

This work has been submitted to **NECTAR**, the **Northampton Electronic Collection of Theses and Research**.

Article

Title: Spring-heeled Jack: the Terror of London

Creator: Mackley, J. S.

Example citation: Mackley, J. S. (2016) Spring-heeled Jack: the Terror of London. *Aeternum: the Journal of Contemporary Gothic Studies*. **3**(2), pp. 1-20. 2324-4895.

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work.

Version: Accepted version

Official URL: <http://www.aeternumjournal.com/issues>

<http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/9059/>



J. S. MACKLEY

University of Northampton

Spring-heeled Jack: The Terror of London

ABSTRACT

The legends of Spring-heeled Jack" circulated after a series of assaults against young women reported in 1837; the descriptions of the assailant were of a "devil-like gentleman" or a "leaping man". Who he was, no one knew, and although the sightings were generally documented around the London area, there were reports from all over the country until 1904. Some of these were fuelled by superstition and copy-cat attacks, others were exaggerated sightings where it was claimed that people were frightened to death. These reports gave rise to stories published as serials in the "Penny Dreadful" newspapers, beginning in 1863. Some stories used Spring-heeled Jack as a mysterious character, others focused on him as an aristocratic who enjoyed pranking people – especially those who abused their status – but who was ultimately a champion for the weak, the vulnerable and the exploited.

Keywords: Spring-heeled Jack; Penny Dreadful; Victorian Gothic; serial novel; Terror of London

The nineteenth century saw an unprecedented increase in the experimental genre of Gothic literature exploring the "gloomth" that was epitomised by some London districts and society. While readers' appetites for the macabre were being satisfied by the supernatural writings of authors such as Horace Walpole and Matthew Lewis, others sought the sensibility of the descriptions of exotic landscapes as depicted in works by authors such as Ann Radcliffe and Eleanor Sleath. However, in 1837 there emerged a character on the streets and open spaces in and around London who established a

reputation for terrifying pranks and assaults on women. Victorian Society quickly put a name to their fears of this phantom attacker: Spring-heeled Jack. Reports of incidents involving Jack continued around England for sixty-seven years. The labyrinthine and claustrophobic streets, thick with London fog and shadows cast by gas streetlamps made the perfect gothic setting for Jack's antics and became the subject of plays and serial novels in the infamous "Penny Dreadful" newspapers, published weekly by the Newsagents Publishing Company and in *The Boy's Standard*, priced at one penny (Kirkpatrick 2013, 13).

This study will principally focus on the reported sightings of Spring-heeled Jack between 1837 and 1904, and will also look at some of the printed "Penny Dreadful" series to show how the story, and the character, of Spring-heeled Jack develops. Although Jack himself is described as "the Terror of London", *these* stories are described as a "Romance of the nineteenth Century". It is acknowledged on the front cover that "a person known to the police as Spring-heeled Jack did frighten and cause the death of several persons" but, according to the publicity on the back cover, *this* Jack is a "wonderful man" who undertakes "daring deeds and startling adventures" to defend the weak and helpless (SHJ 1863 [repr. 1867]). This is the major difference between these historical and fictional reports: the historical entity terrorised the community, whereas the fictional Jack, particularly in the 1863 story, acknowledged his past transgressions and acted, as Punter and Byron describe it, to "police the boundaries of the human, pointing to those lines that must not be crossed" (Punter and Byron 2004, 263). He uses his monstrous disguise of Spring-heeled Jack to identify the hypocrites of aristocratic society, and to stop their abuse of power.

The study of Spring-heeled Jack sighting is rife with difficulties: when we interrogate sources, we find that some authors have written fictions, but that these fictions have been incorporated into the canon of Spring-heeled Jack incidents. Other authors have used fact and fiction interchangeably and their works are the foundation for later writers. Even the so-called facts of those contemporary newspaper reports may have been exaggerated or influenced by oral tales and urban legends already circulating. Some stories have vivid illustrations, when the truth is far less dramatic.

Although there were reports of apparitions and of a "peculiar leaping man" as early as 1817, these were extensions of sightings of London ghosts. The gothic atmosphere of the London fog and pockets of light from gas lamps gave pranksters a place to hide and vanish, and provide a place where witnesses' imaginations could create demons in the darkness. Generally, the reported sightings demonstrate Jack's intention to distress vulnerable women: in 1826 there is a newspaper account in *The Northampton Mercury* (21st January 1826) of a "person nightly appearing in a mask" in Southampton who "has been fired at without effect, being enveloped in steel armour; he also wears a pair of spring boots which enable him to vault over a ten-foot wall". Jack played upon his supernatural reputation, as Botting observes: "Imagined supernatural terrors are accompanied by

other mysteries that lie closer to home and reality” (Botting 1996, 64). Jack’s apparent supernatural powers led to overwrought emotions. Modern discussions of historical events also include the story of Polly Adams, a tavern worker from Blackheath, who, on the 11th October 1837, was attacked by a “devil-like gentleman” at Blackheath Fair who tore off her blouse and scratched her stomach with his claws before escaping by leaping over a fence (Haining 1977, 1-9).

Also in October 1837, Mary Stevens, a domestic servant, was walking across Clapham Common when she was set upon by a figure who leapt out from an alleyway and proceeded to rip at her clothes and touch her body with cold claws. When Stevens screamed, several residents came to her aid, but the attacker was nowhere to be found. On the following day, a figure leapt in front of a carriage causing the driver to lose control and crash. Witnesses describe how the assailant escaped by jumping over a nine-foot wall, surrounded by echoing, maniacal laughter. Shortly after this incident, Jack left footprints, three inches deep, in the ground near Clapham Church when he assaulted a woman. These impressions appeared to show a spring mechanism which gave him his ability to jump. The incidents involving Mary Stevens, the carriage, and the Clapham footprints are discussed by Elizabeth Villiers (Villers 1928, 240-45; cf. Haining 1977, 39), however, these incidents are not documented in any contemporary sources.

These urban myths circulated among the populace. Botting argues that the “gloom and darkness” of Gothic literature more generally, but equally a part of the locale where sightings of Jack were reported, became “external markers of inner and emotional states” (Botting 1996, 91-2). These stories did not distance the horror in an exotic land, or a different historical milieu, instead, they were placed in the locality of the reader (Punter and Byron 2004, 26). In December 1837, there was an account of a businessman who had reported that he had seen a “leaping man” on Barnes Common, although when the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Morning Herald* sent someone to investigate the stories:

he was directed to many persons who were named as having been injured by this alleged ghost, but, on his speaking to them, they immediately denied all knowledge of it, but directed him to other persons whom they had heard, had been ill-treated, but with them he met with no better success; and the police [...] declare that, although they have made every inquiry into the matter, they cannot find one individual hardy enough to assert a personal knowledge on the subject (*The Morning Herald*, 10th January 1838).

