

The Victorian
Ghost Hunter's
Casebook

Edited by
TIM PRASIL

BROM  NES BOOKS

The front cover illustration, captioned “Haunted,” is from James John Hissey’s *A Holiday on the Road: An Artist’s Wanderings in Kent, Sussex, and Surrey* (Richard Bentley & Son, 1887).

Introductions and notes © 2019 Tim Prasil.
All rights reserved.
No claim made on public domain material.
ISBN-10: 1-948084-07-4
ISBN-13: 978-1-948084-07-9

INTRODUCTION

Tim Prasil

What makes ghosts and the Victorian era (1837-1901) such fitting companions? It might be the elegant architecture of the houses—those fancy cornices and cupolas—that make them seem especially suitable for haunting. It might be that some of the greatest supernatural stories ever written—from Charles Dickens’ *A Christmas Carol* (1843) to Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897)—are steeped in Victorian customs, costumes, and cultural concerns. Is it because photography arose during this period and those often-expressionless faces have crept into our twenty-first century consciousness as spectral visages of people long dead? Or was it all simply the mental effects of gas leaking from the lights?¹

There’s probably a mixture of reasons why a haze of ghostliness lingers around the Victorians, but among that blend is their revitalization of the debate over whether or not ghosts are real. The 1800s *began* with widespread agreement among intellectuals and the press that belief in spectral visitations was disappearing as humanity progressed into the new century. Medical men seemed to be at the frontline. In 1805, Dr. John Alderson presented a paper clarifying how ghostly encounters “owe their origin entirely to a disordered state of bodily organs” and how “great mental anxiety, inordinate ambition, and guilt, may produce similar effects.” In 1813, Dr. John Ferriar wrote a book to explain how historic accounts of ghosts and related phenomena can be explained “from the known laws of animal economy, independent of supernatural causes.” In another book, published in 1825, Dr. Samuel Hibbert turned away from physiology and toward psychology and sociology, arguing that “apparitions are nothing more than ideas, or recollected images of the mind, which have been rendered more vivid than actual impressions” and that these false impressions are rooted in “the various systems of superstition, which for ages have possessed the minds of the vulgar.”²

But medical science wasn’t alone in its efforts to launch the nineteenth century without the heavy burden of earlier centuries’

superstitions. Joseph Taylor compiled an anthology of tales that tantalized readers with spooky scenes but then corrected their false assumptions by unveiling the *natural* explanations behind events that had seemed otherworldly. The title page of this 1814 volume says it all: “*APPARITIONS; or, The Mystery of Ghosts, Hobgoblins, and Haunted Houses, Developed.* Being a Collection of ENTERTAINING STORIES, Founded on Fact; And selected for the purpose of ERADICATING THOSE RIDICULOUS FEARS, Which The Ignorant, the Weak, and the Superstitious, Are but too apt to encourage, FOR WANT OF PROPERLY EXAMINING INTO THE CAUSES OF SUCH ABSURD IMPOSITIONS.” Taylor includes a tale told by the Mareschal de Saxe, and since it involves a ghost hunter of sorts, it’s among the most relevant to the book now in your hands. While returning to Dresden, the Mareschal came upon a small village in the chilly shadow of a haunted castle. The villagers insisted that a phantom had been heard and seen at the castle, and the brave Mareschal announced he would spend the night there to confront the ghost. That night, the Mareschal was awoken by a tall figure in armor. Upon being threatened by the Mareschal’s pistols and sword, the figure was then joined by *others!* But they turned out to be living men, who confessed that they were a band of counterfeiters and were ensuring their privacy at the castle by pretending to be ghosts. The coiners gave the Mareschal the option of keeping their secret—or being killed. He opted for the former.³ The tale’s lesson is obvious: ghosts can be as phony as counterfeit money.

Despite this general movement to abolish the belief in ghosts, it’s nearly impossible to keep people from sharing ghost stories. Writers wanting to do so in print prefaced their tales with comments on the pervasive skepticism of the era. In an 1824 essay titled “On Ghosts,” for example, Mary Shelley, author of *Frankenstein* (1818), notes the passing of romantic and fantastical beliefs, ending with a nod to Shakespeare:

What has become of enchantresses with their palaces of crystal and dungeons of palpable darkness? What of fairies and their wands? What of witches and their familiars? and, last, what of ghosts, with beckoning hands and fleeting shapes, which quelled the soldier’s brave heart, and made the murderer disclose to the astonished noon the veiled work of midnight?

