

## “THE HAND AND ARM OF MRS. FOYSTER”

By Walter A Carrithers, Jr.

“Price said of the wall-messages, occurring only during the Foyster tenancy: ‘I think I am right in saying that this phenomenon is unique in the annals of psychical research’ (MHH, p. 144). This statement is incorrect. Price’s own library contained the first edition of Walter Hubbell’s The Haunted House: A True Ghost Story. Being an Account of the Mysterious Manifestations that have taken place in the presence of Esther Cox... The Great Amherst Mystery (St John, 1879), which was an account of a very well-known case in which sensational messages addressed to Esther Cox are alleged to have appeared paranormally on the walls of a house in Amherst, Nova Scotia. Price also possessed Hereward Carrington’s Personal Experiences in Spiritualism (London, 1913), which on pp. 95-124 gives a summary of the Amherst affair; and also Vol. XIII of the Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research (New York 1919) which on pp. 89-130 printed ‘A Critical Study of The Great Amherst Mystery’ by Dr. Walter Franklin Prince. This detailed analysis argued formidably the case for trickery by Esther whilst in a state of dissociation.” HBR, pp. 78-9. (Each of the titles given are, according to the authors, listed in the catalogue to Price’s library, published 1929.) Again, page 111, HBR repeats the charge of mis-statement: “This is incorrect, as we have pointed out.”

Here, as always, it is the details that count; and the objectors overlooked and omit the fact that “the writing on the walls” at Borley Rectory—at least the written words—was writing in pencil (or in some material that produced the resemblance to pencil writing, EBR, pp. 202-3); and thus the apparently pencilled writing on the Rectory walls was “unique in the annals of psychical research, “for the “writing” in the Amherst case had appeared by incision in the

plaster-wall (H. Carrington, Personal Experiences in Spiritualism, Chapter VII, “The Great Amherst Mystery,” report of a personal investigation by the author; p. 98.)

Nor is this the only omission of relevant fact that was suppressed in process of charging Harry Price with falsehood. The authors—while playing ignorant—well knew that Chapter XI, “Deciphering the Marianne Appeals,” (The End of Borley Rectory) begins thusly: “Alleged paranormal wall-writing by psychic ‘entities’ occurs very rarely in houses haunted by either ghosts or Poltergeists, but this phenomenon at Borley Rectory was not unique. In the Poltergeist infestation at Amherst, Nova Scotia, in 1878-79, Esther Cox, the young girl ‘medium’ or centre of attraction, was threatened several times in ‘messages’. One of these, scribbled on the bedroom wall, read: ‘Esther Cox, you are mine to kill!’”

If indeed it was a real mistake in meaning, if not only in lack of proper qualification on Price’s part in 1940 (MHH), the author was nevertheless honest and candid enough to remedy it prominently six years later in his second Borley book (EBR.) One regrets that his prosecutors do not feel obligated to play as fair with their readers.

While on the subject of wall-writing and “incorrect” statements, one cannot fail to note that the authors’ accusation of falsehood begins with the allegation that it was made by Price in reference to the “wall messages, occurring only during the Foyster tenancy,...” (see above). That it was not confined in reference to the wall-messages appearing during the Foyster period is proven by the context which—not unexpectedly separated by the authors from the extracted phrase disputed—appears in HBR thirty-three pages later (p 111): “One of the most striking—if not the most striking—aspects of the haunting of Borley Rectory is the writing on the walls. I think I am right in saying etc.”

This attribution, certainly false as made by the authors, is consistent with their designed effort to make the reader believe that all the “wall-messages” did actually occur only during the Foyster tenancy—thus permitting the skeptics, by reference to Mrs. Foyster’s hand, to conveniently dispel, in their estimation, any mystery as to their provenance. To this end they have criticised two of the reputedly best evidenced instances of the reported discovery of wall-messages at the Rectory: Firstly, a case of August 14-15, 1937, which Price himself described as, “If this is not proof of paranormal activity, I do not know the meaning of the word,” MHH, p. 121, HBR, pp. 130-1; and, secondly, a case of 7 July 1937, i.e. report by Lt. Col. F.C. Westland that on that date “he had discovered ‘a new writing’ in the kitchen passage reading ‘Marianne light mass prayers,’ a phenomenon which appears to be confirmed when we turn to the report of Mr. Mark Kerr-Pearse of 19 July 1937 describing his visit of 3 and 4 July. Mr. Kerr-Pearse says: ‘I would point out here that on my visit of 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> July I am positive that the ‘Marianne Light Mass Prayers’ was not then written as it is most conspicuous and I examined all walls on that visit’ (Report, p. 9).” Ibid, p.111.