On the day before New Year’s Eve of 1837, residents of the neighbourhood of Lewisham described a figure disguised in a bear skin and wearing spring shoes who “jumps to and fro before foot passengers” as part of a wager to appear as these “freaks [...] in nine different parishes”, according to *The Northampton Mercury* (30th December 1837). The figure was now named “Steel Jack” (presumably from earlier sightings when he was seen wearing armour) and then on 13th January 1838 an article carried the headline “Spring

Jack" and it was very soon afterwards, on the 22nd February, that the Press gave a name to their fears: Spring-heeled Jack (reported in the *West Kent Guardian*, on the 13th January 1838, and *The Times*, on the 22nd February 1838).

The antics of this mysterious character must have been the talk of the town: on January 8th, a representation was made to Sir John Cowan, the Lord Mayor of London, signed by "A resident of Peckham". Cowan spoke about this at a public session held the following day in the Mansion House - the Lord Mayor's official residence. The representation claimed that "some individuals (of, as the writer believes, the higher ranks of life) have laid a wager with a mischievous and foolhardy companion (name as yet unknown), that he dares not take on himself the task of visiting many of the villages near London in three disguises, a ghost, a bear and a devil" (as described in *The Times*, on the 9th January 1838) or alternatively he was "a ghost [...] attired in polished steel armour". (*The Morning Herald*, 10th January 1838). The British Library catalogue references a pamphlet, assumed to have been circulated in 1838, describing "The Apprehension and examination of Spring-Heel'd Jack who has appeared as a Ghost, Demon, Bear, Baboon, etc.", however this pamphlet, along with two others relating to Spring-Heeled Jack, was destroyed when the British Museum was damaged during the London Blitz, 10-11th May 1941. Jack was often perceived as the devil incarnate, so, for a society that was undergoing a massive social upheaval because of scientific advances, Jack acted as an anchor to remind the readers about their Christian faith and superstition (Killeen 2009, 127). The hysteria that followed Jack may have developed from anxieties which Robert Miles refers to as a "Gothic cusp" which describes the populous who were facing a new year with the young new queen, Victoria, on the throne, and the uncertainties of the anticipated social upheaval of the times (Miles 1995, 5).

The complaint by the resident of Peckham was followed up by the *Morning Chronicle* with a summary of some of the alarming incidents that had apparently occurred in the villages around London. Residents from Peckham were frightened by "the alleged pranks of the ghost, imp or devil". The Barnes attacks were carried out by a figure "in the shape of a large white bull", but he appeared as a white bear in East Sheen, and in Richmond there were reports of "females being frightened to death and children torn to pieces by the supposed unearthly visitant". In Ham and Petersham, he appeared as a devilish imp where "neither man, woman, nor child durst venture beyond the threshold of their domiciles without a lantern and a thick club stick"; afterwards "an unearthly warrior, clad in armour of polished brass, with spring shoes, and large claw gloves" was seen in Hampton Wick and Hampton Court. In Bushy Park, Teddington, Twickenham, Whitton, and Hounslow he was seen to frighten children and adolescents as well as leaping over the high walls. In Cutthroat Lane in Isleworth, a carpenter named Jones was assaulted by the "ghost" wearing steel armour and bright red shoes. When the carpenter fought back, the ghost was joined by two others who shredded his clothes as they fought. His antics are recorded in Heston, Drayton, Harlington, and Uxbridge. He was seen wearing armour in Hanwell, Brentford, Ealing, Acton, Hammersmith and Kensington. In

Ealing he injured a blacksmith by tearing his flesh with iron claws, in Hammersmith he attacked a pie-seller, and children reported seeing an “unearthly being dancing by moonlight” on the green in front of Kensington Palace. Furthermore, it was reported that “the wager according to which Spring John plays his pranks, runs that he is to kill six females with fright. Six hundred are nearly dead at the idea of it already” (reported in *West Kent Guardian*, 13th January 1838). Spring-heeled Jack was making the rounds of the London villages, leaving terror (and rumour) in his wake (*All the Year Round*, 9th August 1884, 345–50). Reporting in 1884 on the list of sightings of Jack, the author of an article that appeared in *All the Year Round* declared that “so numerous were the tales told of Spring-heeled Jack that a good many must be supposed to be true; whist on the other hand, great allowance must be made for credulity, some people not being content with the marvellous as they find it, but being only too happy to add thereto” (*All the Year Round*, 9th August 1884, 349).

Some of these reports are simply the product of an overactive imagination: one resident of Old Brentford told a policeman that he had seen the “ghost”, but upon examination it transpired that he had seen a police inspector on his horse! The report continues that in all cases “although the stories were in everybody’s mouth, no person who had actually seen him could be ascertained”. On another occasion, a young domestic servant was terrified as her umbrella was snatched away from her. She fled, believing she had been attacked by Spring-heeled Jack, only to discover the following day that her assailant was, in fact, a mass of overhanging brambles (Golicz 2006, 1). Other stories were considered as “the invention of some wag”, and in some cases, the local constabulary had heard nothing of the figure who was terrorising the streets, and the report concludes “we strongly suspect that the Peckham statement will, on investigation, have a similar result” (*The Morning Chronicle*, 10th January 1838). This form of terror, as advanced by Ann Radcliffe, is constructed from “indirect or direct encounters” with a girl “on the cusp of womanhood, and various terrorists who are located at the crossroads of dread and desire” (Davison 2009, 94). In this instance, however, the perpetrators are constructed from the reports of previous encounters with Jack and are generated within the young lady’s mind, an event with which many women could identify (Davison 2009, 144). This is the “supernatural explained” as seen in texts such as Radcliffe’s *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Of course, these were not simply “fantasies”, or the desire to engage with the Gothic as seen in *Northanger Abbey*. Davison, citing Woolstonecraft, observes that “the terrors, the restrains, the dangers of the Gothic novel were not the fantasies, but the realities of a woman’s life” (cited in Davison 2009, 148).