Introduction

These which were realities to our fore-fathers, in our wiser age—

—Characterless are grated
To dusty nothing.

Shelley was not alone. The sentiment is echoed by a writer identified only as “Anslem” in “A Chapter on Ghosts,” published in 1830: “The belief in ghosts and hobgoblins, in fact, is the basis and key-stone of all superstition; and though ‘the march of intellect’ has of late years done away a good deal with the prejudices of the ‘times of old,’ yet it still lurks, and, probably, will ever continue to do so, with the ignorant and vulgar of all countries.”⁴ Curiously, both of these pre-Victorian writers use these comments on outmoded beliefs to then recount allegedly true ghostly encounters, prompting readers to retain an open mind and maybe even a sense of wonder when it comes to the reality of ghosts.

Around 1840, the tide began to turn back toward—if not *believing* in ghosts—then, at least, considering the *possibility* that they might be real, and for some reason, Cambridge University rode the crest of the first waves. In the *Cambridge University Magazine*, an article written by someone identified only as “ΨYXH” argues in *favor* of the reality of ghosts. Like Shelley and “Anslem,” the writer opens by acknowledging how resistant readers will be to such a thesis “in these days of universal incredulity and skepticism.” Over the course of the essay, he supports his case by citing Scripture, the ancient philosophers, and the power that a “good ghost story” has to inspire the “most incredulous” to rethink their convictions. The primary argument, though, comes in the form of inductive reasoning, specifically testing two premises: 1) there is no proof *against* the reality of supernatural visitation and 2) “incontrovertible human testimony” is in *favor* of that reality. This is accompanied by rebuttal of the primary arguments against ghosts. For instance, as if implying Taylor’s book of rationalized ghost stories, the writer contends that

though ninety-nine stories may be resolved into cases of false perception, mere imagination, or imposture—and we have no doubt that the great majority of them may—still, if the hundredth should be absolutely incapable of any such solution, it is sufficient to prove the existence of apparitions; and,

consequently, that the attempt to explain away some stories only, without disproving all, must ever be unsatisfactory.⁵

Given the academic associations of the journal in which it appears and the staunch opposition the writer admits to facing, the article is historically significant in its boldness.

It's conceivable that this article might have some relation with a development at Cambridge University occurring about a decade later. In 1851, fellows at that institution's Trinity College met to discuss and investigate ghosts and similar phenomena. The group was known as the Ghostlie Guild—or, perhaps, the Cambridge Association for Spiritual Inquiry—but it is generally remembered as the Ghost Club. According to a circular describing the original club and its goals, the focus was on accumulating “an extensive collection of authenticated cases of supposed ‘supernatural’ agency.” Beyond the experiences of members themselves, the club would seek “written communications, with full details of persons, times, and places.”⁶ There is no mention in this document of performing any field work, but even as “armchair ghost hunters,” the Ghost Club set a precedent for paranormal research organizations to come. By 1862, a more formal organization with that name appeared in London, though its connections to the Cambridge group are tenuous.

Probably the best-known organization to follow in the path of the Ghost Club(s) is the Society for Psychical Research (SPR), founded in 1882. These groups were all spurred by a curiosity about traditional hauntings along with spiritualist séances, mesmerism/hypnotism, and clairvoyance. However, there was a fundamental difference between the original Ghost Club and the SPR. The name at the end of that circular issued by the former is Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901), a theologian who would go on to become Cambridge's Regius Professorship of Divinity and, later, the Bishop of Durham. Other founding Ghost Club members included Fenton J. A. Hort (1828-1892), another Biblical scholar and minister; and Edward White Benson (1829-1896), who became the Archbishop of Canterbury. Though the SPR looked again to Cambridge University to find its first President, that man was Henry Sidgwick, known primarily for his work in economics. Other prominent members brought a distinctively scientific, not religious, view to the table: William F. Barrett and Oliver Lodge were physicists, William

Introduction

Crookes was a chemist, and Edmund Gurney and William James came from Psychology. Both groups included members with perspectives other than strictly religious or scientific, of course—for instance, literary men such as Arthur Conan Doyle—but one senses that the conversations at the two organizations’ meetings would have reflected those fundamental differences.