The first of these cases is dismissed on appeal to the unpublished “original report” and to “a letter dated 13 June 1952” from Mr. Glanville, one of the investigators, to the authors. I am not in the least inclined to dismiss the case as Price reported it, nor to undertake a refutation of the objections on the premise chosen by the critics—especially when the objections are not substantiated in HBR by so much as a single word taken from or single reference to any page or paragraph or part of the unavailable report and letter (Cf. “Report, p. 9” above.) See Chapter. Nevertheless, one is left to wonder whether, in this instance, the authors presented the pro evidence any better—any more properly or completely—than they did that for their own argument. They allege that “There is no mention in their original report to Price of any second

photograph being taken and, in fact, none was taken, as Mr. Glanville assured us...”—the crux of the issue being “the second negative.” But their reader had just been told, “Now the facts are that they arrived at the house at 9 a.m. on Saturday, 14, August. During the morning they apparently photographed four of the wall-messages.” Expressly were there four photographs after all, or have the authors simply forgotten to say that just one negative was exposed—! (Figures I and II, HBR, showing location of wall-messages, prove that from the standpoint of legibility and practical photography using one exposure—it would have been a physical impossibility to have “photographed four of the wall-messages” Mr. Glanville thought important enough to designate in his Plans.)

In rejecting the second case, the authors add that “The attitude of Price towards these discoveries on the part of his observers in 1937 appears to have been one of kindly tolerance coupled with an understandable desire not to confuse the readers of his books, “the greater the confusion the more chance of ‘phenomena’ being reported” was a rule he was beforehand accused of operating by, Ibid, p. 7; and he later is charged by the authors for injecting EBR with “a fog of mystery and confusion,” Ibid, p. 154 for he omitted all reference to these incidents in his reproductions of the reports of Col. Westland and Mr. Kerr-Pearse and stated positively: ‘It is a fact that no messages appeared after the Rev. and Mrs. Foyster left the Rectory. Those cryptic and rather pathetic appeals that successive observers discovered on the walls all ‘appeared’ during their occupation of the house,’ (MHH, p. 144).

“No doubt Price was influenced towards this opinion by virtue of the fact that he had read Mr. Foyster’s Diary of Occurrences (and therefore know that this message had appeared six years previously) whilst his enthusiastic helpers had not,” HBR, pp. 111-2.

Which, of course, may be true. But what the reader of HBR wanted—indeed what he had a right to, in view of the allegations of its authors—was knowledge that it was true, i.e. that this wall-message had been written in 1931. The real student of psychical research is no more interested in the unevidenced opinion of Harry Price on this subject than he is interested in the belief of the authors that there is “no doubt” these things are true. He wants to know the grounds for assertion that Price’s “enthusiastic helpers” had not read the Rev. Foyster’s Diary of Occurrences, especially in view of the authors’ own statement that it was in Price’s library and had been sent to him back in 1931, HBR, pp. 82-3. He wants to know whether the Rev. Foyster ever noted its appearance; and in what words and on what page of Diary of Occurrences. In fact, the reader is told none of these things, not even so much as being assured that the authors—who we may confidently assume scoured the Diary of Occurrences for every scrap they could find to fling at Harry Price, and who cite word and page when a score is in sight (HBR, p. 86)—ever found there any evidence whatever that its author had ever seen this “Marianne light mass prayers” wall-message.

Continuing, the authors add, “If we accept Price’s statement, confirmed in this instance by Mr. Foyster (who was entitled to speak with authority) only it seems when the authors choose to allow him, but in no case concerning wall-messages he may have known nothing about. (One wonders why, in the course of HBR, this “authority” the Rev. Foyster—perhaps as reward for his testimony to “wall-messages”?—is divested of his titles?). That the wall-writings all appeared in 1931 and that the period of their execution was in fact limited to the summer of that year, we are entitled to wonder a little why this should be so. If the pencillings were paranormal, why did these phenomena occur during a brief fraction only of the 81 years’ life of the house, which we are told was haunted from the earliest days of its existence?” Ibid, p. 112.