Despite this summary, the Lord Mayor received a further representation, this time from Thomas Lott of Bow Lane who observed that “Some individual (‘gentleman’ he has been designated) drives about with a livery servant in a cab, and, throwing off a cloak, appears in these frightful forms, and is to win a wager by the joke” (*The Times*, 10th January 1838). As Cowan received further representations, vigilante groups were formed

- one was apparently led by the Duke of Wellington, even though he was nearly aged seventy at the time (Vyner 1961, 3).¹

Something about these reports of Spring-heeled Jack captured the public imagination. On the 27th January 1838, while the Mansion House Representations were still attracting the public's interest, *Franklin's Miscellany* published a fictionalised story called "The Spring Jack", which was written by "Peter Piper" (Adcock, online). This story is set in a pub on Peckham Rye, perhaps drawing on the existing reports that had been made to the Lord Mayor of London by the anonymous Resident of Peckham. The story is illustrated with a picture of a devilish-faced Jack, wearing boots, a cape, and skin-tight clothes. Five characters have fainted while Jack himself leaps over a house. The narrative describes how his boots "have powerful springs attached thereto, which can be sprung at the pleasure of the wearer". The plot tells of how Jack orders a pot of ale in the local public house, but when it is brought to him, the pewter melts in his fingers. Jack asks for something else to eat, but the landlord refuses. Jack then melts his way into the food cupboard: "placing his fist against the oaken cupboard-door, smoke arose, and screwing his fist about a little, it went through like a red hot poker, taking and devouring the food and then breaking a pie-dish over the landlord's head". The article concludes that this story must be true because the landlord "has ever since punctually attended the neighbouring church" and since then "he has filled his pots and given good measure" (*Franklin's Miscellany*, vol. 1, no. 7, 27th January 1838). Thus, as well as reaffirming the public's terror of Jack's apparently supernatural abilities, it also acted as a morality tale to be a good Christian and to serve honest measures. Here, then, the "monster serves to demonstrate or warn: "by providing a warning of the results of vice and folly, monsters promote virtuous behaviour" (Punter and Byron 2006, 263).

However, away from the world of fiction and rumour, serious attacks were reported and investigated: on the 22nd February 1838, *The Times* carried the headline "OUTRAGE ON A YOUNG LADY". A complaint was put forward to the Lambeth Street office of the police by Mr John Alsop, "a gentleman of considerable property" who worked in the Bank of England and who lived in an isolated cottage on Bear-bind Lane between the villages of Bow and Old Ford. This remote dwelling was thus an ideal spot for an attack. The report described how on the 20th February, Alsop's eighteen-year old daughter, Jane, heard a "violent ringing" at the gate. When she enquired what the matter was, and requested that he would not ring so loud, the figure told Jane that he was a policeman and said, "For God's sake, bring me a light, for we have caught Spring-heeled Jack here in the lane". When Jane returned with a candle, the "policeman" threw off his cloak, then:

¹ The reference to the Duke of Wellington is mentioned in Haining, 1977, 42-44; Mike Dash says there is "no evidence of the Duke of Wellington's involvement in the scare. I suspect it may have been suggested to Haining by discovery of the real involvement of the much less celebrated Admiral Codrington", Mike Dash, pers. comm. (email 1 December 2015).

applying the lighted candle to his breast, presented a most hideous and frightful appearance, and vomited forth a quantity of blue and white flames from his mouth, and his eyes resembled red balls of fire. From the hasty glance which her fright enabled her to get of his person, she observed that he wore a large helmet, and his dress, which appeared to fit him very tight, seemed to her to resemble white oil skin (*The Times*, 22nd February 1838).

She tried to run, but he caught her by the dress and neck then forced her head under his arms and scratched at her dress with claws “which she was certain were of some metallic substance”. Jane screamed and, wrenching herself away from him, she fled to the safety of her house but Jack caught her again. This time he lashed at her dress and neck and tore her combs and a substantial amount of hair from her head before dragging her down the stone steps and away from the house “with considerable violence”. Jane’s younger sister, Mary was frozen with fear, but her elder sister, Mrs Susan Harrison, managed to pull Jane free from Jack’s claws and back into the safety of the house. Even then, Jack persisted at knocking at their door until the women called for the police. Mr Alsop and his wife had been seriously ill with a rheumatic affection over several weeks, but he managed to get out of bed to assist his daughter who had “all appearance of receiving the most personal serious violence”. Alsop also noted that there was an accomplice to this assault as the first attacker did not stop to pick up his cloak as he fled across the fields and therefore there must have been someone else to retrieve it. He offered ten guineas as a reward for the capture of this criminal (*The Times*, 22nd February 1838). Karl Bell points out how the newspapers exaggerated the story as it develops. The earlier reports express surprise that “there must have been some person with him to pick it up”, while the later stories suggest that Jack “had left his cloak behind him which someone else picked up and ran off with”; and Bell concludes that “these shifts [...] were significant in shaping a public sense of who or what Jack was” (Bell 2012, 175).

On Sunday the 25th February, it was reported that “one of the ‘Spring-heeled Jack’ gang” knocked on the door of Mr Ashworth at 2 Turner Street, Commercial Road. The servant boy observed that the visitor had “thrown off his cloak and presented a most hideous appearance”. The boy screamed for help and Jack ran away “unable to accomplish any more mischief” (Reported in *The Morning Herald*, 27th February 1838; cf. Dash 1996, 55; Vyner 1961, 4). The servant claims that the visitor had a claw-like hand and his clothing was adorned with a family crest with the letter W embroidered on his costume – no doubt this was a clue to the villain’s identity.

This “clue” to Jack’s character – suggesting that he can be identified with an aristocrat – brings the legend firmly into the realm of the Gothic: we see the monstrous aristocrat in texts including *The Castle of Otranto*, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, and, of course, the monster as aristocrat in *Dracula*, amongst others. In these case, as Fred Botting argues, “monarchy, courts and inherited wealth” are where “the metaphor of the monster highlights the barbarity and tyranny of feudal power” (Botting 1996, 93). The different

portrayals of Jack as aristocrat will be explored later, most particularly in relation to the 1863 story where his identity is suggested, but never confirmed, and, in addition to playing pranks, Jack uses his status to support the vulnerable, and to expose and punish, the criminal, the bullies, the hypocrite and those who abuse power. It is also seen in the shorter 1878 (origin) story where it addresses (and dismisses) the possibility of Jack being the *alter ego* of the Marquis of Waterford. Instead, Jack has been dispossessed and tries to regain his inheritance. In a time when foreign aristocrats were being replaced in the gothic novel by overambitious or mad scientists, it is curious that Jack is still associated with a class of higher status.

While investigating the complaint presented by Jane Alsop, Mr Hardwick at the Lambeth Street Police-office was presented with the details of another attack. A report printed in *The Morning Post* on the 7th March 1838 reports that on “Wednesday last” (that is, the 28th February) eighteen-year old Lucy Scales and her sister were walking home from visiting her brother, a “respectable” butcher from Narrow Street in the Limehouse area, of East London when she noticed a figure in the shadows of Green Dragon-alley. When she was near to the person “he spurted a quantity of blue flame right in her face”. Blinded, she collapsed and endured several hours of violent fits. Lucy’s description says that she had first thought that the figure, enveloped in a large cloak, was a woman wearing a bonnet or headdress.