We can use this distinction as a rough guide to the evolution of the chronicles presented in this book. Case 1 is taken from the Reverend Frederick George Lee’s *Glimpses in the Twilight: Being Various Notes, Records, and Examples of the Supernatural* (1885), which opens with a lament about the sorry condition of England’s soul: “Of late years it cannot but have been noted by the thoughtful and observant, that the Christian Religion has been too commonly and too generally disregarded.” He goes on to explain how things have become so irreligious, and generous shares of the blame go to “what some American pointedly termed ‘a firm faith in the almighty dollar’” as well as to certain ideas propounded by Charles Darwin regarding the origin of the humans species.⁷ Lee, it becomes clear, is presenting his collected accounts of supernatural interventions into the natural world to counteract this trend toward secularization. Ghost hunters, then, were seeking empirical evidence—not just of ghosts—but of an entire spirit existence.

Nonetheless, as the Victorian era proceeded, science gradually took over ghost hunting. No doubt, some scientists were also looking for confirmation of their spiritual faith, but others were testing the boundaries of observable existence or, at least, looking for a reason why ghosts have such a recurrent place in human history. Regardless of their motives, this new generation of scientists no longer echoed the sweeping skepticism of Drs. Alderson, Ferrier, and Hibbert. In its place, they brought a cautious, if not clinical, curiosity to the topic. This book’s best representative of this movement is Frank Podmore, whose name appears in Cases 7, 8, and 9.

These scientists were rising to a challenge made around mid-century, and the chief instigator was popular novelist Catherine Crowe. Her compilation of “true” supernatural events, *The Night-Side of Nature* (1848) is a book that would have had a prized place on the bookshelf of any proper Victorian ghost hunter and by almost anyone else interested in the supernatural. In her Introduction, Crowe presents ghosts as more a concern of science than religion by first praising German intellectuals for “thinking independently and

courageously” and for “promulgating the opinions they have been led to form, however new, strange, heterodox, or even absurd, they may appear to others.” She then asserts: “But here, in Britain, our critics and colleges are in such haste to strangle and put down every new discovery that does not emanate from themselves, or which is not a fulfilling of the ideas of the day. . . .” British intellectuals routinely reject new ideas, Crowe contends, adding:

And one of the evils of this hasty and precipitate opposition is, that the passions and interests of the opposers become involved in the dispute: instead of investigators, they become partisans; having declared against it at the outset, it is important to their petty interests that the thing shall not be true; and they determine that it *shall* not, if they can help it.

For many traditional Victorian readers, these strong words from a “woman novelist” might have been easily shrugged off if they hadn’t been stated in a book that garnered such extensive popularity.⁸

A few pages later, Crowe positions ghosts firmly within the realm of science. She explains that the subjects covered in her book—prophetic dreams, presentiments, and second-sight along with apparitions—will *not* be treated as supernatural phenomena. Crowe says that, “on the contrary, I am persuaded that the time will come, when they will be reduced strictly within the bounds of science. It was the tendency of the last age to reject and *deny* everything they did not understand; I hope it is the growing tendency of the present one to *examine* what we do not understand.”⁹ Here, then, was Crowe’s challenge: that scientists boldly go into new fields, new disciplines and, at least, *explore* those widespread human experiences with what had traditionally been deemed “supernatural.”

Crowe’s book relies quite a bit on work done by those German scientists she had praised. She knew the language well enough to have earlier translated *The Seeress of Provorst*, by Justinus Kerner. The first part of this book is Dr. Kerner’s chronicle of his treatment of a “ghost-seer” and clairvoyant named Frederica Hauffe. The second part reviews ghosts more generally. In addition to Kerner’s writings, *Night-Side* includes references to similar work done by Johann Heinrich Jung-Stilling, Karl August von Eschenmayer, and others. Presumably, these were the scientists Edwin Paxton Hood

Introduction

had in mind when declaring that, after its strong skepticism at the start of the century, science was leading us back to ghosts: “Who could have thought that these men of the electric rod and the battery, the magnet and the retort, would have kindled for humanity a new torch of belief, and thrown a light from a new lamp into the world of spirits? We wait in anxiety and in awe for the results of future investigations.”¹⁰ Here, along with a call for action aimed at Victorian scientists, we see the roots of 21st-century ghost hunters with their EMF meters, EVP recorders, and night-vision equipment.

