence.

(F) Two Cases of Exceptional Difficulty.

There remains to be noticed but one case of all those as yet published, that of William Moir. (Proceedings, Vol. VI., Case VIII., p. 35.) William Moir, grieve on a farm near Banff, alleged that he was for some months troubled by a constantly recurring dream of finding a corpse on a certain spot near the farm on which he worked. Eventually he did actually dig on the spot indicated, and unearthed a human skeleton, which was supposed to be the remains of a man who had mysteriously disappeared from the district some 40 or 50 years previously. We have Moir’s written statement, but he himself died some years ago. The actual finding of the skeleton by him rests on indisputable evidence. But the only authority cited for the mysterious disappearance many years before is the tradition of the neighbourhood, as reported by Mrs.

1 It is true that the narrator speaks of the body as having been “buried as an unknown castaway” and states that “we were the only friends he (the deceased) had in England.” But as she and her family received their first authentic intimation of the death from a notice in a newspaper, it is clear that the body of the deceased had been identified.
Moir. And the identification of the skeleton is wholly conjectural. Moreover, as Moir never told his dream until after its fulfilment, we have no evidence beyond his own statement that such a dream was ever dreamt. In the absence, therefore, of further evidence as to the time and circumstances in which the skeleton was placed where it was found, and in view of the difficulty, at this interval, of ascertaining whether or not there was any disturbance or unusual appearance in the soil to indicate the whereabouts of the skeleton, I would suggest four alternative explanations of the story, one or other of which may perhaps be considered preferable to the invocation of post-mortem agency. (1) That the dream occurred as alleged, and was due to telepathy from the person or persons who placed the skeleton where it was found. (2) That the dream occurred as alleged, and was due to the prior discovery of the skeleton by Moir in some abnormal condition, e.g., somnambulism, possibly associated with hyperesthesia. (3) That the dream never actually occurred, but that an accidental discovery of the skeleton so powerfully affected a man of admittedly nervous temperament as to give rise to a hallucination of memory on that point. (4) That the accidental discovery of the skeleton was, in the first instance, concealed by Moir through some superstitious fear, and that the story of the dream was invented subsequently to account for the discovery. Between these various explanations it seems impossible to decide, in default of the further evidence, which cannot now be obtained.

Finally, I subjoin an account recently received which seems to call for special consideration in this connection. It is but rarely that accounts of “ghostly” sounds possess much evidential value, from the extreme difficulty of eliminating all possible physical causes for auditory phenomena. But in this case the hallucinatory nature of the sounds heard seems conclusively proved, both in the case of Mr. B. and of Lady Z. We received the first account from the minister of S., a small hamlet in the south of Scotland.

G. 191.

July 23rd, 1889.

It affords me much pleasure, in answer to your letter of the 20th, which I only received to-day, to give you an account of my experience in connection with the music in D. woods, which “does not seem due to any ordinary source.”

I have heard it, I think, four times, and always at the same place, viz., on the public road, which runs along the south bank of the Tweed, and which passes, at the distance of three-quarters of a mile, the old churchyard of D. The churchyard, from which the music always seems to come, is south of the road, and at a much higher elevation, and the intervening ground is densely covered with wood. The first two or three times I heard the sound, it was very faint, but sufficiently distinct to enable me to follow the swellings and cadences. I do not know why, but on those occasions I never for a moment
thought it was real music. Neither did I think it anything very unusual, though the tones seemed more ethereal than any I had heard before. I am exceedingly fond of music, and, in my walks, frequently sing without sound (if I may use such an expression) tunes, pieces, and "songs without words." As there was on every occasion a breeze swaying the branches, I thought that, in my imagination, produced the result, though it did seem strange that I never heard anything similar in other woods.

Years passed, and I had forgotten all about the matter, when I heard it again, and I will not soon forget the last performance.