Ironically, having read about Spring-heeled Jack in the newspaper that afternoon, Mr Scales the butcher had remarked that it was unlikely that he would attack in Limehouse on account of the number of butchers in that area. Lucy Scales’s sister, who was not attacked, could arguably have given a better description of Lucy’s assailant, however “she was not at home when the officer called”, so Mr Scales reported what his sister had told him: the attacker was “tall, thin, and [of] gentlemanly appearance, enveloped in a large cloak, and carried in front of his person a large lamp, or bulls eye, similar to those in the possession of the police [...] he threw open his cloak, exhibited the lamp, and puffed a quantity of flame from his mouth into the face of her sister”. The sister had noted that the assailant never spoke, and in fact, he left when she fell unconscious. Her condition, “suffering from hysterics and great agitation, in all probability the result of fright,” was confirmed by a local surgeon; the police officer confirmed that it was possible to produce this effect “by blowing through a tube in which spirits of wine, sulphur, and another ingredient were deposited and ignited” (*The Morning Post*, 7th March 1838).

At the Police Office, Hardwick said that he felt that the attacks were committed by one person rather than a group. Furthermore, in the police investigation that followed, it is reported that three men from the John Bull public house in Old Ford heard the cries from the Alsop family and went to help. On their way, they met a tall man wearing a large coat. They were told that a policeman was needed at Bear-bind Cottage. It was only

later that they realised that this was most likely the man who had committed the assaults (Dash 1996, 13).

The Alsops' testimony is the earliest clear description of Jack's appearance. In addition, in almost all other newspaper reports (with exceptions such as the attack on the Isleworth Carpenter), Jack is seen operating on his own: here it is suggested that he was an accomplice (although admittedly Alsop never actually saw him). Jack is also seen to select his victim and lure her out to him, rather than pouncing on her in the street. Finally, the fact that Jane responded to the original call "We have caught Spring-Heeled Jack" suggests how widespread and prevalent the oral stories of Jack were circulating at the time.² On the other hand, the surgeon's report leaves no doubt that Lucy Scales was indeed attacked, and her description of Jack was not due to an overactive imagination triggered by reading about him in the newspapers. However, the principal difference is that Jane Alsop was clawed, dragged and had her hair pulled out, whereas Lucy was left prone, but Jack left without further attack. Other features common to the assault on the two young women are that Jack wears a cloak and some kind of headgear (Alsop describes it as a "helmet", Scales as a "bonnet"). He attacks them with his claws and also vomits blue flames. Curiously, there is no report of these flames burning either of the women, but in the case of Jane Alsop, he needs her to bring a candle before he can produce the flames; with Lucy Scales, he is already carrying a lantern. In addition, on no occasion is he seen to leap which is arguably the principal source of his terror. When we consider the account of Jane Alsop, if he *could* jump, then it should have been so easy for him to leap to the upstairs window to gain access to the property and to silence Jane's sister when she calls the police. It is entirely plausible that the attacker knew the Alsop family and particularly the position held by Jane's father. It is also possible, therefore that Jane also knew her attacker and was the circulating stories of a well-known "terror" to conceal his identity. But what is so terrifying about the Alsops' description is that – at least in a gothic context – the sightings of Spring-heeled Jack meant that the terror was no longer occurring a long time ago in a land far, far away. Instead, the monster was local, he was violent, and anyone might encounter him.

Jack's motivations at this stage are a mystery. His actions are mostly described as "pranks" and "outrages" rather than crimes which are horrific assaults against women; one of the commentators observes that he neither robs nor rapes them. Karl Bell comments on the Victorian justice system, noting that "merely frightening someone, even to the point of mental imbalance, appears to have been treated as an immoral prank by a cowardly man against a defenceless woman" (Bell 2012, 78). So aside from a perverse pleasure of terrorising women, what is the purpose of his attacks? When we consider the Jane Alsop testimony, he succeeds in frightening her and causing her physical pain by

² As mentioned earlier, there were three documents presumed to have been dated 1838 which were destroyed in the London Blitz, the other two were catalogued as "Authentic particulars of the awful appearance of Spring-heeled Jack; together with his extraordinary life etc." and "The surprising exploits of Spring-heel Jack in the vicinity of London etc." suggesting that the rumours were broadly circulated.

lashing her with his claws. Certainly, the Alsop report was investigated more thoroughly than that of Lucy Scales. Karl Bell and Mike Dash argue that this may have been on account of different classes, since “Lucy Scales’s more modest background would have been considered intrinsically less reliable, and of less interest, by most newspapers and newspaper readers of the day” (Bell 2012, 28).³

Some of these accounts have been picked out from accounts published in newspapers – for example the 1826 sighting in Southampton, the sighting in 1837 in Lewisham and the representations made to Sir John Cowan in January 1837 as well as the attacks on Lucy Scales and Jane Alsop. These reports may have some recourse to hyperbole – people frightened to death – or blind faith in the urban legends circulating about Jack where no witnesses could be found. However, Dash observes that the first mention of Polly Adams is found in a flawed “history” by Peter Haining, published in 1977. When Mike Dash wrote to Haining for a reference for his sources, Haining replied that he had loaned his research to a scriptwriter and it was never returned (Dash 1996, 88 n. 26). Stephen Ash suggests that Polly Adams and Mary Stevens, may both be characters who appear in one of the early fictional accounts which is Haining’s original source (Ash, online). Nevertheless, these “early” assaults on women have details from Jack’s later sightings (leaping and vomiting flames) at a time that he was “still switching between the guises of ghost, bear and devil” (Dash 1996, 25).

Furthermore, the sighting of Jack at Turner Street is pieced together from three sources: Vyner, in his 1961 article, cites an obscure but contemporary report in the *Morning Herald*, but he suggests that this visitation was Jack himself, rather than “one of the Spring-Heeled Jack Gang”. Nor does he mention either a cloak or a crest.⁴ Instead these are details that are added by Haining in his monograph: “For under cross examination the following day, the servant boy swore that on the folds of the man’s cloak, just above the corner which he clutched to his face with his claw-like hand, he had seen *an ornate crest of some kind – and below it, in gold filigree, the initial ‘W’*” (Haining 1977, 52). The testimony contains descriptions of the devilish aristocrat, the crest and the embroidered W, which serve to bolster Haining’s hypothesis that Jack is the *alter ego* of the Henry Beresford, 3rd Marquis of Waterford who lived from 1811 to 1859, whose name often reappears in relation to Spring-heeled Jack (Haining 1977, 53). Jack would be the Mr Hyde aspect of the Marquis’s Dr Jekyll façade, the “other-self-in-the-self” as Hogle describes it. (Hogle 2002, 7). However, it would be unlikely for the Marquis to have gone to such an elaborate effort to disguise himself when any part of his apparel could give a clue as to his identity.