This is a good example of what one might call the “vanishing act”—a performance of literary legerdemain—in which “when analysed the evidence... appears to diminish in force and finally to vanish away,” *Ibid*, p. 168. A statement by Harry Price (italics original) that “no messages appeared after the Rev. and Mrs. Foyster left the Rectory” is soon followed by the authors’ appeal to “Price’s statement... that the wall-writings all appeared in 1931”—and this is deftly and unobtrusively transformed into the definite implication that the pencillings occurred “during a brief fraction only of the 81 years etc.”

Not only is it doubtful that messages in written words appeared on the walls only during the Foyster tenancy, but it is certain that Price himself in a statement, which had perforce to be omitted—so that the “vanishing act” could “go over”—, maintained that pencillings continued to appear on the walls in mysterious fashion after the Foysters left. And, we have seen that apparent communications—messages, if you will—were evidently written on the walls (and discovered under purportedly impressive conditions) also still later. “Although no ‘messages’ were written during my lease of the Rectory, many new pencil-markings were noted by my observers—some of them appearing spontaneously in their presence. And though we received no messages on the walls, the Glanville family and their friends recorded many of these pathetic appeals via the Planchette and the tipping table, as the reader knows. They were all in the same vein: ‘Light, Mass, Prayers’ etc.” *EBR*, p. 196. (in other words, if the ‘entity’—supposing some sort of intelligent force, apart from the living, to have been, in some way and measure, paranormally involved with the “wall-writings”—could avail itself of the opportunities of the Planchette and “tipping-table”, why, in any large measure, should it have bothered with what we may assume were the relatively more difficult “wall-writings”? These “communications” received by the Glanville family and friends began about four months after the beginning of Harry Price’s

tenancy, which was, relatively speaking, the first period of renewed human attention accorded the rectory “phenomena” following the Foysters’ exit, EBR, p. 105. In this respect, of the five cases of written “messages” purportedly appearing during the Price tenancy—and described herein—only alleged phenomenon (i.e. that reported by Mr. Savage, see p. , ) dates within the period of the Glanville-circle “communications.” And, perhaps significantly, this one Vide EBR, p. 217 (a series of seventeen dashes\_ would seem to require less skill and effort to inscribe than any of the others, perhaps even less than the “arrow-shaft and its head” discovered by the Rev. Henning and Mr. Kerr-Pearse.”)

As for pencilings, and the question of their possible paranormality, the authors, while ostensibly recounting the mysterious events witnessed by members of the so-called ‘Cambridge Commission’ of 1939-1944, (See p. ), for some reason best known to themselves, omitted all reference to pencilings.

On 27 February, 1942, a member of the group and its leader, respectively Mr. J.P. Grantham and Dr. A.J.B. Robertson visited Borley. “”Pieces of paper were placed on the most of the corridor walls and in most of the rooms, a pencil being conveniently placed near each paper. Some of the papers were labeled with remarks such as ‘Please write here,’ this experiment seeming of interest in view of previous claims concerning the appearance of pencil-writing on the walls,” EBR, pp. 152-3. The joint report states: “The next day, on inspecting the pieces of paper, we observed slight marks in indelible pencil on two of the pieces, and more especially on one. The marks appear to be meaningless, and have plainly been made when the paper was folded. Now the paper containing the most marks was the paper we had pinned up in the downstairs drawing-room. Further, we had inspected it extra carefully when taking it down because it was close to some writing on the wall made since the fire (we estimated), on a white

patch left by the peeling off of some wall-paper. There were no marks on it at this stage. Incidentally, we might say the writing on the wall was probably put there by some visitor: there are numerous complicated drawings and writings all over the Rectory, of skulls, etc., but this writing interested us more owing to its simplicity. The main point is our careful inspection of the paper. The papers were carried into the sewing-room and placed in an envelope; this piece we are considering was the last to be collected and was therefore presumably outside. Now we had only one indelible pencil, which we had placed upstairs by the chapel, and this was one of the first to be collected. It was placed with the others in a pocket entirely separate from the papers. It is therefore our own opinion that the markings are abnormal to some degree of probability, but as it is not inconceivable that we made the markings by accident, we should like this to be considered as an only opinion..." Ibid. pp. 153-4.