Last year I was walking up to X., to drive with Mr. and Mrs. M. to a tennis match. When I reached the usual spot, there burst upon my ear, from the direction of the churchyard, what seemed to be the splendid roll of a full brass and reed band. It did not recall the former occasions, and I never for a moment doubted its reality. My first thought was that Sir Y. Z. had lent his park for a Sunday-school treat, and my second was that the band was far too good, and the music of far too high a class for such a purpose. I walked on, enjoying it thoroughly, never dreaming that I was not listening to good ordinary music, till it suddenly struck me that the sound, though now faint, ought to have been inaudible, as there was now between me and the churchyard the big, broad shoulder of S. [a hill]. I began to remember the other—infinently less distinct—performances I had heard, and though not superstitious enough to believe that there was anything which could not be explained on natural grounds, I felt that the explanation was beyond my power of discovery or conjecture. Of course, I intended immediately telling my friends at X., but my attention must have been called to something else, as I did not do so. We drove away, and, after some time, we all, except Mrs. M., got out to walk up a very steep hill. Walking at the side of the carriage I told the most minute circumstances of my strange experience. Mrs. M. seemed to take it very seriously, but Mr. M. ridiculed the whole affair as a freak of the imagination.

I tell you these little incidental circumstances to show you how indelibly the events of the day are engraven upon my memory.

I had not, at that time, heard that the sounds had been listened to by any other person, but it is now well known that they have often been heard by Sir Y. Z., and once by Lady Z.

In the last case the music resembled that of a choir, unaccompanied by instruments. In my case there was nothing resembling vocal music.

(Signed in full) J. L. B.

In answer to questions, Mr. B. writes on the 30th of July, 1889:—

1. I have never had any other hallucinations, so far as I know.

2. I consider it absolutely impossible that there could have been a real band at the place. It could not have been there without the permission of Sir Y. Z. or of his manager. They were both at home at the time. They both knew what I supposed I had heard, yet neither told me (and I see them often) that what I supposed to be music was real music. Again, Mr. M., the parish minister, would have told me. I have been here 18 years, and have only once heard a brass band in the parish of D.; even then it was only the absurd Volunteer band from P. I don't think X. is more musical than S. [Mr. B.'s parish.]
3. The "cemetery" is the churchyard of the suppressed parish of D., which was divided equally between S. and X. The churchyard is in the X. half. The graves were neglected and have all, except three or four, disappeared. The church became ruinous, and was converted into a burial vault for the Z. family. I have been there very frequently, but never heard anything when I was there. I have always, when I seemed to hear music, been on the public road, at the point nearest to the churchyard. I only guess the distance to be three-quarters of a mile, as there is no direct communication between the two points. It is necessary to go round by D. House. I shall tell Sir Y. and Lady Z. about this correspondence if I have an opportunity before I go away for my holiday. Their experience might be interesting.

From Lady Z.

On the hot, still afternoon of July 12th, 1888, I was sitting resting with some old ladies at our pretty little cemetery chapel, within the grounds of our house in Scotland, far away from all thoroughfare or roads. Whilst I was talking I stopped suddenly, exclaiming, "Listen! what is that singing?" It was the most beautiful singing I had ever heard, just a wave of cathedral chanting, a great many voices, which only lasted a few seconds. The lady said she heard nothing, and thinking she might be deaf I said nothing. I quite thought it might be haymakers at work, and yet I turned my head round, for the singing was so close by. It dawned upon me, "The Scotch need not say they cannot sing." There were several others sitting with us, but they heard nothing (which astonished me). I said nothing more till the evening, when I casually said to my husband, "What was that singing where we were sitting this p.m.?" thinking he would reply, "Oh, it was the men at work"; but, to my astonishment, he replied, "I have often heard that before, and it is chanting I hear." (Mark, I had not said I had heard several voices, only singing, which was very remarkable.) And then, and not till then, I saw that the voices could not have been human, and certainly I had not imagined it. I had never heard such heavenly (that is the only adjective I can use) music before, and would not have missed it for anything. I was in no wise in a sentimental or fanciful state of mind when I heard the music, but only talking of the common subjects of the day. This is my written statement, and accurately true.

Signed by me (in full) A. Z.

From Sir Y. Z.

When alone at the cemetery I have occasionally heard, from within the chapel, sounds as of chanting.

(Signed) Y. Z.

The clergyman who procured for us this story, the brother of Lady Z., explains, in a letter dated July 13th, 1889, that the cemetery is "in a secluded part of the grounds, at a good distance from the house." He adds: "My sister has forgotten to state if she ever had any other similar experience; but I am pretty sure she never had."