While some British scientists rose to the challenge issued by the likes of Crowe and Hood, this book illustrates how Victorian ghost hunting was not limited to those on a specifically scientific mission—*or* those on a specifically religious one. Authors renowned for their fiction, travel writers, journalists, and even a few self-proclaimed psychics chronicled their investigations of haunted sites. They were part of a wave of ghost hunters, but they were hardly the first. In fact, some Victorians would have known about Athenodorus, a philosopher from ancient Rome. According to legend, Athenodorus learned of a house with a reputation for being haunted and rented the place to investigate it. Pretty quickly, he observed the ghost, followed it to where it disappeared into the ground, marked the spot, and afterwards led an effort to dig there. A buried skeleton in chains was discovered, and when the bones were re-interred elsewhere with far greater respect and ceremony, the house was cleansed of its ghost.¹¹

Perhaps the next notable pre-Victorian ghost hunter is Joseph Glanvill, who investigated ghostly manifestations at the house of John Mompesson sometime around the 1660s. The case, as he describes it in *Saducismus Triumphatus*, bore signs of possible witchcraft—or maybe poltergeist activity—and the culprit behind it became known as “The Drummer of Tedworth” once it became a standard piece of ghostlore in Victorian publications. Roughly contemporary with Glanvill were two Cornish vicars, whose legendary exploits appeared in Victorian print. The Reverend John Rudall was able to put to rest the suffering spirit of Dorothy Dingley, a.k.a. the Botathen ghost, while the Reverend Richard Dodge exerted his ghost-busting skill in Talland to expel a vengeful phantom who appeared dressed in black and driving a carriage pulled by headless horses.¹²

Yet another contemporary of Glanvill had a very different reputation as a ghost hunter. This is Antoinette du Ligier de la Garde Deshoulières, a fearless woman who—upon hearing that the castle in which she was guest had a haunted room—insisted on sleeping in it. That night, she discovered the horrible manifestations could all be attributed to a large, affectionate dog. The woman was real, but her ghost hunt is probably a fable, one often ending with a lesson about the folly of superstition. Not surprisingly, many of the print sources of it appear in those early decades of the 1800s. However, the tale did survive long enough to appear in Sarah Josepha Hale’s *Woman’s Record; or, Sketches of All Distinguished Women*, published in 1853.¹³

Two more pre-Victorian ghost hunters—both debunkers like Deshoulières—would have been familiar enough to serve as cautionary examples during Victoria’s reign. The first was author and lexicographer Samuel Johnson, who joined a team of ghost hunters to investigate the famous Cock Lane haunting of 1762. The case is too complicated to detail here, but it involved twelve-year-old Elizabeth Parsons, who claimed to have encountered a ghost. Her father discovered that, with Elizabeth acting as a medium, the ghost could communicate through knocking. In this way, the spirit’s business became clear: she had returned from the Great Beyond to accuse William Kent of *poisoning* her. News of these posthumous accusations spread quickly, and Johnson got involved. The assembled ghost hunters’ probe led to the conclusion that, first, Elizabeth’s father had a grudge against Kent and, second, the girl had “some art of making or counterfeiting particular noise, and that there is no agency of any higher cause.”¹⁴ One would think, then, that Johnson leaned toward skepticism when it came to ghosts, wouldn’t one?

Unfortunately, some would remember him differently. A character named Imlac in Johnson’s novel *Rasselas* (1756) argues:

There is no people, rude or learned, among whom apparitions of the dead are not related and believed. This opinion, which perhaps prevails as far as human nature is diffused, could become universal only by its truth; those that never heard of one another would not have agreed in a tale which nothing but experience can make credible.

Introduction

In his authoritative *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (1791), James Boswell quotes this passage as evidence of how well the author could feign an argument in favor of ghosts, but he cautions that “it is a mistake to suppose that he himself ever positively held” the same view. Nonetheless, many subsequent writers have taken Imlac’s statement to mirror the author’s own view. In *Accredited Ghost Stories* (1823), for instance, T.M. Jarvis quotes this passage and declares that it should be seen “as conveying as the opinions of Johnson.” Even Herman Melville’s *Moby Dick* (1851) includes the line: “There are other ghosts than the Cock-Lane one, and far deeper men than Doctor Johnson who believe in them.” Returning to Boswell’s biography, we find that—though Johnson *did* retell ghost stories he had heard from people he trusted—the closest pronouncement he made regarding the subject was noncommittal: “All argument is against it; but all belief is for it.”¹⁵ The lesson here is that even a debunker might be pegged as a *believer* by simply daring to go ghost hunting.

Shortly after the 1700s became the 1800s, another debunker appeared, and he illustrated a far more dangerous side of ghost hunting. In the final months of 1803, the Hammersmith district of London was plagued by a ghost—or someone dressed up like one. One incident involved Thomas Groom, who had been passing through the churchyard and, in his words, “some person came from behind a tomb-stone . . . and caught me fast by the throat with both hands, and held me fast.” Thanks to a nearby companion, Groom escaped. He had seen nothing, but had hit what felt to him like “a great coat.”¹⁶ Other frightening encounters were reported by the newspapers, and after several weeks of this, the braver locals decided to take action.