Not being 'in the act,' these reports were of course excluded from HBR. Of the three pairs of witnesses, one gentleman of one [text missing]

As regards those messages and writings admittedly of the Foyster period, even here the authors are not at all candid for, though they once mention, without comment, "the appearance of messages on... pieces of paper," no instance is related. The reader is given no opportunity or means to form any kind of opinion on the alleged phenomenon, unless indeed we supposed the authors allowed Mr. Kerr-Pearse's later discovery of messages on paper in a cupboard to be a later example. Neither, in touching lightly upon the experiences of Sir George and Lady Whitehouse, is it related that Price reported that, on a visit to the rectory during the residence of the Foysters, these two "saw pieces of paper, bearing cryptic messages appealing to 'Marianne' for help, which fluttered down from nowhere," EBR, p. 35. It is hardly exemplary, as an "S.P.R. enquiry," that though the authors claim to have visited Lady Whitehouse and "discussed her

experiences at Borley”—or, perhaps, only some of her experiences at Borley?—they maintain a suspicious silence on this matter, (Cf. HBR, pp. 103-5.)

One notes, in their analysis, the reiterated suggestion that, for example, “the wall-writing was ‘obviously done by Mrs. Foyster,’”; that parts of the writing, in their own opinion, shows a “distinct similarity” to Mrs. Foyster’s “normal handwriting,” etc., etc., (p. 114, et. al.) And the authors pass without comment the observation that “Dr. Phythian-Adams suggests that the ‘entity’ responsible for the appeals borrowed the hand and arm of Mrs. Foyster to write the messages, and that she was quite unconscious of the actions,” Ibid, p. 112.

It is regrettable that at this juncture the reader was not told that the sponsors of those noted automatists for the S.P.R., Mrs. Piper, Mrs. Leanoard, at. al., did not endeavor to prove that the scripts of those “mediums”, when regarded as of paranormal content (often ostensibly written under “control” of discarnate human entities), did not show a “distinct similarity” to the medium’s normal handwriting. Nor can professed experts in psychical research be altogether excused for ignoring the relevant applicability of the curious but not new hypothesis that in a case such as the Borley rectory “wall-writings,” etc., “astral” hand and arm might be at work unsuspected.

“The Pauline doctrine of the ‘Spiritual body’ does not explain itself, and was not a new idea even in his time,” wrote Dr. James H. Hyslop, “Secretary of the American Society for Psychical research and formerly Professor of Logic and Ethics in Columbia University,” “The whole doctrine of the resurrection had rested upon it long before Christ. We have seen that many of the early Greek philosophers believed in ‘spirits’ and that the doctrine which divided the Pharsees and the Sadducees was very old, in fact extending back to the time of Homer and Aeschylus. The earliest conception of the resurrection was thus one of apparitions and these

apparitions were assumed to be exactly what they appeared to be; namely, some sort of physical organism, the double or counterpart of the physical. Even the Epicureans admitted its existence, sometimes calling it the ‘ethereal organism,’ but asserting that it perished at death. The idea was a very common one and in modern times is represented by the ‘astral body’ of the Theosophists. They borrowed it from Hindu philosophers who seem never to have wholly lost sight of it.” (Life After Death, pp. 94-5.)

The chief of these Theosophists, writing in 1877, referred to a reported phenomenon, stated by Dr. Fairfield, the investigator, to have been seen “under conditions of test provided by himself, in his own room, in full daylight, with the medium seated upon a sofa from six to eight feet from the table hovering upon which the apparition (the hand) appeared, “Dr. Fairfield’s deduction that the fluttering phantom-hand is an emanation from the medium is logical, and it is correct... The ‘force concerned in the phenomenon’ is the will of the medium, exercised unconsciously to the outer-man, which for the time being is semi-paralyzed and cataleptic; the phantom-hand an extrusion of the man’s inner or astral member. That is the real self whose limbs the surgeon cannot amputate...” H.P. Blavatsky, Isis Unveiled, Vol. II, pp. 594-5, (facsimile reproduction, 1<sup>st</sup>. Ed.)

Writing of “those things which give one the (probably absurd) impression of being processes or apparent protuberances from the medium’s body,” and which were observed (seen and felt) during the séances of Eusapia Paladino (when furniture was overturned witnesses seized, writing appeared, knockings sounded, phantoms emerged, etc., etc.—all mysteriously and inexplicably), Sir Oliver Lodge wrote: “This appearance as of extra limbs is indeed so prominent a feature that actual physical malformation of the medium has been suggested to account for them. But I have authority to say that she has been medically examined, and I know that Mrs.