³ Mike Dash references this in an updated version of the study that he presented in the Fortean Times article, see Dash, n. 31 in <http://www.mikedash.com/assets/files/Spring-heeled%20Jack.pdf>

⁴ Dash concedes that Vyner “or some other authority he consulted had access to another, almost certainly contemporary, published account of Jack’s early activities that has otherwise been lost”, see Dash, n. 105 in <http://www.mikedash.com/assets/files/Spring-heeled%20Jack.pdf>

Although there are many other reported sightings it is generally believed that the “pranks” of the first months of 1838 were the work of an individual, but very shortly afterwards there were a number of copycat activities. *The Examiner* newspaper on the 25th March 1838 reported that Charles Grenville, “a tall, ill-favoured young man” had frightened many women and children “by imitating the silly and dangerous pranks of Spring-heeled Jack” although Grenville, who is described as “considered of a weak mind, but perfectly harmless” was discharged when he pleaded that “it was only a bit of fun”. In another example, reported on the 4th April, when the “ghost” leapt out, his victims recognised his voice and he was arrested. He was fined £4 for aggravated assault and was warned that, “If fellows like you think they can frighten respectable females with impunity by imitating the scandalous pranks of Spring-heeled Jack, they will be convinced of their mistake by finding themselves within the walls of Newgate” (*The Morning Post*, 4th April 1838).

Without doubt the antics of Spring-heeled Jack and his imitators had made him a household name, one that may have appealed to the general interest in the Urban Gothic. Just four days after the *Outrage on a Young Lady*, on Monday the 26th February 1838, the first melodrama based on the ghost, *Spring-Heel Jack*, was staged at the Royal Pavilion Theatre. The title-character, *Spring-Heel Jack*, was played by Mr. Graham, as advertised in *The Satirist Newspaper*.⁵

A very different kind of attack is attributed to Jack on Jacob’s Island in Bermondsey on the 12th November 1845. Charles Dickens describes these slums in *Oliver Twist* as containing “every repulsive lineament of poverty, every loathsome indication of filth, rot, and garbage: all these ornament the banks of Jacob’s Island” (Dickens 1954, 381). Here a prostitute named Maria Davis was attacked during the daytime on a bridge over the open sewer called Folly’s Ditch, “eight feet deep and fifteen or twenty wide when the tide is in” (Dickens 1954, 380). It is said that Jack spat blue and white flame into her face, then threw her from the bridge, and she drowned in this culvert.

The root of this story seems plausible: how many “gentlemen”, having taken advantage of the services of a young girl, would then resort to violence to avoid paying afterwards? And the death of a prostitute from the slums, one who had been “reduced to a desolate condition indeed, who seek a refuge in Jacob’s Island” is hardly likely to stir interest among the authorities. Unsurprisingly, a verdict of “Death by misadventure” was recorded, but the locals were less than happy with this and Jack had the crime of

⁵ Mike Dash, pers. comm. (email 1 December 2015). He continues “Spring-Heeled Jack’s audience was not just the working class, another Spring-Heeled Jack piece played at Braham’s upscale theatre in the West End in 1838. The title role was taken by the popular singer-comedian John Pritt Harley (*Actors by Daylight*, 1838, Vol. 1, 14).”; cf. Bell 2012, 182, n.43. A second play, “The Curse of the Wraydons” was written by Maurice Sandoz in 1928 and is based on the 1904 Penny Dreadful series; this was adapted into a film in 1946, directed by Victor M. Gover and starred Bruce Seton as “Jack Wraydon”. This film is also known by the title *Strangler’s Morgue*.

murder added to his charge sheet. Needless to say, the actions recorded in this encounter are out of character (and long after the accepted chronology) for Jack, and this, like many other sensational encounters, is recorded by Haining (Haining 1977, 85–6). Dash argues that “an examination of the surviving London coroner’s records and death certificates shows that no such incident ever occurred”.⁶ Such descriptions – Lucy Scales, Jane Alsop, Maria Davis are all in keeping with male Gothic literary tropes. Anne Williams notes that the female Gothic tradition is to explain the ghosts: this is not the case for Spring-heeled Jack as neither his identity nor his motivation are explained. Furthermore, Williams suggests that the focus of female horror is on terror, however, the descriptions of the Spring-heeled Jack encounters are of a visceral, horrific attack, which only serve to emphasize Jack’s villainy and his violence towards women (Williams 1995, 103–4).

If the Maria Davis encounter was added by Haining, then it may well have been inspired by an episode in the 1863 forty-part “Penny Dreadful” series, titled *Spring-heel’d Jack: the Terror of London*, with the subtitle “A romance of the nineteenth century”. Haining notes that the “Penny Dreadful” series, which developed in the 1860s mostly presented stories of “lurid adventures of youthful heroes” while the earlier stories of the “Penny Blood” series popular in the 1830s through to the 1850s dealt with more adult themes in “Blood and thunder”, and was perhaps related to the *Sturm und drang* style of Gothic novel of the end of the eighteenth century (Haining 1975, 17). While the historical sightings of Jack are to cause terror, the fictional Jack uses his disguise to overcome justice. Quite simply, as Punter and Byron posit, Jack is the “monster” who is “located at the margins of culture”, but it is precisely this kind of monster that highlights hypocrisy, abuse and bullying behavior (Punter and Byron 2004, 263).

In the 1863 (reprinted in 1867) series, it is acknowledged that Jack has a reputation as a highwayman, lying in wait for a passing carriage, as well as those legends that had risen around him of a ghost or a murderer. His appearance is informed by the descriptions given by Lucy Scales and Jane Alsop, “a tall form, whose head and body glower with a blue, phosphorescent fire, from the back of which hung, in graceful folds, a long striped cloak” (SHJ 1867, 23). However, rather than terrorising young women, as reported in 1838, in the “Penny Dreadful” stories, those who fear Jack are generally those who bully and victimise young women, otherwise his image as a “terror” is not maintained:

What his true object could be none have been able to conjecture. Certain it is that robbery was not the cause for he was never known to take a single coin from his victims, even when fright rendered them almost insensible; nor did he ever practice any other degree of cruelty beyond affrightening them (SHJ 1867, 2).

⁶ Dash notes that Haining’s book cites three other instances where Jack has been responsible for the deaths of his victims between 1848 and 1887, “Spring-heeled Jack and the terrified child” <http://blogs.forteana.org/node/105> (accessed 27 November 2015).

That said, Jack acknowledges that he has done wrong things in the past for which he needs to atone, and he still enjoys creative mischief and confusion (SHJ 1867, 3). Even so, one of his early adventures is to save a young woman, Ellen Folder, from her violent and abusive landlord; however, she is still driven to suicide and hurls herself into the Thames.