The case has many parallels amongst the traditional ghost stories current in smoking-rooms and round dinner tables, and in such volumes
of ghostly lore as *The Nightside of Nature*, but I doubt if our collection contains another equally well authenticated instance of this type. The narrative, at first hearing, suggests that this ethereal music may have been an echo from something which has survived the grave. The surroundings themselves harmonise with such an explanation; and there would be a peculiar appropriateness in such requiems of the dead being audible only to the living representatives of the house, even when others are sitting by. But how, on this theory, is the experience of Mr. B. to be explained? and what significance can be attached to the change in the character of the sounds, from a chant of many voices to the strains of a band of wind instruments? Such difficulties can hardly be held fatal to the theory. But it may be contended that there is, in truth, no need to invoke the intervention of any but mortal agencies. Imagination, fed by traditions familiar from childhood, or the meditations natural to the place, might suffice to suggest strains of music in the sound of the wind amongst the trees: a hallucinatory idea being thus built up on a basis of external fact. Such a hallucinatory idea, once originated, could be transferred to other susceptible persons under appropriate conditions; and would take shape in accordance with the idiosyncrasies of the per­cipient, or his surroundings at the moment. In Lady Z. sitting near the vault, the original hallucination would naturally reproduce itself unchanged. To the traveller along the high road, who could not, under normal conditions, hear voices singing at the distance of three-quarters of a mile, the transmitted idea would adapt itself to the circumstances without losing its essential character. Still, I am not disposed to deny that, whatever the explanation, the story is suggestive and remarkable.

To sum up: I have endeavoured to show, from a scrutiny of the “ghost” stories collected by the Society, that there is a strong tendency amongst the narrators of such experiences to import into their narratives features suggestive of the presence of an alien intelligence or personality behind the phenomena; that this tendency operates with little restraint amongst the reporters of the experiences of others; that it has demonstrably in some cases affected the first-hand narratives; and that its operation may be suspected in other cases where it cannot be definitely proved. It is contended, further, that in the great majority of cases there is no sufficient ground for attributing the phenomena recorded to any source other than the minds of the percipients themselves; and that there are various characteristics in the best authenticated narratives which strongly suggest that the phenomena originate simply as casual hallucinations.

Lastly, a series of narratives, in which the alleged resemblance between the phantasm and some person deceased appears to rest on
good evidence, or where the other circumstances under which the phantasm occurred seem to render its explanation as a casual hallucination inadequate and to suggest post-mortem agency, are examined in detail, and an endeavour is made to show that in all such cases an alternative explanation may be found in the prolonged latency and subsequent emergence of an impression received from the dead man himself before his death, or in telepathy from the minds of other persons still living; and various circumstances are pointed out in the narratives under review which make in favour of such explanations. It is contended, therefore, that there is no sufficient justification for invoking post-mortem agency until either the theory of telepathy from the living has been proved inadequate to the facts, or the limits of its operation have been explored and defined.

There are some fine lines of Rossetti’s which are directly suggested by our subject:

“May not this ancient room thou sitt’st in dwell
In separate living souls for joy or pain?
Nay, all its corners may be painted plain,
Where Heaven shows pictures of some life spent well;
And may be stamped, a memory all in vain,
Upon the sight of lidless eyes in Hell.”

That is a poet’s guess, and poets have before now guessed the truth. But to prove the conjecture we require such and so much evidence as is needed to establish any other scientific hypothesis. We are not entitled to assume such a solution of the problem as may flatter our hopes or buttress our philosophy. Rather, when we are conscious of an intuitive desire which impels us towards belief, we are bound to scrutinise the more rigidly the claims to our regard. It is not assuredly from any love of that ungracious rôle that I have played the part of devil’s advocate.

But we are no less bound to be on our guard against the converse tendency, which is equally unscientific. It may be admitted that the evidence before us is not sufficient to prove post-mortem agency; but we are not entitled, therefore, to conclude that the possibility of such agency is disproved. The only legitimate conclusion from such premises is the practical one, that more evidence is required. On this point, at any rate, I find myself at one with my colleagues. We are all alike anxious to receive more evidence, and we are all alike prepared to give it grateful welcome, and, as far as in us lies, impartial consideration. In the present stage of our inquiry, at any rate, we are agreed that the elaboration of theories should be subordinated to the collection and verification of evidence. For without a far wider basis of ascertained facts, our rival hypotheses are but houses built upon the sand.
APPENDIX.