Sidgwick and Mrs. Lodge took pains to assure themselves that there was nothing whatever abnormal about her external configuration. They were also satisfied that she did not bring with her into the séance room any concealed appliances or dummy limbs.” From Experiences of Unusual Physical Phenomena Occurring in the Presence of an Entranced Person (Eusapia Paladino), a report of sitting attended by Oliver J. Lodge, D. Sc., Mr. F.W.H. Myers; Professor Charles Richet; Dr. J. Ochorowicz, (formerly Professor of Psychology and Natural Philosophy in the University of Lemberg); Dr. Freiherr von Schrenck Notzing; and Professor and Mrs. Sidgwick, among others (1894.) Journal, S.P.R., vol. Vi, pp. 329, 321.

None of which should, however, be taken to imply that Mrs. Foyster was another Paladino, or that phenomena—supposing them to have been genuinely paranormal—could only have occurred in her presence during one of her apparently frequent “trances” or “fainting-fits.” \*

---

\* During the visit of Mrs. Goldney, “Mrs. Foyster collapsed in an apparent faint... KMB and the rector assisted Mrs. Foyster up to bed and shortly afterwards there was a crash caused by ‘an empty claret bottle... hurled down the staircase well’ whilst ‘one of the bells (the pull of which was in one of the upstairs rooms) started to ring violently.’ These events were followed by the noise made by some ‘small pebbles’ which ‘rattled down the stairs,’ and by Mrs. Foyster ‘calling out in alarm’ because she had been locked in her bedroom. In the opinion of KMG, who has had hospital training, not only was Mrs. Foyster’s pulse normal, but she showed no signs of genuine physical distress.” And, in the next paragraph, it is added that the Rev. Foyster “refers repeatedly to his wife’s ill-health in simple physical terms such as ‘feeling absolutely rotten,’ ‘somewhat collapsed for a time’, ‘had a very bad turn’, ...” Ibid., pp. 88-9.

---

(It is reported of many supposed mediums—D.D. Home, as a famous example—that mysterious phenomena were experienced about them while they were up and about and seemingly conscious.) Neither should it be considered relevant to the question of a phenomenon’s authenticity that, according to the authors, Mrs. Foyster’s neighbors in later life were unable to say “that there was anything extraordinary about her in a psychic sense, at least,” HBR, p. 89.

One can only wish the authors could boast of a measure of “hospital training” in the “psychology of pain” and in the recognition of “physical terms” of distress. Beyond this, one wishes they had a more appropriate appreciation for the duties of their own calling and were prepared to give their readers something worthy of an “S.P.R. enquiry.” According to their own delineation as submitted, we might (with little imagination and no disputation of testimony presented) properly suppose that whilst a bottle came down the main staircase well, something was pulling the bell-wire in bedroom (No. 3); and, while Mrs. Foyster was locked in and calling from bedroom (No. 7), pebbles were rattling down the back stairs. What the “patient’s” pulse was doing during all this, we are not told—perhaps only the lady with hospital training was busy counting her own. (It is perhaps significant that, when Price on the following morning “accused Mrs. Foyster,” Mrs. Goldney intervened on her behalf, HBR, p. 78.)

Nor should one be so dogmatic—in a subject so full of mystery and dubious theories—as to believe that anyone not a “medium” and not in “trance” or “fainting-fit” could not lend a hand (astral) to a passing “Poltergeist” in need of help. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the only possibly new discoveries of messages in written word found at the Rectory after Mrs. Foyster’s removal were made by Lt. Col. Westland on 7 July 1937, and by Mr. Kerr-Pearse about 25 July 1937; and that the latter gentleman may have been sleeping at the Rectory during this period. (It is also during this period that discovery was made of the unexplained incision of

the “arrow-shaft and its head”, 19 July 1937; and, the “photographed” pencil-markings of August 14-15, 1937.) The authors assert their belief that Mr. Kerr-Pearse “lived” at the Rectory for a period of possibly more than a month (HBR, p. 110) and Mr. S.H. Glanville, the “chief observer,” reports that Mr. Kerr-Pearse, during his stay “for several weeks continuously” slept “in the large summer house in the garden.” He immediately adds that, “One hot August day three people called, two of them were known to Kerr-Pearse” and “Although they were not official observers they were taken over the house,” Fate, October, 1951, p. 102.