As his hand was within a few inches of her dress, Ellen sprang away from his grasp, out over the balustrade into the space beyond and disappeared from his sight.

A moment Jack stood like one transfixed to the earth – then on to the seat he sprang, dashed his hat to the ground, and strove to tear his cloak from his shoulders [...] he mounted the balustrade, cast one look down into the black waters beneath, then sprang far, far out from the narrow ledge, resolved to save or perish in the attempt (SHJ 1867, 32).

Jack does indeed save the young woman, as well as a number of other victims of oppression, although he still has occasion to play pranks where he sees fit. In addition, Jack is seen without his mask and is recognised on several occasions. In a passage in the final chapter, Jack is seized by a watchman. Struggling to get free,

Jack's mask slipped from his face, the light flashing from the adjacent lamp flashing on his features he was recognised by the man who held him, and who, in his younger days, had been a servant in his father's family.

"Spring-heeled Jack!" he shouted. "The Mar–"

A heavy blow on the mouth from Jack's fist stifled the word, and released him from the watchman's hold (SHJ 1867, 318).

There are a few places in this series where Jack chooses to remove his mask in order to reveal who he is, and on each occasion he is identified only as "The Mar–". This is an example of the two aspects of Jack's divided self coming together (Davison 2009, 213). Clearly an aristocrat, as he is recognised by the nobility or, as shown above, by a former servant of his family; when facing the "Libertine", Richard Clavering, Jack tells him, "I command here while I remain", even though he is in Clavering's own house (SHJ 1867, 44). Although this is never explained, it is undoubtedly an allusion to the Marquis of Waterford who, as mentioned above, was occasionally named as a possible candidate for Spring-heeled Jack. Local legend describes the "Mad Marquis" in relation to his drunkenness, vandalism and general anti-social behaviour, although Karl Bell acknowledges that the correlation between Marquis and masked prankster are "based on little more than the bad reputation of a drunken hell raiser", and that this is a "lazy supposition" (Bell 2012, 35, 103–6). While there had been some contemporary observation that connected Jack and the Marquis, it is mentioned briefly in *All the Year Round*, although it concludes that "not a shadow of proof could ever be adduced to support this theory" (*All the Year Round*, 9th August 1884, 346). The connection with the Marquis is also

mentioned in Brewer's *Reader's Handbook* (1896). The entry on Spring-Heel Jack describes how:

The Marquis of Waterford, in the early parts of the nineteenth century, used to amuse himself by springing on travellers unawares, to terrify them; and from time to time others have followed his silly example [...] I myself investigated some of the cases reported to me, but found them for the most part Fakenham ghost tales (Brewer 1896, 939).

Some contemporary reports refer to the perpetrator of these attacks as one from the "higher ranks of life" which has been read as a reference to the Marquis as the kind of nobleman who would take a wager to cause terror by appearing in the nine different parishes (Dash 1996, 44, citing *The Times*, 9th January 1838). However, in the 1863 stories, once Jack's mission to protect the vulnerable is completed, and he has been recognised by the watchman, he declares: "This unfortunate discovery renders my presence in England dangerous to my safety. I must fly". Having escaped to the coast, "Jack sprang out over the rock into the glistening sea" while the fates of those that Jack helped are intertwined and all achieve a positive ending (SHJ 1867, 318).

A later series of instalments initially published by Charles Fox around April 1878 and then reprinted in six issues of the *Boy's Standard* between the 18th July and the 22nd August 1885 sets forth an argument that Beresford could not have been Spring-heeled Jack, although the narrator admits that "the manner of proving it does not redound to the noble marquis's credit" (SHJ 1878, 3-4). This story describes how Jack had been involved in incidents between the 4th and 6th April 1837, while the Marquis was tried at the Derby assizes for committing an assault at the Croxton Park Races at Waltham on the Wolds near Melton Mowbray at the time. It continues by erroneously suggesting that the attacks on Jane Alsop and Lucy Scales occurred in 1837, a year earlier than actually reported; even if it could be proved that Polly Adams was attacked in October 1837, the assault at Croxton Park took place six months *before* this. According to these reports, the Marquis and his friend attempted to overturn a caravan and when the watchmen arrived, the marquis challenged one to a fight; the marquis and his "gentleman" friends overwhelmed the watchman and then proceeded to paint him red - they also painted several doors and windows of nearby houses which gave rise to the expression "paint the town red". Thus, when the Marquis was tried and fined, the narrator reports that "our readers will see that this disgraceful affair proves conclusively that the Marquis of Waterford and Spring-Heeled Jack had a separate existence, unless the Marquis was gifted with the power of being in two places at once" (SHJ 1878, 6). Clearly, the emphasis of these details was to ground the story in reality, rather than considering the uncanny motif of the double.

Having dismissed the Marquis from being a possible candidate, the 1878 series then embarks on a story to explain Jack's origins. It begins with accounts from Jane Alsop and Lucy Scales which are very close to the news reports, noting that "these are almost all of

the published facts about this extraordinary man" (SHJ 1878, 13). Thus, this description of events serves to ground the narrative in reality by presenting recorded facts. The narrator claims that he has read the account of Spring-heeled Jack in a manuscript and once again this textual evidence adds credibility to the narrative. The narrator declares,

we have been favoured by the descendants of Spring-Heeled Jack with the perusal of his "Journal" or "Confessions", call it what you will. The only condition imposed upon us in return for this very great favour is that we conceal the real name of the hero of this truly remarkable story (SHJ 1878, 14).

The reason for this secrecy is obvious:

The descendants of Spring-Heeled Jack are at the present time large landed proprietors in the South of England, and although had it not been for our hero's exploits they would not at the present time be occupying that position, still one can hardly wonder at their not wishing the real name of Spring-Heeled Jack to become known (SHJ 1878, 14).

The name that the narrator chooses to call his "hero" is Jack Dacre, born in the Year of Waterloo, and son of a baronet "whose creation went back as far as 1619" (SHJ 1878, 14). This is perhaps an allusion to Charlotte Dacre, author of the Gothic novel, *Zofloya; or, The Moor*. The themes of this novel include the role of patriarchal power, as well as questions of morality, themes we also see in the other Spring-heeled Jack stories. As always in the aristocracy, the elder son inherits the title and the estate and lives up to his income, while the younger is sent away, in this case out to India, with nothing but a good aristocratic education in order to establish his reputation in his own right.