G. 186, p. 251.—The room in which Mrs. G. had slept on the night of her vision was for some weeks in the summer of 1888 placed at the disposal of members of the Society. The room, situate on the second floor, and looking on the street, was very small, and was separated from the neighbouring room by a wooden partition. Some 10 or 12 persons occupied this room, for about 30 nights in the aggregate, during the summer of 1888, but no unusual experience was recorded. The partition has now been pulled down, and the room thrown into the adjoining bedroom; but the mysterious noises had ceased some months before the change was made. Nothing, in fact, of an unusual character appears to have taken place since the occurrence of the phenomena recorded in the text.

G. 187, p. 256.—The subjoined account gives the history of the house during the tenancy of an Associate of the Society for Psychical Research and his wife.

The house is one of a continuous row, and the front door is approached from the road by three or four steps. It has railings in front and steps down an area to the basement. The rooms are arranged as follows:—

Basement: Breakfast-room in front; kitchen at back; wash-house leading from kitchen and opening into a small square garden about 20ft. by 16ft., planted with trees, and surrounded by other gardens.

Ground Floor: Sitting-room in front; bedroom at back overlooking garden; small spare room at end of passage.

First Floor Landing: Servants’ room—over spare room.

First Floor: Front bedroom; small slip room just over front door—empty; back bedroom overlooking garden.

The house is situated on high ground. There are four or five ways of getting to it from different parts of the town, and each route is up hill. It is 10 minutes’ walk from the railway station; and a very bright light which is kept going there at night illuminates the back rooms to some extent. Shunting operations can quite easily be heard, especially when the wind blows from the station, and in quiet times the workmen can be heard as they call to one another. A branch line between steep embankments runs at right angles to the road, and tunnels under it some 50 yards from the house; but the traffic on this line is not heavy, and we never noticed any noise from that direction, even when trains entered or emerged from the tunnel.

I occupied the “haunted house,” with my wife and one maid-servant, for a period of nearly 13½ months—or, to be exact, from August 17th, 1888, to September 27th, 1889. During our tenancy we were not disturbed by any startling or violent manifestations, nor did we see any apparitions. Several visitors stayed in the house, and slept there, from time to time, mainly with the object of having experiences if possible, but I do not think many of them met with much reward. In one or two cases these visitors heard noises during the night which they could not quite account for; but in most instances the sounds were so trivial that little importance was attached to them.

On 137 nights visitors slept in the house—25 men and 14 women in all.
Sometimes both the spare bedrooms on the first floor were occupied on the same nights by one or more persons; sometimes only one of the rooms was in use. Altogether the front bedroom was occupied by visitors on 87 nights, and the back bedroom on 96 nights.

Although my wife and I had no visual experiences in the house, we were certainly confronted with a few odd noises—of a sort which would undoubtedly have arrested attention in any house, no matter whether it had a ghostly reputation or not. I carefully made a note of every unusual event immediately after its occurrence; and as the number of them is not great, I give the complete list, taken from my diary.

1888.

August 17th.—Took up our abode in the house.

August 20th.—My wife heard a zinc pail, as she thought, being rattled in the spare room at the top of kitchen stairs. There was a zinc pail in this room, but she found it undisturbed. Later in the day she heard a similar sound, proceeding, as she thought, from the wash-house, but the zinc pail in that place was found in its proper position.

August 27th.—On two occasions to-day the front door bell rang violently. The first time no one was found at the door; the second time my wife was quick enough to detect two children in the act of running away.

September 4th.—When I returned from town this evening my wife stated that during the day she had twice heard a crash downstairs like fireirons being thrown upon the kitchen stove. She ran downstairs immediately each time, but found nothing displaced in any way. After hearing this account I went down with my wife to survey the spot, and as we were discussing the matter we both of us heard a loud, sharp noise, like the crack of a whip, proceeding apparently from the spare room at the head of the kitchen stairs. Getting lights, we proceeded at once to the room; but nothing could we find to account for the noise. Time, 8 p.m.

September 5th.—In the evening I was writing at my desk in sitting-room, and heard noise like shovels and fireirons being thrown upon kitchen stove. My wife was dozing upon the sofa in the room with me, and I was surprised that the noise did not rouse her. I ran downstairs at once and made an examination, but there was nothing whatever to indicate the cause of the disturbance. Time, 9.10 p.m.