Among these ghost hunters looking to pull the sheet off the cruel prankster was Francis Smith. With a pistol at the ready, he conducted surveillance in Black Lion Lane. Suddenly, he spotted a figure dressed in white. He shouted, “Damn you, who or what are you?” And his gun fired! The white figure was not a ghost, though. It wasn’t even someone masquerading as a ghost. Instead, it was Thomas Millford, a tradesman whose work with plaster accounted for his white, smock-like apparel. Tragically, Smith’s bullet penetrated Millford’s jaw and fatally shattered his spine. Smith quickly confessed his terrible mistake, was sentenced to death for willful murder, but was pardoned and served only one year. The 1800s began on a dark note for ghost hunting.

Interestingly, sprinkled among the earliest press reports on the Hammersmith ghost incident are the earliest uses of the term “ghost-hunter” that I’ve found after several years of searching.¹⁷ Perhaps this was a cryptic sign that the new century would experience a curious surge of ghost hunters, especially after an 18-year-old named Victoria took the throne. And it’s high time I let some of those who chronicled their investigations take the stage. I have done little to alter their language other than correct obvious errors or touch up a few confusing spots. I retained the nuances of nineteenth-century English, including the hyphens in words such as “to-night” and “bed-room,” two-word phrases that have *become* single words such as “any one” and “some one,” and the plentitude of commas. In this way, the Victorian ghost hunters can narrate their own chapter of history with much greater charm and distinctiveness than the quick pre-Victorian history I provide above.

And, as I mentioned, theirs was a distinctively *ghostly* period of history to narrate.



¹ Ghosts are traced to furnace gas in Franz Schneider, Jr.’s “An Investigation of ‘Haunted’ House,” *Science*, 37:958 (May 9, 1913), pp. 711-712.

² John Alderson’s speech was published in *The Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* 6.23 (July, 1810) pp. 287-96. Alderson then revised the paper for *An Essay on Apparitions, in which Their Appearance Is Accounted for by Causes Wholly Independent of Preternatural Agency* (Longman, et al., 1823). John Ferriar, *An Essay towards a Theory of Apparitions* (Printed for Cadell and Davies by J. and J. Haddock, 1813) p. 14. Samuel Hibbert, *Sketches of the Philosophy of Apparitions; or, An Attempt to Trace Such Illusions to Their Physical Causes* (Oliver & Boyd/Geo. B. Whittaker, 1825) p. v.

³ Joseph Taylor, *Apparitions; or, The Mystery of Ghost, Hobgoblins, and Haunted Houses Developed* (Printed for Lackington, Allen, and Co., 1815) pp. 103-12. The tales follow the same pattern of some key Gothic novels, from Ann Radcliffe’s *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) to Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* (1847), in concluding with a natural explanation for what had seemed to be ghostly events.

⁴ Mary Shelley, “On Ghosts,” *London Magazine* 9 (March, 1824) p. 253. The Shakespeare quotation is from *Troilus and Cressida* (1602). Anslem, “A Chapter on Ghosts,” *The Pocket* 2.1 (July, 1830) p. 29. This article is continued in “Another Chapter on Ghosts,” *The Pocket* 2.2 (Aug., 1830) pp. 132-38.

⁵ “A Chapter on Ghosts,” *Cambridge University Magazine* 1.2 (May, 1839) pp. 145, 146, 148.

Introduction

⁶ Arthur Wescott uses the name “Ghostlie Guild” in a biography of his father, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Wescott* (Vol. 1, Macmillan, 1903) p. 117, and Epes Sargent uses both “The Cambridge Association for Spiritual Inquiry” and “The Ghost Club” in *Planchette; or, The Despair of Science* (Roberts Brothers, 1869) p. 203. “Circular of a Society Instituted by the Members of the University of Cambridge, England, for the Purpose of Investigating Phenomena Popularly Called Supernatural” is reprinted in Appendix A of Robert Dale Owen’s *Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World* (J.B. Lippincott, 1860) pp. 514-16.

⁷ Frederick George Lee, *Glimpses in the Twilight* (William Blackwood and Sons, 1885) pp. 3, 14-19.