After his father's death, Jack returns to England, although he is shipwrecked en-route and saved by Ned Chump, a sailor who becomes his assistant. At Dacre Hall, Jack discovers his cousin Michael has taken over, and although Jack is welcomed, the reader discovers that Michael has bribed Jack's lawyer, one of the only people who could verify Jack's identity, and further plots Jack's death. When Jack is expelled from the hall, he swears his revenge on Michael and he and Ned construct a device to help him to jump based on the teachings of an Indian *Moonshee* – a Muslim teacher. He also dresses himself in a theatrical gown in the style of Mephistopheles but this is only to collect his due and to strike terror into the guilty. Amongst his adventures, Jack overcomes a corrupt tenant "who had possessed himself of the lease in an unlawful manner" since the tenant's niece is the true owner of the farm, but was being held prisoner (SHJ 1878, 41). The niece consequently represents the "troubled and persecuted virgin" of Gothic stories with no relatives to protect her (Punter and Byron 2006, 137), and, as Kate Fergusson Ellis notes for the young lady's situation more generally, the heroine finds herself in "an enclosed space that should have been a refuge for evil but has become the very opposite, a prison" (Ellis 1989, xiii). Amongst Jack's exploits, he also strikes terror into the heart of his cousin

when he holds up a mail coach in which Michael and his lawyer are travelling. We are told that “Although the newspapers of the time inform us that Jack committed many robberies, there is no doubt that this is incorrect”. Jack may have robbed his cousin and his corrupt lawyer, but he argues that this money belongs to him anyway. He returns hundreds of pounds to the passengers travelling with them.

The story ends with Jack saving a baronet’s daughter from the evil machinations of her stepmother. Once Jack recovers his heritage, he marries the baronet’s daughter. So, the entire story is focused on Jack reclaiming what belongs to him as an aristocrat. He is not like the noble who defends the poor as seen in the folklore of Robin Hood, nor is he villainous (and at the same time romanticised) as in the legends surrounding Dick Turpin. Instead, this story is an “origin myth” of how Jack fashioned his springs. As with all the other “Penny Dreadful” stories, in this story, he doesn’t deserve the epithet “the Terror of London”, particularly in relation to the more brutal stories of attack and violation such as those of Polly Adams and Lucy Scales which are discussed at the beginning of the story. However, as Karl Bell argues, when Jack is presented in the “origin” story, “he had started to conform to the familiar mould of penny dreadful stereotypes, thus weakening his previous individuality” (Bell 2012, 206). Even though the name Jack Dacre is a pseudonym, Jack’s motivations and abilities are all explained, and the mysteries of his character are reduced to him being an aristocrat with a devilish mask and spring-loaded boots; consequently, the character loses his mystique.

Yet the reports of Spring-heeled Jack continued: there was another documented case at the British Army camp at Aldershot in Hampshire which became attached to the sightings of Spring-heeled Jack, even though the appearance was described as a sheet-clad phantom. This incident is discussed in an article by Roman Golicz, entitled *Spring-heeled Jack: A Victorian Visitation at Aldershot*. In March 1877, the report described that during night duty:

A sentry was on duty at the North camp, and about midnight someone came towards him, who refused to answer the usual challenge of “who comes there”, and after dodging about the sentry box in a fantastic fashion for some little time, made off with astonishing swiftness, not however until the sentry had loaded his rifle and fired (*Sheldrake’s Aldershot & Sandhurst Military Gazette*, 17th March 1877, cited in Dash 1996, 17).

This figure was seen again at a second sentry post near the cemetery. The report concluded with a caution that “enjoyment of this kind had better be discontinued before one of the nocturnal pranks leads to unpleasant results” (Dash 1996, 17; cf. Golicz 2006, 2). A second incident was reported on the 18th April where the ghost had sneaked up to the sentry box, attempted to grab the sentry’s rifle and then slapped the sentry in the face before leaping away “with astonishing bounds” (*The Times*, 28th April 1866; discussed by Dash 1996, 19). The sentries involved in this instance were investigated for deserting their

posts (Golicz 2006, 2). His antics were discontinued until the end of August, but then it is reported that Jack had climbed the sentry box and reached down with a dead-cold hand to touch or slap the face with the guard on duty. Jack's identity was eventually uncovered when a sentry bayoneted him in the leg, and the wounded man was revealed to be a subaltern officer (Bell 2012, 40). The Aldershot case was covered by Valentine Dyall in *Everybody's Magazine* in 1954).

The Aldershot sighting appears as only a silly trick played on apprehensive guards on sentry duty where the epithet of Spring-heeled Jack was attached to an apparently ghostly sighting. The popularity of the Jack stories meant there were many copycat incidents and these ensured he didn't remain encased in the pages of the "Penny Dreadful" stories. Another literary voice who described the pranks was Beatrix Potter, whose journal entry for the 1st March 1877 describes how:

There has been a most singular nuisance going on since Christmas around Manchester. A gang of young men calling themselves *Spring-heeled Jacks* have been going about in the dusk and frightening people. They wore India-rubber dresses which would puff up at will to a great size, horns, a lantern and springs in their boots (Potter 1966, 181).

Potter describes them as cowardly bullies and as thieves for they took money, and wonders if they are "Medical Students from Owens College, and it is not impossible". Potter goes on to describe how they frighten a gentleman "inside out of his wits" and a "poor girl who nearly had a fit". However, when authorities send some detectives, one pretends to search for money when confronted with a *Jack*, but instead produces handcuffs (Potter 1966, 181).

Jack's final appearance was reported to have been in Everton in Liverpool during September 1904. This may have also been inspired by the "Penny Dreadful" series published in the same year. It is reported that, over a few nights Jack appeared in his traditional guise of mask, cloak and boots, and jumped some twenty-five feet into the air; however, his exploits seemed limited to amusing himself by beguiling and frightening his audience with his abilities, as he leapt across the terrace roofs. While this was covered by contemporary newspapers, it was reported some decades later that "Jack" was a man suffering from religious mania who shouted "my wife is the devil" and would leap across rooftops to escape the police. The locals witnessing the delusions of a terrified man no doubt merged with the legend of Spring-heeled Jack to create the reported story (*News of the World*, 25th September 1904; *Liverpool Echo*, 19th May 1967; cited in Dash 1996, 21). As Killeen explains, "the ghost story usually ends with an 'exorcism' in which the ghost is evicted from the house and the supernatural evacuated from the natural" (Killeen 2009, 133-4), but in the case of the historical sightings of Spring-heeled Jack, he simply disappears away. While in the published stories of Spring-heeled Jack, the serials finished in 1904, and, by this time, Jack had been given a backstory to provide a logical explanation

for his actions, and he could be perceived as an aristocrat using his statue to correct injustice.