September 6th.—Arrival of M. W., maid-servant, who was given bedroom on first floor landing.

September 21st.—I, writing at my desk, heard noise overhead (apparently in front bedroom) like a person tapping upon the floor with a hammer, using about enough force to drive tacks in. Eight or ten knocks, and then silence. I at once got a light and went up. Could find no explanation. Wife out. Girl in kitchen in basement. Time, 8.5 p.m.

September 22nd.—Girl casually mentioned to my wife that twice in the early morning (6.45 and 7.15 a.m.) she had gone to front door in answer to bell, but had not found anyone there.

October 10th.—My wife and I were taking tea in sitting-room. Time, 5.38. Front door bell rang. I at once went to window to find out who visitor was, but could see no one. While I stood at window, thinking visitor must be standing in recess of doorway, servant opened door. No one was
there. I therefore went out and looked up and down the street. Two lamp-lighters on the other side were the only persons about, and they assured me that they had not observed anybody come up our steps.

October 13th.—Servant mentioned to my wife that she thought queer noises occurred in the house. Said often when in bed she heard footsteps coming up and down stairs by her door. She supposed it must be from next door, but it sounded very close. [The next house on the same side as our staircase was empty at this time.]

October 16th.—On this night a visitor slept in front bedroom. He stated next morning that about 1.30 he had heard a peculiar crisp noise in his room, something like a silk dress rustling.

October 18th.—At 0.30 p.m. a loud double knock was given at front door. No one was found there. I was in London, and my wife told me of the incident upon my return in the evening.

October 27th and 28th.—Colonel and Mrs. H. occupied front bedroom on these nights. On the second night Colonel H. heard mild groans and loud breathing. It is probable that these sounds came from the adjoining bedroom in the next house.

November 10th.—I was aroused during the night by hearing a tramping noise, apparently in the back bedroom overhead. The noise ceased in a minute or less. I intended to go up and explore, but being only very slightly awake, I unfortunately fell asleep again without carrying my intention into effect.

December 9th.—On this Sunday evening occurred the most really unaccountable noise of any yet noticed. I was in the house alone, writing at my desk. Time, 8.30. Suddenly I heard a noise which seemed to come from the hall, outside my room door. I can only compare the sound to that which would be made if half a brick were tied to a piece of string and jerked about over the linoleum—as one might jerk a reel to make a kitten playful. The bumping noise seemed to commence close to the door of the room in which I was sitting; it appeared to proceed along the passage to the top of the kitchen stairs—traversing a distance of some 15ft. in about half a dozen jumps—and then it seemed to turn the staircase corner and to jump down three or four stairs, one at a time. I went out, carrying my reading lamp with me, but nothing could I find, either in the passage or down the kitchen stairs. So, much puzzled, I returned and resumed my writing. In about five minutes the bumps began again, seeming to me to come from the part of the kitchen stairs where they had previously left off. This time I ran out too quickly to take the lamp with me. Just as I reached the head of the stairs the knocks stopped again. All was now dark, but fearing to lose time by returning for the lamp I went downstairs backwards, feeling along each stair with my hands as I proceeded. Reaching the bottom, I stepped into the kitchen and turned up the gas there, but nowhere was anything to be seen that could have caused the curious sounds. More perplexed still, I returned once more to my writing, but had scarcely shut the sitting-room door and settled myself at the desk when three sharp thumps sounded on the floor just outside the door. I sprang across the room and threw the door open. Nothing was to be seen. Again I searched in all directions—without getting the slightest hint of an explanation. The thing was inexplicable, and it has remained so to me ever since. At any rate, there are the facts. I can suggest no explanation. The
idea that the noises really occurred in the next (empty) house does not commend itself to me for the simple reason that they seemed to be so distinctly in the places referred to. I was the only person in the house. We had no cat at that time; and we never at any time found any indications of mice in the place.

December 15th.—A most remarkable and inexplicable noise occurred at 11.35 p.m. on this date.