⁸ Catherine Crowe’s *The Night-Side of Nature; or, Ghosts and Ghost Seers* (T.C. Newby, 1848) pp. 8-9. In the Victorian era, subsequent editions of this popular book are: T.C. Newby, 1849; G. Routledge, 1852; a “New Edition” from G. Routledge, 1857; G. Routledge, 1866; and G. Routledge, 1882. Meanwhile, American editions are: J.S. Redfield, 1850; Redfield, 1853; W.J. Widdleton, 1868; and another “New Edition” from Henry T. Coates, 1901. These are just the editions I’ve confirmed with online scans. More may certainly exist.

⁹ Crowe, p. 17-18.

¹⁰ Edwin Paxton Hood, *Dream Land and Ghost Land: Visits and Wanderings There in the Nineteenth Century* (Partridge and Oakley, 1852) p. 30. Crowe’s translation of Kerner’s book is titled *The Seeress of Prevorst* (J.C. Moore, 1845).

¹¹ Victorian readers might have become familiar with the story from its original source, Pliny the Younger, translated by Alfred Church and W.J. Brodribb for *Pliny’s Letters* (William Blackwood and Sons, 1872) pp. 163-64—or from articles about specters, such as Edwin Sharpe Grew’s “Famous Ghosts,” *Ludgate Monthly* 4 (July, 1897) pp. 257-58.

¹² Glanvill’s own account of his investigation can be found in the second part of *Saducismus Triumphatus: or, Full and Plain Evidence Concerning Witches and Apparitions* (third edition, printed for A.L. and sold by Roger Tuckyr, at the Golden Leg, 1700) pp. 49-62. Victorian retellings of this ghost hunt are many, but include J.E. Smith’s “The Drummer of Tedworth,” *Legends and Miracles and Other Curious Stories of Human Nature* (B.D. Cousins, 1837) pp. 41-47 and the anonymous “A Third Evening with the Witchfinders,” *Dublin University Magazine* 31.184 (April, 1848) pp. 440-44. The legends of Rudall and Dodge can also be found in various sources, but most readers probably would have learned about the former from Robert Stephen Hawker’s “The Botathen Ghost,” *All the Year Round* 17.421 (May 18, 1867) pp. 501-04, and the latter from Thomas Q. Couch’s “The Spectral Coach,” which first appeared in Robert Hunt’s *Popular Romances of the West of England; or, The Drolls, Traditions, and Superstitions of Old Cornwall* (John Camden Hotten, 1865) pp. 252-60.

¹³ The pre-Victorian sources are the anonymous “Madame Deshoulieres, the French Poetess,” *The Literary Gazette* 1.46 (Dec. 6, 1817) pp. 363-64; the anonymous “The Ghost Discovered,” *The Repository of Arts, Literature, Fashions, Manufactures, &c.* 5.25 (Jan. 1, 1818) pp. 38-40; and Joseph Clinton Robertson and Thomas Byerley (as Shoto and Reuben Percy), *The Percy Anecdotes* (printed for T. Boys, 1820) pp. 136-40. The Victorian source is the “Deshoulières, Antoinette du Ligier de la Garde” article in Sarah Josepha Hale’s *Woman’s Record; or, Sketches of All Distinguished Women* (Sampson Low, Son, 1853) pp. 288-89.

¹⁴ Samuel Johnson, *Gentlemen’s Magazine* 32 (Feb., 1762) p. 81. Johnson’s authorship is confirmed in James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, Vol. 1 (printed by Henry Baldwin for Charles Dilly, 1791) p. 220.

¹⁵ Samuel Johnson, *Rasselas* (Willis P. Hazard, 1856) p. 58. Boswell, Vol. 1, p. 186. T.M. Jarvis, *Accredited Ghost Stories* (printed for J. Andrews, 1823) p. 2.

Herman Melville, *Moby Dick* (Harper & Brothers, 1851) p. 345. Boswell, Vol. 2, p. 190.

¹⁶ Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 8.0, 13 October 2019), January 1804, trial of FRANCIS SMITH (t18040111-79).

¹⁷ Smith and the others lying in wait for the Hammersmith ghost are referred to as “ghost-hunters” in an anonymous recap of current events called “Domestic Incidents,” *Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure* 1.1 (Jan., 1804) p. 63. It also appears in “Affairs in England,” *Scots Magazine and Edinburgh Literary Miscellany* 66 (Jan., 1804) p. 68. The Hammersmith/Smith tragedy joined the Cock Lane/Johnson as popular British ghostlore, and Victorian readers would have had an easy time either reading or hearing about them.