There are other examples of encounters with Spring-heeled Jack, from the south coast of England and Guernsey, as far west as Neath in South Wales and as far north as Edinburgh. Excluding them from this article is dictated by the space available, as well as the issue that many of the encounters may have been fabricated by later writers. While the 1837 reports of the “devil-like gentleman” are most likely more recent fabrications, the attacks on Jane Alsop and Lucy Scales were genuine, most likely the work of one person (or one attacker with an accomplice) even if their attacker was trading on the reputation of ghost stories that had been circulating since the beginning of the century to create the ambiance of fear. After that, it appears that any genuine later attacks were perpetrated by an imitator, or that Spring-heeled Jack has become a convenient scapegoat for an unsolved crime. Other stories still are no more than a product of imagination. Although it is said that some of Jack’s victims “died of fright” such reports are most likely exaggerations. Elizabeth Villiers argues that “Spring-Heeled Jack” should not be included in a list of criminal adventurers since, except by very vague rumour, no actual crime was ever laid to his charge (Villiers 1928, 238). Essentially, there are two versions of Spring-heeled Jack: the historical entity whose role was to terrorise; and the fictional Jack who acknowledged his past transgressions and acted, as Punter and Byron describe, “to police the boundaries of the human, pointing to those lines that must not be crossed” (Punter and Byron 2004, 264). Clearly the story of Jack’s antics, both as the “Terror of London” and of the protagonist of the “Penny Dreadful” stories who protected the vulnerable, caught and held the public’s imagination. It is perhaps of no surprise, then, that the image of Jack, the bloodthirsty haunter of London’s slums, would return to the public’s consciousness in 1888, now armed with a knife and a new sobriquet, Jack ‘the Ripper’, quickly became front page news.

Acknowledgements

A significant debt in Spring-heeled Jack studies is owed to Mike Dash, whose article in *Fortean Studies* contains transcriptions of much of the source material. In addition, his article interrogates genuine reports as well as what he refers to as “Fakelore”. Mike Dash also generously and promptly answered email queries as well as supplying many references that have been cited in this article.

Spring-Heeled Jack Primary Sources

- Anon. 1863. *Spring-Heel'd Jack: The Terror of London*. Reprinted 1867. London: Newsagents Publishing Company. Possibly written by Colin Henry Hazlewood.
- Anon. April 1878. *Spring-Heel'd Jack: The Terror of London*. *The Boys' Standard*. 1st Series. Reprinted 1885. London: Charles Fox. Possibly written by George Sala or Alfred Burrage (Charlton Lea).
- Hook, S. Clarke. June 1897. *The Mystery of Spring-heeled Jack or, The Haunted Grange. The Marvel*. Number 189. London: Alfred Harmsworth.
- Lea, Charlton (pseudonym of Alfred Burrage). 1886. "Spring-Heeled Jack, The Terror of London." 48-part serial. Reprinted 1889. London: Charles Fox, the Aldine Publishing Co.
- 1904. "Spring-Heeled Jack, The Terror of London." 12-part serial. London: the Aldine Publishing Co.
- Monstery, Thomas. 4 March 1885. *Spring-Heel Jack; or, The Masked Mystery of the Tower*. Beadle's New York Dime Library #332.

References

- Adcock, John. "Spring-Heeled Jack in Popular Culture, 1838-2005." <http://john-adcock.blogspot.co.uk/2015/10/spring-heeled-jack-in-popular-culture.html> (accessed 27 November 2015).
- Armitt, Lucie. 2011. *Twentieth-Century Gothic*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Ash, Stephen J. "The Complete Spring Heeled Jack Page." <http://www.dionysos.org.uk/SHJ1.html> (accessed 27 November 2015).
- Bell, Karl. 2012. *The Legend of Spring-Heeled Jack*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Botting, Fred. 1996. *Gothic*. New Critical Idiom Series. London: Routledge.
- Brewer, E. Cobham. 1896. *The Reader's Handbook of Allusions, References, Plots and Stories*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Dash, Mike. 1996. "Spring Heeled Jack: To Victorian Bugaboo from Suburban Ghost." *Fortean Studies* 3. Ed. Steve Moore. London: John Brown Publishing. 7-125.
- "Spring Heeled Jack: To Victorian Bugaboo from Suburban Ghost." Updated online version at <http://www.mikedash.com/assets/files/Spring-heeled%20Jack.pdf> (n.d.) (accessed 27 November 2015).
- "Spring-heeled Jack and the terrified child" <http://blogs.forteana.org/node/105> (accessed 27 November 2015).
- Davison, Carol Margaret. 2009. *Gothic Literature 1764-1824*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Dickens, Charles. 1954. *Oliver Twist*. London: Collins.
- Ellis, Kate Ferguson. 1989. *The Contested Caste: Gothic novels and the Subversion of Domestic Ideology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Golicz, Roman. 2006. *Spring-heeled Jack: A Victorian Visitation at Aldershot*. 2nd Ed. Farnham: Don Namor Press.

- Haining, Peter. 1975. *The Penny Dreadful, or, Strange, Horrid and Sensational tales!* London: Victor Gollancz.
- 1977. *The Legend and Bizarre Crimes of Spring Heeled Jack*. London: Frederick Muller Limited.
- Hogle, Jerrold E. 2002. "Introduction" in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Ed. Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-20.
- Killeen, Jarlath. 2009. *Gothic Literature 1825-1914*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kirkpatrick, Robert. 2013. *From the Penny Dreadful to the Ha'Penny Dreadfuller: A Bibliographic History of the Boys' Periodical in Britain 1762-1950*. London: The British Library (Oak Knoll Press).
- Law, Jonathan. Ed. 2011. *The Methuen Drama Dictionary of the Theatre*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Miles, Robert. 1995. *Ann Radcliffe: The Great Enchantress*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Potter, Beatrix. 1966. *The Journal of Beatrix Potter from 1881-1897*. London: Frederick Warne and Co. Ltd.
- Punter, David and Glennis Byron. 2004. *The Gothic*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Villiers, Elizabeth. 1928. *Stand & Deliver*. London: Stanley Paul & Co. Ltd.
- Vyner, J. 'The Mystery of Springheel Jack', *Flying Saucer Review* vol. 7.3 May-June 1961. 3-6.
- Williams, Anne. 1995. *Art of Darkness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Contributor Details

J.S. Mackley is a Senior Lecturer in English and Creative Writing at the University of Northampton, England. He holds an MA in Late Medieval Studies and a PhD in English, both from the University of York. He has published and spoken widely on his areas of research interests in Medieval Literature, Folklore, Gothic and Fantasy Literature. His publications include *The Legend of St Brendan: A Comparative Study of the Latin and Anglo-Norman versions* (Brill, 2008), and a novel, *The Gawain Legacy* (Cosmic Egg Books, 2014).

E-mail: jon.mackley@northampton.ac.uk