Our bedroom adjoined the sitting-room, and was separated from it by curtains. Across one corner of the sitting-room (one of the corners adjoining the bedroom) a piano was placed, and over this instrument, upon the wall, hung a guitar. The guitar, as most people are probably aware, has six strings—three silver and three gut. On this night I had retired before my wife, and had been in bed about five minutes; she remained in the sitting-room in order to say her prayers by the fire, as it was a very cold night. In the midst of the quietness which ensued I suddenly heard the guitar play—pung, pang, ping—pung, pang, ping—here my wife called out in a loud, awe-struck whisper, "Did you hear that?" whilst even as she spoke a third pung, pang, ping sounded clearly through the rooms. I immediately sprang out of bed and rushed in to her, finding her kneeling upon the hearth-rug by an armchair, staring with astonishment at the guitar upon the wall. No more sounds were heard, though we sat waiting by the fire for over half an hour. My wife told me that she had been distracted once or twice during her prayers by a noise like someone sweeping their hand over the wall paper by the fireplace and in the recess across which the piano stood. She had looked round to see where the kitten was (an extremely lazy Persian), and found that it was curled up asleep behind her. She said that when the guitar sounded its chords (in arpeggio) for the second and third time she was looking straight at the instrument, and such critical observation as she had at command under the surprise of the thing satisfied her that there was nothing visible near it, and that it made no perceptible movement. Well, that is all. The three gut strings of that guitar unmistakably sounded three times in succession (making nine notes altogether) when no person was touching it, and no thing was touching it as far as we could discover. The first explanation that suggests itself is that the pegs slipped round slightly and so caused the strings to vibrate and emit sounds—as often happens with stringed instruments, I am told. But the answer to that suggestion is, 1st, the sounds were not of that sort—they were more clear and musical than the result of slipping pegs would be; 2nd, it is extremely improbable that three pegs would each slip just enough to produce the corresponding chord in a lower key; 3rd, if this improbable thing happened once it could scarcely happen three times in succession, and without the changes of pitch being noticed; 4th, all six strings of the guitar were perfectly in tune next day! So slipping down is out of the question. How to account for the fact I do not know. I can only record it as it occurred, and leave it to others to estimate the probability of such a feat being accomplished by mice (in a house where mice were unknown), or by a moth (in December), or by something similar which escaped our observation.

1889.

January 13th.—When I came in, about 10.30, my wife informed me that
when sitting alone during the evening she had heard the guitar make one note. She could not reach the guitar to see whether one of the six strings would give that note, and so she found the corresponding note on the piano in order to remember it. I at once tried the experiment. The instrument was not now in tune, but I found that the middle gut string gave a note corresponding to the one indicated upon the piano.

January 24th.—To-day our maid-servant (from whom we believed the history and reputation of the house had been carefully kept) complained that she had heard outside her bedroom door, in the morning about 5.30 or 6, a loud crash like a quantity of bottles being hurled upon the floor. We assured her it was a dream; but she maintained that she was wide awake when it happened, and had been awake for some time.

February 16th.—Lieut.-Colonel S., Sir L. G., and Captain N. occupied the two bedrooms. In the morning the two former reported hearing simultaneously a noise, apparently on the linoleum between the open doors of the two rooms, like paper rustling or mortar falling. I believe they immediately rushed from their rooms and met on the landing. Time about 2 a.m.

February 15th.—My wife's sister, Miss E. B., slept in top back bedroom on this and five or six following nights. After the first night she reported hearing three loud raps on her room door, such as might be done with a walking-stick. She could not say quite what time in the night this took place, but she is positive she had not been asleep. It might have been about 1 a.m. She did not hear anything on the following nights.

June 29th.—Mrs. V. reported that when alone in the sitting-room, between seven and eight this evening, she heard a note from the guitar. Subsequently Mrs. V. stated that the note heard was somewhere about "A above middle C." If the note was as high as this and came from the guitar it must have been produced by one of the gut strings. Mrs. V. had no idea that the guitar had ever done this sort of thing. My wife and I were out at the time, and the servant was downstairs.

From time to time I passed several nights alone in each of the three bedrooms (the visitors' rooms and the servant's) besides our own, to see if I could meet with experiences of any sort, but nothing ever happened on these occasions that I am aware of.

(Signed) X. Y.

The present tenant of the house (who took possession on September 28th, 1889) wrote to us on March 13th, 1890:—

'I am sorry to say we are thoroughly disappointed in the ghost; we have neither seen nor heard anything which even a believer in ghosts could lay to their charge.'