In this direction, it is interesting to speculate upon a possible significance of some of the written phenomena of this period. “Some time” before 19 September 1937 the observers at the Rectory had “ringed with chalk” a number of different objects at different places over the house, in the hope that the “Poltergeist” would manifest by moving them.\*

---

\*“Among them was an empty tobacco tin which was placed on the drawing-room mantel-piece. For some time none of these objects showed any signs of movement. But on September 19 we walked into the drawing-room and immediately noticed that the tin from the mantel-piece had gone. We went on our way through the house and on the landing found the tin. It had been placed with almost mathematical accuracy on the very small mark that we had made on the floor to mark the area where the two ladies had been so acutely affected [the “Cold Spot”, see p. ]; where Mr. Smith had heard the whispering; where the wedding ring was found [EBR, p. 215] and where Mrs. Foyster had been struck in the face,” Fate, October, 1951, p. 103. Excusing themselves from the task of analyzing “in detail many of the supposed inexplicable incidents occurring during the enquiries of Mr. S.H. Glanville and Mr. Mark Kerr-Pearse,” the authors chose to “content” themselves—and those readers of their school who are in so odd a fashion

easily contented—with a “few remarks” on a “few” incidents. Needless to say, that instead of the above, they chose to “examine critically” the report of the “moving sack”, of which they could object “we cannot suppose that he [Mr. Kerr-Pearse] had paid any very particular attention to it as he had not marked it with chalk...” HBR, p. 137. The reader was not told that the suggestion of chalk, in the discussion, originated with the reports of Price’s observers at this period—whether it did or not; but the authors do not allow their reader a hint of any kind that objects under “control” at the rectory had been “ringed” and “chalked” by investigators and had been found displaced!

---

One message discovered by Mr. Kerr-Pearse himself, the last week of July, said “Important do not move this paper,”\_On 19 July, Mr. Kerr-Pearse had submitted to Price a possible decipherment of the wall-messages (HBR, p. 158); and evidently less than a week later he dings a mysterious paper, apparently written in cipher (Ibid, p. 157.) And but twelve days before this—there was discovered the “Marianne Light Mass Prayers” message (which Mr. Glanville—who may really have been Harry Price’s “authority” on the specific question—appears to have thought dated from the Foyster period, although on what grounds is not shown, Fate, October, 1951, p. 99.) But this writing—which Mr. Kerr-Pearse himself seems to have positively believed new—appears unique in that while all the other Wall Writings similarly designed in Mr. Glanville’s Plans are merely the whole or part of a proper name (as if in an unfinished message) or a “pathetic appeal” for someone to “get” etc., the “discovery” of 1937 was no more than a synthesis of the principal names manifest in the appeals, as they would have been read by an analyst; and, unlike the others, is no plea at all. (In other words, Marianne being absent and gone for years, it is less intelligent to suppose that this combination of names originated with “Marie

Lairre” than that it came from the mind, if not the “astral” hand, of the reader, Mark Kerr-Pearse.)

On 3 August 1937, Mr. Kerr-Pearse reports he was rummaging in the cellars, presumably looking for something connecting with the “haunting” or with the legendary crime; and, as a possible sign-post to his new activity, he had, one day and a fortnight before, discovered the “arrow-shaft and its head” inscribed in the wall at the top of the cellar stairs.

In contrast to these possibilities—which are exhausted no more than are the mysteries of the occult—the reader of HBR is left with but three alternative theories (unless its authors mean to take Adelaide for a suspect too, after all the labor they have expended to convict Marianne!), i.e. that the Foyster-period messages were only related to Marianne by address—or were the product of her “hand and arm” consciously or unconsciously, HBR, p. 112. More explicitly, so far as the authors were able, the reader was induced to decide between the fraud theory or almost no theory at all by being kept ignorant of the legitimate hypothesis—reasonable enough in so provisional a study as that of possible psychic phenomena—that, like the physical hand of Mrs. Piper writing under “paranormal” control, the “astral” hand of Mrs. Foyster, similarly operative—for all we know—, might well have produced messages resembling and perhaps identical in script to her normal handwriting.

The evidence in the one case—so far as it concerned the question of graphology—would have to be as fairly evaluated as in the other, something the authors of HBR do not even consider. But, as Dr. J.H. Hyslop so ably put it, “The careful psychic researcher always admits that the message, whatever its origin, comes through the mind of the medium and is colored by it in the transmission, whether by interpretation, conscious or subconscious, or by the habits of the organism itself. He always expects theory of their origin to be qualified by these influences... He

expects of the reader some intelligence above a savage in the examination of the facts!" (Life After Death, p. 212.)

---